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Overview of RPT

Reappointment Critical Review
- Non-tenured faculty
- During 3rd academic year at GT

Promotion Review
- Asst → Assoc Prof  6th academic year
- Assoc → Prof  6th year after Assoc promotion
- Cases for early promotion

Tenure Review
- After 5 complete academic years, no later than 6
- May include up to 3 years credit for time at previous institutions
- Cases for early tenure
- Can get up to two tenure clock extensions

Periodic Peer Review
- 1st PPR occurs 5 years following tenure, promotion, or award of Regents’ title
- Subsequently, every 5 (or 3) years, depending on outcome
If considering “going up” early or when going for promotion, consult with school chair, others.
HOW TO COUNT TTK YEARS

• When counting tenure track years, the year of review counts towards the year in grade requirement because the review takes a year to complete.

• For example, an ASTP hired in August 2013 with no prior service credit and no tenure clock extensions, would have a review calendar that looks like this:
  ➢ AY 13-14 – Year 1
  ➢ AY 14-15 – Year 2
  ➢ AY 15-16 – Year 3 - critical review year, materials submitted in fall of 2015
  ➢ AY 16-17 – Year 4
  ➢ AY 17-18 – Year 5 – faculty member is early eligible to go up for tenure, materials submitted in spring 2017, results provided in spring 2018
  ➢ AY 18-19 – Year 6 – required year for faculty to go up for tenure
  ➢ AY 19-20 – Year 7 – Terminal Year if tenure not granted

• Remember, GT policy is that faculty member can only go up for tenure two times
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3</td>
<td>Reappointment of TTK Faculty without Tenure (includes critical review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.4</td>
<td>Tenure and Promotion Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.5</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.6</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.7</td>
<td>Promotion and Tenure Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.8</td>
<td>Promotion and Tenure Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.9</td>
<td>Periodic Peer Review Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROMOTION CRITERIA

From Section 3.3.6 of the GT Faculty Handbook, below are the criteria for promotion.

Minimum expectations in all professorial ranks are:

• Superior teaching.
• Outstanding professional service to the Institute, and/or the community.
• Outstanding research, scholarship, creative activity or academic achievement.
• Professional growth and development.
PROMOTION CRITERIA

From Assistant to Associate Professor

• Sufficient time in grade. Generally, five (5) or more years in grade are expected. Three (3) years in grade, at least two (2) of them at Georgia Tech, or two (2) years of relevant professional experience plus two (2) years as an Assistant Professor at Georgia Tech, are a minimum requirement. Credit for previous academic or professional experience should be explicitly stated at the time of employment.

• A doctorate in an appropriate discipline or experience which is of value comparable to the doctorate in preparing the candidate for the role of an educator.

• Clear evidence of effective teaching.

• Clear evidence of creativity while at Georgia Tech.

• Clear evidence of contributions to Georgia Tech in meaningful ways by service to the Institute, to the public, or to appropriate professional organizations.

A candidate for promotion to Associate Professor should satisfy the first four (4) of these qualifications. Marginal qualifications in any of these areas might be compensated for by strength in the fifth.
PROMOTION CRITERIA

From Associate Professor to Professor

• Sufficient time in grade. Generally, six (6) or more years in rank are expected. Three (3) years at the Associate Professor rank, at least two (2) of them at Georgia Tech, or two (2) years of relevant professional experience plus two (2) years as an Associate Professor at Georgia Tech are considered a minimum requirement before promotion. Credit for previous academic or professional experience should be explicitly stated at the time of employment.

• A doctorate in an appropriate discipline or experience which is of value comparable to the doctorate in preparing the candidate for the role of an educator.

• Significant contributions as an educator.

• Clear evidence of significant creativity.

• Evidence that the candidate is making substantial contributions to Georgia Tech by service to the Institute, to the public, or to the profession.

• Broad recognition in terms of visiting professorships, invitations to give papers or seminars, memberships on national committees, offices in professional societies, or other appropriate honors.

A candidate for promotion to Professor should satisfy clearly the first four (4) of these qualifications and should have some demonstrable accomplishments in the last two.
TENURE CRITERIA

From Section 3.3.5 of the GT Faculty Handbook

Minimum expectations in all professorial ranks are:

• Superior teaching, demonstrating excellence in instruction.
• Academic achievement, as appropriate to the mission.
• Outstanding service to the Institute, profession or community.
• Professional growth and development.

Noteworthy achievement in all four (4) of the above need not be demanded, but should be expected in at least two (2).

Tenure may be awarded upon completion of a probationary period of at least 5 years of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor or higher.
P&T PACKAGE COMPONENTS

- Coversheet
- Candidate Bio
- Dean Letter
- College Committee Letter
- School Chair Letter
- School RPT Committee Letter
- Area Committee Letter
- Candidate’s CIOS
- Reference List
- Sample Reference Request Letter
- Reviewer Biosketches
- Reference Letters
- Candidate’s Statement of Accomplishments
- Candidate’s CV
- Candidate’s Statement of Completeness
- Candidate’s Waiver

5 Intellectual Products

Indicates items submitted by candidate

Use CoE CV format
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

• Summary of candidate’s career at Georgia Tech
• 150 word limit, 12 point or larger font
• Written in third person
• First sentence states candidate name, current rank, and school
• Should explain candidate's research area briefly including why it is important
• List candidate’s degrees, give general description of educational and scholarly activities, and name a few major awards
• 1-2 sentences on impact can be included
• No picture
CV FORMAT

• Items required
  ➢ Table of contents
  ➢ Page numbers
  ➢ Date on CV – date CV was generated/submitted
  ➢ 11 points of higher font
  ➢ Margins no less than ¾ inch

• CV must be bookmarked by major sections
  ➢ If the candidate has no data for a heading – keep heading and indicate no data
  ➢ Do not change the headings so that they maintain consistency with Institute format
  ➢ Institute CV format: http://www.academic.gatech.edu/current-faculty/promotion-tenure
CV FORMAT – CHANGES FOR 2018 AND BEYOND

• Institute CV format updated with changes to the following sections
  • Section I: Added Name of Advisor
  • Section II: Added Name of postdoc advisor
  • Section V: Changed name of section to “Education”
  • Section V. C.: Changed name to “Education Innovation and Other Contributions” and revised text to reflect new educational and mentoring programs
CV FORMAT - 2

- CoE version with suggested subheadings – any headings in blue need not be maintained, any in black (Institute) must be maintained.

  https://coe.gatech.edu/sites/default/files/standard-cv-format-for-rpt-05-30-2017-coe_version_032818_0.docx

III. Honors and Awards

List all professional honors and awards, such as teaching citations, research awards, recognitions for outstanding service, honorary degrees, etc.

  A. International or National Awards
  B. Institute or School Awards

- Unfunded proposals, awards, or projects in a nondisclosure phase that you do not want sent to external reviewers, may be put as an addendum to the CV at the end of the CV
COE CV FORMAT

- CoE version is modified to provide consistency across the college on dimensions associated with CoE faculty contributions in scholarship, teaching, and service

- Helpful hints to organize your CV
  - Number your lists – Avoid using bulleted items where numbered items would make the CV easier to evaluate.
  - Separate keynote/plenary talks, invited conference/workshop presentations, and seminars. These have different purposes and audiences and should be listed separately.
  - Separate national/international awards from school/institute awards (Like CoE CV version)
  - Provide proposals submitted not funded as an appendix to the CV on a separate page
COE CV FORMAT - 2

• Helpful hints to organize your CV

• Society and Policy Impacts (Item G) – Examples of what other faculty have included in this section include
  • Media coverage/features/releases (Web, TV, Radio, Print)
  • Descriptions of the impact of candidate’s research relative to field, in industry, or policy (global or national)
  • Activities related to outreach including K-12 students, high school teachers, and under-represented groups in engineering (minorities and women)
  • Participation in local/national science and engineering festivals
CANDIDATE STATEMENT

• 3-5 pages with 10 point min. font with 1 inch margins, single spaced

• Candidate’s “voice” in the package
  ➢ Provide perspective on the candidate’s accomplishments at GT with regard to teaching, research, & service – If all three areas are not covered, dossier will be returned
  ➢ Should point out innovative elements of their scholarship and teaching and its impact
  ➢ Clarify contributions in collaborative work
  ➢ Describe advising styles and results, teaching philosophies, innovations, and responses to teaching evaluations

• Should not summarize examples of the 3-5 intellectual products but rather place them in context of the school, college, Institute, and discipline
CIOS - NEW

• CoE faculty will use the Institute CIOS table going forward based on feedback from the Institute P&T Committee.

• **Must** contain normative data for the Institute and the candidate’s college based on class size (no longer include data for subject) → this data can be found at https://www.academiceffectiveness.gatech.edu/resources/cios/norm_data/

• Faculty members teaching a cross-listed course with a small number of students in each section may combine the scores using the standard table format and use normative data for the combined size

• No additional materials other than the CIOS table can be included for the candidate
EXTERNAL REFERENCES

• Candidates submit 5-8 names (see https://coe.gatech.edu/sites/default/files/coe_guidance_on_soliciting_external_reference_letters-2017-final_032817.pdf)

• Should be ....
  ➢ Full professors or senior leaders in industry research
  ➢ From “clear leaders in the candidate’s field”
  ➢ From Institutions of similar or higher stature than GT
  ➢ For promotion to full – should include international reviewers

• Associate professors should be avoided, but if used must be tenured
• “Generally, the letter writers should not have a personal or professional connection to the candidates”
• If there is a relationship, then it must be declared and the majority of letters must come from those references with no professional or personal connections to the candidate
• Candidates can request a particular individual is not contacted as an external reviewer
LEVELS OF REVIEW – P&T

Turn in Packet Materials

External Reviewers
  Area Committee

School RPT Committee
  School Chair

College Committee
  Dean

Institute Committee
  Provost
  President

Summer/Fall

Early Fall

Fall

January/February
AREA COMMITTEE

• Evaluates the five intellectual products submitted by candidate and provides measure of the candidate’s scholarly impact to the field
• School chair appoints this committee in consultation with the School RPT committee
• Does **not** evaluate the candidate’s teaching or service contributions
• Does **not** provide a vote or opinion on whether the candidate should be awarded tenure and/or promotion
• Usually three tenured faculty members with domain expertise in the candidate’s field of research
• Committee members can be from outside the school and in some rare cases outside the Institute (ex: Emory) if not enough members can be found on campus with enough expertise
SCHOOL LEVEL REVIEW

School Committee –

• Includes a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate’s case on all three criteria, teaching, creativity (research), and service

• Committee should be composed all tenured faculty members at the Professor rank

• **NEW** – Committee letters should include
  • Date of deliberation
  • List/table of votes (instead of “unanimous”)

School Chair –

• Independent assessment of the candidate’s case on the three criteria

• Includes a vote for/against promotion and/or tenure and basis for this judgement

• **NEW** – School Chair letter discusses the candidate’s Critical Review outcome, issues identified, and how the candidate has overcome them.
COLLEGE LEVEL REVIEW

- College Committee -
  - Has 11 committee members, one from each school and 3 at-large members
  - Two committees – ASTP→ASOP, ASOP→PROF
  - School committee members do not vote on cases from their school
  - Anyone with a potential conflict of interest abstinens from the vote on the case
  - Vote is taken by anonymous ballot
  - Makes an independent judgement of the case based on the 3 criteria, includes reasoning for this vote in the letter, and summarizes the merit of the case
  - Letter is addressed to the Dean and signed on behalf of the committee by one member

- Dean –
  - Makes a focused assessment of the case discussing the case’s strengths or weaknesses based on the three criteria
  - Includes a vote and discusses any reasoning in cases where he/she disagrees with the previous votes
  - Letter is addressed to the Provost
INSTITUTE LEVEL REVIEW

• Institute Committee –
  • Composed of all six Deans, and one additional faculty member from CoA, CoB, CoC, and IAC. Two additional faculty members from CoE and CoS
  • Provost chairs committee meeting and determines order of presentation of cases
  • Each Dean presents his/her cases to the committee
  • Provost assigns a second committee member outside of candidate’s college as a 2nd reader to discuss whether candidate’s material is consistent with the Institute’s criteria
  • Vote is taken by anonymous ballot and no letter is written

• Provost and President –
  • Meet and discuss each case
  • Provost makes a recommendation on each case
  • President makes the final decision and notifies the BOR
UPDATING MATERIALS

- Candidate can update CV and addendum for unfunded proposals and nondisclosure items, usually at the start of the fall semester
  
  *(check with your school for the deadline date for this)*

- When update is made candidate must
  - Submit newly dated CV with table of contents and bookmarks
  - New signed and dated statement of completeness matching the date on the new CV

- Subsequent updates or corrections must be submitted as a signed and dated memo in the file with clear information on what is being updated and with a new statement of completeness with date of update
Only submit an update for **definite events** that include

- New significant publications
- Student graduation
- New funding awarded
- New award
- *NOT* publication submissions, proposal submissions, etc. -- items that are possibilities

College will only accept CV updates as an addendum with a new statement of completeness until **October 12, 2018 for P&T and January 10, 2019 for Critical Review**
CRITICAL REVIEW PACKAGE COMPONENTS

• Coversheet
• **Candidate Bio**
• Dean Letter
• College Committee Letter
• School Chair Letter
• School RPT Committee Letter
• Area Committee Letter
• **Candidate’s CIOS**
• **Candidate’s Statement of Accomplishments**
• **Candidate’s CV (with table of contents)**
• **Candidate’s Statement of Completeness**
LEVELS OF REVIEW – CRITICAL REVIEW

Turn in Packet Materials

Area Committee
School RPT Committee
School Chair

College Committee
Dean

Institute Committee
Provost
President

Fall

December/January

February/March/April
COE P&T OUTCOMES: 2012-17

CoE Promotion & Tenure Outcomes -- 2012-2017

- Tenure Total: 75 cases, 85% successful
- Tenure Asst Prof: 62 cases, 84% successful
- Tenure Assoc Prof: 9 cases, 90% successful
- Tenure Prof: 4 cases, 100% successful
- Promotion Total: 113 cases, 88% successful
- Promotion Prof: 62 cases, 84% successful
- Promotion Asst Prof: 51 cases, 93% successful

Legend:
- Red: No
- Blue: Yes
CoE Critical Review Outcomes -- 2012-2017

This data includes repeat cases i.e. more than one case from the same faculty member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes w/counseling</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes w/ warning</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67% of cases resulted in a positive outcome.
Resources

Dr. Pinar Keskinocak  Until June 30, 2018
Interim Associate Dean, COE
Faculty Development & Scholarship
pinar@isye.gatech.edu

Dr. Kimberly Kurtis  After July 1, 2018
Associate Dean, COE
Faculty Development & Scholarship
kim.kurtis@coe.gatech.edu

Dr. Terri Lee
Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs and Accreditation, COE
terril.lee@coe.gatech.edu
WEB RESOURCES

• CoE website  http://coe.gatech.edu/rpt-process

• Faculty Affairs
  http://www.academic.gatech.edu/current-faculty/promotion-tenure

• Research Faculty Promotions
  http://www.research.gatech.edu/faculty-and-staff-resources/research-faculty-promotions

• Faculty Handbook
  http://www.policylibrary.gatech.edu/faculty_handbook

• Board of Regents Policy Manuals  http://www.usg.edu/policies/

• Faculty Governance  http://www.facultysenate.gatech.edu/
QUESTIONS?