NON-TENURE-TRACK PROMOTION PROCESSING

Office of Faculty Affairs
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PROMOTE - promote.gatech.edu

Please select a process below

- Academic Promotion & Tenure
- Critical Review
- Tenure on Appointment
- Research Faculty Promotion
  - Academic Non-Tenure Track Faculty
PROMOTE User Guides Available

https://docs.tag.gatech.edu

- Candidate Records and Dossiers
  - Adding Candidates and Confirming Candidate Dossiers
  - Helping Candidates with their Dossiers
  - Email Notifications in PROMOTE
- External Review
  - Overview: How to Manage External Reviewers and Evaluators
  - Sending Letter Request Emails to External Reviewers and Evaluators
  - Working in the Details Section of External Reviewers and Evaluators
- Internal Review
  - Academic Faculty Promotion & Tenure Internal Review Workflows
  - Critical Review Internal Review Workflows
  - Overview: How to Manage Internal Review Committees
  - Research Faculty Promotion Internal Review Workflows
  - User Role Breakdown

***Candidate and Committee/Coach user guides and tutorials also available!***
PROCESS TIMELINE

March-May
Faculty Affairs available to work with colleges/units to review list of potential candidates.

January-May
Chair/Unit Head meets with the candidates to determine eligibility and timeline.

March-June
School/Unit Admin creates Candidate Profile in PROMOTE
Candidate uploads a CV, Biosketch (150 word limit), Reflection and Personal Evaluation (Lecturers), CIOS table (if teaching), Job Description (Academic Professionals and Librarians/Archivists), Personal Narrative (Academic Professionals and Lecturers) (3-5 pages), and 3-5 Sample Teaching Materials (Lecturers)/Examples of Creative Work (Academic Professionals and Librarians/Archivists), and Covid Impact Statement and submits their package.

April
Lecturer 3rd Year Reviews due to Faculty Affairs – must follow College/Division process

May-June
Unit Confirmer (College/Division Admin) and Faculty Affairs review package to ensure that all dates, degrees, etc. are correct on the dossier and all uploaded documentation is in the correct format and properly bookmarked. School/Unit sends out External Reviewer Requests.
WHAT SHOULD CONFIRMERS LOOK FOR (CANDIDATE PROFILE)

- Rank dates are correct
- Ensure candidate is eligible to go through the process
- Department is correct and minority department is included and correct for faculty with joint appointments
- Degree list is complete and correct
  - Note that discrepancies would need to be updated in OneUSG and degrees must match the transcript on file in Faculty Affairs
- Prior Credit is correct
- The correct number of External Reviewer Suggestions are entered, and their information is complete
WHAT SHOULD CONFIRMERS LOOK FOR (Components)

- All components are included for Teaching Effectiveness in accordance with Institute and College requirements – can no longer be updated after confirmation

- CIOS table is formatted correctly, includes normative data on the same page as faculty data, and the calculations are correct (Academic Faculty who Teach)

- All additional examples of teaching effectiveness

- Position Description is complete and accurate (for Academic Professionals and Archivists)

- Sample Teaching Materials are uploaded, complete, and accurate (for Lecturers)

- Examples of Relevant Work is uploaded, complete, and appropriate for faculty category

- Personal Narrative is formatted correctly

- CV is in GT format and bookmarked correctly

- Covid Impact Statement is uploaded in “Additional Documents”
  - Can be up to 2 pages long or can be as short as one sentence stating that the candidate experienced no impacts.
## Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Academic Professional</th>
<th>Librarian/Archivist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biosketch</td>
<td>150 word max</td>
<td>150 word max</td>
<td>150 word max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Description</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection and Self Evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Narrative</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback and Evaluation from Others</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Effectiveness (including CIOS w/ Normative Data)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>If the candidate teaches</td>
<td>If the candidate teaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Teaching Materials</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of Relevant Work</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Reviewer Suggestions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXTERNAL REVIEWS

- Required for all academic non-tenure-track promotion candidates.
- The Unit Head or Admin manages the External Reviewer Module.
- The Unit Head (and possibly unit/school/ad-hoc committee) determine whom to contact from the list of potential reviewers, selecting reviewers from both the Supervisor list and the candidate list.
- The Unit Head or Committee Chair contacts potential reviewers.
  - The Unit Head may appoint a delegate in PROMOTE to manage this task.
  - Standard Institute template language is used for all reviewer requests, but a personalized message may be included at the top of the messaged.
- Potential conflicts of interest should be noted by the Unit Head in PROMOTE.
  - In cases where the supervisor is not a unit head, the supervisor should provide this information to the Unit Head and/or Admin.
Before and after review at each level, the Admin at level should ensure:

- Appropriate committees (including Chair/Director and Dean/VP) are created at their respective level, include correct individuals, and have appropriate access. Note that the Committee Chair has the ability to enter votes and upload letters.
- Meeting dates, votes, and all committee members names are included in the letters and the votes in the letters match the votes entered PROMOTE.
- Ensure that no external reviewer names are included in letters; reviewers should be referred to by number only.
- Letter is signed by a committee member/chair/Director/Dean/VP.

Note that the status must be set to “Review in Process” in order for the committee members to see the dossier(s).
• Starting with the past promotion cycle the Institute committee expanded the use of Consent Agenda voting.

• Candidates that unanimous “yes” votes at all lower levels were placed on a proposed Consent Agenda.

• Committee members were able to review all dossiers and given time to pull any candidate of the Consent Agenda for full discussion/vote.

• The Consent Agenda candidates were voted on as a group move forward with promotion.
RESOURCES

- Faculty Handbook - Section 3.2.2
  https://www.policylibrary.gatech.edu/faculty-handbook/3.2.2-non-tenure-track-academic-faculty-members-hiring-and-promotion-guidelines
- Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure webpage
  https://faculty.gatech.edu/faculty-affairs-reps/promotion-tenure
- Promotion and Tenure Calendar (includes dates for all processes)
- PROMOTE User Guides
  https://docs.tag.gatech.edu/
- Memo from Vice Provost
  https://faculty.gatech.edu/sites/default/files/images/memo_academic_professionals_and_lecturers_6-5-2018.pdf