

Promotion Process for Academic Professional Faculty in the College of Sciences

This page provides information about the promotion process for faculty in the Academic Professional track in the College of Sciences at Georgia Tech. It augments [section 3.2.2 of the faculty handbook](#) and the Office of Faculty Development guidance [memo](#). It is important for faculty to review these two documents and to follow the procedures described below, some of which are specific to the College of Sciences.

The four ranks of the Academic Professional track at Georgia Tech include: Associate Academic Professional, Academic Professional, Senior Academic Professional, and Principal Academic Professional. Minimum times in rank are generally required for consideration for promotion. However, promotion is not routine: each rank has its own performance criteria. Thus, successful performance at one rank in and of itself does not necessarily imply having met the criteria for the next rank simply with the passage of time.

Minimum expectations for promotion in all Academic Professional ranks should be based on the five (5) criteria listed below. The candidate must demonstrate noteworthy achievement in number one (effective administration) and two of the others.

1. effectively carrying out assigned administrative duties within unit
2. superior teaching and/or educational impact, if applicable
3. outstanding service to the Institute, and/or community
4. outstanding research, scholarship, creative activity, or academic achievement, as defined by role
5. professional growth and development

General Promotion Process Timeline

Candidates should discuss the timeline and the due date of the dossier with the school chair, their supervisor (if it is not the school chair), or school RPT administrator.

Summer

Candidates should review their eligibility to be considered for promotion. The candidate prepares and loads components of the promotion dossier to PROMOTE by late summer (a school administrator may assist in this task). The school chair also adds names of external reviewers. Once everything is loaded, the candidate should review the dossier and click on “submit”. At this point, the package will be “confirmed” by CoS, and it is forwarded to reviewers.

Fall

Once all the review letters have been received within PROMOTE, the school chair reviews the package and submits their review letter with the rest of the dossier, including external review letters, to the Dean’s Office. This is generally due by mid-fall. The case for promotion will then be reviewed by a college-level committee.

Spring

After the college-level review, the package is submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs and it is subject to an institute-level review. Promotion decisions are announced by late spring, to take effect starting on July 1.

The review process

In the College of Sciences, the single required committee review will be conducted **at the college level**, thus there is no school-level committee review. The sequence of reviews is in the following order:

1. School chair (in consultation with the supervisor if the chair is not the supervisor)
2. College committee
3. Dean
4. Institute committee
5. Provost

Preparing the Promotion Dossier

Once eligibility for promotion has been established, the supervisor and candidate should discuss the candidate's readiness for promotion. If both eligibility and readiness are determined, the candidate should: (A) begin preparing the dossier's components, and (B) prepare a list of potential reviewers.

Preparing lists of potential reviewers – the candidate's responsibility and the chair's responsibility

Reviewers should be at "arm's length". They should have a rank equivalent to, or higher, than the rank being sought. Note that all reviewers are external to the College of Sciences.

The candidates should suggest a minimum of four individuals to serve as "arm's length" reviewers:

- For promotion to Senior Academic Professional, the candidate should provide a list containing four (4) individuals who are **external** to the College of Sciences, of which at least two (2) are **external** to Georgia Tech.
- For promotion to Principal Academic Professional, the candidate should provide a list containing four (4) individuals who are **external** to the College of Sciences, of which at least three (3) are **external** to Georgia Tech.

Note that while the candidate suggests names of potential reviewers, the supervisor/chair, **not the candidate**, selects the individuals from whom review letters will be sought.

The term "**arm's length**" refers to the concept that external referees have no close connections or relationships with the candidate. This is desired to increase the likelihood of an objective assessment. This does not mean that the candidate must never have met the reviewer. Indeed, networking at conferences and panels, and meeting with visitors to campus, are good ways of identifying potential reviewers.

The following are examples of those who should **not** be included among the list of suggested reviewers:

- Anyone who has previously served as a supervisor or mentor of the candidate (e.g., undergraduate, doctoral and post-doctoral advisors, and employers)
- Past or current collaborators of the candidate
- Colleagues in the same department as the candidate at some time in the past

- Relatives and personal friends
- Individuals external to Georgia Tech who had prior employment at Georgia Tech

The supervisor/chair should solicit some letters from additional “arms length” external reviewers not suggested by the candidate. These may include, for example, those in the Academic Professional or Lecturer tracks at other USG Research Universities (e.g., UGA, GSU), lecturers with security of employment (UC system), and other equivalent positions; and tenured faculty who are in a position to provide insights into the accomplishments of the candidate (e.g., department leaders, other faculty).

The chair collects a minimum of three “arm’s length” review letters:

- At least **one** should come from an individual not suggested by the candidate.

Components of the Dossier - Candidate’s Responsibility

The following five components are prepared by the candidate and uploaded to PROMOTE as separate files. The candidate also completes a Waiver of Right of Access prior to submission of their components.

Biosketch

The biosketch consists of no more than 150 words summarizing the candidate’s background, including education, a description of the individual’s role, and accomplishments in the current position, including awards. This should be written in third-person. The biosketch component is a text field in PROMOTE. It needs no titles or headers.

Position Description

The position description should be developed in consultation between the candidate and their supervisor.

- The description should be a maximum of two pages, usually in the form of a bulleted list.
- The description should state current professional responsibilities in a small set of broad areas (i.e., classroom instruction, instructional support, advising, supervision of GTAs, laboratory coordination, program evaluation, scholarship, etc.) with a brief description of each.
- The candidate must provide the percentage of time dedicated to each area.

If duties are to change after promotion, these changes should be outlined in a separate paragraph or list.

Personal Narrative

This statement is limited to a maximum of five pages. It is the candidate's voice in the promotion package. It should provide perspective on, and context for, the candidate's accomplishments at Georgia Tech in the areas of instruction, service, and scholarship.

Curriculum Vita

The CV must be in the Institute standard format (including a table of contents) for Academic Professionals. Main headings of the PDF file must be bookmarked before loading onto PROMOTE (the school's RPT administrator may be able to assist with this).

Examples of Relevant Work (three to five files)

- Candidates should add a cover sheet to the first example of relevant work that provides a bullet list to briefly describe each example.
- Any student information included in portfolio items must be redacted in accordance with FERPA.
- Dossiers have typically included examples of creative work from a variety of different job functions described in the position description.
 - These examples should be the work of the candidate and should be based on work completed in the current position.
- Below are some examples of creative work from recent dossiers:
 - Advising materials
 - Orientation materials
 - Published papers
 - Funded proposals
 - Annual of final reports for a grant
 - Course syllabi
 - Curricula materials, including lab activities
 - Course materials developed for multiple sections coordinated by the candidate
 - TA training materials
 - Conference and/or poster presentations

Note, the Additional Documents component is not utilized in the College of Sciences.

Waiver of Right of Access

Within PROMOTE the candidate will sign the Waiver of Right of Access and submit the dossier before the chair/supervisor sends the dossier for external reviewer. Once the dossier is submitted, no more changes can be made. Updates to the CV can be made later in the form of up to two addenda, typically before the college-level review (late December) and/or before the institute-level review (late January).

Components of the Dossier - School's Responsibility

The school RPT administrator will arrange for the remaining components:

Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching Effectiveness is one PDF file containing:

- The DOTE report that summarizes instructional effectiveness, utilizing CIOS data as well as classroom visits. Please note, this is one report/summary, not multiple separate teaching observations. The candidate should see this report so that any areas of concern can be addressed in the candidate's personal narrative.
- CIOS table (in landscape orientation). The template for CIOS scores is on OFA's website, but CoS has constructed an [example](#), which requests weighted averages of multiple sectioned lectures be calculated. All lecture and lab classes (where candidate is instructor of record) should be included on the CIOS table. Include [normative data](#) (from the Office of Academic Effectiveness' website).

Soliciting reviews

Through PROMOTE, the school sends the candidate's documents to the selected external reviewers for review.

External letters

The RPT administrator and/or chair will follow up with external letter writers to ensure the letters arrive by the deadline.

External reviewer biosketches

If the external reviewer does not provide this via PROMOTE, the school will need to write 150 words maximum per biosketch for each external reviewer that submits a letter.

Supervisor's letter

The Chair, in consultation with the supervisor (if the chair is not the supervisor) will provide a letter of evaluation addressed to the dean. This letter should provide an analysis of the candidate's experience and performance using the relevant criteria, a summary of external letter feedback, and a recommendation for or against promotion. ***External reviewer names must not appear in the supervisor's letter, only reference to their reviewer number.*** Additional professional responsibilities to be undertaken upon promotion should also be described.

Past Examples of Demonstrated Superior Performance

Besides the requirement of a terminal degree and time in rank, promotion to the rank of Senior Academic Professional "requires evidence of superior performance in the chosen field, recognition by peers (whether national, regional, or local), and successful and measurable related experience."

Promotion to the rank of Principal Academic Professional requires, in addition, "successful and measurable related experience including but not limited to supervision of others' work, significant responsibility and authority within program area, and demonstrated impact."

The following are examples of activities that have been recognized as valuable contributions by recent review committees. ***This is not a checklist of requirements.*** The specific ways in which individuals

demonstrated some of these characteristics varies widely, which is understandable given the broad scope of duties of non-tenure-track academic faculty.

Some of the characteristics of recent dossiers for promotion to Senior Academic Professional were:

- excellence in instruction
 - required for all non-tenure track faculty who have an instructional role
 - successful execution, and emerging independent leadership in areas related to assigned duties
 - contributions in areas beyond those in the original job description; an expanding scope of responsibilities
 - external engagement (e.g., participation in regional/national workshops/conferences that are relevant to the position)
 - initiating/completing programs that have a high impact on student- learning/advising/experiences related to the position. Candidates had obtained significant funds to support these programs (programs included, for example, lab instruction, student financial aid, undergraduate research, other experiential learning, etc.)
 - a record of bringing evidence-based instructional approaches to the role at GT (e.g., from workshops/conferences/literature) and influencing others in the unit to adopt these practices
 - a record of disseminating work at GT to internal and external constituencies (e.g., through conferences, publication)
-

Some of the characteristics of recent dossiers for promotion to Principle Academic Professional were:

- excellence in instruction
 - required for all non-tenure track faculty who have an instructional role
- sustained independent leadership in areas related to assigned duties
- a broad set of contributions, at a high level, in areas beyond those in the original job description
- a sustained record of external engagement (e.g., participation in regional/national workshops/conferences that are relevant to the position)
- a record of sustaining programs that have a high impact on student- learning/advising/experiences that are central to, and expand on, the mission of the unit. Candidates had obtained significant funds to support these programs (programs included, for example, lab instruction, student financial aid, undergraduate research, other experiential learning, etc.)
- institute-level or external recognition of service, advising, teaching and/or scholarship (through, for e.g., awards, peer-reviewed papers, peer-reviewed nationally-competitive grants, etc.)
- extensive service engagement in campus-wide initiatives with evidence of growing leadership
- a strong record of supervision (which may include non-tenure track faculty and classified staff, as well as extensive supervision of teams of graduate teaching assistants)