## Proposed Changes

### Request:

Colleges currently vary in the length of summary they have been allowing. A task force reporting to the Provost has recommended more flexibility than 3 pages and a limit to 5 pages.

### Format for Promotion and/or Tenure Packages: Guidelines for Candidates

It is important that all candidates follow as closely as possible the same format in preparing the documentation for promotion and/or tenure packages, although some flexibility should be allowed. All candidates must include a copy of their curriculum vitae. The candidates should also write a brief summary of their major accomplishments at Georgia Tech with regard to teaching, research, and service. These personal narratives shall be three (3) to five (5) pages with one-inch margins, standard single-spaced and 10 pt minimum font. The candidates also are required to submit evidence of three (3) to five (5) examples of their relevant, creative capabilities. These may include published papers, books, software, patents, art productions, or other relevant examples.

### Current

#### 3.3.9 PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES

- **Request:**
  Colleges currently vary in the length of summary they have been allowing. A task force reporting to the Provost has recommended more flexibility than 3 pages and a limit to 5 pages.

- **Format for Promotion and/or Tenure Packages: Guidelines for Candidates**
  It is important that all candidates follow as closely as possible the same format in preparing the documentation for promotion and/or tenure packages, although some flexibility should be allowed. All candidates must include a copy of their curriculum vitae. The candidates should also write a brief summary of their major accomplishments at Georgia Tech with regard to teaching, research, and service. These personal narratives should be limited to three (3) pages with one-inch margins, standard single-spaced and 10 pt minimum font. The candidates also are required to submit evidence of three (3) to five (5) examples of their relevant, creative capabilities. These may include published papers, books, software, patents, art productions, or other relevant examples.
### Proposed Changes

#### Request:
Period Peer Review (PPR) is a faculty-led process with no decisions made outside the colleges. The President has no role except when a faculty member has appealed a PPR result through the Faculty Status and Grievance Committee.

#### Communication of Outcome of Five (5) and Three (3) Year Reviews:
The committee shall submit to the School Chair and Dean:
- PPR Committee report
- Supporting documentation
- Chair’s assessment of Faculty member’s goals and performance

The Dean shall provide a copy of all documents to the Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Faculty Affairs; the Vice Provost’s Office, through Faculty Affairs, maintains all files of reviews.

The Dean (Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Faculty Affairs for Colleges without Schools) shall transmit a letter and all documentation to the Faculty member.

### Current

3.3.10 PROMOTION PEER REVIEW POLICY

#### Communication of Outcome of Five (5) and Three (3) Year Reviews:
The committee shall submit to the School Chair and Dean:
- PPR Committee report
- Supporting documentation
- Chair’s assessment of Faculty member’s goals and performance

The Dean shall provide a copy of all documents to the Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Faculty Affairs; the Vice Provost’s Office, through Faculty Affairs, maintains all files of reviews.

The Dean (Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Faculty Affairs for Colleges without Schools) shall transmit a letter and all documentation to the Faculty member.

Upon conclusion of the review process, the President shall send a letter to the Faculty member indicating the outcome, with a copy to the Unit Head and/or Dean. For Three (3) Year Follow-up Reviews, the President shall transmit a final decision after considering the FSGC’s recommendation, if the FSGC was involved.
## Proposed Change in Section 3.1.2 of the Faculty Handbook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1.2 FACULTY SALARIES AND EVALUATIONS</strong>&lt;br&gt;Statutes Committee suggests strengthening statement to comply with Board of Regents policy and SACS expectations.</td>
<td><strong>3.1.2 FACULTY SALARIES AND EVALUATIONS</strong>&lt;br&gt;Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 8.3.5&lt;br&gt;Annually, each Faculty member shall receive a written performance evaluation from their Unit Head. In addition, the Faculty member will discuss this review with the Unit Head and will sign a statement to the effect that the Faculty member has received the written review. The Faculty member will have the opportunity to respond, in writing, to the evaluation and to receive a written response from the supervisor to the comments of the Faculty member. Both the Faculty member's comments and the response will then become part of the record. The Institute will ensure that the individuals responsible for conducting performance evaluations are appropriately trained to carry out such evaluations. The evaluation procedures may also utilize a written system of peer evaluations, with emphasis placed on the Faculty member's professional development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>