Georgia Institute of Technology

School of Materials Science and Engineering

Faculty Policy and Committee Handbook

GT Reference: http://www.policylibrary.gatech.edu/faculty_handbook

Overall Update: 3/4/2020

Introduction

The purpose of this handbook is to document the policies of the School of Materials Science and Engineering (MSE), and by-laws, charges, responsibilities, and procedures of the various committees in the School. It provides the corporate memory for the School in these matters.

Standing Committees

The standing committees of the School's Faculty are as follows:

- Faculty Advisory Committee
- Faculty and Staff Awards Committee
- Seminar Committee
- Graduate Program Committee
- Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee
- Faculty Search Committee
- Undergraduate Program Committee

Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC)

Purpose

The FAC will serve as the focal point for faculty participation and input with respect to the governorship of the school—its vision, philosophy, and policies, and will provide this feedback to the school chair.

Function

The FAC will meet on an as-needed basis to discuss topics of concern/interest regarding the school, and invite faculty participation at those meetings. The FAC will report to the faculty, typically at faculty meetings, summarizing topics discussed and consensus opinions.

The FAC will be available to faculty who wish to raise sensitive issues/concerns regarding the school. The FAC may then decide to advocate on behalf of this individual or idea, anonymously if appropriate, in a meeting with the school chair, or at a faculty meeting.

The FAC will be available to the school chair and associate chairs for consultation on issues regarding the school. However, it operates independent of the school administration hierarchy and will self-determine the attendees at its meetings and its involvement on charges given to it by the faculty or the school chair.

The committee will function as the faculty-elected entity for down-selecting committee members (and chairs) for tenured faculty Periodic Peer Review Committees. The FAC will also select a faculty committee for periodic (at least annual) review of the school budget, with direct access to

all school budgetary information (income and expenditure details) provided to this committee. The FAC will recommend to the Dean of Engineering the faculty members who should comprise the Review Committee, and the faculty member who should Chair the Review Committee, for each five-year review of the Chair of the School of Materials Science and Engineering. The FAC will also review and make recommendations to the School Chair on Adjunct and Courtesy Faculty Appointments and Reappointments.

(Policy updated 9/20/16)

Composition

The FAC will consist of eight members, who can be any tenured or tenure-track faculty member in the school with a 50% or greater appointment. Four committee members will rotate off after a two-year term.

Once the FAC is chosen, it will elect a chairman at its first meeting.

The "starting" FAC will be selected by secret vote of the faculty at a faculty meeting. At least nine candidates, if possible, must be nominated for down-selection to the eight members. Faculty members may self-nominate or be nominated by another, so long as they agree to participate. By secret ballot, faculty will list eight (different) faculty that they wish to have on the committee. The elected members of the "starting" committee will then be determined based on the top-eight vote-earning candidates.

The "starting" committee was formed in September 2012. Each two-year period after that date, 4 members will rotate off and 4 new members will be elected by the faculty in a similar fashion as described above. In 2012, the FAC internally decided who rotated off. Thereafter, rotation will be based on maintaining equal service time periods for all members.

In the event a committee member leaves before the end of the two-year term, a replacement will be elected by the faculty to complete the remainder of the term.

(Policy updated 10/20/2015)

Faculty and Staff Awards Committee

The Faculty Awards Committee will promote the recognition of faculty and staff accomplishments. They will select potential nominees for awards and select nominees for awards that limit the number of nominees from MSE. The staff committee member will coordinate the collection of supporting documents and ensure deadlines are met and will maintain an awards database.

Seminar Committee

The Seminar Committee is responsible for the MSE Seminar series. It solicits nominations, selects speakers, and provides logistical services to the seminar speakers and their hosts. The faculty host

coordinates the logistics and meetings schedule with the assistance of a staff member. Typically, no seminars are held during the summer.

General Guidelines: The School reimburses the speaker for the round-trip economy airfare, parking, and ground transportation and pays for one night at the GT Hotel & Conference Center, when available. Typically, the seminars are held at 4:00pm in one of the auditorium spaces available, such as that in the MARC Callaway building.

Graduate Program Committee

The Graduate Committee is responsible for the MSE School's graduate programs curriculum, graduate student fulfillment of requirements, qualifying examination, and other issues related to graduate education.

Section 3.3.1 of the Faculty Handbook of the Georgia Institute of Technology (December 2013) provides for a school's responsibility for its curriculum, reading in part as follows:

> The Faculty of a Department of Instruction shall, subject to the direction of the Academic Faculty, be responsible for the program of studies offered by the Department. The Faculty of a Department may recommend such changes and modifications in its curriculum as it may deem desirable and shall have the power to fix prerequisites for courses which it offers.

The charges and responsibilities of the Graduate Committee are as follows:

- Review and approve all changes to course syllabi and pre-requisites.
- Review and approve curriculum changes.
- Review and approve all new courses.
- Periodic review of cross-listed courses.
- Present committee meeting recommendations to the MSE Faculty for vote regarding charges, responsibilities, and procedures.
- Maintain active course listing and outline.
- Approve thesis and dissertation reading committees.
- Approve graduate student programs of study.
- Evaluate and approve proposed new graduate degree and certificate programs.
- Establish dates of Ph.D. Qualifying Exams.
- Review and approve graduate student petitions pertaining to graduate program requirements.
- Provide feedback on the School's graduate student handbook.
- Any other issue pertaining to graduate education.

The committee's chair shall be the Associate Chair for Graduate program. Other members shall consist of those faculty members who advise the school's graduates and other faculty members

who may be appointed by the School Chair. The Academic Office staff member primarily responsible for overseeing the graduate program shall serve as the committee's secretary.

Approval of New Courses

The typical approval process for a new graduate course is as follows:

- A faculty member requests that the course be approved as a Special Topics course (e.g., MSE 8803).
- After the course has been taught at least once or twice as a Special Topics course, a faculty member requests approval as a permanent course with a permanent course number.

Any faculty member who wishes to propose a new course (either Special Topics or permanent) should forward the following to the Chair of the Graduate Committee:

- Cover letter requesting approval of the course by the Graduate Committee.
- Completed New Course Proposal Form (available at the Institute's Graduate Curriculum Committee's website: http://icc.gatech.edu/)
- Course syllabus, including, but not limited to, course outcomes, target audience, pre-requisites, textbook, list of topics, grading policies, topical outline.
- The request should conform to the Institute Graduate Curriculum Committee's guidelines.

The Graduate Committee will review the course proposal and act upon the request. If approved, the course proposal will be brought to the School Faculty at one of its meetings for consideration.

Approval of Thesis and Dissertation Reading Committees

A student and her or his advisor should select an appropriate reading committee, following the requirements for committee composition in the MSE Graduate Handbook and according to the Institute's guidelines. The student should prepare and submit either the Request for Approval of Master's Thesis Topic form or the Request for Admission to Ph.D. Candidacy form to the MSE Academic Office. The forms are found at http://www.grad.gatech.edu/theses-dissertations-forms and should be signed by the student and her or his advisor and other committee members. The Request for Approval of Master's Thesis Topic form should be submitted no later than the term before graduation. The Request for Admission to Ph.D. Candidacy should be signed on the day of the proposal defense, which is generally the term following successfully completing the qualifying examination. If a proposed committee member is not a Georgia Tech faculty member, a bio-sketch of that proposed member including educational background, academic/work experience, and representative publication record (if any) must accompany the form. The advisor must inform the School Graduate Committee in the event that the dissertation contains any proprietary information that will require a delay in the placement of the dissertation in the Georgia Tech Library.

The proposed reading committee will be screened for conformance with the Institute's requirements by the Chair of the Graduate Committee. Institute requirements are found at http://www.grad.gatech.edu/thesis/thesis_man.html

Review and Approval of Graduate Student Petitions

The Graduate Committee will review, deliberate, and take appropriate action on graduate student petitions pertaining to the graduate program requirements. The petition must be submitted in writing to the MSE Academic Office and must contain the following:

- Petition form available at the Registrar's website:
   http://registrar.gatech.edu/students/formlanding/forms_records.php.
- A letter from the student outlining the reasons/justification for the petition.
- Appropriate documentation in support of the student's petition, including advisor's approval.

The student will be informed as to the disposition of the petition after the MSE Graduate Committee has taken action.

Periodic Peer Review (PPR)

How the PPR Process Works

All tenured academic faculty, including administrators, undergo a Periodic Peer Review (PPR) every five years. This review assesses effectiveness in teaching, research, service, and professional activities. It is conducted by a committee of faculty peers.

The MSE PPR Committee will consist of at least three members. Full time MSE faculty members going up for PPR should nominate at least four suitable (i.e., satisfying the eligibility conditions outlined in this paragraph) faculty members from the academic faculty of the School of Materials Science and Engineering to serve in their PPR committee. The Faculty Advisory Committee (elected body of the MSE faculty) will then select the final PPR committee of at least three faculty members, including the committee chair, from this list of at least four faculty members provided by the faculty member going up for PPR. Faculty members with close to 33% appointment in another unit should nominate at least three suitable faculty members from MSE and two suitable faculty members from the secondary unit. Those with close to 50% appointment in another unit and primary appointment in MSE should nominate three suitable faculty members from MSE and three suitable members from the secondary unit. The Faculty Advisory Committee will ensure that at least one faculty member in the PPR committee will be from the secondary unit for faculty members with close to 33% appointment in another unit and at least two members of PPR committee will be from the secondary unit for those with close to 50 % appointment in another unit. In both cases at least two members of the PPR committee should be from MSE, such that the majority of the PPR committee members should not be from the secondary unit. All PPR committee members should be tenured, non-administrative faculty members in Georgia Tech with the same or higher academic rank compared to the person undergoing PPR. The FAC may add additional conditions on the selection of the PPR committees with a majority vote by the MSE academic faculty.

(Approved by Faculty vote and Updated 1/20/2015)

Process and Package Contents for Periodic Peer Review

For more details, see Section 3.3.9 of the Faculty Handbook and the Georgia Tech Faculty Affairs website at http://www.facultyaffairs.gatech.edu/current-faculty/promotion-tenure

1. The Periodic Peer Review Committee must be selected by the school Faculty Advisory Committee. The school level PPR committee is comprised of tenured, non-administrative, academic faculty. The committee should consist of at least three members. The school faculty specifies the composition of the committee. The school faculty should also determine if faculty holding administrative appointments are eligible to serve on the school level PPR committee.

2. Packages including the following items are prepared by the candidate and submitted to the school chair:
   a) Approved Individualized Evaluation Criteria – This plan should be between the school chair and the faculty member. Default criteria are teaching, research, and service. Alternative criteria may be applied depending on a faculty member's shifting roles in the institute. When the default criteria are not used, this section should include any written communications between the School Chair and the faculty member describing the alternative review criteria.
   b) Periodic Peer Review Statement of Completeness - It is the candidate's responsibility to prepare and review his/her package after it is assembled and sign a statement to that it is accurate and complete.
   c) Faculty Statement of Accomplishments and Goals - This statement should focus on the candidate's most noteworthy accomplishments for the years under consideration, as well as, a multi year plan for the next five years of professional growth and activity in teaching, service, and research.; five page maximum.
   d) Current Vita - In standard institute format used for promotion and tenure.
   e) Course/Instructor Opinion Survey (CIOS) Results – Teaching effectiveness scores for the last 5 years should be included in a table summary format. This summary format is the same format as for P&T. Other information that is relevant to evaluate teaching effectiveness may be included as well.

3. School Chair Letter and Performance Summary (provided by the school chair) The school chair will write a letter to the school PPR committee summarizing the performance evaluations of the past five years and assessing the reviewee's goals and plans for the next five years based upon the agreed criteria. The school chair does not provide a recommendation of a 3 year or 5 year result. This letter is provided to the school PPR committee.

4. Institute PPR Cover Sheet (provided by school RPT coordinator)

5. School Level PPR Committee Letter (provided by committee chair)
   A committee of tenured, academic faculty of the school in which the faculty member has primary appointment, will prepare a letter addressed to the reviewee, to include performance commendation, critique of substandard performance, recommendations for corrective action, an overall evaluation score (5 or 3 years), and a record of the committee

vote. <u>All members of the PPR committee will sign the coversheet and the letter.</u> This letter will be added to the PPR package and forwarded to the dean.

6. Office of the Dean
    The letter of the school level review committee, along with all supporting documentation including the school chair's assessment of reviewee's goals, will be transmitted to the dean. The dean will then transmit a copy of the package along with the review results to the reviewee and the Office of Faculty Affairs.

Criteria for Periodic Peer Review

The default criteria for PPR are teaching, research and service. Alternative criteria may be applied, but an understanding, confirmed in writing, must be reached between the school chair and the faculty member before the evaluation begins.

Eligibility for Periodic Peer Review

Tenured faculty, reviewed every five years.

In the case of Regents' Professors, their appointments and reappointments may count as a replacement for PPR. For those receiving permanent reappointment, the review may be considered as a one-time replacement for PPR.

Decisions for PPR

Review outcomes will include a decision that the next review will occur after either 5 or 3 years. Reviewee's identified by the review committee as having deficiencies will be recommended for a 3-year review. In this case, the committee must clearly state the basis for that decision. A 5-year decision indicates no deficiencies; the faculty member's next review will be in 5 years. Faculty members receiving a 3-year result are required to meet with the school chair and dean to create a development plan.

(PPR Process updated 9/21/10)

Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee Best Practices Guidelines

For more details, see: https://coe.gatech.edu/rpt-process.

Types of Reviews

Full Reviews: All decisions regarding promotion and tenure are "full" reviews.

Third Year Critical review: The third year review, often referred to as a "critical" review, is also a full review, except that external letters are not required.

Administrative Review: All other reviews are deemed to be "administrative". Administrative reviews are internal to the College of Engineering (CoE), but can involve a full review if deemed necessary by the School Chair, the CoE Dean, or requested by the candidate.

Full and Critical reviews go through all Institute levels for review through to the Georgia Tech President.

Types of Decisions

Promotion and Tenure: Each RPT Committee member's vote shall specify recommendation of one of two outcomes with regard to promotion and/or tenure: (i) in favor of or (ii) opposed to. If an RPT Committee member abstains from voting, it shall be recorded as such. Abstention from voting is strongly discouraged.

Third Year 'Critical' Review: Each recommendation will specify one of four outcomes:
- "Reappointment" signifies a positive performance of the faculty member toward promotion and/or tenure.
- "Reappointment with Counsel" signifies that while the faculty member's performance is regarded as positive overall, improvements in one or more categories of activity are needed to ensure the candidate's successful progress toward promotion and/or tenure.
- "Reappointment with Warning" indicates that significant problems exist in one or more categories, such that continuation of the existing pattern of activity is likely to result in a failure to achieve either promotion or tenure.
- "Non-Reappointment" signifies that the faculty member's performance is such that there is little or no possibility of the candidate meeting the promotion and/or tenure requirements. The candidate will not receive a contract beyond the following academic year.

Guidance to Candidates on Preparation of Documentation

Reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions are based on criteria spelled out in the Georgia Institute of Technology Faculty Handbook. Information regarding format and content of documentation can be found at the Georgia Tech Faculty Affairs website: http://www.facultyaffairs.gatech.edu/current-faculty/promotion-tenure and Section 3.3.8 Promotion and Tenure Procedures

It is the faculty member's responsibility to assemble the portfolio of accomplishments relative to the criteria described in the Faculty Handbook.

Intellectual Products: Selection of manuscripts/reports should consist of a candidate's top five intellectual products.

References: Suggested names should be senior experts in the field represented by the scholarship of the candidates. Generally, the letter writers should not have a personal or professional connection to the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor, postdoctoral mentor, research collaborator). If letters from these individuals are solicited, they must be in addition to those normally required and identified as such. Letters from references not listed by the candidate must also be solicited as determined by the School Chair and RPT Chair, as appropriate. It is acceptable to use the same reference letter for two consecutive years of the process.

External reference letters: Letters to external referees ask for 1) a candid assessment of the creativity, impact, productivity, and promise of the candidate's creative contributions, based on the top five intellectual products included in the package, along with any knowledge of other contributions, 2) comments on particular aspects of the candidate's creative contributions in research and scholarship and an assessment of impact on the field, 3) comparison of the candidate to the leaders, by name, in their field of creative contribution at a similar career stage.

External evaluations shall be solicited by the Unit Head(s) with the understanding that, in so far as possible, access to them will be limited to persons involved in the promotion/tenure decision. All candidates will be asked to sign a waiver indicating whether or not the candidate "waives all rights to see the identity of the external letter writers and/or the content of their letters." The waiver form with the candidate's decision will be included in the package.

Area Committee

For more details, see: https://coe.gatech.edu/rpt-committee-guidelines.

The purpose of the area review letter is to report the committee's evaluation of the intellectual products submitted by the candidate and to provide measures of scholarly impact. The area committee is typically composed of three tenured faculty members with domain expertise in the candidate's field of research; area committee members can be from the candidate's unit or can be interdisciplinary in composition. The letter should include a detailed explanation of the committee's examination of the submitted intellectual products, including placing the candidate's contributions in context and commenting on the importance and measurement of scholarly impact of the work.

The letter does not evaluate the candidate's teaching or service contributions. The letter does **NOT** discuss grants or funding. The letter does **NOT** discuss quantity/productivity of research publications and/or presentations. The letter does **NOT** include a recommendation on the final outcome of the case. The letter does **NOT** contain a committee vote.

The Area/Internal/Research Committee's letter **is addressed to the School Chair and written on the committee chair's school letterhead**. In addition to the School Chair, the letter will be read and interpreted by the
- School RPT Committee
- COE RPT Committee, composed of faculty from every engineering school
- Dean of Engineering
- School Chairs from every engineering school
- Provost Advisory Committee aka Institute RPT Committee, composed of the Deans of each college, faculty from each college, and the Vice Provosts
- Provost, and
- President.

In addition, in recent years many of the candidates have been requesting and receiving a copy of his/her RPT packets at the end of process, so the candidate is likely to eventually read the committee letter.

The Area/Internal/Research Committee's letter is from everyone on the committee. **Every member should sign the letter to confirm his/her participation in the case evaluation, and careful review of the committee letter.**

Letters should
- Cover all aspects of the committee's evaluation, explaining strengths and concerns, placing the candidate's contributions in context and commenting on the importance and the measurement of scholarly impact of the work, relative quality of journals where published, etc. There will be future readers of the committee letter who are not in engineering and will appreciate the perspective provided.
- Be careful not to be side-tracked by a single issue that dominates the evaluation and/or the letter contents.
- Reflect the committee discussion and evaluation. The tone of the letter should be consistent with the evaluation; e.g., a very positive letter should be the outcome of a very positive evaluation but not the opposite.
- Explicitly disclose all real or potential perceptions of conflicts of interests that committee members have with the candidates (e.g., committee member X served as a Co-PI on grant XXX with the candidate in 20XX; committee member Y co-authored YY papers with the candidate, none of which are part of the intellectual products under review;) and state that the committee member with the potential conflict has made an honest effort not to be influenced by it in his/her evaluation.
- Be kept confidential at all times.

School Committee
For more details, see: https://coe.gatech.edu/rpt-committee-guidelines.

The purpose of the letter is to report the school committee's evaluation of the case. It includes the vote count and a complete explanation of the committee's comprehensive examination of the case.

The School RPT Committee's letter is **addressed to the School Chair** and **written on school letterhead**. In addition to the School Chair, the letter will be read and interpreted by the
- COE RPT Committee composed of faculty from every engineering school
- Dean of Engineering
- School Chairs from every engineering school
- Provost Advisory Committee aka Institute RPT Committee, composed of the Deans of each college, faculty from each college, and the Vice Provosts
- Provost
- President.

In addition, in recent years many of the candidates have been requesting and receiving a copy of his/her RPT packets at the end of process, so the candidate is likely to eventually read the committee letter.

The School RPT Committee's letter is **from everyone** on the committee. The letter should be signed by the committee chair on behalf of the committee unless the school's process requires all committee members to sign the letter.

Letters should
- Clearly report the committee's vote and those present/absent for the case deliberations.
- Provide a detailed analysis of the candidate's materials in relation to each of the three criteria: teaching, creativity, and service. The external letters should be discussed in a balanced way. Particular attention should be given to any negative comments.
- Cover all aspects of the case, explaining strengths and concerns, making it clear that every potential dimension was considered and evaluated by the committee. A distinct paragraph must explicitly discuss measurement of the candidate's scholarly impact. Committees should be careful not to be sidetracked by a single issue that dominates the discussion, overall vote, and/or letter from the committee.
- Reflect the committee discussion and evaluation. The tone of the letter should be consistent with the vote; e.g., a very positive letter should be the outcome of a very positive vote. An explanation should be provided for split votes and alternative thinking by a subset of the committee.
- Never predict the eventual outcome of this review or future reviews.
- Provide perspective on the candidate's research area, relative quality of journals where published, funding potential for area, relative challenge of teaching schedule, relative contribution significance of service, awards, special conventions in the school, etc. There will be future readers of the committee letter who are not in engineering and will appreciate the perspective provided.
- Never refer to external references by name or institution. Instead, number the references a priori and then refer to them by number.
- Be kept confidential at all times. For security reasons, most committees try to avoid the use of email for transfer of drafts and material.

Committee members should explicitly disclose all real or potentially perceived of conflicts of interests that committee members have with the candidates (e.g., committee member X served as a Co-PI on grant XXX with the candidate in 20XX; committee member Y co-authored YY papers with the candidate, none of which are part of the intellectual products under review) and state that the committee member with the potential conflict has made an honest effort not to be influenced by it in his/her evaluation. If the committee member deems they cannot serve impartially due to a significant conflict of interest (e.g., family relationships; close collaborations; advisor-advisee relationship; business relationships; or marked personal or professional conflicts), the member should not participate in discussion of the candidate and should vote "Abstain-required." In cases where a committee member does not want to vote on a case for reasons other than a conflict of interest, than the committee should vote "Abstain-other." Both cases of abstentions should be used rarely and in exceptional circumstances only.

College of Engineering Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (CoE RPT) Committee

For more details, see: https://coe.gatech.edu/rpt-committee-guidelines

The MSE Representative to the CoE RPT Committees will be selected by the School Chair and FAC. Representatives will serve two years after which they will serve on the School RPT Committee utilizing their experience for the School process.

Confidentiality

To ensure the integrity and confidentiality of the evaluation process, as well as the independence of all pertinent channels of review, RPT Committee members should not discuss deliberations or recommendations before, during, and after the evaluation process with parties outside the Committee. As reviews make their way upward through the levels of the process, both the written text and vote should be considered as the form of advisement, and interactions with the School RPT Committee Chair should be limited to clarification of information contained in the RPT Committee letters.

Feedback to Faculty Candidates

For more details see: Guidance on the Promotion and Tenure Process and Section 3.3.8 Promotion and Tenure Procedures

When the decision is final, the President communicates the result to the faculty member in writing delivered through the dean's office. After the candidate has received official notification, the dean or school chair may review the decision with the candidate. But the confidential aspects of the process remain confidential, including discussions in meetings of the faculty committees and the content and writers of external letters. For promotion and tenure decisions, the candidate may request a redacted copy of the entire file, with the coversheet, external letters, and references to external letters removed.

For critical reviews as with promotion and tenure decisions, candidates may request a copy of the file after the process is complete. School chairs (or other appropriate persons) should confirm to their deans in writing that they have reviewed the results with any candidates who were "reappointed with counseling" or "reappointed with warning." This step creates a documentary record that the intended messages are being sent. Best practices suggest that the candidate receive a written summary of the discussion, as often during stressful conversations people may forget and/or fail to comprehend important details.

In cases of disapproval of promotion, a candidate shall be counseled concerning the reasons for a negative decision.

In a case of third year critical review that results in a recommendation from the Provost-level review for either reappointment with counsel or reappointment with warning, the School Chair meets with the candidate, discusses the reasons for counsel or warning, drafts a memorandum to the candidate summarizing the discussion, and asks the candidate to indicate agreement with the memorandum by signing and returning the original copy of the memorandum. The original of that signed memorandum is forwarded to the Dean and a copy is put in the candidate's file in the School.

Evaluation and Promotion of Lecturers
(Extracted from CoE website)

The following is an overview of the promotion process for Lecturers and the list of documentation required to be considered for promotion. This is based on "Section 3.2.2 Non-Tenure Track Academic Faculty Members: Hiring and Promotion Guidelines" of the Georgia Tech Faculty Handbook.

Lecturers are expected to focus on classroom instruction but the following may also be included as part of their duties (this should be detailed in the appointment letter of the Lecturer):

- Service activities – Participation on internal or external related committees, faculty advisor to student organizations, incorporation of recent research into courses, attendance at or organization of teaching workshops, or other creative contributions.
- Development of original course material and syllabi in line with the learning outcomes of courses.
- In rare cases, administrative duties may be assigned but teaching should account for a majority of the workload for lecturers.
- Only Lecturers serving 75% time or more are eligible for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Calendar years of service are the same for everyone at or above the 75% level.

Qualifications for Promotion to Senior Lecturer *(from the GT Faculty Handbook)*

Senior Lecturers are expected to participate fully in the School/College and at a more robust level than a Lecturer. Their participation may include new course development, service on internal/external committees, research and implementation regarding pedagogy, and/or provide leadership within the School/College.

Third Year Review

Lecturers will receive a third year review to determine progress towards promotion to Senior Lecturer. This review process is described below.

1. Lecturers will prepare a dossier of materials that includes the following:
    1. **Biosketch** - 150 word biosketch in a 12 point or larger font that describes the candidate's tenure at Georgia Tech, current duties, and any significant awards or honors.
    2. **Teaching Portfolio** – **(Updated for 2018)** Includes all materials for course(s) taught, self-evaluation, and other related information.
    3. **CIOS Table with Normative Data** – The candidate should provide a table of student evaluation scores from the Course Instructor Opinion Survey (CIOS). The table should include the scores from the question: "Is the instructor an effective teacher?" Normative data from the candidate's college and teaching subject area (i.e., school), if applicable, should be included. The candidate should use the table template provided by the Faculty Affairs. Other evidence of effective teaching may be provided with the guidance of the supervisor.

4. **Curriculum Vitae for Lecturers** **(Updated for 2018)** - Summarizes biographical, personal, and professional data. The modified CoE institute standard resume for non-tenure track promotions should be used as a template and candidates should delete any categories/headings that are not relevant to them.
5. **Statement of Completeness** – Statement indicating materials submitted are accurate and complete. Signed and dated with the same date as the CV.

2. School Committee Letter – The dossier will be reviewed by the school undergraduate committee, graduate committee, or appropriate committee as determined by the School Chair. This committee will provide feedback to the Lecturer in a letter that includes progress that the faculty member is making towards promotion to Senior Lecturer based on the criteria from the GT Faculty Handbook. This letter should include constructive information to the candidate about the areas where he/she is excelling at and indicate areas (if any) that need change or improvement. This letter will be addressed to the School Chair.
3. School Chair Letter - School Chair will provide a letter of evaluation addressed to the Dean. This letter should provide an analysis of the candidate's experience and teaching performance and progress that the candidate is making towards being promoted to Senior Lecturer.
4. College Committee Letter – The Dean will convene a committee of five or more tenured full professors, senior lecturers, or principal academic professionals to review the candidate's materials. The committee will provide feedback to the Lecturer on progress that the faculty member is making towards promotion to Senior Lecturer.
5. Communicating Results – The Dean will write a letter communicating the result of the review process to the Lecturer. Possible results for this process include, Yes or No. The Yes result could be an unconditional "Yes" with keep up the good work or a "Yes" with some needed corrections suggested. The "No" result could result in termination of the Lecturer for the next academic year and is at the discretion of the school chair and/or direct supervisor.
6. Dean's office will submit to Institute Faculty Affairs to complete the process.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Promotion to Senior Lecturer can be considered after six (6) years at the Institute. The review process is described below.

1. Supervisor and faculty member meet to discuss eligibility and readiness for promotion.
2. Faculty member prepares the following dossier:
   1. **Biosketch** - 100 word biosketch in a 12 point or larger font that describes the candidate's tenure at Georgia Tech, current duties, and any significant awards or honors.
   2. **Teaching Portfolio** **(Updated for 2018)** – Includes materials for course(s) taught, self-evaluation, and other related information. It is at the discretion of the faculty member which courses are chosen to highlight their growth as a Lecturer over the review period. This portfolio does **not** need to cover every course taught, etc. Refer to the CoE guidance teaching portfolios for non-tenure track promotions.
   3. **CIOS Table with Normative Data** – The candidate should provide their own table of student evaluation scores from the Course Instructor Opinion Survey (CIOS). The

candidate should use the table template provided by the College that is the same table that is used by tenure-track faculty for their promotion process. The table should include the scores from the question: "Is the instructor an effective teacher?" Normative data from the candidate's college and teaching subject area (i.e., school), if applicable, should be included. Other evidence of effective teaching may be provided with the guidance of the supervisor.

4. **Curriculum Vitae (Updated for 2018)** – Summarizes biographical, personal, and professional data. The modified CoE institute standard resume for non-tenure track promotions should be used as a template and candidates should delete any categories/headings that are not relevant to them.

5. **Reviewer List with bios** – Names of potential reviewers with one paragraph bios for each potential reviewer. The candidate should provide the names of at least three (3) people, external to the unit, who are in a position to evaluate the dossier for promotion. At least one evaluation letter should be from an individual external to the Institute. Candidate has the right to request that certain individuals not be contacted as a reviewer. It is the supervisor/school chair's final decision as to who is solicited for a reference letter.

6. **Statement of Completeness** – Statement indicating materials submitted are accurate and complete. Signed and dated with the same date as the CV.

7. **Waiver** – Statement indicating whether or not candidate waives rights to see the identity of external letter writers or content of their letters.

3. External Evaluation Letters – Supervisor or School Chair (whomever is conducting the unit-level evaluation) will solicit external evaluation letters from the reviewers. These references must be external to the unit and should include one evaluation letter from an individual external to the Institute.

4. School Committee Letter – The dossier will be reviewed by the school undergraduate committee, graduate committee, or appropriate committee as determined by the School Chair. This committee will provide feedback to the Lecturer. This letter will be addressed to the School Chair.

5. School Chair Letter – The School Chair will provide a letter of evaluation addressed to the Dean. This letter should provide an analysis of the candidate's experience and teaching performance, a summary of the external letters, and a recommendation for or against promotion.

6. College Committee Letter – The Dean will convene a committee of 5 or more tenured full professors, senior lecturers, or principal academic professionals to review the candidate's materials. The committee will vote on the promotion and write a letter of recommendation describing the rationale of the vote for or against promotion.

7. Dean Letter – The Dean will write a letter to the Provost the summarizing the main strengths and/or weaknesses of the case and whether he/she recommends promotion or not.

8. Institute Committee – One representative from each college, the library, and professional education (8 members total) will convene and review all cases for promotion and vote for or against promotion.

9. Provost – After review by the Institute Committee, the Provost will review the package and communicate the final outcome to the Dean, who in turn communicates the decision to the faculty member, completing the process.

Decisions for Promotion

The effective date of promotion is July 1 for faculty members on a fiscal year contract and August 15 for faculty members on an academic year contract. A positive decision grants promotion to the candidate; a negative outcome means the candidate has not met expectations for promotion at Georgia Tech.

(Policy inserted 3/27/2019)

Evaluation and Promotion of Academic Professionals
(Extracted from CoE website)

The following is an overview of the promotion process for Academic Professional and the list of documentation required to be considered for promotion. This is based on "**Section 3.2.2 Non-Tenure Track Academic Faculty Members: Hiring and Promotion Guidelines**" of the Georgia Tech Faculty Handbook.

Eligibility for Promotion – Associate Academic Professionals, Academic Professionals, Senior Academic Professionals who are appointed as full time and have been in rank at least the minimum time as specified in the faculty handbook. Time in rank does **not** guarantee promotion.

Appointment and Promotion Requirements by Rank

Minimum expectations in all Academic Professional ranks are listed below. The candidate does not need to demonstrate noteworthy achievement in all five (5) of the following areas, but must do so 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 (Georgia Tech), and/or community
4. outstanding research, scholarship, creative activity, or academic achievement, as defined by role; and
5. professional growth and development.

Associate Academic Professional

- Entry level rank
- In exceptional cases, this rank may be used for individuals completing a terminal degree for a period of two years. If no degree is conferred, another position appointment is required.

Academic Professional

- Requires terminal degree

- Significant related experience or promotion from the rank of Associate Academic Professional
- Quality of performance and potential for development must be recognized by peers (*internal)*
- Three (3) years as an Associate Academic Professional

Senior Academic Professional

- Requires terminal degree
- Evidence of superior performance in chosen field
- Recognition by peers (national, regional, or local)
- Successful and measurable related experience
- Five (5) years as an Academic Professional

Principal Academic Professional

- Requires terminal degree
- Evidence of superior performance in chosen field
- Recognition by peers (national, regional, or local)
- Successful and measurable related experience including, but not limited to,
  o Supervision of others' work
  o Significant responsibility and authority within program area
  o Demonstrated impact
- Six (6) years as an Senior Academic Professional

How the Promotion Process Works

1. Supervisor and faculty member meet to discuss eligibility and readiness for promotion.
2. Faculty member prepares the following dossier
   1. **Biosketch** - 150 word biosketch in a 12 point or larger font that describes the candidate's tenure at Georgia Tech, current duties, and any significant awards or honors.
   2. **Position Description** – provided with input from the supervisor and if the promotion will include a change in responsibilities. This should be updated and indicate percent time the unit expects the individual to devote to each major activity.
   3. **Personal Statement** - (5 pages max with one-inch margins, standard single-spaced and 10-point minimum font) – The statement is the candidate's "voice" in the promotion process and should provide perspective on and context for the candidate's accomplishments at Georgia Tech with regard to the five criteria for Academic Professionals. Academic Professionals should clearly label the three areas of superior performance in their statement and consolidate information relevant to them under those labels. This statement should reference the three (3) to five (5) examples of relevant best work and indicate how these relevant works are related to the areas of superior performance. The narrative should be written in the third person, with a three-page minimum and five-page maximum limit with one inch margins, standard single-spaced, and 10-point minimum font.

4. **Curriculum Vitae** (**Updated for 2018**) – Summarizes biographical, personal, and professional data using the Institute standard format for academic professionals.
5. **Three (3) to Five (5) examples of relevant best work** – Work that represents the candidate's contributions in administration, service, and/or the candidate's field. These may include reports, published papers, books, software, patents, art productions, or other relevant examples that reflect their superior performance and will be recognized by their peers as such.
6. **CIOS Table with Normative Data** – If the candidate has teaching responsibilities, the candidate should provide their own table of student evaluation scores from the Course Instructor Opinion Survey (CIOS). The table should be in the Institute standard format and include the scores from the question: "Is the instructor an effective teacher?" Normative data from the candidate's college and teaching subject area (i.e., school), if applicable, should be included. Other evidence of effective teaching may be provided with the guidance of the supervisor.
7. **Reviewer List with bios** – Names of potential reviewers with one paragraph bios for each potential reviewer. The candidate should provide the names of at least three (3) reviewers, external to Georgia Tech, who are in a position to evaluate the dossier for promotion. Candidate has the right to request that certain individuals not be contacted as an evaluator. It is the supervisor/school chair's final decision as to who is solicited for an evaluation letter.
8. **Statement of Completeness** – Statement indicating materials submitted are accurate and complete. Signed and dated with the same date as the CV.
9. **Waiver** – Statement indicating whether or not candidate waives rights to see the identity of external letter writers or content of their letters.

3. External Peer Review – Supervisor or School Chair (the person conducting the unit-level evaluation) will solicit external evaluation letters. There should be at least three letters, but not more than five, but each should be from an evaluator outside of the unit (i.e. outside of the college). At least one letter of evaluation should be from an individual external to the Institute for promotion to Academic Professional or Senior Academic Professional and at least two letters should be external to Georgia Tech for promotion to Principal Academic Professional.
4. Supervisor or School Chair Letter – Supervisor or School Chair will provide a letter of evaluation addressed to the Dean. For appointments at the school level, it should be the direct supervisor, a tenured faculty member, or the School Chair who provides the letter. For appointments at the college level, the direct supervisor, a tenured faculty member, should provide the letter. This letter should provide an analysis of the candidate's experience and performance using the relevant criteria related to their position, a summary of the external letters, and a recommendation for or against promotion. If the promotion also includes a change in or additional professional responsibilities or percentage time allocation among different activities, the change should be described.
5. College Committee Letter – The Dean will convene a committee of 5 or more tenured full professors or principal academic professionals to review the candidate's materials. The committee will vote on the promotion and write a letter of recommendation describing the rationale of the vote for or against promotion.

6. Dean Letter – The Dean will write a letter to the Provost summarizing the main strengths and/or weaknesses of the case and whether he/she recommends promotion or not. In a case in which the supervisor is the Dean, the Dean may provide the committee with written guidance that describes the candidate's accomplishments, the quality of the candidate's work, and expertise which warrants promotion at this time. If the promotion also includes a change in or additional professional responsibilities, the change should be described.
7. Institute Committee – One representative from each college, the library, and professional education (8 members total) will convene and review all cases for promotion and vote for or against promotion.
8. Provost – After review by the Institute Committee, the Provost will review the package and communicate the final outcome to the Dean, who in turn communicates the decision to the faculty member, completing the process.

Decisions for Promotion

The effective date of promotion is July 1 for faculty members on a fiscal year contract and August 15 for faculty members on an academic year contract. A positive decision grants promotion to the candidate; a negative outcome means the candidate has not met expectations for promotion at Georgia Tech.

(Policy inserted 3/4/2020)

Faculty Search Committee

The Faculty Search Committee is responsible for soliciting, and reviewing applications for new faculty hires. The Chair of the Faculty Search Committee may assign additional committee reviewers from amongst the MSE faculty when appropriate.

The School Chair provides regular input to the committee on areas of need, and conveys directives from the upper administration relating to faculty hiring.

The School's I.T. staff, based on input from the committee's chair, maintains the faculty recruiting website. A staff member who supports the Faculty Search Committee monitors the school's designated recruiting site.

Faculty Input to the Hiring Process of Academic Faculty

After a visit by a faculty candidate, the School Faculty will provide input for the hiring process by filling out individual feedback forms and sending them to the Chair of the Search Committee. At a School faculty meeting, the Search Committee Chair will lead a discussion of the candidate. As part of this discussion, the Search chair will summarize the candidate's background, achievements and letters of recommendation, the comments and scores from the feedback forms, and the recommendation of the search committee. The faculty will discuss and a formal vote will be taken. If approved, the School Chair will report the decision to the candidate and procedure with an offer once approved by the CoE.

Adjunct Faculty Appointments

Adjunct appointment faculty in the School of Materials Science and Engineering (MSE) at the Georgia Institute of Technology (Georgia Tech) are individuals who are not full-time, tenure-track academic faculty with primary appointments in other Schools at Georgia Tech.

It is expected that all Adjunct MSE faculty will play a substantial active role in MSE School life. Activities such as participation on thesis committees, co-advising graduate students, research collaborations and/or joint proposals with regular MSE School faculty, and teaching or co-teaching courses that have MSE course numbers are strongly encouraged. Adjunct MSE Faculty are expected to meet the same standards of excellence and achievement as the regular faculty of the MSE School. Adjunct MSE faculty status does not obligate the School of MSE to provide services, salary, or support.

Any full-time academic faculty member of the MSE School may suggest a candidate for an Adjunct Faculty appointment to the MSE School Chair. First-time Adjunct candidates will then be asked by the MSE Chair to submit, to the FAC, a curriculum vitae and a cover letter explaining why they desire an Adjunct faculty position, and how such an Adjunct Faculty appointment would benefit the applicant and the MSE School. The FAC will consider the merits of each case and make a recommendation to the MSE School Chair as to whether to invite the candidate to visit the school and present a seminar to the faculty. If an invitation is deemed appropriate, the MSE School Chair will contact the candidate, explain the rights and responsibilities of an Adjunct Faculty appointment, and invite the candidate to visit the school and present a seminar. After the candidate's visit and seminar, the FAC will present a motion at a MSE faculty meeting to accord or deny the Adjunct Faculty appointment status to the candidate. This motion will be discussed and then voted upon by secret ballot of the regular MSE faculty. The School Chair will then be responsible for communicating the decision to the Adjunct Faculty candidate in a timely manner. Adjunct Faculty approved by the MSE faculty must submit a full hiring package, which will be uploaded into GT-TRACS and sent to the College of Engineering and OFA for approval. The School's human resources representative handles the paper work and communicates directly with the prospective Adjunct Faculty candidate.

Adjunct MSE faculty appointments will be for five year terms. At the completion of an Adjunct Faculty appointment term, the Adjunct Faculty member may be considered for reappointment. Such consideration commences with the submission by the Adjunct Faculty member of a package that includes a description of his/her activities with the MSE School during the previous 5 year period, along with an updated curriculum vitae, to the FAC. The FAC will then evaluate this package and present a motion at a MSE faculty meeting to accord or deny renewal of the Adjunct Faculty appointment status to the candidate. This motion will be discussed and then voted upon by secret ballot of the regular MSE faculty. The School Chair will then be responsible for communicating the renewal decision to the Adjunct Faculty candidate in a timely manner. Adjunct Faculty approved by the MSE faculty for a renewal appointment must submit an updated reappointment hiring package, which will be uploaded into GT-TRACS and sent to the College of Engineering and OFA for approval. The School's human resources representative handles the paper work and communicates directly with the reappointed Adjunct Faculty candidate.

During the course of an Adjunct MSE Faculty appointment, the MSE School Chair may ask the FAC to initiate a review of an Adjunct Faculty member's status if the Adjunct Faculty member's participation in MSE School activities is viewed as insufficient or if the Adjunct Faculty member is in anyway noncompliant with the MSE School policy regarding Adjunct Faculty. Removal of Adjunct Faculty status requires a recommendation from the FAC after such a review. Adjunct faculty will be notified in writing of a pending review, and of the outcome of the review, by the MSE School Chair.

(Policy updated 10/20/2015)

Joint Faculty Appointments

A joint faculty appointment is recognized by the College of Engineering (COE) and the Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA) as a faculty member who is <u>paid</u> by more than one school. Joint appointments require personnel paper work. The School's human resources representative handles the paper work and communicates directly with the prospective candidate.

Courtesy Faculty Appointments

Courtesy appointment faculty in the School of Materials Science and Engineering (MSE) at the Georgia Institute of Technology (Georgia Tech) are full-time, tenure-track academic faculty with primary appointments in other Schools at Georgia Tech. The MSE School makes a clear distinction between Courtesy, Adjunct, and Academic Faculty when representing itself to the Institute and general public, and has specific expectations for the role that each type of faculty member should play.

It is expected that all Courtesy MSE faculty will play a substantial active role in MSE School life. Activities such as participation on thesis committees, advising or co-advising of graduate students, research collaborations and/or joint proposals with regular MSE School faculty, faculty search committees, and teaching or partly teaching courses that have MSE course numbers are strongly encouraged. Evidence of established participation in MSE activities is highly recommended. Courtesy MSE faculty are expected to meet the same standards of academic excellence and achievement as the regular faculty of the MSE School. Courtesy MSE faculty status does not obligate the School of MSE to provide services, salary, or support.

Courtesy MSE faculty are allowed to supervise PhD or MS candidates pursuing degrees in the MSE School. However, a Courtesy MSE faculty member is expected to be involved in the MSE graduate student recruitment process (i.e., participation in graduate student recruitment fairs and other recruitment activities) in order to be allowed to supervise such students. These Courtesy faculty-advised students must be fully supported as Graduate Research Assistants with all of the costs of their research covered by the Courtesy MSE faculty member. The advised students will complete all academic requirements of the graduate program in the MSE School. The thesis committee must be composed according to the guidelines of the MSE School.

Courtesy MSE faculty are expected to mention their affiliation with the School of MSE on publications and printed materials, where appropriate.

Any full-time academic faculty member of the MSE School may suggest a candidate for a Courtesy faculty appointment to the MSE School Chair. First-time Courtesy Faculty candidates will then be asked by the MSE Chair to submit, to the FAC, a curriculum vitae and a cover letter explaining why they desire a Courtesy Faculty position, and how such a Courtesy Faculty appointment would benefit the applicant and the MSE School. The FAC will consider the merits of each case and make a recommendation to the MSE School Chair as to whether to invite the candidate to visit the school and present a seminar to the faculty. If an invitation is deemed appropriate, the MSE School Chair will contact the candidate, explain the rights and responsibilities of a Courtesy Faculty appointment, and invite the candidate to visit the school and present a seminar. After the candidate's visit and seminar, the FAC will present a motion at a MSE faculty meeting to accord or deny the Courtesy Faculty appointment status to the candidate. This motion will be discussed and then voted upon by secret ballot of the regular MSE faculty. The School Chair will then be responsible for communicating the decision to the Courtesy Faculty candidate in a timely manner. After MSE School approval, the MSE School Chair requesting the appointment will write a letter to the Chair of the prospective Courtesy Faculty member's School, making a request for this non-paid position. Upon receipt of signatures by both Chairs, a copy of the letter and appointment package is uploaded into GT-TRACS and sent to the College of Engineering and OFA for approval. The School's human resources representative handles the paper work and communicates directly with the prospective Courtesy Faculty candidate.

Courtesy MSE faculty appointments will be for five year terms. At the completion of a Courtesy Faculty appointment term, the Courtesy Faculty member may be considered for reappointment. Such consideration commences with the submission by the Courtesy Faculty member of a package that includes a description of his/her activities with the MSE School during the previous 5 year period, along with an updated curriculum vitae, to the FAC. The FAC will then evaluate this package and present a motion at a MSE faculty meeting to accord or deny renewal of the Courtesy Faculty appointment status to the candidate. This motion will be discussed and then voted upon by secret ballot of the regular MSE faculty. The School Chair will then be responsible for communicating the renewal decision to the Courtesy Faculty candidate in a timely manner. After MSE School approval, the MSE School Chair will write a letter to the Chair of the prospective Courtesy Faculty member's School, making a request for this non-paid renewal position. Upon receipt of signatures by both Chairs, a copy of the letter and appointment package is uploaded into GT-TRACS and sent to the College of Engineering and OFA for approval The School's human resources representative handles the paper work and communicates directly with the prospective Courtesy Faculty renewal candidate.

Courtesy Faculty appointments will be terminated if the individual separates from Georgia Tech. During the course of a Courtesy MSE faculty appointment, the MSE School Chair may ask the FAC to initiate a review of a Courtesy Faculty member's status if the Courtesy Faculty member's participation in MSE School activities is view as insufficient or if the Courtesy Faculty member is in anyway noncompliant with the MSE School policy regarding Courtesy Faculty. Removal of Courtesy Faculty status requires a recommendation from the FAC Committee after such a review.

Courtesy Faculty will be notified in writing of a pending review, and of the outcome of the review, by the MSE School Chair.

(Policy Approved by Faculty; updated 10/20/2015)

Faculty Mentoring Policy

- During the first 6 months of employment, each new untenured (Assistant, Associate) faculty member will identify potential faculty mentors among the tenured faculty.

- At the end of 6 months of employment, the untenured faculty member will meet with the School Chair and Faculty Development and Mentoring (FDM) Committee Chair to discuss and then select a tenured faculty mentor.

- The faculty mentor will be available for regular discussions, on at least a monthly basis, with the untenured faculty member on issues related to progress toward tenure.

- Each year, the untenured faculty member will submit an annual report of his/her accomplishments (in research, teaching, and service) to the FDM Committee Chair and to the School Chair.

- The FDM Committee and the School Chair will then each provide to the untenured faculty member an independent annual written assessment of his/her progress toward tenure, with possible suggestions for improvement.

- Upon the request of an Associate Professor with tenure, and upon submission of his/her annual report of accomplishments (in research, teaching, service) to the FDM Committee and the School Chair, the FDM Committee and School Chair will each provide an independent annual written assessment of the progress of the Associate Professor towards promotion to Full Professor.

(Policy Approved by Faculty; Updated 11/13/12)

Undergraduate Program Committee

The Undergraduate Program Committee is responsible for oversight of the school's undergraduate programs and courses, and on any issues pertaining to undergraduate education within the school.

Section 3.3.1 of the Faculty Handbook of the Georgia Institute of Technology (December 2013) provides for a school's responsibility for its curriculum, reading in part as follows:

> The Faculty of a Department of Instruction shall, subject to the direction of the Academic Faculty, be responsible for the program of studies offered by the Department. The Faculty of a Department may recommend such changes and modifications in its curriculum as it may deem desirable and shall have the power to fix pre-requisites for courses which it offers.

The committee's responsibilities are listed below:

- Periodic review of curriculum and suggestions for its improvement
- Review and approve all changes to course syllabi, textbooks, and pre-requisites
- Review and approve curriculum changes, including graduation requirements
- Review and approve all new courses, minors, and certificate programs, as well as their modifications
- Periodic review of course offerings to determine their continued listing or deactivation
- Periodic review of all courses, including their ABET syllabi
- Periodic review of cross-listed courses
- Periodic review of minor and certificate programs
- Solicit input from Student Advisory Board on matters related to undergraduate education.

The committee's chair shall be the Associate Chair for Undergraduate programs. Other members shall consist of those faculty members who advise the school's undergraduates and other faculty members who may be appointed by the School Chair. The Academic Office staff member primarily responsible for overseeing the undergraduate program shall serve as the committee's secretary.

The committee will approve its minutes for a given meeting by a vote at the next meeting.

Revisions to Faculty Committee, Charges, Responsibilities, and Procedures

Standing School faculty committees will communicate desired revisions to their charges, responsibilities, and procedures to the FAC, along with the reasons for the revision. The FAC also may recommend revisions to any of the School's committee charges, responsibilities and procedures, in consultation with that committee and its chair. The FAC will review the revisions, and if necessary ask the committee requesting the revisions for clarifications of or modifications to the revisions. The FAC will vote on the revisions. Approved revisions will be incorporated in the School Faculty Handbook and on the website of the committee affected by the revisions.

Safety Committee

The MSE Safety Manual and exam requirements are found at
http://www.mse.gatech.edu/lab-safety .

Faculty Commencement Participation Policy

- Each MSE faculty member will be designated to participate in a particular undergraduate fall or spring commencement ceremony.

- If this designated faculty member is unable to participate in the assigned commencement ceremony, then it is the responsibility of this faculty member to find another faculty member who is willing to act in his/her place.
- Each MSE faculty member is expected to participate in the commencement ceremony of each of his/her primary M.S. and Ph.D. thesis advisees.
- If the faculty member is unable to participate in the commencement ceremony of his/her primary M.S. or Ph.D. thesis advisee, then it is the responsibility of this faculty member to find another faculty member who is willing to act in his/her place.

(Approved by MSE faculty on 11/9/10)

Faculty Workload Policy

- As per BOR policy, a full-time faculty teaching load for an academic year consists of 24 credit hours (eight courses), excluding summer semester courses for which a given faculty member receives additional pay.
- Six credit hours (2 courses) of relief are provided for each academic year for internal and external service (on committees, maintaining laboratories, etc.). Tenured faculty members are expected to serve on significant MSE service committees or to chair one of the major MSE committees (e.g., undergraduate studies committee, graduate studies committee, tenure and promotion committee, faculty recruiting committee).
- New faculty will generally not be assigned a course to teach in their first semester, and not more than one course during their first academic year, at Georgia Tech. Untenured faculty will generally not be assigned to teach more than 2 cources per academic year during their first three years at Georgia Tech.
- Consideration is given for release time for major activities such as organization of national/international conferences and research program development (for example, major center proposals involving large groups of faculty).
- Each full-time MSE faculty member is expected to teach a minimum of 4.5 credit hours (1.5 courses) per academic year. In exceptional cases of increased research workload (e.g., a sudden multimillion dollar increase in annual research funding by a given faculty member), a faculty member may negotiate with the School Chair for consideration of a buyout from this minimum level of teaching. For each course bought out, a faculty member must provide one month of salary. With the approval of the School Chair in such an exceptional case, a faculty member may buy out of teaching up to two courses over the period of three academic years. It is expected that such a buyout (up to 2 courses over 3 years) will not occur on a repetitive basis.
- Actual teaching load will be based on the annual performance rating used by the School Chair. The performance rating accounts for teaching weighed at 40% (including classroom instruction and numbers of students and other researchers advised by faculty), research weighed at 40% (including publications, patents, sponsored research funding and proposals submitted) and internal and external service weighed at 20%. The performance rating averaged over a three-year period is balanced with a three-year average of the annual teaching load.

(Approved by faculty vote 9/18/2012)