

April 2015

Georgia Institute of Technology
College of Engineering
**Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Process to
Review Faculty Members with Joint Appointments**

Engineering faculty members who have fiscal joint appointments with two Georgia Tech units (in other words, their salaries are received from two different schools) must be reviewed using the special reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) process described in Section 3.3.8 of the Georgia Tech Faculty Handbook. In order to facilitate coordination, transparency, and collaboration among the units involved in the review, joint appointees with majority appointment in the College of Engineering (CoE) should be reviewed by an RPT process structured along the lines described in this document. The Georgia Tech Faculty Handbook can be accessed at

<http://www.academic.gatech.edu/handbook/>

The special RPT process for the review of faculty members who have CoE joint appointments includes the following important features.

1. Home Unit. Each RPT review candidate with a joint appointment receives X% of his/her salary from School A and Y% from School B, where X is greater than Y. This document applies only to situations where School A is located within the College of Engineering.
 - Because School A holds the majority appointment, it is considered the "home school" for administratively handling the RPT paperwork and will work closely with School B as needed.
 - CoE is considered the "home college." If School B is positioned within another college, designated College B, when the RPT review packet moves up to the college committee level, the CoE dean's office will work directly with the dean's office associated with College B.
2. Internal Research Area Committee. A subtle point that is not always clear in Section 19 of the Faculty Handbook is that "Internal Peer Review" refers to the unit or school level faculty committee that deliberates and votes on the RPT case. Some of the colleges do not have an initial step for review of intellectual products by an "Internal Research Area Committee," a standard part of the CoE RPT process that also applies to the review of CoE joint appointees.

The chair of School A will formally appoint and charge the members of the Internal Research Area Committee based upon input on potential committee membership 1) from the RPT candidate, 2) from the School A RPT Committee, and 3) from the chair of School B, who will provide input obtained 4) from the School B RPT Committee. This committee should be composed of faculty members who have the appropriate expertise to review the five intellectual products submitted by the RPT candidate, and they can be associated with any unit on campus (and in the rare case on-campus expertise is not available, internal research area committee members can be chosen from Emory, Georgia State, etc.).

3. External Review Letters. For the CoE reviews, external letters are not requested for reappointment reviews but are solicited for promotion and tenure reviews. For the review of joint appointees, the chair of School A will formally request the external review letters based upon input provided by the candidate, the School A RPT Committee, and the chair of School B, who will provide input he/she has obtained from the School B RPT Committee.

4. Unit or School Level Review Committee. To prevent a joint appointee from facing "double jeopardy" by having to satisfy two different school RPT committees, a special faculty committee is formed that is composed of faculty from both units in approximately the proportion of the joint appointment. In other words, the school level faculty RPT committee should be composed of approximately X% faculty members from School A and Y% faculty members from School B. The School A school chair should solicit input from the candidate on potential committee membership, and then work with the chair of School B to appoint and charge this committee based upon input from its respective faculty RPT committees. The specially appointed faculty RPT committee for the candidate will deliberate the case, vote, and document its evaluation in a letter to be added to the packet.

5. School Chair Review. Both the school chairs from School A and School B will review the candidate's packet. They will confer and then "jointly provide recommendations." Their letter(s) and votes are added to the packet.

6. College RPT Committee. If School B is not located within the College of Engineering, a copy of the packet is provided for review by both the CoE and College B RPT faculty committees. Usually the CoE RPT committee letter is ready by the first part of November, so this is added to the packet and passed along to the dean's office for College B so that its college RPT committee can review the packet as a part of its deliberations, which are usually held later than those in the CoE. The College B RPT committee vote is shown on the front cover sheet with the CoE college RPT committee vote, but in the past the College B committee has not added a letter. However, if its decision is drastically different than the decision of the CoE RPT college committee, this committee should add a letter to explain its alternative view.

7. Deans' Review. If School B is not located within the College of Engineering, both deans review the packets and then confer. The cover sheet shows both of their votes but the letter for the packet is prepared by the CoE dean. After the dean's letter is added to the packet, it is passed along to the provost's office by the CoE.