

**The Daniel Guggenheim
School of
Aerospace Engineering**

**Reappointment, Promotion, &
Tenure By-laws**

May 21, 2013

This log sheet should be updated each time the AE RPT by-laws are revised.

Date of Revision	Version	Prepared by	Date of Preparation	School Chair	Remarks
21-May-13	1	Dr. Krish Ahuja	21-May-13	Dr. Vigor Yang	This is the first detailed document on the AE RPT by-laws. It was reviewed and approved by the College of Engineering and Office of Legal Affairs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Scope.....	4
2	Membership	4
3	Administering the RPT Process	4
4	RPT Committee Responsibilities	5
5	Evaluation Process for Granting of Tenure and/or Promotion.....	6
5.1	Process followed to arrive at the RPT Committee’s Recommendations	6
5.1.1	Step #1: Communications with the Candidate	6
5.1.2	Step #2: RPT Package Preparation	6
5.1.3	Step #3: Selection of External References	7
5.1.4	Step #4: Solicitation for External Recommendations	7
5.1.5	Step #5: Formation of Area Committee	7
5.1.6	Step #6: Receipt and Documentation of the External Reference Letters	8
5.1.7	Step #7: Completion of the Area Committee Reports	8
5.1.8	Step #8: Submission of the Data Package to the RPT Committee.....	8
5.1.9	Step #9: RPT Committee Deliberations.....	9
5.1.10	Step #10: Submission of RPT Recommendations to CoE	9
6	Evaluation Process for Critical (i.e., third year) Reviews for Untenured Academic Faculty	9
7	Evaluation Process for Research Faculty	9
7.1	Criteria for Promotion	9
7.2	Eligibility for Promotion.....	10
7.3	Contents of the Research Promotion Package	10
7.4	Other Remarks with respect to Research Promotions.....	10
7.5	Summary of Steps	11
8	RPT Committee Deliberations and Recommendations Process	11
9	Package prepared by the School Chair for the Dean’s Office.....	12
10	Tables and Appendices (provided here for information only):.....	12
10.1	Table 1. Approximate Timetable for Promotion and Tenure of Academic Faculty	13
10.2	Table 2. Approximate Timetable for Critical Reviews of Untenured Academic Faculty.....	15
10.3	Table 3. Approximate Timetable for Promotion of Research Faculty	15
10.4	Table 4. Typical Timeline for Promotion and Tenure	16
	Appendix A: Example of Letter Sent to Faculty at Large at the Beginning of Each Calendar Year	18
	Appendix B: CIOS Scores	32
	Appendix C: College of Engineering Standard Documentation for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure	33
	Appendix D: AE RPT Committee’s Recommendation for Measuring Impact of the Scholarship.....	36
	Appendix E: Communications with External References (Chronological Record).....	38
	Appendix F: Joint Appointments	39

Georgia Institute of Technology
School of Aerospace Engineering
Policies and Procedures for
Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure
21 May 2013

1 Scope

The AE Committee on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (henceforth the RPT Committee) shall review the documentation provided by the candidate and other internal/external review bodies and provides an evaluation of the candidate's qualifications to the School Chair and the College in cases related to:

- Granting of tenure and promotion for academic faculty, including joint appointments that derive salary from AE;
- Academic rank and tenure for new hires, where appropriate
- Critical (i.e., third year) reviews for untenured academic faculty; and
- Promotion of research faculty.

2 Membership

The RPT Committee is comprised of an RPT Chair and tenured professors, representative of the main technical disciplines of the School.

The RPT Committee shall consist of at least five members appointed by the School Chair. Only tenured academic personnel at the rank of Professor are eligible to serve. The School Chair appoints both the RPT Chair and the committee members. The School Chair also appoints a RPT Coordinator, who is ordinarily a member of the AE staff, to assist the RPT Committee and candidates.

Each member shall serve for one four-year term. New members shall be appointed each year, with members rotating off the RPT Committee each year as their terms expire. Following a member's four-year term of service, s/he is not eligible for reappointment for two years. The School Chair may reappoint the RPT Committee Chair to serve an additional four-year term.

3 Administering the RPT Process

The RPT Chair has the responsibility for administering the RPT process. S/he ensures that each candidate is well informed, through the RPT coordinator, of how the RPT process operates, and is available to assist each candidate in preparing the required documentation at each stage of the process.

During RPT Committee meetings, each case is considered as follows. Each member is provided access to the candidate's RPT package as well as the External Reference letters and the report of the Area Review Committee. The Committee meets to discuss each case. If any procedural clarifications are required, the Chair and the Committee may consult the Associate Dean for Faculty Development in CoE. This is followed by a period of discussion and then by a vote. After the meeting, the RPT Chair assigns one or more of the RPT committee members to prepare a first draft of the letter reporting the committee vote and the reasoning behind it (including reasons for dissenting votes), and provides this draft letter to the RPT Chair, who then finalizes the letter in consultation with the entire RPT Committee.

If a conflict of interest arises between an RPT committee member and a candidate, the affected committee member shall be excused from the entire evaluation process for the candidate. Conflicts of interest typically arise when a member of the RPT committee is (1) former doctoral or post-doctoral advisor of the RPT candidate, (2) is a close collaborator with the candidate, or (3) has close personal ties with or is related to the candidate.

The Chair of the RPT committee provides the letter of evaluation to the School Chair after it has been signed by all RPT committee members who participated in the evaluation process, the discussions and the final vote.

The RPT committee's deliberations are independent of the School Chair and the School Chair does not have any influence in the committee's decisions.

4 RPT Committee Responsibilities

RPT Committee members are expected to be familiar with the following documents pertaining to the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process:

- Sections 3.3.2- 3.3.9 of the Faculty Handbook on "Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty." This can be found at:
<http://dev2013facultyhandbook.gatech.edu/faculty-handbook>
- The Institute report on "Recommended Best Practices in RPT Process," and "Report of the Georgia Tech Promotion and Tenure ADVANCE Committee." These can be found at:
 - ADVANCE Full Report: <http://www.advance.gatech.edu/archive/ptac/>
- Yearly promotion calendar issued by the CoE (late May/early June)
- Additional information on promotion and tenure is available for reference at:
 - http://www.usg.edu/academic_affairs_handbook/ - Board of Regents Academic Affairs Handbook
 - <http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/> - Board of Regents Policy Manual
 - <http://www.adept.gatech.edu/> - GT ADEPT Tool - Awareness of Decisions in Evaluating Promotion and Tenure. (ADEPT provides case studies and various forms of letter writer material relevant to promotion

and tenure evaluations. One of the primary goals of the instrument is to assist users in identifying forms of bias in evaluation processes to achieve fair and objective evaluations.)

- <http://coe.gatech.edu/content/rpt-information-forms-guidelines> - RPT Information, Forms & Guidelines prepared by CoE for the current year.

In addition, RPT Committee members are:

- encouraged to undergo ADEPT training within their first year of service by visiting www.adept.gatech.edu
- expected to actively participate in the committee discussions.
- strongly encouraged to participate via teleconference, if unable to attend a meeting
- not permitted to appoint another person to represent them.

The process must be conducted with utmost objectivity and without bias. RPT Committee Members should never discuss RPT matters with the candidate or anyone outside the Committee.

5 Evaluation Process for Granting of Tenure and/or Promotion

This section discusses the AE RPT Committee evaluation process for granting of tenure and/or promotion for the academic faculty, including joint appointments that derive salary from the AE School.

5.1 Process followed to arrive at the RPT Committee's Recommendations

The process followed to arrive at the RPT committee's recommendations for granting tenure and/or promotion to the AE faculty consists of ten steps, described below.

5.1.1 Step #1: Communications with the Candidate

A letter is sent to the faculty at large by the School Chair or by his designee, providing detailed guidelines on how to prepare the candidate's package of materials, which includes detailed biographical information relating to his/her employment and profession, details on his/her research, teaching, and service records, and other accomplishments. An example of such a letter appears in Appendix A.

5.1.2 Step #2: RPT Package Preparation

The candidate prepares a draft package and sends it to the School Chair's office for review. This package is reviewed and may be sent back to the candidate with requests to provide clarifications or any information that may be missing. Considerable feedback is possible at this stage. The RPT coordinator is responsible for providing the feedback to and communicating with the candidate. The intent of these iterations is to provide the candidate with the opportunity to put forth a package that accurately depicts his/her career and accomplishments to date at Georgia Tech in a form which maximizes his/her chances for success.

5.1.3 Step #3: Selection of External References

The External References should be senior experts in the field in which the candidate works. The External References should not have direct personal or professional connections to the candidate. If an External Reference has a personal or professional connection to the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor, postdoctoral mentor, research collaborator), this should be clearly stated in the documents. Individuals who did not have any close collaboration with the candidate (joint authorship of technical papers, joint proposal submissions, etc.) for the previous five years are preferable.

The candidate is requested to provide names of up to four external references (“External References”). S/he also needs to provide a short biographical sketch for each of these External References. The School Chair considers names from the suggested list and selects as many as ten External References. The School Chair may choose whether to use none, some, or the entire candidate’s suggested External References. The School Chair may, from time to time, consult the RPT committee to obtain names of suitable External References.

A candidate for P&T may request that a particular individual NOT be contacted as an External Reference. Such requests are typically honored. If the School Chair nonetheless concludes that use of that particular external reference is necessary or helpful, the letter must be in addition to those normally required, identified as such, and separated from the other external letters.

A candidate may choose to request that more than one individual NOT be asked to serve as an External Reference. However, the School Chair may decide, at his or her discretion, whether to comply with such a request. If the candidate requests that more than one individual be excluded, this request must be explained and noted in the promotion and tenure package of the candidate. The candidate must give a brief reason (one sentence or less: e.g., "unpleasant past interactions") for names of individuals s/he wishes to be excluded from the list of possible External References.

5.1.4 Step #4: Solicitation for External Recommendations

The School Chair sends the candidate’s package along with a cover letter to the External References. If sufficient letters are not received, the School Chair may select and contact additional external references without first consulting with the candidate.

5.1.5 Step #5: Formation of Area Committee

- The School Chair in consultation with the candidate and the RPT committee shall appoint an appropriate Area Committee to evaluate the candidate's intellectual products.
- Candidates shall have the opportunity to suggest to the School Chair the names of individuals who would be appropriate members of the area committee.
- This committee has at least three members.

- Members of the RPT Committee are permitted to serve as members of the Area Committee. This does not preclude them from voting in the RPT committee deliberations. A package consisting of five of the candidate's most significant intellectual products, chosen and provided by the candidate, is sent by the School Chair to the Area Committee for evaluation. The School Chair also designates an Area Committee Chair, who is responsible for coordinating the task of producing the written evaluation.
- For candidates for promotion to Associate or Full Professor, the area committee shall consist of three faculty members who have ranks higher than that of the candidate. Hence, an Assistant Professor may be evaluated only by Associate and Full Professors, and an Associate Professor may be evaluated only by Full Professors. Untenured faculty shall not serve on Area Committees. For Full Professors seeking tenure, the area committee shall consist of tenured Full Professors.
- A faculty member from outside the AE School will be considered if the current faculty in the School does not have enough expertise in the research area to evaluate the impact of the candidate's work. As a last resort, faculty members outside Georgia Tech can also be asked to serve on the Area Committee. The School Chair will determine, in consultation with the Dean, whether faculty members not employed by Georgia Tech should be asked to serve.
- Former doctoral or post-doctoral advisors or collaborators of the RPT candidate can be included in the Area Committee participation, but the relationship must be declared in the letter and the person must be able to provide an unbiased assessment of the candidate's materials.
- For joint appointments, input shall be obtained from the faculty of both units. In the event that the individual units do not have appropriate expertise relating to the candidate's specific creative contributions, the area committee may include individuals who are not members of the Georgia Tech faculty. The School Chair will determine, in consultation with the Dean, whether faculty members not employed by Georgia Tech should be asked to serve.

5.1.6 Step #6: Receipt and Documentation of the External Reference Letters

The letters from the External References are received by the School Chair. A record of all communications with the External References is kept in the Chair's Office.

5.1.7 Step #7: Completion of the Area Committee Reports

A report on the quality of the Candidate's technical contributions is transmitted by the Area Committee to the School Chair.

5.1.8 Step #8: Submission of the Data Package to the RPT Committee

The School Chair forwards the candidate's data package to the School's RPT committee. The data package consists of (1) the information required of and submitted by the candidate(see Appendix A), (2) the Area Committee report described in Section 5.1.7, (3) letters from at least six External References with a one-paragraph biosketch for each, and

(4) a chronological record of the communications with the External References in the format shown in Appendix E.

5.1.9 Step #9: RPT Committee Deliberations

The data package described above is reviewed and voted upon by the RPT Committee, and its recommendations are sent to the School Chair. The deliberation process of the RPT committee is described below in Section 8.

5.1.10 Step #10: Submission of RPT Recommendations to CoE

The School Chair reviews the recommendation from the RPT Committee, provides an independent assessment, adds a cover letter, and submits the entire package to the Dean of the College of Engineering.

6 Evaluation Process for Critical (i.e., third year) Reviews for Untenured Academic Faculty

This section discusses the RPT Committee evaluation process for critical reviews of untenured academic faculty during their 3rd year and sometimes in the fourth or fifth year if the previous year review leads to a reappointment with warning.

The process outlined above for granting of tenure and/or promotion to the academic faculty is followed for granting of reappointment to untenured academic faculty as well, except for steps #3 (Selection of Letter Writers), #4 (Solicitation for External Recommendations), and #6 (Receipt and Documentation of the Letter writer Letters).

7 Evaluation Process for Research Faculty

This section discusses the RPT Committee evaluation process for research faculty promotions.

Professional research personnel are members of the General Faculty and are considered Research Faculty. Because of the differences in functions, instructional and research faculty have different promotion criteria. Note that the term “Scientist” is used to indicate the appropriate designation – Engineer, Scientist, Associate, or Technologist. The process of promotion of the research faculty and package contents are summarized below and additional details can be found in Section 22.0 of the Faculty Handbook.

7.1 Criteria for Promotion

See Section 3.2.1 of the Faculty [Handbook](#) for further details.

7.2 Eligibility for Promotion

See Section 3.2.1 of the Faculty [Handbook](#) for further details.

Individuals who meet the minimum criteria for promotion may recommend themselves for promotion, or be recommended by their direct supervisor.

7.3 Contents of the Research Promotion Package

The promotion package submitted by the candidate includes:

- i. Research Promotion Coversheet
- ii. One paragraph summary of accomplishments of candidate for institute review
- iii. CV (in format as specified for research promotion candidates)
- iv. File with support documents (optional)
- v. Immediate supervisor's recommendation letter (optional)
- vi. A peer review letter (All research promotion packages must include a peer review at the school, laboratory, center, or unit level.)
- vii. For Principal Research Scientist Promotion: At least three external letters of recommendation, with bios of external evaluators, must also be included in the package.
- viii. School Chair Recommendation Letter
(See: <http://www.coe.gatech.edu/content/research-faculty-promotion-0> for details)

The candidate's package is then forwarded to CoE.

7.4 Other Remarks with respect to Research Promotions

For promotions from RE I to RE II and from RE II to Senior Research Engineer, the RPT Committee evaluates the candidate using the guidelines provided in the Faculty Handbook, section 3.2.1. For promotion to higher ranks, namely, Principal Research Engineer, the School Chair, after discussion with the candidate, senior faculty, and the RPT Committee Chair, appoints a Research Promotions Committee for each candidate and names its Chair. The Research Promotions Committee shall consist of at least three (3) members who are knowledgeable in the candidate's area of specialization. The Research Promotions Committee may include members from other campus units when appropriate.

The RPT Committee, in consultation with the School Chair, may appoint a separate subcommittee made up of Senior Research Engineers and Principal Research Engineers to conduct the evaluation of research faculty in compliance with Institute guidelines and provide the recommendation letter to the School Chair.

7.5 Summary of Steps

1. The candidate provides to the RPT Committee Chair all required documentation in an electronic format conformant to Institute guidelines.
2. The Area Committee meets to evaluate the candidate's Statement of Noteworthy Accomplishments and prepares a summary letter.
3. The RPT Committee meets to evaluate each candidate's scholarly contributions, votes, and prepares a summary letter to the School Chair.
4. The School Chair then reviews the package and provides his/her vote and letter.
5. The School Chair letter and all required documents are sent to the Dean of the College of Engineering.

8 RPT Committee Deliberations and Recommendations Process

- The RPT Committee Chair calls the meeting.
- Any potential conflicts of interest with respect to any committee member must be fully disclosed in writing to the Chair of the Committee, who shall inform the School Chair. Examples of conflict of interest include, but are not limited to, collaborations with the candidate or service as former thesis or post-doctoral advisor.
- In cases of conflict of interest, the affected committee members shall excuse themselves from any review, discussion, or vote on promotion and tenure decisions for the specific candidate.
- A quorum of the RPT Committee, consisting of a majority plus one, is required for any committee deliberation.
- RPT Committee meetings are closed meetings.
- All RPT Committee deliberations shall be confidential.
- In cases where the candidate has joint appointments, the School Chair shall contact the School Chair of the other unit(s) involved to coordinate the process in accordance with the provisions of Section 3.3.2, entitled "Joint Appointments," of the Faculty Handbook. See Appendix F for additional details on Joint Appointments.
- The evaluation letters prepared by the RPT Committee for promotion and tenure recommendations should include the following points to ensure consistent representation of each case:
 1. **Opening Overview** – What is the nature of the candidate's teaching and research (i.e., what does the person do)?
 2. **Impact and Productivity** – What is the impact to Georgia Tech and the discipline? A statement of the candidate's productivity relative to the discipline should be explained. Each Promotion and Tenure package should include an explicit discussion of the impact of the candidate's scholarship relative to the College's or Unit's measures of impact as described in Appendix D.
 3. **External Letters** – Discuss the external letters including an interpretation of the External Reference's viewpoints and comments. External References should

normally be from disciplinary peer programs. If letters from dissertation advisors, co-authors, or other collaborators of the candidate are included in the package, the relationship must be disclosed.

4. **Teaching Effectiveness** – A discussion of teaching effectiveness is expected. Interpretation of the Course/Instructor Opinion Survey should take into account the response rate received for each course.
 5. **Service** - A discussion of service by the candidate to the School, Georgia Tech and the profession should be provided.
- The evaluation and recommendation letters prepared by the RPT Committee for candidates for third-year critical review should include the above points with the exception of external letters.
 - The evaluation and recommendation letters prepared by the RPT Committee for research faculty should include the points 1, 2 and 5, above. For promotion to Principal Research Engineer and Regents Researcher, points 1-3 and 5 will be considered. Some participation in teaching is also expected and as such these Course/Instructor Opinion Survey (CIOS) scores should be considered for these two ranks if the candidates were involved in teaching.
 - All RPT Committee members must sign the evaluation letters, and dissenting votes must be clearly explained in writing in the evaluation letters. Confidentiality throughout the process is required. The School Chair will relay the final decision to the candidate. If the candidate wishes to obtain additional information about committee deliberations, he/she must request this information from the Provost office.

9 Package prepared by the School Chair for the Dean's Office

After the recommendations of the RPT committee are submitted to the School Chair, s/he prepares a package for each candidate including the documents listed in Appendix C.

10 Tables and Appendices (provided here for information only):

The tables and appendices used here are listed below:

Table 1 - Sample timetable for promotion of academic faculty

Table 2 - Sample timetable for review for critical third year reviews

Table 3 - Sample timetable for promotion of research faculty

Table 4 - Progression of the tenure and promotion process

Appendix A: Example of letter sent to faculty at large at the beginning of each calendar year

Appendix B: Example of CIOS Scores to be filled in by the candidates

Appendix C: College of Engineering Standard Documentation for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

Appendix D: AE RPT Committee's Recommendation for Measuring Impact of the Scholarship

Appendix E: Chronological Record of Communications with External Letter Writers

Appendix F: Joint Appointments

10.1 Table 1. Approximate Timetable for Promotion and Tenure of Academic Faculty

Date	Activity
Mid Jan to Mid-March	RPT Committee canvasses faculty for those who wish to be considered outside of a decision year. Candidates wishing to be considered are encouraged to consult with the Chair and senior faculty before making a decision.
Beginning of April	The School Chair, after discussion with the candidate, senior faculty, and RPT Committee Chair, appoints an Area Committee and names its chairs for each candidate.
Beginning of May	The candidate provides the names and brief biographical sketches for external referees to the School Chair. The Chair, in consultation with the RPT committee, selects referees.
Mid May	Candidates provide all required documentation in an electronic format conformant to Institute and College guidelines to the RPT Committee Chair. Based on the documents provided by the candidate, the School RPT Coordinator submits a well-organized CD-ROM and/or printed dossier for distribution to external referees.
Mid May	Requests for external references are sent with a return deadline of August 1.
Beginning of August	Candidate may submit updated CV with significant changes. Significant changes include accepted or published journal publications, new awards, or newly funded grants. Submitted publications and proposals are not considered significant changes. Changes should be clearly identified in a separate memo to the RPT Chair.
Late August	Area Committees meet to evaluate each candidate's Statement of Noteworthy Accomplishments and five intellectual products and prepare a summary letter, which is due to the RPT Committee on

	August 31.
September	RPT Committee meets to evaluate each candidate's package, vote and prepare summary letter to School Chair.
October	Candidate may submit updated CV. Changes should be clearly identified in a separate memo to the RPT Chair.
October	School Chair letter and all required documents are sent to the College of Engineering.

10.2 Table 2. Approximate Timetable for Critical Reviews of Untenured Academic Faculty

Date	Activity
Jan 15 to Mar 15	RPT coordinator sends letters to faculty who are subject to critical review in the current decision year indicating the required documentation and deadlines. Candidates sign an acknowledgement confirming receipt.
Aug 1	Candidates provide all required documentation in an electronic format conformant to Institute guidelines to the RPT Committee Chair through the RPT coordinator.
Aug 15	The School Chair in consultation with the RPT committee establishes an Area Review Committee and submits the candidate's intellectual products for review
October 15	Area Review Committee completes its task and sends its letter to the School chair
November 15	RPT Committee meets to evaluate each candidate's progress towards tenure and promotion, vote and prepare summary letter to School Chair.
Dec 15	School Chair letter and all required documents are sent to the College of Engineering.

10.3 Table 3. Approximate Timetable for Promotion of Research Faculty

Date	Activity
Jan 15 to Mar 15	The School Chair canvasses faculty for those who wish to be considered.
Jul 1	The School Chair, after discussion with the candidate, senior faculty, and RPT Committee Chair, appoints an Area Committee and names its chair for each candidate. The Area Committee shall consist of at least three (3) members who are knowledgeable in the candidate's area of specialization. The Area Committee may include members from other campus units when appropriate.
Jul 2	Candidates provide all required documentation in an electronic format conformant to Institute guidelines to the RPT Committee Chair. The documentation is described in Appendices A and B.
Sep 1-30	Area Committees meet to evaluate each candidate's Statement of Noteworthy Accomplishments and prepare summary letter, which is due to the RPT Committee Chair on September 30.
Oct 1	Candidate may submit updated CV. Changes should be clearly identified in a memo to the RPT Chair.
Oct 1-15	RPT Committee meets to evaluate each candidate's scholarly contributions, vote and prepare summary letter to School Chair.
Oct 30	School Chair letter and all required documents are sent to the College of Engineering.

10.4 Table 4. Typical Timeline for Promotion and Tenure

For example: Hire Date May-October 2005. If the date is between November and April, the first year is considered to be zero years in tenure track and one year in non-tenure track if requested by the candidate and approved at the School Chair and Provost level. The critical reappointment and eligibility for tenure is delayed by one academic year.

Contract Year	Reappointment Notification Date	Notified of Contract #	Years: at Tech In Tenure Track In Non-tenure Track	Notes
1 st 2005- 2006	Feb 2006	2 nd contract 2006-2007	1 1 0	
2 nd 2006- 2007	Oct 2006 April 2007	3 rd contract 2007-2008 4 th contract 2008-2009	2 2 0	Earliest AY to be tenured w/3 yrs credit and no breaks
3 rd 2007- 2008	April 2008	5 th contract 2009-2010	3* 3* 0	Earliest AY to be tenured w/2yrs credit and no breaks
4 th 2008- 2009	April 2009	6 th contract 2010-2011	4 4 0	Earliest AY to be tenured w/1 yrs credit and no breaks
5 th 2009- 2010	April 2010	7 th contract 2011-2012	5 5 0	Earliest AY to be tenured w/0 yrs credit and no breaks
6 th 2010- 2011	April 2011	8 th contract 2012-2013	6 6 0	Must be considered for tenure in this AY if there are no breaks. If not tenured, Automatic Non-Reappointment for 8 th contract.
7 th 2011- 2012	Must be tenured by the end of 7 th year contract to receive additional contracts			

* Critical Review Year

Critical Reappointment Outcomes

If a candidate receives a reappointment with warning, s/he will automatically receive a critical/full review the following year, meaning the candidate will be reviewed by all committees and unit heads. If a candidate receives a “No” reappointment decision, the decision is final and the case cannot be reviewed again in the subsequent year.

Breaks in Service

If an untenured faculty member takes a presidentially approved leave within the academic year, s/he may also request a temporary stop of the tenure clock. The number of years in non-tenure track will increase but the number of tenure track years will remain the same.

Appendix A: Example of Letter Sent to Faculty at Large at the Beginning of Each Calendar Year

This letter sent to faculty at large at the beginning of each calendar year can be as short as the one appearing immediately below (Format 1) or as detailed as the letter that follows on the next page (Format 2).

Format 1:

(The dates shown here will change from year to year)

If you plan to submit materials for promotion this coming year, please discuss with Vigor first. If your conversation with him results that you are participating in the process, please be aware of the following deadlines and schedule. Resources and information for this process may be found at <http://coe.gatech.edu/content/promotion-tenuredtenure-track-faculty>. Keep in mind that, with the exception of the May 1 deadline and the October 5 deadline, the others are subject to move within a week or two either way

May 1 - provide to me the following:

1. An up-to-date CV in standard GT format,
2. five intellectual products, CIOS summary of all courses taught at GT,
3. a statement of noteworthy accomplishments no longer than three pages and written in third person,
4. a professional biosketch of no more than two short paragraphs, and
5. a list of at least four external letter writers with biosketches.

All of these materials are preferred electronically. There are two documents that should have your original signatures and be submitted directly to Ms. Margaret Ojala or me. These are a Statement of Completeness and a Waiver of Right to Access Confidential Statements. We must have these documents in the office before proceeding with the review of your case. These documents are attached and can also be found at: <http://www.coe.gatech.edu/content/rpt-information-forms-guidelines>.

May 31 or thereabouts - packages will be sent to external letter writers, the final list determined by the School Chair

By August 15 - Area Review committee will prepare a letter to the RPT committee regarding review of intellectual products

August 15 or thereabouts - RPT committee will start review of external letters, Area Review letters, and other materials and write the committee letters

September 17 or thereabouts - Vigor will review all materials and prepare his letters

October 5 or thereabouts - All P&T packages will be submitted to the Dean's Office

Sometime in late February or early March of next year, letters of determination will arrive from the President

Format 2 (Year 2012-2013 used as an example)

MEMORANDUM

TO: AE Faculty

FROM: AE School Chair

DATE: January 15, 2012

SUBJ: **Reappointment, Promotion & Tenure – 2012-13 Submission Information**

I. Promotion and/or Tenure – Materials must be turned in to my office by May 1, 2012.

If promotion and/or tenure is an option for you and you intend to apply, please let me know as soon as possible.

Please submit:

1. A hard copy of your materials, with **original signature** on required documents, along with an electronic “Word” version. The materials should include Items 1-7 as indicated on the attached "Standard Documentation for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure" list.
2. A list of four suggested letter writers with a one-paragraph biosketch for each (include mailing address, phone number and email address).
3. 1 copy each of five of your most significant intellectual properties/publications, along with an electronic “PDF” version of each.
4. Submit each item as an individual file using the following naming style:
LastName_FirstName_XXX.

II. Third-Year Critical Review – Materials must be turned in to my office by July 2, 2012.

Please submit:

1. A hard copy of your materials, with **original signature** on required documents, along with an electronic “Word” version. The materials should include Items 1-6 as indicated on the attached "Standard Documentation for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure" list.
2. Submit each item as an individual file using the following naming style:
LastName_FirstName_XXX.
3. 1 copy each of five of your most significant intellectual properties/publications, along with an electronic “PDF” version of each.

III. Periodic Peer Review – Materials must be turned in to my office by October 1, 2012.

Please submit:

1. A hard copy of your materials, with **original signature** on required documents, along with an electronic “Word” version. The materials should include Items 1-5 on the attached “Standard Documentation for Periodic Peer Review” list.
2. Submit each item as an individual file using the following naming style:
LastName_FirstName_xxx.

Memo to Faculty re RPT 2012-13
Page Two
January 15, 2012

The due dates for all actions are indicated on the attached “TENTATIVE SCHEDULE”.

You must follow the directions as indicated in the attached documentation when preparing your materials as these are the guidelines the Board of Regents' has requested that we follow.

If you have any questions, please call me or Susan Jackson at 404-894-1236.

For additional information on the process, refer to the:

- Georgia Tech Faculty [Handbook](#)
- College of Engineering website at <http://www.coe.gatech.edu>
– “Faculty & Staff – RPT Process”

Document Naming Styles:

xxx = For RPT / CR processes (Example: Roberts_Smith_Bio)

- Item 1: Bio
- Item 2: Statement of Completeness (Original documents only)
- Item 3: Waiver (Original documents only)
- Item 4: Accomplishments
- Item 5: CV
- Item 6: Letter writers
- Item 7: CIOS

xxx = For PPR process (Example: Brown,_Doresa_Criteria)

- Item 1: Criteria
- Item 2: Statement of Completeness (Original documents only)
- Item 3: Accomplishments
- Item 4: CV
- Item 5: CIOS

**COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING DEADLINES FOR
REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION & TENURE, PERIODIC PEER REVIEW,
RESEARCH FACULTY PROMOTIONS,
AND REGENTS' PROFESSOR NOMINATIONS**

AY 2012-2013

The following schedule is subject to change should the Institute Offices of Faculty Career Development Services, Graduate Studies and Research, or the Board of Regents, announce different deadlines at a later time.

*** TENTATIVE SCHEDULE 02/15/2012 ***

ACTIVITY	CANDIDATE'S MATERIAL To AE SCHOOL CHAIR	FIRST LEVEL COMMITTEE REPORT To AE SCHOOL CHAIR	FULL COMMITTEE REPORT To AE SCHOOL CHAIR	PACKAGE DUE IN DEAN'S OFFICE
TENURE AND PROMOTION OF ACADEMIC FACULTY	04/23/12	08/20/12	09/24/12	10/05/12
PROMOTION OF RESEARCH FACULTY	08/31/12	--	10/22/12	11/02/12
NOMINATION TO REGENTS' PROFESSOR OF ACADEMIC FACULTY	11/05/12	--	--	01/04/13
3 RD YEAR CRITICAL REVIEW FOR ACADEMIC FACULTY	07/02/12	10/24/12	11/19/12	12/14/12
PERIODIC PEER REVIEW OF ACADEMIC FACULTY	10/15/12	--	01/28/13	02/08/13

**COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
STANDARD DOCUMENTATION
FOR
REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE**

The following documentation is required for academic faculty under consideration for tenure, promotion, or reappointment requiring a full review. A full review is necessary in those reappointment cases for which a faculty member:

- is in his or her third year of tenure-track service;
- receives a negative recommendation from any administrative level;
- is in his or her terminal year and requests such a review;
- received a warning in a full review in the previous year; or
- requests such a review or his or her School Chair requests such a review.

All other reappointment reviews are administrative reviews and require the only the original copy of the Regents' "Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure" cover sheet.

1. CANDIDATE'S BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

This biosketch will be forwarded to the Board of Regents as part of an Institute summary of candidates. It should be no more than 150 words, written in third person. The first sentence should state the candidate's name, current rank, and school.

2. CANDIDATE'S STATEMENT OF COMPLETENESS (FORM ENCLOSED)

3. WAIVER OF RIGHT OF ACCESS TO CONFIDENTIAL STATEMENTS (FORM ENCLOSED)

4. CANDIDATE'S STATEMENT OF MOST NOTEWORTHY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Three page maximum. This documentation is incorporated into an Institute submission to the Board of Regents. Therefore, do not use the first person singular pronoun. All narratives should be written in the third person. The statement should focus on the candidate's five most significant scholarly accomplishments.

5. CANDIDATE'S VITA IN STANDARD FORMAT (FORMAT ENCLOSED)

6. CANDIDATE'S SUMMARY OF INSTRUCTION OPINION SURVEY (SEPARATE EXCEL ATTACHMENT)

Course/Instructor Opinion Survey (CIOS) scores that are included should reflect a high response rate for the course. Faculty members should encourage student participation in the CIOS.

7. LIST OF LETTER WRITERS WITH BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

Up to six letters of letter writer are required only for cases involving tenure or promotion; they are not required for any reappointment reviews. Provide a name, mailing address, phone number, email address, and one-paragraph (approx. 50-100 words) biosketch for each letter writer. In general, external letter writers should be leaders in the field and from disciplinary peer programs. Majority of the letter writers must be from another US university. If letters from dissertation advisors, co-authors, or other collaborators of the candidate are included in the package, the relationship must be disclosed. Providing letter writer names from Industry or international institutions are discouraged.

CANDIDATE'S STATEMENT OF COMPLETENESS – FIRST NAME_LAST NAME

The following statement must be included in the candidate's material.

I have reviewed my vita for reappointment/promotion/tenure. I attest to its completeness and accuracy to the best of my knowledge.

Signature

Date

**WAIVER OF RIGHT OF ACCESS TO CONFIDENTIAL STATEMENTS – FIRST NAME_LAST
NAME**

The following statements must be included in the candidate's material. The candidate must choose one statement.

I waive my right to access to any information contained in any letter of letter writer included in my reappointment/promotion/tenure materials and agree that such letters shall remain confidential.

I prefer not to waive my right.

I understand that in either case, letter writers will be informed of my choice.

Signature

Date

**COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
STANDARD FORMAT FOR RESUMES
FOR
REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE**

Use the format shown below. How the information is presented within each section is left to the candidate. If appropriate, candidate should consider grouping information and presenting it under subheadings for ease of reading. Also, candidate should consider presenting the information in a compact manner so as to keep the total amount of vita pages to a minimum. (No type font less than 10 points or margins less than 3/4 of an inch) Include only those vita subsections or other requested information for which you have data. **After the CV is submitted for review by external letter writers and the area committee, updates are not allowed except in special circumstances.** Your school RPT administrator can check with the dean's office to determine if your special circumstances permit the submission of a revised CV.

**CANDIDATE'S NAME
TITLE
SCHOOL**

I. EARNED DEGREES

List all college or professional degrees. Honorary degrees, if any, should be listed under Honors and Awards.

II. EMPLOYMENT

List all professional employment. Consulting and similar temporary employment should be listed in section V.

III. TEACHING

A. INDIVIDUAL STUDENT GUIDANCE

List all Postdoctoral Fellows, Ph.D. students, M.S. Thesis students, and undergraduate students supervised. For Ph.D. and M.S. Thesis students, include date of graduation and title of thesis and, if known, the current position of the graduate students. For Ph.D. students currently supervised, indicate the quarter advisement began their progression through appropriate exams, and title of their project.

B. OTHER TEACHING ACTIVITIES

List all other significant teaching activities such as continuing education, new courses developed, laboratory experiments and instructional materials developed, etc.

IV. SCHOLARLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. PUBLISHED BOOKS AND PARTS OF Books

List all books or parts of books published. Include only those accepted or in-press and indicate their status.

B. REFEREED PUBLICATIONS

List all refereed journal publications and conference proceedings, and other refereed materials. "Refereed" refers to a full paper, not an abstract, reviewed by two or more peers. Review by an editor is not considered Refereed. Include those accepted or submitted and indicate their status.

C. OTHER PUBLICATIONS

List all other publications that are not otherwise included in IV. A and B. Do not list (here or elsewhere) M.S. or Ph.D. theses, or research reports that are contractual obligations of the completion of research grants and contracts.

D. PRESENTATIONS

List all conference presentations, keynote addresses, testimony before legislative committees, invited seminars, etc. Do not list a presentation here if it is listed elsewhere.

E. OTHER SCHOLARLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

List all other scholarly accomplishments such as software, patents, invention disclosures, etc.

V. SERVICE

A. PROFESSIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

List all national and international contributions of service and positions of leadership in the profession.

B. CAMPUS CONTRIBUTIONS

List all contributions, committee involvement and leadership, and other activities in support of Georgia Tech. Contributions to other organizations for which you were previously employed, if any, may be included.

C. OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS

List all other activities, such as consulting, professionally-related civic activities, etc.

VI. GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

A. AS PRINCIPAL AND CO-PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

List all funded grants and contracts as principal and co-principal investigator. Proposals pending may be included, but do not include grants and contracts not funded.

B. AS INVESTIGATOR

List all funded grants and contracts as investigator. Proposals pending may be included, but do not include grants and contracts not funded.

VII. HONORS AND AWARDS

List all professional honors and awards, such teaching citations, research awards, recognitions for outstanding service, honorary degrees, etc.

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
STANDARD DOCUMENTATION
FOR PERIODIC PEER REVIEW

The following documentation is required, and in the order listed, for academic faculty under consideration for post-tenure review. The following guidelines are only an outline of the procedures for PPR. Please refer to the Faculty Handbook, Section 3.7 for details.

1. COMMUNICATIONS ESTABLISHING REVIEW CRITERIA

Written communications between the School Chair and the faculty member establish the review criteria. Periodic Peer Review policies assume the default criteria are the unit's tenure and promotion criteria unless alternative criteria are established between the School Chair and the faculty member. In either case, this section should include a written communication between the School Chair and the faculty member either reaffirming that the default criteria apply or describing the alternative review criteria.

2. PERIODIC PEER REVIEW CANDIDATE'S STATEMENT OF COMPLETENESS (FORM ENCLOSED)

3. FACULTY MEMBER'S STATEMENT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Five page maximum. The statement should focus on the candidate's most noteworthy accomplishments for the years under consideration. The statement should also include a list of goals for the forthcoming three to five years. In the case of individuals undergoing a second or subsequent Periodic Peer Review, this statement will include specific information on how goals from the previous review have been met.

4. CANDIDATE'S VITA

Faculty may choose any format he or she believes is the most informative. The standard format required for reappointment, promotion and tenure may be used.

5. CANDIDATE'S SUMMARY OF INSTRUCTION OPINION SURVEY (SEPARATE EXCEL ATTACHMENT)

Additional Information:

Include any other information that is relevant to evaluate teaching effectiveness, such as evaluations conducted by colleagues or CETL staff.

Appendix B: CIOS Scores

Name: (Insert Name here)

Undergraduate Courses

Qtr/Sem. Taught	Course No. Course Name	No. Enrolled	No. Respond.	Median Score for “The Instructor is an Effective Teacher”
q(s)/yr	nnnn/name	nn	nn	nn
	<i>Average</i>	nn	nn	nn

Graduate Courses

Qtr/Sem. Taught	Course No. Course Name	No. Enrolled	No. Respond.	Median Score for “The Instructor is an Effective Teacher”
q(s)/yr	nnnn/name	nn	nn	nn
	<i>Average</i>	nn	nn	nn

Appendix C: College of Engineering Standard Documentation for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

1. “REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE” COVER SHEET

Faculty Affairs office will provide the dean’s office coversheets with appropriate entries. The Dean’s office will forward these to each school.

2. CANDIDATE’S BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

This biosketch will be forwarded to the Board of Regents as part of an Institute summary of candidates. It should be no more than 150 words, written in third person. The first sentence should state the candidate’s name, current rank, and school.

3. SCHOOL CHAIR’S RECOMMENDATION LETTER

The School Chair’s letter should address at least three areas: (1) the quality and impact of the candidate’s scholarship, broadly defined (such as the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and/or instruction, as appropriate to the candidate) and their relationship to the educational mission of the Institute; (2) the quality and impact of the candidate’s teaching as evidenced by student evaluations, classroom observation, and/or evaluation of instructional materials provided by the candidate; and (3) the significance of the candidate’s contributions and leadership to the profession and the significance of the candidate’s contributions to either the School, College, and/or the Institute.

4. SCHOOL COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION LETTERS

The School Committee’s letter should comment on the three areas listed in **3**. ‘Split’ votes should be explained.

5. AREA COMMITTEE’S LETTER

The Area Committee’s letter should provide an in-depth assessment of the quality of the candidate’s most significant scholarly accomplishments. For candidates working in interdisciplinary areas, consideration should be given to the inclusion of members from outside the School who would be able to assess the candidate’s work. The Area Committee’s assessment should be made independent of the external letters of letter writer, and they should not vote or express judgment on the question of promotion and/or tenure.

6. CANDIDATE’S STATEMENT OF COMPLETENESS

The following statement must be included in the candidate’s material and signed by the candidate.

I have reviewed my vita for reappointment/promotion/tenure. I attest to its completeness and accuracy to the best of my knowledge.

Signature Date

7. WAIVER OF RIGHT OF ACCESS TO CONFIDENTIAL STATEMENTS (NOT REQUIRED FOR CRITICAL REVIEW)

The following statements must be included in the candidate’s material and signed by the candidate. The candidate must choose one statement.

___ I waive my right to access to any information contained in any letter of letter writer Included in my reappointment/promotion/tenure materials and agree that such letters shall

Remain confidential.

___ I prefer not to waive my right.

I understand that in either case, letter writers will be informed of my choice.

Signature Date

8. CANDIDATE’S STATEMENT OF MOST NOTEWORTHY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Three page maximum. This documentation is incorporated into an Institute submission to the Board of Regents. Therefore, do not use the first person singular pronoun. All narratives should be written in the third person. The statement should provide perspective on the candidate’s accomplishments by explaining the candidate’s contributions within his/her areas of expertise including an explanation of the importance of addressed problems and significance of the impact of results.

9. CANDIDATE’S VITA IN STANDARD FORMAT (See separate instructions.)

10. CANDIDATE’S SUMMARY OF INSTRUCTION OPINION SURVEY (See separate instructions.)

11. LIST OF LETTER WRITERS WITH BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

Board of Regents policy requires a minimum of three letters of letter writer. However, the College prefers at least six letters of letter writer from persons of equivalent or higher rank than the person being considered. Letters of letter writer are required only for cases involving tenure or promotion; they are not required for any reappointment reviews.

Provide a brief description of the process followed to select the external letter writers, and then provide information about them using format of a table. This table should contain the letter writer’s name, affiliation, who suggested the letter writer, dates of notification requesting a letter writer letter, date letter writer letter was received, the letter writer alias number to be used by subsequent committees in referring to the letter writer letter, and any pertinent notes related to the letter writer. Refer to the external letter writer list table template provided in Appendix E for details. Provide a biographical sketch for each letter writer. One paragraph (approximately 50-100 words) is preferred.

External letter writers should be

“senior experts in the field represented by the scholarship of the candidate. The faculty candidate can recommend external letter writers, but the majority of the letters should come from letter writers selected by the Chair, the faculty committee, or the Dean. If an external letter writer has a personal or professional connection to the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor, postdoctoral mentor, research collaborator), this should be stated in the documents. A substantial majority of the letters should not have personal or professional connections to the candidate.

A candidate for P&T may request that a particular individual NOT be contacted as an external letter writer. Such requests are typically honored. If the School Chair or Dean concludes that overwhelming reasons necessitate use of that letter writer, the letter must be must be in addition to those normally required, identified as such and included separately from the other external letters.” (R. Bras Memo, April 2012.) Please refer to memo from Provost Rafael Bras on the College of Engineering website.

12. ONE SAMPLE OF THE LETTER USED TO SOLICIT EXTERNAL LETTER WRITERS

The letter must include the statement: "The Georgia Institute of Technology will maintain the confidentiality of your evaluation to the greatest possible extent. While the Georgia Open Records Act does apply, Dr. {Name} has waived his right under the Act to view your evaluation." In cases of non-waiver, the letter must include, "The Georgia Institute of Technology will maintain the confidentiality of your evaluation to the greatest possible extent. However, the Georgia Open Records Act does apply, and Dr. {Name} has not waived his right under the Act to view your evaluation."

13. LETTERS OF LETTER WRITER

Provide copies of all correspondence received from the letter writers. If a letter of letter writer was solicited but was not received, please so indicate in the list of letter writers in item 11.

Appendix D: AE RPT Committee's Recommendation for Measuring Impact of the Scholarship

Last Updated: 28 October 2012

Pursuant to Provost Rafael Bras's mandate below, per his memo dated April 2012 to College Deans,

"Each College (or units within a College) should determine appropriate measures of scholarly impact of faculty candidates for P&T. Each P&T package should include an explicit discussion of the impact of the candidate's scholarship relative to the College's or Unit's measures of impact,"

The AE RPT committee has developed the following guidelines for measuring the impact of scholarship.

Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor: Given the short clock for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the time it takes to get papers accepted and published in leading journals, and the time it takes for published papers to show up in citation counts, the RPT Committee will judge the impact primarily on three factors:

Primary impact measures:

1. Assessment by external references
2. Assessment by the Area Review Committee
3. Quality of refereed journal publications as judged by the reputation, influence, and distribution of the journals

To the extent that a candidate can demonstrate impact on the additional dimensions listed below, the committee will weigh this appropriately to arrive at an overall assessment of impact:

Other Impact Measures: (not listed by order of importance)

1. Citations
2. Visibility and involvement at national and international conferences, and academic and other associations
3. Placement of doctoral students
4. Invited seminar presentations
5. External grants
6. External awards
7. Media mentions and practitioner impact
8. High impact books
9. Invention disclosures filed or patents pending or granted

Promotion from Associate to Full Professor: The promotion from associate to Full Professor requires that the RPT Committee consider the impact of a candidate's scholarship more broadly than that for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. This simply recognizes that with extended time spent in an academic environment, a faculty candidate has an opportunity to establish the impact of his\her scholarship in a number of different ways. Keeping this in mind, the RPT Committee has identified different dimensions of impact. Although the quality and impact factor of the journal publications, and external references' assessment of a candidate's scholarship will continue to be important, the RPT Committee will carefully consider the impact of a candidate's scholarship on other dimensions to arrive at an overall assessment of impact.

Primary impact measures:

1. Assessment by external references
2. Assessment of the Area Review Committee
3. Quality of refereed journal publications as judged by the reputation, influence, and distribution of the journals
4. Citations

Other Impact Measures (not listed by order of importance)

1. Visibility and involvement at national and international conferences, and academic and other associations
2. Placement of doctoral students
3. Invited seminar presentations
4. External grants.
5. External awards
6. Media mentions and practitioner impact
7. High impact books
8. Editorial board appointments to premier journals
9. Patents granted

Appendix E: Communications with External References
(Chronological Record)

External Reference List for Dr. George P. Burdell							
Ref.	Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Name Suggested by? (Candidate/Chair)	Dates		Notes
					Ltr sent	Ltr Rec'd.	
1	Anderson	James	U Penn	Candidate	7/1/2011	8/15/2011	Contacted again on 7/30/11 and 8/10/11. No responses ever received.
2	Mitchell	Robert	MIT	Chair	7/1/2011	Not Received	Responded "severe illness in family- sorry can't help right now."
3	Lendell	Chrsitine	U Arkansas	Candidate	7/1/2011	7/20/2011	
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							

External Letter writer List Guidelines

1. Prefer number as labeling method
2. Write these numbers at the top of each letter ("Letter writer 1") and bookmark with this label in electronic file.

Appendix F: Joint Appointments

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 19 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://dev2013facultyhandbook.gatech.edu/faculty-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.