

Guidance to CoE PPR Committees

The following is based on Section 3.3.9 of the Georgia Tech Faculty Handbook found at http://www.policylibrary.gatech.edu/faculty_handbook .

The *purpose* of the school PPR committee letter is to assess a candidate's past contributions and future plans for continued professional growth in the areas of teaching, research, and service *or* individualized criteria as agreed upon by the candidate and the School Chair. It includes the vote count and a complete explanation of the committee's comprehensive examination of the case. If following a subsequent PPR, the committee's letter should address how the goals from the previous PPR or candidate's approved development plan were achieved.

The PPR Committee's letter is **addressed to the candidate being reviewed** and **written on school letterhead**. The PPR Committee should consist of at least three members composed of tenured Academic faculty from the unit of the PPR candidate's primary appointment at the same rank or higher rank than the person being evaluated. If a faculty member has a joint appointment with budget sharing, then one member of the committee must be from the non-primary unit.

The PPR Committee's letter is *from everyone* on the committee. Every member is required to sign the committee letter and the PPR coversheet. The information below on the review process is copied verbatim from Section 3.3.9 of the GT faculty Handbook:

Review Process

The committee shall:

- Examine the documentation provided by the Faculty member and the Unit Head
- Assess the Faculty member's performance based upon agreed criteria. The assessment should be written, and should contain the information specified below, based upon the committee's recommendation

Outcomes

The outcome of a PPR may be:

- a recommendation for a five (5) year review if the Faculty member's performance is satisfactory or better;
- a three (3) year review if the Faculty member's performance is less than satisfactory;
- or a referral of the matter to the appropriate Dean for further consideration.

A second consecutive recommendation for a three (3) year review indicates major and/or chronic deficiencies.

Five (5) year review recommendation following a First review or subsequent Five Year reviews: Faculty member is making appropriate progress

The committee's report should contain:

- Narrative text commending satisfactory or better performance
- Critique of substandard performance (if any)
- Recommendations for corrective actions (if any)
- Recommendation for five (5) year review
- Record of committee's vote
- The signatures of all members of the PPR committee
- Comments on Faculty development and resources appropriate for execution. For Associate Professors, this should include activities to enhance prospects for successful promotion.

**Three (3) Year review recommendation after an initial review or a five year review:
Major or Chronic Deficiencies**

The committee's report should contain:

- Narrative text containing critique of substandard performance
- Detailed recommendations for corrective actions (if any)
- Narrative text containing commendation for satisfactory or better performance
- Recommendation for three (3) year review
- Record of committee's vote
- The signatures of all members of the PPR committee
- Comments on Faculty development and resources appropriate for execution. For Associate Professors, this section should include activities to enhance prospects for successful promotion.

Five (5) Year Review recommended after Three (3) Year Follow-up Review: No Major Deficiencies; Significant Improvement Made

The committee's report should contain:

- Narrative text explaining that no major or chronic deficiencies are present
- Comments on what improvement(s) have been made, if any
- Recommendation for five (5) year review
- Record of committee's vote
- The signatures of all members of the PPR committee

**Three (3) Year Review Recommendation after a Three Year Follow-up Review:
Deficiencies Still Present, but the Faculty Member is Making Progress**

The committee's report should contain:

- Narrative text citing deficiencies still present
- Comments on any improvement made, as well as significant improvements not made
- Recommendations for corrective action
- Possible resources
- Recommendation for Three (3) Year Review and for Dean to consider referral to FSGC
- Record of committee's vote
- The signatures of all members of the PPR committee