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COE OP 10.03: Third-year Review

Date: April 2007

Purpose: The purpose of this College of Engineering Operating Policy is to ensure standardization in conducting the third-year review for tenure-eligible faculty. The Third-year review should aid faculty members in developing their full potential.

Review: This Operating Policy will be reviewed in the summer of every even-numbered year by the College of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee with any recommendations for revision presented to the COE Executive Committee by August 15.

University Ops related to faculty review
- OP32.32 Performance Evaluations of Faculty

POLICY/PROCEDURE

This Operating Policy and its procedures abide by the provisions set out in the Texas Tech University Performance Evaluations of Faculty Operating Policy OP32:32 and the Texas Tech University Regents’ Rules.

The Texas Tech University College of Engineering provides undergraduate and graduate programs within a college committed to quality education and nationally-recognized research and public service. Therefore, it is essential that its faculty be dedicated to achieving excellence in teaching, research and service in order to preserve and continually improve the vitality of the college. In this vein, when the College of Engineering hires tenure-eligible faculty it is with the expectation that tenure will be achieved and that the faculty member will be successful. To facilitate this outcome it is the expectation of the College that tenure-eligible faculty will be mentored and guided through the tenure period and the Annual Review (COE OP 10.02), the Third-year Review (this OP 10.03) and the Tenure and Promotion Application (COE OP 10.01) aide this process. Each new tenure track faculty will receive copies of these college policies at commencement of employment.

1. Timing
   The probationary period begins in September of the calendar year of a faculty member’s initial appointment to a tenure-eligible rank at Texas Tech University. All time accrued in full-time service at Texas Tech University in a tenure-eligible rank will be counted in the probationary period. The probationary period may be modified according to the university’s
Operating Policy. The Third-year review will be undertaken in the 3rd spring semester of the probationary period.

2. **Third-year Review Committee**
The department may constitute its own third-year review committee from its tenured faculty, but a minimum size is three (3) tenured faculty.

3. **Third-year Review Document**
The faculty member under review will prepare a dossier as outlined in section 8 of the COE OP 10.01 on Promotion and Tenure, excepting that external references will not be sought. The first two annual reviews will also be made available for consideration by the review committee. The dossier will be submitted to the Chair by March 1 of the 3rd spring semester of the probationary period. The chair will then circulate the dossier to the review committee.

4. **Review Procedure**
The Chair will convene a meeting of the Third-year review committee by April 1. The committee will elect a chair from among its members. The review committee will evaluate and vote (Attachment B) on the dossier in terms of the criteria established in the COE OP 10.01 Promotion and Tenure. The chair of the review committee will summarize the deliberations and present a written report (Attachment A) to the departmental chair that documents the procedures undertaken in the review and makes recommendations in terms of the criteria for eventual tenure and promotion. The review report should be presented to the faculty member within two weeks of the review committee’s meeting.

5. **Chair’s Responsibilities**
The Chair will discuss the review committee’s report and its recommendations with the faculty member under review within two weeks of the review committee’s meeting. The report will go on the faculty member’s file and may be requested by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Chair will advise the Dean in writing of the review outcome by the end of the review process.

6. **Faculty Member’s Responsibilities**
The faculty member under review will be given an opportunity to respond to the review report in writing to the chair if they wish. This must be within two weeks of the meeting with the Chair.

7. **Review Outcomes**
Three outcomes for the review are envisaged. A satisfactory review represents progress towards, but does not guarantee, tenure.

A review may recommend remedial measures are required. In such an event, the Chair in consultation with the faculty member and the review committee will recommend in writing remedial measures in areas deemed unsatisfactory which will be monitored by the review committee. Specific and documented progress must be made on these issues prior to the 4th annual evaluation.
Should progress towards tenure be so unsatisfactory, the department chair may recommend termination.

8. Grievances
Any grievances over this process, recommendations and Chair’s discussion will be resolved using COE OP 10.06 and University OP 32:05 for dispute mediation.
Name: ________________________________ Department/Unit: ____________________________

Date of Employment: _______________________

Rank/Title: ____________________________________________

Date of employment: ___________________

Date Submitted: ___________________

Review Committee Members:

___________________________________________________________________________________

Review Committee Vote: (record vote)

_____ Satisfactory Progress

_____ Remedial Action Required

_____ Unsatisfactory Progress

Committee Chairperson Signature ____________________________    Witness Signature ____________________________

ATTACH SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE DISCUSSION & ANY RECOMMENDATIONS

Attachment A (Cont.)
Chair, Department/Area: ________________________________

Comments: __________________________________________

Signature

____________________________________________________

Dean Of Engineering: _________________________________

Comments: _________________________________________

Signature

____________________________________________________
THIRD-YEAR REVIEW COMMITTEE
BALLOT

Name of Candidate: ______________________________ Date: ______

Department: ______________________________

Satisfactory Progress  ☐

Remedial Action Required  ☐

Unsatisfactory Progress  ☐

Reasons for vote:

(Comments shall be handwritten. Comments will be shared with the candidate, College Committees, dean, & provost. The ballots are discoverable in case of litigation. Please do not sign.)