COE OP 10.03: Third-year Review

Date: September 2014

Purpose: The purpose of this Whitacre 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 Whitacre College of Engineering Promotion Tenure Committee with any recommendations for revision presented to the WCOE Executive Committee by August 15.

University OPs related to faculty review
- OP 32.01 Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures
- OP 32.32 Performance Evaluations of Faculty
- OP 32.05 Faculty Grievance Procedures
- WCOE OP 10.01 Tenure and Promotion
- WCOE OP 10.02 Annual Review and Expectations
- WCOE OP 10.06 Mediation of Faculty Disputes

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 OP 32.32 and the Texas Tech University Regents’ Rules.

The Texas Tech University Whitacre 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 spirit, when the Whitacre 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 (WCOE OP 10.02), the Third-Year Review (OP 10.03) and the Tenure and Promotion Application (WCOE OP 10.01) aiding 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 (OP 32.01). The third-year review will be undertaken in the third spring semester of the probationary period, or equivalent if the probationary position is modified.

2. **Third-year Review Document**
   The faculty member under review will prepare a dossier as outlined in section 9 of the WCOE OP 10.01 on Promotion and Tenure; however, the Dean’s letter, the department chairperson’s letter and the solicited reference letters should not be included. The first two annual reviews will also be made available for consideration by the review committee.

3. **Review Procedure**
   The third-year review process includes the candidate, department chair, a third-year review committee (further referred to as committee) knowledgeable of the candidate’s teaching, research and service. The candidate will prepare the dossier to be shared with the other entities involved in this process. The responsibilities and deadlines for all involved parties are outlined in sections 4 through 7 of this OP. The third-year review document should include the peer-observation summaries (OP 10.01, Appendix D, Attachment A and B) provided to the candidate as the result of the peer-observation process conducted annually.

4. **Candidate’s Responsibilities**
   The candidate will
   - Notify the department chair in writing of the intent to seek a third-year review by January 1 (or equivalent adjusted date) of the third spring of the probationary period.
   - Review the Faculty Handbook, TTU OP 32.01, TTU OP 32.05, TTU OP 32.32, WCOE OP 10.01, and WCOE 10.02, WCOE OP 10.06.
   - Submit final material for dossier in the format described in Section 3 of this document to the department chair by March 1.
   - Meet with the department chair to review comments of the third-year review report by May 1.
• The candidate will be given an opportunity to respond to the contents of the third-year review report in writing to the Chair if they wish. The candidate's response must be submitted within two weeks of the meeting with the department chair.

5. **Chair’s Responsibilities**

The department chair will

• Form a third-year review committee by March 15. The third-year review committee will consist of three to five tenured faculty members knowledgeable of the candidate’s teaching, research and service. The committee members would normally be expected to be from the department, but may include other members from the college if deemed necessary by the chair.

• Review the committee's report by April 1st.

• Write a letter of recommendation regarding the proposed action for the candidate in the department. The letter will contain recommendations for the candidate to prepare for tenure and promotion. Recommendations should consider departmental and college tenure and promotion guidelines. These recommendations should be as specific as possible. The department chair should avoid using language that can be interpreted in multiple ways and contexts. The department chair will complete his/her letter by April 20th.

• The department chair will discuss the review committee’s report and its recommendations with the candidate within two weeks of the tenured faculty review meeting. The department chair's letter and third-year review report will go on the candidate's file and may be requested by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

• The department chair will advise the dean in writing of the third-year review outcome by May 1. The department chair will include the third-year review committee’s report and the chair’s recommendation to the candidate in the submission to the Dean.

6. **Third-year Review Committee**

The third year committee members will

• Select a chairperson from their membership and all members will review the candidate’s dossier.

• Meet to discuss the candidate's dossier. Submit a report summarizing the results of the review process and capturing the reasons for the committee members' vote per the ballot (Attachment B).

• Submit the report to the department chairperson within 10 business days of the committee meeting. Attachment A will serve as a coversheet to the committee's written report.

7. **Outcomes**
Three outcomes for the review are envisaged.

- A satisfactory review represents progress towards, but does not guarantee, tenure. No additional action related to the third year review is required.

  A review may recommend that remedial measures are required. In such an event, the department 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 that a positive outcome is unlikely the department chair may recommend termination of the candidate and will work with the Dean as appropriate.

8. **Grievances**

Any grievances over this process, recommendations and Chair's discussion will be resolved using WCOE OP 10.06 and University OP 32.05 for dispute mediation.
Attachment A

Third-Year Review Evaluation Form
Whitacre College of Engineering Texas Tech University

Name: ___________________________ Department/Unit: ___________________________

Date of Employment: ________________

Rank/Title: ___________________________

Date Submitted: ________________

Review Committee Members:

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Summary Vote: (record vote)

___ Satisfactory Progress

___ Remedial Action Required

___ Unsatisfactory Progress

______________________________  ______________________________
Committee Chairperson Signature  Witness 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.)