

Department of Educational Psychology, Leadership, and Counseling

Third Year Review Policy

PURPOSE¹

The information below outlines the requirements and procedures for the third-year review of tenure-track faculty in the Department of Educational Psychology, Leadership, and Counseling. At the department level, the third-year review process is primarily a mentoring process to help guide tenure-track faculty to successful promotion and tenure (P&T) at Texas Tech University. Therefore, this process requires an honest and constructive review of each tenure-track faculty member, yielding formative and summative assessments of their progress towards P&T. At the college level, the summative evaluation will result in the Dean's recommendation for reappointment, remediation, or non-appointment.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. Each tenure-track faculty member deserves a clear and consistent explanation of the third-year review criteria and P&T requirements.
2. Each tenure-track faculty member deserves clear feedback about their progress in meeting P&T requirements and specific guidance for future efforts.
3. Faculty evaluations should provide tenure-track faculty with the necessary guidance for growth and development. This guidance should be reasonable and appropriate. An unfavorable tenure decision should not be the first criticism the faculty member receives during their probationary period.
4. Any evaluation should be based solely on the stated criteria in the college's P&T policy and TTU OP 32.01 and 32.38 and on the documented evidence provided and not mere impressions of a person's achievements, attitudes, opinions, and personality.
5. Like tenure reviews, the third-year review is a criterion-referenced and not a norm-referenced evaluation. Faculty should be evaluated based on the review criteria (i.e., criterion-referenced). The evaluation should not be influenced by how well the faculty member performs in relation to his or her peers (i.e., norm-referenced).
6. Evaluators at all stages of the evaluation process should know and apply the stated criteria consistently.
7. Provisions of OP 40.01 (see Opportunity Policy and Affirmative Action Program) and the TTU Statement of Ethical Principles (OP 32.01A) are observed at all stages of the evaluation process.

POLICY/PROCEDURE

1. Department-Level Evaluation
 - a. Faculty under third-year review may choose to undergo evaluation based on newly changed requirements or based on the requirements in place at the time of hire.
 - b. The timeframe for conducting the third-year review will be during the sixth long semester (spring term). If the faculty member under review is hired at mid-year (November through May), the following fall semester will commence their first semester for purposes of the third-year review. The faculty member under review will submit the third-year dossier by January 20 of the sixth long semester of service.

¹ Some of the wording in this document was derived from existing policy documents (e.g., TTU OPs, approved college policies).

- c. The format of the dossier should generally follow that of the tenure and promotion dossier. See Appendix A for a list of contents.
 - d. The Third-Year Review committee will review the faculty member's dossier. The committee will be comprised of the department's elected faculty representatives currently serving on the Promotion and Tenure committee. Additionally, the faculty member under review may select one additional member of the Promotion and Tenure committee to serve on the Third-Year Review Committee.
 - e. The Third-Year Committee is charged with providing thoughtful, evaluative comments to each faculty member under review and providing early feedback about their progress towards promotion and tenure, along with suggestions for improvements when appropriate. Upon completion of the review, a written summary of the committee's conclusions and recommendations shall be provided to the department chair and later disseminated to the faculty member under review (see g. below) tenured faculty of the department, and the dean. This report should include the following: (forthcoming)
 - f. The department chair will review the committee's report. The department chair can decide to supplement the committee's report with an independent assessment of the faculty member's progress.
 - g. Tenured faculty in the department will have the opportunity to review the faculty member's dossier in addition to the committee's report, and if applicable, the department chair's report [see f.]. Additionally, tenured faculty will provide additional feedback to the faculty member under review. Upon completing the review, tenured faculty will evaluate whether the candidate's performance meets expectations and provide feedback (see Appendix B).
 - h. The department chair will review (1) the faculty member's dossier, (2) Third Year Committee's report, and (3) feedback provided by tenured faculty, and write an overall assessment of the faculty member's progress towards promotion and tenure. The department chair's report should include the following:
 - i. Contextual information
 - ii. Performance summary
 - iii. Formative evaluation and recommendations from the third-year review committee and tenured faculty (including quantitative data)
 - iv. Overall assessment of the faculty member's progress towards promotion and tenure
2. College-Level Evaluation
- a. The department chair will forward the faculty member's dossier and all other related documentation (e.g., third-year committee's report and the department chair's report) to the dean.
 - b. The dean will review the dossier and, taking into account the committee report and the chairperson's assessment, and will prepare a written statement of the outcome of the third-year review. The dean may recommend reappointment, remediation, or non-appointment.
3. Appeal Procedure
- a. If the decision is made to issue a letter of non-reappointment, the faculty member under review will be provided an opportunity to appeal the outcome directly to the Office of the PSVP (see OP 32.38 for more information).

Appendix A

Contents of the Third Year Review Dossier

1. Cover letter to the department that specifies the OP version that was followed as well as a summary of teaching, scholarship, service and a statement of goals.
2. Original offer letter (i.e., hiring contract with redacted information regarding salary and start-up funds).
3. Current curriculum vitae with the percentage of contribution for publications and current rank of the journal as provided by the department chair.
4. Three years of annual reports and the related annual reviews provided by the faculty annual review committee and department chair.
5. Summaries for the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service (i.e., narratives). Each summary should not exceed two pages.
6. Evidence supporting the faculty member's progress toward excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. Evidence must include three peer reviews for teaching and no more than three copies/reprints of publications representative of the faculty member's work.

Appendix B

Third-Year Review Evaluation Rubric and Open-Ended Questions

Criteria	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Partially Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
TEACHING				
Effectiveness as an instructor <i>Primary Data Sources: Students evaluation means on Q1-3; Student comments, Peer evaluations</i>	The candidate's teaching evaluation means are consistently above 4, and other data sources confirm that they are an effective instructor.	The candidate's teaching evaluation means are above 3; other data sources confirm that they are an effective instructor.	The candidate's teaching evaluation means range from 2 to 5; other data sources confirm that there are areas needing improvement.	The candidate's teaching evaluation means are consistently below 3; other data sources confirm that there are areas needing improvement.
Academic rigor and faculty engagement in coursework <i>Primary Data Sources: Course syllabi, teaching narrative, student comments, peer evaluations</i>	Courses taught possess most of the following characteristics: high cognitive demand, higher-ordered learning outcomes, students receive feedback on assignments/assessments, the curriculum is aligned, and high levels of faculty engagement with students.	Courses taught possess several of the following characteristics: high cognitive demand, higher-ordered learning outcomes, students receive feedback on assignments/assessments, the curriculum is aligned, and high levels of faculty engagement with students.	Courses taught possess some of the qualities described in the "does not meet the expectations" and "meets expectations" column.	Courses taught possess most of the following characteristics: low in cognitive demand, lower-ordered learning outcomes, students do not receive feedback on assignments/assessments, curricular misalignment, and low faculty engagement.
Thoughtful attempts to improve instruction (or curriculum) based on feedback from students and peers <i>Primary Data Sources: Annual report, teaching narrative, course syllabi, other teaching artifacts</i>	The candidate furnishes concrete evidence showcasing how they improved instruction based on feedback from students and peers.	The candidate explicitly describes how they have used feedback from students and peers to improve instruction.	Efforts to improve instruction are implied in the teaching narrative or annual report.	The candidate does not describe or document efforts to improve instruction.
Development or implementation of community-engaged teaching activities (if applicable)	The candidate and community partners have created learning experiences that include community partners and/or utilize service learning pedagogy.	The candidate utilizes community representatives or voices in course materials and learning experiences.	The candidate is preparing to include community-engaged teaching activities in future course assignments.	
RESEARCH				
Research Productivity <i>Primary Data Sources: Research narrative, CV</i>	The candidate averages 3 or more publications per year and actively presents their research at conferences.	The candidate averages 2 publications per year and actively presents their research at conferences.	The candidate averages 1 publication per year and actively presents their research at conferences. Conference presentations outnumber publications.	The candidate does not have any publications (since being hired) or a record of presenting their research at conferences.
Research Quality <i>Primary Data Sources: CV, Research narrative</i>	Published manuscripts are in journals ranked a 4 or 5.	Published manuscripts are in journals ranked a 3, 4, or 5.	Published manuscripts are in journals ranked a 2, 3, or 4.	Published manuscripts are in journals ranked a 1 or 2.

Emergence as an established scholar <i>Primary Data Sources: Research narrative, CV</i>	The publication record consists of several solo and lead author publications. The publication record and the research narrative provide evidence of an established scholar.	The publication record consists of some solo and lead author publications, coupled with several co-authored publications in which they are not the lead author. The publication record and the research narrative provide preliminary evidence of an emerging scholar.	The publication record consists solely of publications in which the candidate is not the lead author. The publication record and the research narrative does not provide sufficient evidence of an emerging scholar.	There is no record of publication.
Established research agenda <i>Primary Data Sources: Annual report, research narrative, CV</i>	The candidate describes their research agenda and provides evidence showing how a majority of the research projects (e.g., publications, grant writing) are related to the agenda.	The candidate describes their research agenda and provides evidence showing how several research projects (e.g., publications, grant writing) are related to the agenda.	The candidate describes their research agenda but does not discuss its relationship with past, current, and future research projects (e.g., publications, grant writing).	The candidate does not describe or document their research agenda.
Projects at various stages of the publication pipeline <i>Primary Data Sources: Annual report, research narrative, CV</i>		There is evidence that there are multiple projects and manuscripts at various stages in the pipeline that will increase the candidate's chances of maintaining (or increasing) their research productivity.	There is evidence that there are some projects and manuscripts in the pipeline, but there may not be enough to maintain research productivity.	There is no evidence of projects or manuscripts in the pipeline OR the pipeline consists only of projects in the conceptualization stage.
Meets the grant-writing goal as stated in the offer letter (if applicable) <i>Primary Data Sources: Offer letter, research narrative, cover letter.</i>	The candidate has exceeded the grant-writing goal as stated in the offer letter.	The candidate met the grant-writing goal as stated in the offer letter.	The candidate has applied for external funding, but the total amount requested is at least 50% less than the goal as stated in the offer letter.	There is no evidence of grant writing.
Development or implementation of community-engaged scholarship projects (if applicable)	The candidate leads research projects that are responsive to the needs of communities and include community, regional or other partners in the development and implementation of the study.	There is evidence that the research topics are responsive to the needs of the community, regional or other partners, and/or students.	There is evidence that the candidate's research agenda has some impact on communities and/or students.	
SERVICE				
Engaged in activities that directly benefit the program, department, college, and/or university <i>Primary Data Sources: Annual report, service narrative, CV</i>	Chairs Note: New assistant professors should not strive to exceed expectations in this domain prior to their third-year review.	The candidate is engaged in a variety of service activities within the institution. The supporting documentation suggests that their contributions are meaningful and impactful.	The candidate is engaged in a variety of service activities within the institution. However, there is no evidence to suggest that their contributions are meaningful and impactful.	There is no record of service at any level.
Service to professional organizations <i>Primary Data Sources: Annual report, service narrative, CV</i>		The candidate is engaged in service activities within the profession. The supporting documentation suggests that their contributions are meaningful and impactful.	The candidate is engaged in service activities within the profession. However, there is no evidence to suggest that their contributions are meaningful and impactful.	There is no record of service within the profession.
Development or implementation of outreach and community	Per OP 32.01. the candidate leads "discipline-related activities in service to the immediate	The candidate contributes to "discipline-related activities in service to the immediate	The candidate has minimal contributions to "discipline-related activities in service to the	

engagement activities (if applicable) <i>Primary Data Sources: Annual report, service narrative, CV</i>	community, to the state and region, and to society at large” that are meaningful and impactful.	community, to the state and region, and to society at large” that are meaningful and impactful.	immediate community, to the state and region, and to society at large.”	
---	---	---	---	--

1. Comments to the Candidate

- a. What recommendations would you offer the candidate to make a positive tenure review more likely?

2. Comments to the Department Chair

- a. Please use the space below to provide any additional comments or to note any concerns that you have regarding the candidate's progress towards promotion and tenure.
- b. What additional support from the department or college do you recommend that will increase the candidate's chances of a positive tenure review?