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Date: January 2019

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. The updates in January 2019 were made to comply with University OP 32.28

University OPs related to faculty review

- OP 32.01 Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures
- OP 32.28 Third-Year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty
- 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 Third-Year Review of Tenure Track Faculty OP 32.28, 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), OP 32.28 Third-Year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty and the Tenure and Promotion Application (WCOE OP 10.01) aiding this process.

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 32.28). The timeframe for conducting the third-year review will be during the sixth long semester (spring term).

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. No outside reference letters are needed. The first two annual reviews will also be made available for consideration by the review committees.

3. **Review Procedure**
The third-year review process includes the candidate, department chair, a third-year review committee knowledgeable of the candidate’s teaching, research and service, college tenure and promotions committee, and the dean. 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 shall
   - 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 and departmental expectations.
   - Submit final material for dossier in the format described in Section 3 of this document to the department chair by January 20th
   - Meet with the department chair to review comments of the third-year review report by March 15.
   - 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 a week of the meeting with the department chair. Chair will provide a copy of the response to college tenure and promotions committee.
5. **Chair’s Responsibilities**  
The department chair shall

- Notify the candidate in writing of the intent to seek a third-year review by January 10th of the sixth long semester of the probationary period.

- Form a third-year review committee by the first week in February. The third-year review committee will consist of minimum of three 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.

- The department chair will discuss the review committee’s report and its recommendations with the candidate within two weeks of the third-year review committee meeting. The department chair's letter and third-year review report will go on the candidate's file, and will be forwarded to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee

- 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 March 15.

- The department chair will advise the dean and the College Promotion and Tenure Committee in writing of the third-year review outcome by March 15. 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 shall

- Consist of a minimum of 3 tenured faculty members with rank above that of the candidate.

- 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 by February 28th

- Attachment A will serve as a coversheet to the committee's written report.
7. **College- Level Evaluation**

   a. College-level peer evaluation of the third-year dossier will be conducted by the college tenure and promotion committee. This effort will be undertaken to ensure through evaluation of candidate’s contributions in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service. As in cases of voting on tenure and promotions, a faculty member serving on a college-level tenure and promotions committee may have only one vote in consideration of a third-year review candidate from that committee member’s home department. That vote will have been made at the department or faculty level, and the faculty member will recused from the discussions and voting at the college level.

   b. The college level committee will consider all the materials provided by the candidate, the tenured faculty votes, the tenured faculty comments, and the chairperson’s independent evaluation and recommendation. This evaluation will be based on the criteria set by respective departments and the college.

   c. The college-level committee will provide a written recommendation, which will be shared with the dean, the chairperson, and the candidate. The recommendation by the college committee will be a part of candidate’s overall dossier and should be completed by no later than April 1st of the sixth long semester.

8. **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.

9. **Evaluation by the Dean**

   a. The dean of the college will make an independent evaluation and provide a recommendation based on inputs received. A written recommendation from the dean informing about the outcome of the third-year review should be shared with the candidate and the department chair by no later than April 15th of the sixth long semester of service.

   b. The dean may recommend continuation, a program of remediation, or non-reappointment. In case of a decision of non-reappointment the candidate will be eligible for a terminal year of employment in the following academic year.
10. Appeal Procedure and Grievances

a. If the decision is made to issue a letter of non-appointment, the candidate will be provided an opportunity to appeal the outcome directly to the Office of the PSVP. The candidate is expected to submit a written statement which includes a clear reasoning for the appeal by the last day of their sixth long semester of service. The appeal process will be governed by procedures set in the University OP 32.02 Faculty Non-appointment, Dismissal, and Tenure Revocation;

b. 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.)