**3rd-Year Review Process**

The 3rd-year review is essentially a “pre-tenure review” process which is used to assess whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure. It consists of four elements:

1. Peer Review of Teaching – this should be scheduled for spring of the prior year or fall of current year (we want to avoid scheduling for winter of the current year because this delays completing the dossier).
2. Promotion and Tenure Vita (from Digital Measures) – this should be all years in academia.
3. Three-page Candidate Statement:
   1. Scholarship: 1.5 to 2 pages in length
      1. Highlight themes and streams and current contributions.
      2. Discuss plans going forward and pipeline research.
   2. Teaching: .5 to .75 pages in length
      1. Courses taught/eSETs and discussion of teaching (what you emphasize).
      2. Teaching philosophy.
      3. Teaching contributions outside of class.
   3. Service: .5 pages in length
      1. Low expectations but there should be some College/Discipline-related service and increasing professional service (this becomes more important as one approaches the tenure year).
   4. Commitment to Diversity: No longer than a paragraph. Such contributions can be part of teaching, advising, research, extension, and/or service.  They can be, but do not have to be, part of scholarly work.
4. Three pieces of research: This should be the highest quality publications/manuscripts that a faculty member possesses.

**3rd-Year Review Timeline**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Responsible Party** | **Due Date** |
| PROT review | Assistant Professor coordinates with PROT Chair | Spring of 2nd year or fall of 3rd year. |
| PROT letter | Peer Review Team | Completed by February 1st of 3rd year. |
| Dossier (P&T Vita, Candidate Statement, 3 pieces of research). Submit to Noelle. | Assistant Professor and Noelle. | February 1st of 3rd year (Noelle gets completed dossier to P&T Committee by February 15th). |
| College P&T letter | College P&T Committee | April 1st of 3rd year. |
| Supervisor letter | School Head | May 1st of 3rd year. |
| Dean’s letter (optional) | Dean | May 15th of 3rd year. |
| Outcome meeting with candidate (NOTE: this meeting replaces the annual review meeting only – the assistant professor still needs to complete the annual review). | Dean, ADR and School Head | Late May of 3rd year. |

**University Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor**

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is based upon evidence of the candidate's:

* demonstrated effectiveness in teaching, advising, service, and other assigned duties
* achievement in scholarship and creative activity that establishes the individual as a significant contributor to the field or profession, with potential for distinction, and
* appropriate balance of institutional and professional service.

60% of the tenure clock has passed by the end of the Spring Term – 2 years until packet is submitted (typically July 1st after the 5th year unless an extension has been granted).

**Outcomes**

1. Everything is on track and there are positive outcomes in all areas.
   * Good publication(s), R&Rs/strong manuscripts under review, solid/good teaching evaluations. Some Institutional (College/Discipline) service and evidence of professional service.
     + This outcome will come with an encouragement to ensure that the candidate maintains momentum and a reminder that a premier publication is required (if the candidate has not hit one yet).
2. Making process with a caveat or two.
   * Research is moving forward and there is reason for optimism in research (such as R&Rs at strong journals and other research submitted with additional work nearing submission). Solid teaching evaluations. Some service.
     + This outcome will come with a strong warning concerning the deficiencies. For teaching issues, the candidate should be directed to Inara Scott (Assistant Dean for Teaching and Learning Excellence) for mentoring. Candidate will be given a reminder that a premier publication is required for support from the College for P&T.
3. Serious Concerns – leading to continuing review OR a terminal contract.
   * Serious deficiency in research and/or teaching such that the candidate is placed on continuing review (no pay raises while on continuing review and the candidate will have to go through a formal review each year by College leadership (School Head/ADR/Dean) while on continuing review). If deficiencies are too severe and tenure is highly doubtful, the candidate will be given a terminal contract (one-year to look for another position).
     + Two things will come into play with the choice of outcomes when there are serious concerns:
       1. Is the candidate’s pipeline strong enough for a potentially favorable P&T outcome if the manuscripts were to hit?
       2. Is there enough time on the clock for the candidate to be successful?