Third Year Review for Assistant Professors in the Moody College of Communication

University Resources

Each tenure-track faculty member at the Moody College of Communication is reviewed during the spring semester of the third year (or sixth semester) of their initial appointment as an Assistant Professor. The purpose of the review is to provide diagnostic feedback to the Department or School, the Moody College, and to the Assistant Professor regarding the individual’s progress toward the standards needed for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure. The Third Year Review is not intended to provide an unequivocal signal of the likelihood of tenure.

The implementation of this review is delegated to the individual Departments and Schools. Each unit’s Executive Committee (EC) or Budget Council (BC) is responsible for an assessment of the instructor’s teaching, productivity, and service. Documentation could include curriculum vita, faculty annual reports, course instructor evaluations, peer teaching reviews (at least two) and other information typically considered in annual review and promotion processes.

- **Productivity (Research/Scholarship/Creativity)**
  - Completed work as well as work in progress may be considered.
  - A research statement may be requested for consideration.

- **Teaching (Undergraduate and Graduate Student Levels)**
  - Student assessments for all courses should be considered.
  - Peer teaching reviews are to be considered and at least two within the 3 year time frame.
  - A teaching statement may be requested for consideration.

- **Service**
  - Service to the department, college, university, profession, or nation, state, and/or community may be considered as appropriate to the department.
  - A service statement may be requested for consideration.

- **Other Items**
  - Evidence of merit or recognition such as fellowships, grants, honors.

**Assessment Outcomes:**

Each faculty member being reviewed shall be placed in one of the following categories:

- **Exceeds expectations** – a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for the institution, discipline, or unit.
- **Meets expectations** – normally expected level of accomplishment.
- **Does not meet expectations** – a failure beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance, but of a character that appears to be subject to correction.

**Process:**

- During the spring semester of the second year of employment (or fourth semester), the Director of Faculty Advancement will meet with each EA and each Chair or Director to review and identify those who will be engaging in third-year reviews in the upcoming year. These lists will be finalized by the end of February in the spring semester.
- Based on these lists, the Dean’s Office will submit a request to the Provost’s Office for instructor records to be used in the third-year review assessments.
- The faculty member should submit all relevant materials along with annual reports in the time period designated by the Department or School, in consultation with departmental leadership.
- Each Department/School will decide whether or not to solicit external review letters as part of the third-year assessment. If done, these external reviewers will not be eligible to review this particular instructor during the promotion and tenure stage. If used, external reviewers do not require approval from the Dean’s Office.
- Each Department/School will review materials submitted for third-year reviews no later than the end of April.
- Each Department/School will write a brief assessment to the faculty member of the process engaged in the review, and an evaluative and developmental review of faculty member’s productivity, teaching, and service. These reports are typically no longer than three pages. You should use the Assessment Outcomes listed above to assess each of the three areas, but there must be only one overall outcome.
- These reports are forwarded to the Director of Faculty Advancement in the Dean’s Office, no later than May 15th or corresponding date in the sixth semester.
- These reports are given to the faculty member being reviewed, who has the right to submit a formal response within ten (10) working days of receiving the written evaluation results of their review, and if done, it will become part of the third-year review document and should accompany the evaluation to the Dean’s Office via the Director of Faculty Advancement. At the time of promotion, the third-year review (and response if written) will be a formal document in the faculty member’s promotion dossier.
- Chairs or Directors (or their designate) are to discuss their reviews with the faculty member in person.
- Unsuccessful reviews should be discussed with the Dean, and can form the basis of a non-renewal recommendation to the dean and provost in accordance with Regents’ Rule 31002.

Additional Information on this process may be found at:

http://provost.utexas.edu/faculty-affairs/mid-probationary-review