

Third Year Review for Assistant Professors

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

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 evaluative feedback to the Department or School, the Moody College Dean's Office, and to the Assistant Professor regarding the individual's progress toward the accomplishments expected 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, however, it may be a strong indicator of candidates who are unlikely to be successful in this pursuit.

The implementation of this review is delegated to the individual Departments and Schools. Each unit's Extended Budget Council (EBC) is responsible for an assessment of the instructor's teaching, scholarship, and service. Documentation assembled for the review must include curriculum vita, faculty annual reports, course instructor evaluations, and at least two peer teaching reviews. Other information may be included in this review process at the discretion of the Department/School. External letters from outside reviewers may be included in this process but are not required, however, any outside reviewers providing letters may not be solicited for subsequent letters for that faculty member's Promotion and Tenure process without Dean's approval.

- Scholarship (Research/Creative Works)
 - Completed work as well as work in progress may be considered.
 - A candidate research statement may be requested for consideration.
- Teaching (Undergraduate and Graduate Student Levels)
 - Student assessments (CIS) for all courses should be considered.
 - Peer teaching reviews are to be considered and at least two must have been completed within the three-year time frame.
 - A candidate teaching statement may be requested for consideration.
- Service
 - Service to the department, college, university, profession, nation, state, and/or community may be considered as appropriate to the department.
 - A candidate service statement may be requested for consideration.
- Other Items
 - Evidence of merit or recognition such as fellowships, grants, or honors.

Assessment Outcomes:

Each faculty member being reviewed shall be placed in one of the following categories for each area being reviewed and for their overall performance as well:

- 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:

1. During the spring semester of the second year of employment (or fourth semester), the Director of Faculty Advancement will meet with each Administrative Manager 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.
2. 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.
3. The faculty member should submit all relevant materials along with annual reports in the time period designated by the Department/School during the third year of employment, in consultation with Departmental/School leadership.
4. Each Department/School will decide whether or not to solicit external review letters as part of the third-year assessment. If used, external reviewers do not require approval from the Dean's Office. If included, external reviewers *will not* be eligible to review this particular instructor during the promotion and tenure stage unless explicitly approved by the Dean.
5. Each Department/School will review materials submitted for third-year reviews no later than the end of April or the corresponding date in the sixth semester of employment. Departments/Schools may choose to have the full EBC perform the review or may create a sub-committee to conduct the review to ensure the review is fair, accurate, ethical, and informed. It is important that reviewers are not in conflict with the person under review (e.g., former advisor or mentor, regular collaborator, etc.); those in conflict should recuse themselves from participation.
6. 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 the faculty member's scholarship, teaching, and service. These reports are typically no longer than three pages. The Assessment Outcomes listed above should be used by the Department/School to assess each of the three areas, each with their own outcomes, but there also must be one overall outcome summarizing the comprehensive work of the faculty member.
7. A copy of these reports is forwarded to the Director of Faculty Advancement in the Dean's Office, no later than May 15th or the corresponding date in the sixth semester, who in turn will forward to the Dean and Senior Associate Dean.
8. 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.
9. Chairs or Directors (or their designate) are to discuss their reviews with the faculty member in person.
10. Negative reviews (i.e., "does not meet expectations") must be discussed with the Dean by the Chair/Director and can form the basis of a non-renewal recommendation to the dean and provost in accordance with [Regents' Rule 31002](#).

Information on this process may be found at:

<https://provost.utexas.edu/faculty-affairs/mid-probationary-review>