

Generic Guidelines for 3rd Year Review in a Department

Process:

1. Candidate submits a 3rd year portfolio at the required date (communicated by the Chair).
2. A departmental committee reviews the packet and prepares a short report that includes what's going well, what is missing or not at the level required and what the candidate should do from now until tenure to maximize the possibility of success. (Ideally, members of such a committee might act as mentors throughout the assistant professor's pre-tenure years. However, a well-structured 3rd year review is possible without this level of involvement.)
3. The committee submits the report to the tenured faculty who comment upon the review and forward it to the Chair for review.
4. The cumulative review are reviewed and commented upon by the Chair and the Dean.
5. The Chair (and the committee) meet(s) with the candidate to discuss strengths and recommendations contained in the report.
6. The report should remain on file with the Chair. The candidate should receive a copy of the report.

Departmental Preparation for 3rd Year Review

1. The Chair can encourage mentoring to be done right from the beginning of junior faculty's career. Senior faculty need to know this is important, and expected of them. Care must be given to ensure quality mentors and to provide training for them.
2. The Chair and senior faculty together design templates and criteria appropriate to the discipline. Having clear criteria does not pre-suppose a 'formula' or cookie-cutter approach to tenure and promotion. The department should be able to describe what "excellent" and "insufficient" mean.
3. The Chair establishes a departmental committee of faculty members that will review 3rd year candidates' portfolios. This can be an existing executive committee or one set up specifically for this purpose. It is most useful to use existing structures when setting up formal 3rd year review processes in the department, unless those in positions of power within existing committees are not the most useful reviewers of candidates.

4. The Chair informs all faculty of the process, and makes sure all junior faculty understand what the process looks like and what documentation will be expected. Junior faculty need to understand that this is not just a collection of annual merit reviews, but rather a rehearsal for tenure review.
5. The Chair should ensure that there is support in place (via mentoring, readers of drafts of statements, information about the process, help in preparing the packet...) for junior faculty as they prepare for review.
6. The Chair looks for successful examples to show junior faculty. It will be extremely important to stress these as examples, not as models. Each case will look different—there is no ‘formula’ for success. Junior faculty may want guidelines to be more detailed than is possible. Qualitative distinctions must be clear to them.

Candidate’s Preparation for 3rd Year Review

1. The Candidate should be encouraged by the Chair and senior faculty to work with one or more mentors. These can be supplied, or self-chosen. A mix is ideal—the candidate should be encouraged to actively seek out extra mentors.
2. The Candidate prepares a 3rd year review portfolio. This set of documents should look as much as possible like a tenure review packet and include evidence of teaching, research and service. The packet should indicate plans for future directions in all three areas.

The Candidate:

- a. supplies an up-to-date CV
 - b. collects documentation of teaching, research and service and places it in an organized binder reflecting each of these facets of faculty work
 - c. writes a teaching, research and service statement as the opening document of the portfolio
 - d. prefaces each section with its appropriate statement (teaching portfolio has teaching statement, research portfolio a statement of research interests and accomplishments, etc)
 - e. supplies evidence to support each statement
3. The Candidate meets with the Chair (and perhaps with the committee) to discuss the portfolio and the reviewers’ responses.
 4. The candidate makes a plan (with help from senior faculty, mentors, the Chair) for how to achieve success in the following years before promotion.