CoA Tenure Track Faculty Third Year Review Guidelines

During the third year of a College of Architecture (CoA) tenure track faculty member’s probationary appointment, a review is conducted by the CoA to assess the faculty member’s first five semesters’ cumulative progress toward tenure. This review shall be required of all tenure track faculty members that began employment in the CoA during or after the fall 2014 semester. Tenure track faculty members that began fall 2012 or fall 2013 may request this review after consulting with their Division Director.

The intention of the Third Year Review is to establish a more significant and broader review of the faculty member’s progress. Unlike the annual evaluations or PTT process, the intent of the Third Year Review is to provide a forum in which all directors of the College’s five divisions are exposed to the development of all junior faculty in the College. Familiarity with and exposure to junior faculty of other divisions can facilitate a better understanding for directors of the nuances of other divisions’ priorities and tendencies. The tenure vote after the five year milestone is a College-wide vote, underscoring the importance of this assessment milestone. This process allows other divisions to gain familiarity with their teaching, research and creative work, and service efforts. Ultimately, this Third Year Review should be viewed as a positive opportunity for junior faculty and division directors to be more aligned and to promote more direct and comprehensive feedback regarding the junior faculty member’s development.

The Third Year Review dovetails with the Progress Toward Tenure review process only during the faculty member’s third year of appointment. The Third Year Review also mimics aspects of the CoA tenure review process. The Third Year Review is independent of and separate from the annual faculty evaluation. The Third Year Review will align with the timeline of the third Progress Toward Tenure Letter per the Provost’s annual Progress-Towards-Tenure Letters Memorandum.

At the beginning of each academic year, the Associate Dean for Administration establishes a calendar for the Third Year Review in consultation with the Dean and CoA Directors. The candidate’s Director and Associate Dean for Administration notify eligible faculty members at the beginning of the third year of their probationary period about the third year review.

The faculty member is responsible for assembling a digital dossier that includes an extended CV outlining their teaching, research and creative contributions, service and other relative documents of support and/or clarifications. The dossier is a limited and condensed version of the tenure dossier submitted after the fifth year.

The Third Year Review digital dossier shall include the following:
1. Summary page including the faculty member’s contact and status information.
2. CoA tenure and promotion criteria and Division annual evaluation criteria.
3. Appointment letter.
4. Curriculum Vita reflecting teaching, research and creative activity and service efforts for the past five semesters of the probationary period.
7. Supporting documentation and evidence of efforts noted in the CV.
8. Years 1 and 2 Progress Toward Tenure letters.
9. Year 3 Progress Toward Tenure letter.
10. Third Year Review Form.
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**Third Year Review Process**

A. The Director shall prepare a letter that addresses the faculty member’s cumulative teaching, research and creative and service performance. This letter is known as the third year Progress Toward Tenure (PTT) letter.

B. After reviewing the faculty member’s digital dossier adequately, the PTT letter shall be reviewed by the following: (i) the faculty member’s designated mentors, (ii) the division Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee, (iii) the Directors of the other CoA divisions. Additionally, one evaluative letter shall be prepared and submitted to the Director by an external reviewer from outside of the University, who has access to the faculty member’s dossier. This external reviewer must be approved by the Director and Associate Dean for Administration. This reviewer cannot be used as a promotion and tenure reviewer for the faculty member in the future. Obtaining an external review may not be feasible in all circumstances and is not mandatory. If requested and approved, coordination and communication with the external reviewer will be carried out by the Director.

C. Upon review of the PTT letter, reviewers shall sign the Third Year Review Form to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the letter’s content and accuracy pertaining to the faculty member’s cumulative performance. Reviewers may concur, dissent, or abstain. In all instances, they may provide written comments explaining their positions, either on the Third Year Review Form or in an attached letter. Sharing external reviewer information and outcomes shall follow tenure and promotion policy.

D. When each reviewer has completed their review, their form shall be returned to the Director. The Director may modify the PTT letter following receipt and review of the executed Third Year Review Form.

E. In a face-to-face meeting scheduled by the Director, the faculty member, Dean and Director shall discuss the findings of the Third Year Review. The faculty member shall be provided a copy of the Third Year Review Form along with the Director’s PTT letter no fewer than 3 working days prior this meeting.

F. The completed Third Year Review Forms shall be included in the faculty member’s dossier along with the Director’s PTT letter.

It is within the Director’s discretion, as is the case with each annual PTT letter, to recommend or not recommend reappointment of the faculty member to college administration after the completion of the Third Year Review. The Director also maintains discretion, in consultation with the Dean if required, to adjust teaching, research and creative activity, and/or service loads as a means to bolster successes in the faculty member’s efforts. In some cases when appropriate and possible, faculty members whose efforts are already showing significant promise or success may be given priority for, among other examples, receipt of CoA research and academic conference travel grants to further facilitate research and creative activity development.

In the instance that the faculty member receives a mixed or negative Third Year Review, the Director may work with the CoA Dean to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). The CAP must be agreed to and signed by the faculty member, Director, and Dean. The CAP shall list the faculty member’s teaching, research, and service activities, and detail respective performance goals or adjustments of focus and efforts for the subsequent year. Failure to make substantial progress in achieving the goals in the CAP may lead to the faculty member’s dismissal at the end of the term prescribed in the CAP.

Any grievances arising as a part of the Third Year Review process shall be addressed according to Section
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3.9 of the University of Oklahoma Faculty Handbook.

The results of the Third Year Review may also suggest that the faculty member’s development efforts appear consistent with the expectations of not only the division, but those of the College as well. Supportive feedback or neutral feedback garnered through the Third Year Review Form may suggest the faculty member continue their trajectory of development. The exposure of efforts to directors of other divisions may then provide further opportunities for collaboration, a wider spectrum of feedback and mentoring, and strengthen possibilities that a greater understanding and appreciation of a faculty member’s efforts has been facilitated.

The Director shall notify the faculty member at the start of the process that communicated or documented results of the third year review signify no commitment to the faculty member by the Director, other Directors, Committee A or College Administration as to whether tenure will or will not be granted at the end of the mandatory five year review period.