

Educational Leadership & Policy Studies

Third Year Review Policy

1. Overview

This document is intended to provide guidance for tenure-seeking professors as they work towards promotion and tenure in the Educational Leadership & Policy Studies Department (DELPS) in the College of Education (COE) at the University of Houston (UH). A portfolio must be submitted to the Department Chair by March 1st of the candidate's third year.

The faculty member will meet at least once a year, outside the normal yearly evaluation, with the Department Chair to review progress toward a successful third-year review. During the meeting, the faculty member will provide specific examples of his/her work in all three areas noted below. The Department Chair will, in turn, provide constructive feedback on the progress made during the entirety of employment in the tenure-seeking track position and practical guidelines for the faculty member moving forward. The department policy aligns with the UH Faculty Handbook.

Reviews during Probationary Period. Every tenure-track faculty will undergo an annual performance review conducted by the Department Chair or appropriate administrator or committee according to departmental procedures. Additionally, faculty whose appointment letters state that they have at least a four-year probationary period prior to being eligible for tenure must undergo a thorough pre-tenure review. This pre-tenure review is in addition to the annual performance review and will be carried out according to departmental procedures. This pre-tenure review normally is conducted during the faculty member's third year for those on a seven-year probationary period. The faculty member under pre-tenure review must submit a portfolio in accordance with departmental/college policies and criteria for mandatory tenure review. An independent review will be conducted by at least the departmental Promotion and Tenure committee and the departmental chair and include any additional review levels mandated to detail the strengths and weaknesses of the pre-tenure review portfolio. The final letters generated as part of the departmental pre-tenure review become part of any subsequent mandatory tenure review portfolio.

2. Schedule of Review Process

Each tenure-track faculty member will undergo a third-year review in the spring of the third full academic year of service. The review will consider all activities and achievements that are eligible for consideration in a promotion and tenure review, including activities undertaken by tenure-track faculty members in a comparable position at another institution. In accordance with the UH policy, if the tenure-track faculty member began service at UH in a non-tenure-track position, the review

should be held in the third year of full service since appointment to the tenure track and should include only those activities and accomplishments since entering the tenure track. Also, in accordance with UH policy, if a tenure track faculty member's probationary period is extended, the third-year review commences, as described here, at the end of the approved extension.

3. Evaluation Components

The areas of evaluation during the third-year review align with the University of Houston Faculty Handbook (UHFH) (p. 106) and Departmental policies regarding workload and tenure. Each area is listed below with the corresponding criteria needed for the review. While faculty are not expected to demonstrate full capacity in all three UH tenure and promotion areas during the third-year review, faculty are expected to demonstrate emerging national prominence, research and scholarship that are independent, teaching ability, and some service-based work.

A portfolio of the following components will form the basis for the evaluation. It is the responsibility of the tenure-track faculty member undergoing a third-year review to ensure that the material contained in the packet is complete, accurate, and professionally presented.

The third-year review portfolio should consist of a copy of the Offer Letter, Curriculum Vita, Statement of Accomplishments, and Relevant Exhibits.

4. Dossier Documents

- Offer letter
- If applicable, a copy of any approved extension letters.
- Curriculum Vitae
 - Research and scholarship
 - Teaching and student learning
 - Service
- Statement of Professional Accomplishments (3-page single space limit)
 - Description of career goals
 - Accomplishments in each area of the UH workload (research/scholarship, teaching and student learning, and service)
 - Direction for future professional work
- Relevant Exhibits
 - Up to three publications and/or papers under peer review that represent a sample of scholarly work.
 - All UH teaching evaluation scores and, as the candidate chooses, additional comments provided on those evaluations by students. Candidates may also include a contextualizing statement.
 - Evidence of service in support of what has been documented in the CV. Sample of evidence of service such as an email, letter, meeting agenda, website page, or certificate.

- Copies of the annual performance review letters from the Department.¹

5. Letters from the Review Committee and the Department Chair

The purpose of the third-year review is to provide feedback to tenure-track faculty to help them assess their progress toward achieving tenure at UH. It is also an opportunity for the department to carry out a comprehensive assessment of performance and make recommendations concerning the reappointment of the faculty member.

The letter from the review committee must indicate strengths and areas for improvement. The letter should also indicate a specific recommendation (see below) with accompanying vote by all committee members.

The letter from the Chair to the faculty member must indicate whether or not the pre-tenured faculty member is being reappointed, along with the terms of the reappointment (for instance, a one-year renewal with required 4th year review). The Chair's letter should state specific reasons for the decision and, if appropriate, suggestions for performance improvements. The letter should specifically indicate that one of three possible decisions has been made:

- Reappointment with no reservation
- Reappointment with reservation and specific steps to be taken (e.g., this may entail a one- or two-year renewal with an additional review scheduled before the mandatory tenure review)
- Non-reappointment with specific reasons

6. Due Process

In alignment with University Policy, faculty undergoing third-year review have the right to be heard, to clarify vagueness, and/or correct factual errors before any recommendation is forwarded to the next level of review.

¹ In the unusual circumstance where annual performance review letters are unavailable, continuation of service in the College is considered a proxy for good standing.

Third-Year Review – Overview of the Process

The purpose of the third-year review is to provide tenure-track faculty with an assessment of their progress towards achieving tenure. The review also provides an opportunity for the department and college to carry out a formal assessment of the candidate's performance to include recommendations regarding reappointment. The tasks and timeline for the third-year review process are outlined below:

Task	Timeline
Department Chair meets with faculty candidate to discuss preparation of third-year review materials.	Spring semester prior to the 3 rd year review year (i.e. Spring of year 2).
Department Chair appoints a Third-Year Review Committee comprised of a minimum of three (3) tenured faculty members in the department.	Fall semester of the 3 rd year review year.
Candidate prepares dossier for internal review.	Fall and early Spring.
Candidate submits electronic dossier to Department Chair, who in turn shares with the Third-Year Review Committee.	by March 1 st or the following business day in the event the 1 st falls on a weekend.
Department Chair and Third-Year Review Committee conduct independent reviews of candidate's dossier.	by April 1 st or the following business day in the event the 1 st falls on a weekend or holiday.
The Third-Year Review Committee Chair sends the recommendation letter to the candidate. Candidate has five business days to review the letter and present the committee with any corrections to factual errors.	5 working days from receipt of recommendation letter from the committee.
Department Chair meets with candidate to discuss results of dossier review and recommendations regarding reappointment.	by April 15 th or the following business day in the event the 15 th falls on a weekend or holiday.
Candidate has opportunity to respond in writing to letters prepared by Department Chair.	5 working days from receipt of decision letter from Chair.
In cases where the recommendation is non-reappointment, a letter must be sent by the Dean no later May 31st (see UHFH).	
In all circumstances, the candidate is entitled to due process as described in the UHFH.	

The deadlines are intended to be general guidelines so that the process may be concluded by the end of the spring semester. Any significant deviation from these deadlines (for example, by two weeks or

more) must be approved by the Department Chair. Any alterations in timelines need to continue to meet university deadlines and be completed no later than May 31st.

Appendix – Resources for Faculty

University of Houston, Faculty Handbook:

<https://uh.edu/faculty-senate/resources-and-publications/faculty-handbook/>

College of Education, Promotion and Tenure Policy located on UH COE Faculty Intranet:

<http://www.uh.edu/education/faculty-and-staff/mycoe/>

Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Promotion and Tenure Policy:

<https://www.uh.edu/education/departments/elps/policies/>

Revision Log

Revision Title	Inserted Revision	Date and Recorded Vote of Faculty Approval (including chair)
Original development of full policy	Full policy	October 3, 2017 (vote of 15-0)
Due process and voting	Section 6 was added to clarify due process procedures. Language was also added to specify inclusion of a vote. Finally, typographical errors were corrected.	April 2, 2019 (vote of 14-0-0)
Clarifications of language and timelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Font was changed to Arial to comply with ADA standards. • Wording on what information is included in the review process and what the committee reviews (page 1). • Extension letters in section 4 bullet 2. • Professional added before Accomplishments – Section 4 fourth bullet. • UH workload is defined in the fourth bullet on p. 2. • Moved evidence of service under the teaching bullet on the final bullet on p. 2. • Removed the term ‘mid-stream’ on the first sentence of the last paragraph on page 2. • First sentence page 3: added that all committee member’s votes must be present. • Links on p. 4 were updated to go directly to the documents. • Added a line on tasks table p. 5 to include candidate review of committee letter separate from chair review. • 15 days was moved to 5 days to ensure university deadlines can be met. • Added: Any alterations in timelines need to be continue to meet university deadlines. 	September 9, 2023 (vote 6-0-1, of 10 eligible faculty, i.e., T/TT)