



## Third year review Best Practices and Recommendations in the College of Family and Consumer Sciences

### Overview

In addition to annual performance review as a mechanism to provide feedback on the readiness of faculty for promotion for clinical faculty and for promotion and tenure, non-tenured assistant professors shall be given third-year reviews in accordance with the University Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure. From those guidelines, pages 25-26, Third Year Review for Assistant Professors is stated:

*The head of the Promotion and Tenure Unit (PTU) will appoint a faculty committee, in accordance with the appointment unit bylaws, to provide a thorough review of the individual's dossier. This committee will contain no fewer than three eligible faculty membership. The review will be substantive and will provide the faculty member with critical feedback about his/her progress toward promotion and/or tenure at the University of Georgia. The third-year review committee will report its findings to the PTU, and the eligible faculty, including the PTU head, will vote to recommend whether progress toward promotion and tenure is sufficient. The PTU head is not obligated to reveal his/her vote.*

*The committee will then report its recommendations, along with the vote, to the PTU head. The PTU head will provide the faculty member under review with a written report regarding his/her progress toward promoting and/or tenure. The candidate may reply in writing to the report within 30 days and any reply becomes part of the report. The PTU heads letter, and response by the candidate, will be included in the promotion and/or tenure dossier when it is developed.*

### Third-year review policies and “best practices” in the College of Family and Consumer Sciences

#### I. Department/Unit will use consistent terminology for providing feedback

The PTU committee and tenured faculty will use the four-point scale listed below. After consultation with the PTU tenured faculty the PTU head will make one of the following four recommendations. Progress is:

1. Satisfactory
2. Some improvement required
3. Substantial improvement required
4. Unsatisfactory

## **II. PTU head recommendation provides clear feedback**

The PTU head must provide a written recommendation to the non-tenured faculty under review. The third-year review should be used to convey appropriate information to non-tenured faculty. Areas of strengths and weaknesses should be identified, with emphasis on providing critical and clear feedback in alignment with the recommendation given and development of action steps/plans for needed improvements. Where a record is unsatisfactory, non-reappointment may be warranted.

The PTU head's third-year review statement and recommendation should:

- Describe the procedures followed in the department, a tally of the votes, and a statement of the recommendation of the PTU head.
- Consist of a comprehensive evaluative analysis of the candidate's "case" for promotion/tenure of the candidate, followed by a recommendation by the PTU head following the four recommendations described. Note: This is NOT to be an "executive summary" of the contents of the packet. The evaluative analysis should begin with a summary of the candidate's responsibilities. It should also document all statements and address all significant concerns/questions in the candidate's record.
- Include an analysis of all prior annual reviews. Identify trends in these performance evaluations. Analysis should be holistic and integrative across years of service, not a year-by-year disjointed discussion. If feasible, the Unit Head should include a discussion of the performance for each area of responsibility (teaching, research, public service, and service).
- Describe the range of the candidate's responsibilities (job expectations in explicit terms) and provide the context of the position. This is especially important for public service personnel and others with unique job expectations.
- The summary of faculty who has any assigned administrative responsibilities should include an evaluation of the candidate's performance of these responsibilities.
- Include an evaluative interpretation of any awards and other recognitions received by the candidate that are listed in the vitae.

### **III. Ballots of tenured faculty**

Ballots should be provided using the standard terminology. Progress is:

1. Satisfactory
2. Some improvement required
3. Substantial improvement required
4. Unsatisfactory

Each ballot should provide space for written feedback. The recommendation feedback should include frank, objective comments in its defense. This recommendation is to be used to provide feedback to the PTU head and is to be seen only by the PTU head. Completed ballots are not to be seen by the untenured faculty.

### **IV. Recommendations are conveyed to the dean**

The PTU head and the PTU committee written recommendations are both to be forwarded to the dean. This is followed up by a meeting of the PTU head with the dean to discuss the review prior to the sharing of the recommendations to the untenured faculty.

Version 02 16 2017

P:\Dean Fox\IP & T\Third Yr Review\Third year review best practices recommendations02 16 2017.docx