



Pre-Tenure Review Policy

Area:	Division of Academic Affairs	Number:	308
Applies to:	Division of Academic Affairs	Issued:	May 23, 2013
Sources:		Revised:	
		Reviewed:	August 9, 2018
Policy Owner:	Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs	Page(s):	2

I. Purpose

In addition to the annual review of faculty, the University conducts a comprehensive review of achievements and performance in the third year of the probationary period as a basis for recommending renewal or nonrenewal of the contract beyond the following year.

II. Policy Statement

Each department or unit must develop procedures and criteria within the parameters established by Regents policy and the university policy outlined below. The procedures and criteria shall be described to faculty by the department chair/unit head and provided to each incoming faculty member in a written set of departmental/unit procedures. The written procedures shall make clear that a positive pre-tenure review is not a guarantee of promotion and/or tenure.

Because the pre-tenure review looks ahead to tenure and, in many cases, promotion, criteria at the unit level must mirror the unit's tenure and promotion criteria, emphasizing excellence in teaching. The pre-tenure review must assess progress toward tenure and promotion and provide written feedback to the faculty member with specific suggestions for continued progress. The pre-tenure review may lead to a decision of nonrenewal in those cases where tenure is not possible.

The pre-tenure review is carried out in the third year of the probationary period or, in those cases where the faculty member has prior years of service toward tenure, at the midpoint of the remaining probationary period.

III. Exclusions

None.

IV. Procedures

By September 15th of each year, candidates for pre-tenure review are notified of their review and asked to prepare materials specified in the unit's procedures for submission by February 1st. Submissions should include copies of annual reviews and materials related to achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service. Unit procedures must outline how and by

whom the materials will be evaluated; how input will be sought from peers, students, unit heads, and others; and the specific criteria for the review. All input will be considered by a committee of tenured faculty which must include at least three members. Committees which function as part of the pre-tenure review should be diverse in their composition. Units are not required to substitute the pre-tenure review for the annual review but may do so.

The review committee shall deliver its written report to the unit head who is responsible for making a recommendation to the next level of administrative oversight. Unit heads who are department chairs will discuss the content of the review committee's report and their own recommendations with their dean. Unit heads shall then give the faculty member a written summary of their recommendation, a copy of the committee's report, and any suggestions for continued progress; discuss all materials with the faculty member; and give the faculty member an opportunity to provide a written response which will be appended to the written report. Feedback from the pre-tenure review should be candid and future-oriented. Unit heads are responsible for assisting faculty with implementing plans for continued progress. Such plans should be integrated with campus resources such as the Center for Teaching Excellence; internal and external grant programs; and formal and informal mentoring systems. In cases where tenure is not possible, the unit head will deliver a letter of nonrenewal consistent with timetables in Regents and university policies.

Both parties sign the report to indicate that they have discussed it. The unit head should remind the faculty member that a positive pre-tenure review is not a guarantee of promotion and/or tenure. The unit head apprises the next higher level of administrative oversight of the results of the pre-tenure review conference and provides that officer with a copy of the signed report. A copy shall be placed in the faculty member's file at the unit level, along with materials submitted for the review. Subsequent annual reviews should assess continued achievement and provide feedback regarding acceptable progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The dean composes a memorandum to the provost, summarizing the findings at each level of review for each candidate and including a final assessment on whether the candidate meets, exceeds, or falls below expectations. This memorandum is submitted *electronically* to the Provost's Office no later than mid-April.