

Third Year Review

The third year review is an opportunity to obtain feedback on the tenure track faculty member's progress toward tenure. A dossier must be submitted to the department chair by January 15 of the candidate's third year. The department chair, in consultation with the executive associate dean, will identify a three person review committee to provide a written formative evaluation of the candidate's progress. The evaluation will be used to identify specific activities to enhance the candidate's progress toward tenure.

A candidate for tenure (and/or promotion) must excel in at least one of the three categories (teaching, research/creative activity, service) and be at least satisfactory in the others. An alternative is for an individual to submit the dossier as a "balanced case" and to present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance or comparable benefit to the university. The balanced case is not a default option when an individual fails to reach excellence in one of the three domains; rather the balanced case is planned and reflects integration across the three. From the first year of appointment, a candidate, in discussions with the chair and mentor(s), should consider how to best put forward the case that will be submitted in August following the fifth year. The strategy for forwarding the case should be revisited periodically during the tenure probationary period. The third year review provides an excellent opportunity to obtain feedback on the candidate's decision on whether to forward the case as outstanding in one area or as a balanced case.

The candidate should compose a dossier that is divided into the following four sections: General, Teaching; Research/Creative Activities; and Service.

I. General

- The candidate's personal statement about teaching, research/creative activities, and service. The candidate's statement may include excerpts from progress or final reports submitted to funding agencies as supplemental descriptions of the candidate's current and future research endeavors.
- A vita with a list of all publications designating, in the left-hand margin, whether the publication was evaluated as evidence of teaching, research/creative activities, or service.

Annual Reviews should not be included in the dossier unless specifically requested by the candidate. These reviews represent private communications between the individual faculty member and the closest supervisor, and should remain private.

II. Teaching

This section of the dossier should contain objective evidence of the candidate's performance as a teacher. Evidence submitted in this section should be selected to present a complete description of the characteristics and of the quality of the candidate's teaching. To present a comprehensive and balanced perspective on teaching, three general sources of data must be presented.

Instructor generated

- list of the specific courses taught and the enrollments listed by semester and academic year; the most recent syllabi of each course taught
- The numbers of Ph.D., M.A., or similar committees chaired or served on and the titles of any dissertations directed, listed by academic year.
- Titles and abstracts of any dissertations directed

- A list of the publications which are relevant to teaching.
- A statement of the candidate's philosophy of teaching, and reflections on efforts to evaluate and improve teaching

Peer/Colleague Generated

- Observations of classroom performance
- Evaluations of pedagogy used in teaching, quality of readings, rigor of courses, student evaluation procedures, links between teaching goals and design of courses etc.

Student generated

- solicited and unsolicited feedback from students,
- course-related student products,
- student evaluations

III. Research/Creative Activities

Dossiers must contain evidence that reveals the candidate's research efforts:

- A list of the candidate's research/creative publications. When a manuscript is accepted for publication, the letter from the editor should be attached.
- Copies of professionally relevant publications, including print and electronic journals.
- An indication by the candidate of the division of labor on co-authored works, i.e., the candidate's contribution to works with more than one author. The exact status of each publication should be noted. For example, articles which have been officially accepted by an editor or publisher should be identified as "in press." Articles which have been submitted for editorial review, but which have not been accepted or which have been accepted subject to revision should be identified as "submitted" or "under editorial review." Work in preparation should also be labeled.
- Funded project activity

IV. Service

This portion of the dossier should contain:

- A list of the candidate's service activities.
- A list of the candidate's service-related publications.

Service activities may be rendered to the Department, to the University, to professional organizations, to governmental bodies or to other similar institutions. Service may occur at local, state, national or international levels.

The tenure track candidate should consult the Dean of Faculties web page to determine the most current form of the Dossier Checklist. See: <http://www.indiana.edu/~deanfac/>