

April 2, 2007

From: Ahmed Abdelal, Provost
To: Academic Deans, Chairs
Subject: Third Year review guidelines

This memorandum is intended to articulate uniform guidelines to assist academic units in their efforts to effectively evaluate probationary tenure track faculty.

As you are aware, the faculty handbook makes reference to the annual review of probationary faculty (p.35, 2000 rev.) “*each department or comparable unit shall provide an annual review of progress for its probationary faculty by tenured faculty on specified tenure criteria*”. A large proportion of academic units have elaborated upon this and developed more comprehensive unit level review procedures at the mid point of the six year probationary period. In most of these cases the unit level guidelines make provision for the issuance of a terminal contract for faculty deemed not to have met specific criteria towards tenure in their respective units. Equally, a positive mid-point review, substantiated by appropriate documentation can form an important component of a candidate’s eventual tenure dossier.

The provost office has undertaken a comprehensive review of best-practices from the various procedures and policies for mid-point review developed by academic units. As a result of this, the following guidelines are provided for administration of mid-point review of tenure rack faculty. .

1. Each unit must describe a specific procedure for three-year review of tenure-track faculty, which is distinctive from annual review, and is more comprehensive in scope.
2. The mid point review must be conducted in the spring semester of the third probationary year.
3. As part of the process, a brief dossier is to be prepared by the probationary faculty member, using an abbreviated version of the model tenure dossier. It should contain a CV, statements on research / scholarship, teaching, and service, and supporting materials in each category (e.g. peer and student reviews, sample publications / proposals).
4. A defined committee is appointed by the unit for the purpose of review of the dossier prepared by the probationary faculty member.
5. The committee members review the dossier. The committee then generates a report, and conducts a formal vote which is recorded, and becomes (in the case of an affirmative outcome) part of the eventual tenure dossier.
6. As a result of the review, said committee will vote to recommend either i. reappointment, ii. reappointment subject to specific conditions being met (and subsequent re-evaluation) or iii. issuance of a terminal contract. The committee forwards the report to the unit chair (where relevant) and to the Dean.
7. The candidate is entitled to make a written response to the committee report . The committee will take such a response into consideration before finalizing its report.
8. The Committee report as well as any additional documentation / evaluation from the unit chair (where relevant) will be communicated to the Dean by March 31. The Dean, in turn, makes a recommendation regarding renewal to the Provost by April 15. The Provost will make the final determination regarding contract renewal or termination.