Third-Year Review Guidelines
The University of Texas at San Antonio

This set of guidelines provides information for faculty undergoing a Third-Year Review (TYR) as prescribed by the *Handbook of Operating Procedures* (*HOP*), chapter 2.24 "Third-Year Review." These guidelines also provide information for faculty serving on Department Faculty Review Advisory Committees (DFRAC), Department Chair/School Directors, and deans involved in the review process. These guidelines are reviewed annually and updated by Academic Affairs.

The process of promotion and tenure is one of the most important activities undertaken by the university each year as it is one means by which the university upholds high standards and expectations for its faculty. It is the incumbent responsibility of all who are involved in the review process to read all applicable materials, deliberate the strengths and weaknesses of each case in good faith, independence and with objectivity, and to observe confidentiality concerning the views of others, as revealed during review discussions. A respectful, thorough, and objective review of faculty accomplishments depends upon the conscientious efforts of all participants in the review process.

The TYR process is a pre-tenure comprehensive review process employed by the university *(i)* "to assess overall performance and provide the basis for a fair evaluation which may be used in the decision regarding reappointment;" and *(ii)* "to afford faculty an opportunity to practice preparing their files for review, document their achievements, and understand how they will be judged for tenure and promotion at UTSA" (HOP 2.24).

These guidelines are divided into several sections with the following contents:

Overview of Process— a brief description of the timeline for review and the responsibilities of each party at each stage of the process.

Preparation of the Review Packet— a listing of essential and optional elements to include in the review packet prepared by tenure-track faculty.

Review Process— an outline of the responsibilities of the Third-Year Review DFRAC (or TYR-DFRAC), Department Chair/School Director, and dean in carrying out the review.

Checklist— a summary of required and optional materials to be submitted for the purposes of third-year review.

Schedule for Third-Year Review

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. This includes activities undertaken by tenure-track faculty members in a comparable position at another institution. If the tenure-track faculty member began service at UTSA 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.

Overview of Process

The purpose of the third-year review is to provide mid-stream feedback to tenure-track faculty to help them assess their progress toward achieving tenure at UTSA. It is also an opportunity for the college and university to carry out a comprehensive assessment of performance and make recommendations concerning the reappointment of the faculty member. Each review involves evaluation by three different entities— the TYR-DFRAC, the Department Chair/School Director, and the dean.
The dean makes the final recommendation concerning the results of the third-year review. The review process is summarized in the table below:

When	*Who*	*Responsibility*
Spring	Academic Affairs	Notify deans which tenure-track faculty members are due to undergo a third-year review in the coming year.
	Academic Affairs	Notify tenure-track faculty that a third-year review will take place in the coming academic year.
Fall	Department Chair/School Director, Tenure-track faculty	Meet to review TYR process and provide/receive advice on assembling review packet.
Fall	Department	Departments are encouraged to have the entire DFRAC serve as the TYR committee, but departments may elect a TYR-DFRAC subcommittee to carry out the review.
	TYR-DFRAC	Report membership of TYR-DFRAC to the Dean no later than September 10th. The Dean's Office will provide the committee names to Academic Affairs.
		Convene to elect a committee chair by December 1st.
January	Tenure-track faculty under review	Assemble review packet and submit through Digital Measures Workflow no later than January 23rd or the first workday thereafter.

January-February	TYR-DFRAC	Evaluate the submission and prepare a written summary of evaluation analysis in Digital Measures Workflow.
		Full DFRAC review and approval of evaluation.
		Submit evaluation to Department Chair/School Director by Feb. 13th.
February	Department Chair/School Director	Review the submission and the TYR-DFRAC report. Write the chair's evaluation.
		Send copies of TYR-DFRAC and chair's reports to the faculty member under review.
February-March	Department Chair/School Director TYR-DFRAC Chair	Meet with tenure-track faculty member under review to discuss evaluation no later than March 3rd.
	Tenure-track Faculty Member	Optional opportunity to respond to departmental evaluation before it is forwarded to the Dean. Response due by March 10th.
March-April	Department Chair/School Director	Write summarizing report and forward to the Dean by March 24th through Digital Measures Workflow.
		Review TYR report and determine final evaluation.
	Dean	Provide a written recommendation for forwarding to Academic Affairs through Digital Measures Workflow by April 7th;
April	Provost	Discuss evaluations with deans and make recommendation to president concerning the reappointment of all faculty members undergoing third-year review.
April - May	President	Review and decide all recommendations concerning reappointment of faculty members by April 21st.
		Report non-reappointment decisions to provost, deans, and faculty members by May 1st.

The deadlines indicated in this chart 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 Academic Affairs upon the written request of the dean.

Preparation of the Review Packet

The review packet contains the materials that form the basis for the evaluation at all levels of review. It is the responsibility of the tenure-track faculty members undergoing a third-year review to ensure that the material contained in the packet is complete, accurate, and professionally presented.

The contents of the review packet should include the following elements (Described more fully below):

1. a professional curriculum vitae
2. a statement of professional goals, objectives, and accomplishments during the evaluation period
3. evaluations and analyses reported by the TYR-DFRAC, Department Chair/School Director, and dean, as well as any optional external review letters solicited by the department, and the optional response of the faculty member to the departmental review reports
4. documentation of teaching effectiveness
    o summary of course evaluations (complete template)
    o peer observer's report(s)
    o faculty member's report (s)
5. documentation of research accomplishments and plans
6. documentation of service contributions
7. optional supplementary materials

The professional curriculum vitae should serve as a simple listing of professional activities, while the optional supplementary materials may provide more in-depth information about those activities. The suggested contents of each of these elements should include but are not limited to those suggested below. The faculty member undergoing third-year review is responsible for preparing all items, except #3; the TYR-DFRAC, Department Chair/School Director, and college dean are responsible for appending materials contained in #3.

Items #1 – 2 and 4 – 7 constitute the review materials utilized by the TYR-DFRAC and the chair in evaluating the faculty member's performance. In general, the dean will only review items #1 – 2 along with the department's evaluation reports in #3, placing the primary responsibility for the review with the department. Items included in #4 – 7 may be made available to the dean, but are chiefly used at the department level.

Each of these items is described more fully in the following sections.

Checklist

A checklist of the essential contents of the review package, as well as a checklist of possible optional supplementary materials that may be submitted can be found on Academic Affairs' webpage.

1. Professional Curriculum Vitae

Name and Contact Information   This should include UTSA address, phone number, and email address, as well as current academic rank (for example, "Assistant Professor" or "Associate Professor without Tenure").

Educational Background   Please list all institutions from which a degree was earned, including the degree received and the major field of study.

Professional Employment History   List all positions held in sequential order, with applicable dates, since earning the baccalaureate degree, including the present position at UTSA.

Awards and Honors   List any awards, honors, prizes, competitions, or other recognition received related to professional activities.

Research/Scholarly/Creative Activities Summary

Summarize all products of research/scholarly/creative activities, including publications, exhibitions, performances, architectural projects, reviews, or other documentation of scholarly contributions. *All products should include the date and title of publication /exhibition /performance, the impact (e.g. impact factors, citations , Almetrics, etc.) the venue, and where applicable, the inclusive page numbers or size of the scholarly contribution*. List separately the different types of publications (e.g. journal articles, books, reviews, *etc.*), scholarly products, or creative activity outcomes, providing respective listings of invited contributions, refereed contributions, and non-refereed contributions. Use separate headings for publication status such as Published, Accepted, Under Review/Submitted, and In preparation with published works listed first.

Scholarly Presentations

List all external oral or poster presentations at conferences, meetings, or other institutions/universities related to scholarly work, and provide the dates and locations of presentations. Provide separate listings for invited presentations, refereed, and non-refereed contributions.

Granting Activities

Provide a list of grant proposals submitted, whether for research, instructional, or public service activities (please indicate one of these for each grant), giving the name of the granting agency, the project dates, the project title, and the total amount requested and awarded, if appropriate, for each.

Intellectual Property

Where applicable, provide a summary of any intellectual property generated from scholarly activities and indicate any patent applications, copyright privileges, licensing, or other commercialization that has resulted. The summary should include dates, titles, and identifying information.

Teaching Activities

List all formal courses taught at UTSA, indicating the level of the course (undergraduate or graduate) and its title. Provide a list of students mentored in research/scholarly/creative activities and any theses or dissertations directed. Summarize any service on graduate committees and for student advising.

Service Activities	Provide separate listings of all committee assignments, assigned administrative activities (for example, Department Chair/School Directormanship, center directorship, etc.), and professional service activities (including leadership in disciplinary organizations, service as a journal editor, manuscript or grant proposal reviewer, meetings or symposia organized, etc.). Each activity should include the dates of participation, the organizational level of the activity (for example, department, college, etc.), and any leadership roles played.

2. Statement of Professional Goals, Objectives, and Accomplishments

The statement of self-evaluation should be organized in three sections, outlining the applicant's activities, experiences, and plans in the areas of teaching, research/scholarly/creative activities, and service, respectively.

- For the teaching section, the applicant may wish to include a teaching statement outlining her or his philosophy/approach to teaching, and describe any innovative approaches used in delivering instruction.
- In the research/scholarly/creative activity section, the applicant can provide a context for her or his scholarly work including the impact and benefit of their work, indicating the relationship between different projects and plans for future scholarship and how those plans build on past accomplishments (if applicable).
- The service section should provide an overview of service activities and explain the applicant's participation in key service roles, including her or his philosophy of service and how it complements teaching and scholarly activities.

The statement of self-evaluation should be no more than 10 pages long.

Covid Impact Checklist*

We also recognize that the COVID-19 pandemic may have caused varying disruptions to faculty in their teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service goals. Furthermore, we understand that these disruptions impact individual faculty in unique ways, based on differing responsibilities and circumstances, and differing timescales and intensities. The COVID_19 Impact Checklist allows faculty to provide information on disruptions to their teaching, research / scholarship / creative activity, and/or service that provide additional, important evaluation context.
Faculty will submit their Covid Impact Checklist in Digital Measures Workflow after the TYR-FRAC has completed their evaluation, before the review packet is forwarded to the Department Chair/School Director.

3. Evaluation and Review Materials

As the TYR packet goes through the evaluation process, each level of review should append its analysis and recommendation to the packet for consideration by the next level of review. Guidelines for these various levels of review are provided in the "Review Process" section of these guidelines below. The materials should be arranged in the following order, with the responsibility for appending each set of materials indicated below:

Item	Responsible Individual	When
TYR-DFRAC evaluation report	TYR-DFRAC Chair	After faculty packet received
Chair's evaluation report Response to departmental review by faculty member (optional) Chair's summary memo, if faculty member provided a written response to departmental review	Department Chair/School Director	Upon completion of department-level evaluation
Dean's evaluation	Dean	Upon completion of college-level review

The department may opt to solicit a "friendly" external review letter as part of its total evaluation process. This is ___not___ a required step, but may provide helpful third-party constructive advice to the faculty member. For example, one might ask a former mentor of the faculty member to examine the review packet and provide feedback to the faculty member about appropriate activities to undertake that would optimize chances for a successful application for promotion and tenure. The use of such a letter should be agreed upon in advance by the faculty member and the Department Chair/School Director as it may necessitate earlier preparation of the review packet. If the optional external review is used by the TYR-DFRAC and the Department Chair/School Director, the letter should be included along with the department's evaluation reports in this section of the packet before sending forward to the dean.

4. Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness

Listing of Courses with Teaching Evaluation Summaries

Provide a table of courses taught during the evaluation period (the probationary period), using the template provided below (this template may be downloaded from the Academic Affairs' website or the information can be run using the "UTSA Summary of Student Course Evaluations" report in Digital Measures). Do not include copies of student evaluation surveys or comments among these materials.

Semester	Course No.	Course Type	New Prep?	Course Enrollment	No. of Responses	Course Rating	Instructor Rating
SP2011	ABC.nnn3	LD, UD or GR	NEW	Xxx	Yyy	X.X	Y.Y
Note: LD = lower division, UD = upper division, GR = graduate level							

Teaching Portfolios	For each course taught, provide a portfolio containing the course syllabus, exams, handouts, problem sets and other written assignments, and other course materials developed by the faculty candidate.
Peer Observation Report(s)	Please refer to the Peer Observation Guidelines and the HOP, Chapter 2.20 "Peer Observation of Teaching" for more information.
Instructional Development	List any workshops, seminars, or other related meetings attended (or organized) to increase pedagogical effectiveness. This information should include the dates, formats, locations, and names of organizers.
Instructional Grants	List all grants related to instructional activities. This may be taken directly from relevant grants listed on the professional curriculum vitae and should contain the information indicated above for "Grant Activities." Provide copies of all funded grants and, optionally, referee comments for those grant proposals.
Teaching Awards	List any awards received for excellence in university-level teaching. This may include both awards received at UTSA and at other institutions of higher education, and should indicate the date, award name, awarding unit (for example, college, university, *etc*.), and institution.
Students Mentored	Provide a list of all students mentored in scholarly and research activities under your mentorship. For undergraduate course advisement, a summary of the number of students served is sufficient.

5. Documentation of Research Accomplishments and Plans

Scholarly Products

Provide an electronic copy of all research/scholarly/ creative works produced during the evaluation period. This includes full copies of any journal articles, book chapters, papers in conference proceedings, architectural projects, digital images of artwork, recordings of musical performances or compositions, and other short-format works. These may include manuscripts under review or in preparation. *All relevant products should include the impact (e.g. impactor factor of the journal, citation indices, Altmetrics, etc.) of the published work.* Portions of books may also be scanned to create a digital image for use in the internal review. In cases where the amount of scholarly products is extensive, a representative sample of scholarly products may be submitted, after consultation with the Department Chair/School Director.

Reviews

Where appropriate, provide copies of any reviews of scholarly and creative activity, including reviews of books published, exhibitions, performances, compositions, architectural projects, and other creative endeavors.

Grant Proposals

An electronic copy of all funded grant proposals, as well as any proposals under review, or in preparation, should be provided with an indication of the present status of the proposal. Referee comments from funded proposals may be submitted along with the proposals themselves. If the amount of funded proposals is extensive, a representative sample of proposals may be submitted, after consultation with the Department Chair/School Director.

Intellectual Property

Provide documentation of any intellectual property produced, including patents, copyrights, licensing agreements or other commercialization activities. Faculty are not required to divulge sensitive information concerning the intellectual property, but may document its development and potential commercialization through letters and other communications.

6. Documentation of Service Activities

Committee Assignments   Separately list committee assignments at the department, college, and university levels, indicating dates of service and the name of the committee chair. Applicants should also indicate the extent of their contributions to the work of each committee listed.

Professional Service Activities   List any activities related to professional service, both internal and external. These may include committee assignments, manuscript and proposal review, journal editorship, organization of meetings, and other assistive activities. In all cases, provide dates of service, organizations served, and time committed.

Leadership Positions   Provide a summary of any leadership positions held at the university or within a professional/disciplinary organization or society. List the dates for each applicable position, the responsibilities of the position, and the time commitment involved in executing the responsibilities of the position. Also, indicate any special accomplishments achieved while in the leadership position.

7. Optional Supplementary Materials

Faculty members undergoing third-year review may submit optional supplementary materials to highlight or document achievement in the areas of teaching, research/scholarly/creative activities, and service activities. A checklist of possible items that might be included among the supplementary materials is included in the Digital Measures Workflow form.

Faculty members may also make available other supplementary materials in support of the application, including full sets of student teaching surveys with comments, works in progress, a statement of future research goals and directions, and other items as allowed by the department and college. The supplementary materials are primarily used at the departmental level of review. Once the department-level evaluations are completed, the optional supplementary materials will remain available during the college review of the packet. In extraordinary cases, where the supplementary materials might clarify a point in dispute from earlier reviews, the dean may request access to these materials for a given case.

The intent of supplementary materials is to facilitate the separate evaluations of the TYR-DFRAC and the Department Chair/School Director in this process.

Special Note to Faculty

These guidelines are intended to help you prepare a compelling, well-documented packet for your third-year review. Much of the content of this packet is identical to the material that you will collect in preparation for consideration for tenure and promotion. Your application packet will be evaluated at all levels of the review. For you research/scholarly/creative activities it is important

that all products include the date and title of publication/exhibition/performance, the impact factor of the journal, number of citations for the publication, the venue, and where applicable, the inclusive page numbers or size of the scholarly contribution. As you prepare your packet, please consider how readily a reader may access and absorb the material it contains. Repetition and verbosity will only serve to fatigue reviewers without adding substance to your packet— be as succinct as possible in each section of the packet.

Review Process

The third-year review should not differ significantly from the review that takes place for promotion from assistant to associate professor with tenure; and, therefore departments are encouraged to have the TYR-DFRAC committee consist of DFRAC as a whole. Whether the entire DFRAC or a subcommittee prepares the initial report, the TYR-DFRAC report should be signed by all members of DFRAC. The process for third-year reviews involves three levels, including the TYR-DFRAC, the chair, and the dean. At each level of this process, the reviewer(s) should pay particular attention to the question whether or not the candidate is making acceptable progress toward promotion and tenure. Deficiencies should be assessed to determine whether or not a candidate's performance in any category places him or her in a situation in which success is unlikely. In those cases, the review should explicitly state the problems and the reviewers should make a recommendation to the Provost as to the continuing appointment of the candidate.

Membership of the TYR- DFRAC Committee

The membership of the TYR-DRAC committee is determined by the following process:

- In years that a faculty member is undergoing a third-year review, the DFRAC of each department, as defined by department and/or college bylaws, shall serve as the TYR-DFRAC or the DFRAC may elect a subcommittee to serve as the TYR-DFRAC committee.

- If the TYR-DFRAC committee does not consist of the entire DFRAC, the TYR-DFRAC should include at least three (3) tenured faculty members. Faculty who are appointed as part-time administrators are eligible to serve on the TYR-DFRAC. If there are fewer than three (3) eligible faculty members to serve on the committee, the chair shall nominate a slate of potential members from outside the department to be appointed by the dean. The slate should include at least two nominees for each vacancy that needs to be filled by dean's appointment.

- The TYR-DFRAC shall elect its own chair.

- The committee chair is responsible for constructing and submitting the TYR-DFRAC's report to the chair through Digital Measures Workflow.

- Each DFRAC member shall sign-off on the committee chair's report. If the TYR-DFRAC is a subcommittee of the whole DFRAC, then the committee's report shall be made available to the entire DFRAC for final review and approval.

Roles of Various Entities

The third-year review process is governed by the college dean, with the primary evaluation occurring at the department and college level. The role of each entity may be summarized as follows:

Tenure-Track Faculty Member— compiles the review packet for evaluation by the department and college. Upon completion of the department's review, the faculty member will meet with the Department Chair/School Director and the chair of the TYR-DFRAC to discuss the review. The faculty member should receive a copy of the reports from the TYR-DFRAC and Department Chair/School Director at least 3 work days in advance of the meeting. After discussing the review, the faculty member is invited to optionally comment on the reports in terms of clarification, the likelihood of accomplishing the necessary steps to be awarded tenure, neglected or additional information that came in after the review process was initiated, and explain any extenuating circumstances that may warrant further consideration before a decision will be rendered about contract renewal. The candidate may also elect not to respond to the report without penalty.

TYR-DFRAC— a full and detailed analysis of the faculty member's performance during the evaluation (probationary) period. The TYR-DFRAC provides a peer review by those members of the university community best qualified to judge the quality of the faculty member's activities. Accordingly, the TYR-DFRAC should provide a detailed written analysis of the faculty member's instructional, research/scholarly/creative, and service activities and make a recommendation for the performance evaluation in each of these three areas of activity. The analysis of the TYR-DFRAC should ideally represent a consensus of the committee, but where there are differences, the report should clarify all perspectives.

Department Chair/School Director— a full and detailed review of the faculty member's performance during the evaluation period, from the perspective of how that performance meets the expectations of the discipline and the department and addresses its mission, subject to the protections of academic freedom. The chair should independently evaluate the review packet, but consider the analysis of the TYR-DFRAC in arriving at a recommended evaluation in each area of performance and an overall evaluation. The chair's report should succinctly amplify points in the TYR-DFRAC report where there is agreement, and fully explain the reasons for any differences of opinion with the TYR-DFRAC report. When the chair's evaluation report is completed, the chair shall send a copy of that report, along with the TYR-DFRAC report, to the candidate, then schedule a meeting with the faculty member and the TYR-DFRAC chair to discuss the evaluation. If the candidate opts to provide a response to the chair's and/or the TYR-DFRAC's reports, the chair will then need to provide a summarizing analysis of the review report that takes the faculty member's response into account.

Dean— an independent, comprehensive review of the review packet, taking the TYR-DFRAC and Department Chair/School Director's analysis and recommendations, as well as the faculty member's optional response, into consideration. The dean is responsible for maintaining high standards for performance within the college and for analyzing cases in the context of how faculty performance achieves the mission and objectives of the college, again subject to the protections of academic freedom. The dean should provide a written analysis of each case under review, but may liberally cite opinions and analysis provided by earlier levels of review. In cases where the dean is in agreement with all previous analyses and recommendations, it is sufficient to provide a simple statement of agreement. When final evaluations are forwarded to Academic Affairs, the dean shall notify all faculty members undergoing third-year review of the final evaluation.

The dean is also responsible for evaluating and recommending the need for corrective and/or remedial actions needed to enhance the possibility for successful promotion or, conversely, for determining whether a terminal contract should be offered.

General Guidelines for the Third-Year Review DFRAC

In addition to the policies expressed under HOP 2.24, the TYR-DFRAC should adhere to the following guidelines. Careful observance of these policies and guidelines is necessary to ensure a fair, objective, and consistent process throughout the analysis of each third-year review.

- The TYR-DFRAC conducts internal peer evaluations for the purpose of making recommendations on the evaluation of faculty performance.

- Faculty members serving on the TYR-DFRAC have the responsibility to read **all** review packet materials, reviewing the applicant's performance in each of the performance criteria thoroughly and participating in committee discussions and formulating committee recommendations. Participation by proxy, email, absentee, etc., is not appropriate.

- The analysis of a TYR-DFRAC should indicate the factors that contributed to the committee's recommendations **and** illuminate any factors that were prominently cited during the deliberations that would have been supportive of a contrary or alternative recommendation.

- Recommendations should be based on consistently applied criteria appropriate for the faculty candidate's academic discipline.

- Faculty serving on a TYR-DFRAC should focus on factual information and guard against inaccuracies caused by either emphasis or omission of information.

- Minority opinions and analyses from members of FRACs may optionally be included as part of the FRAC report along with other committee analyses and recommendations. These "minority reports," if utilized, may be segregated in a separate section of the report, but should not be submitted separately, and should be made available for review by the entire FRAC to ensure consistency. No other information or correspondence may be placed in the applicant's file for transmittal to a Department Chair/School Director or onward to the provost.

- Only tenured faculty members may serve on a TYR-DFRAC. As described above, if the committee, when constituted in accordance with the *Handbook* and college bylaws, has fewer than three tenured professors, the chair shall nominate and the dean shall appoint additional tenured professors from outside of the department until there are three on the committee.
- The TYR-DFRAC report should be signed by all DFRAC members.

Each dean is responsible for reviewing policies and procedures and these guidelines with Department Chair/School Directors and for assuring that these policies, procedures and instructions are followed.

Guidelines for Department Chair/School Director's Evaluation

A critical part of the third-year review process is the recommendation of the Department Chair/School Director because the chair has the greatest competence to review the quality of a faculty member's performance within the academic discipline, balanced by the context of the department's long- term needs and aspirations. The chair's report should contain the following essential elements:

- a copy of the TYR-DFRAC's report;

- an analysis of the candidate's contributions in each of the areas of teaching, research/ scholarly/ creative activity, and service within the context of the department's needs;

- an explanation of aspects of the case within the academic discipline that may be unfamiliar to reviewers at the college-level— for example,
  - accepted standards for publishing scholarly work, including multiple author protocols,
  - the importance of the faculty member's contribution in any collaborative activities,
  - the quality and impact of the publication outlets, performance venues, or exhibition galleries (as appropriate) utilized by the applicant,
  - clarification of usual citation numbers for researchers in the faculty member's field,
  - the significance of the teaching activities undertaken by the faculty member relative to disciplinary norms,
  - departmental expectations for student research mentoring at both undergraduate and graduate levels,
  - the significance of any professional service contributions made by the faculty member,
  - the willingness of the faculty member to serve on departmental committees, *etc*.

- a succinct statement of the chair's recommendation, with explanation of the factors leading to this recommendation.

The chair should strive to compose the report using factual data to support conclusions, and expressing the evaluation in terms of departmental expectations and aspirations. Most importantly, the chair should endeavor to connect the performance with the department's expectations for a tenured faculty member.

Guidelines for Dean's Evaluation

The role of the dean's evaluation is to uphold high standards across the college and ensure that each faculty member's performance supports the long-term quality and productivity of the college. In all cases, the dean's evaluation should provide the following essential information:

- the nature of the department's recommendations through the TYR-DFRAC and chair,

- a succinct statement of the dean's evaluation and any recommendations—possible outcomes include:

  o If performance evaluation is "satisfactory," send written notification of that fact to the Provost (through Digital Measures Workflow) and recommend reappointment of faculty member to Provost by April 10th. Also, send written notification to the faculty member, and include a concise analysis of the faculty member's performance strengths and weaknesses, with specific advice about areas in which the faculty member should focus attention during the remaining probationary period.

  o If performance evaluation is "unsatisfactory," submit all written reports to the Provost (through Digital Measures Workflow) with dean's recommendations for reappointment and/or corrective actions or issuance of a terminal contract by April 10th.

If the TYR-DFRAC and chair have provided analyses and recommendations with which the dean is in agreement, then the dean may provide a succinct statement of concurrence with the earlier analyses.

If earlier recommendations express diverse outcomes, or if the dean disagrees with their conclusions, then a more comprehensive report should be provided. That report should contain an explanation of the reasons supporting the dean's recommendation, citing decisive arguments included in the TYR-DFRAC and/or chair's reports. The dean should take care to express conclusions within the context of the college's expectations and aspirations for long-term quality among its faculty.

Retention of Third Year Review Documents

Third Year Review documents are retained in accordance with the university's official retention schedule, as follows:
- Record series 3.1.143 Faculty Promotion and Tenure Review Records (Promotion File) – Evaluations, recommendations memos, etc. are retained for 2 years following the date granting/denying reappointment.
- Record series 3.1.137 Employee Recognition Records – A copy of the letter granting/denying reappointment is retained for 5 years after employment ends.

The university's full records retention schedule can be accessed through the following link:
https://www.utsa.edu/openrecords/retention.html