

### **Procedure for Five-Year Review**

This review is conducted either by the chair alone, or in consultation with the departmental faculty. In both cases, the chair and the faculty member assemble the documentation needed to assess fully the latter's contributions to teaching, research, and service. The review period is since the last approved action. The required documentation includes:

1. List and copies of publications (Exhibit C).
2. Creative achievements since the last advancement.
3. List and evaluations of courses taught in the review period (Teaching, Advising, and Curricular Development Record).
4. Record of University and professional service in the review period.

#### **A. Review by the department chair**

1. The chair and the faculty member assemble the documentation above.
2. The chair meets with the faculty member to review the record, then makes one of three recommendations: advancement; no advancement, performance satisfactory; no advancement, performance unsatisfactory. (See the definitions in UCD-220, II.B.5)
3. The chair writes letter summarizing the meeting with the faculty member and evaluating the performance of the faculty member in teaching, research, and service. The chair must discuss the faculty member's progress with respect to the plan developed at the time of the third-year deferral, if one occurred.
4. If the performance is found to be unsatisfactory, the individual, working closely with the chair, must develop a plan for progress, including a timetable, that will be sent with the chair's letter. In this case, the Vice Provost forwards the full dossier to the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) for review and evaluation.
5. CAP may endorse the chair's review, request a full departmental review, and/or make a recommendation different from that of the chair.

#### **B. Review by the department**

1. Based on the record, the department, following its standard voting procedures for advancement at the current step of the faculty member, makes one of the three recommendations described above.
2. The chair meets with the faculty member to discuss the department's recommendation and forwards the recommendation in writing to the dean and Vice Provost along with the documentation discussed above.
3. The chair's letter summarizes the meeting with the faculty member and evaluates the performance of the faculty member in teaching, research, and service.

4. If the performance is found to be unsatisfactory, the individual, working closely with the chair, must develop a plan for progress that will be sent with the chair's letter. The chair must discuss the faculty member's performance/progress with respect to the plan developed at the time of the third-year deferral, if one occurred. In this case, the Vice Provost forwards the full dossier to CAP for review and evaluation.
5. CAP evaluates the chair's letter and review material and makes one of the three recommendations described above.