The School of Mathematics follows certain procedures in matters of reappointment, promotion, and tenure (abbreviated as RPT). This document outlines the procedures (not standards) currently employed in the School of Mathematics (SoM) when carrying out the so-called “critical review” of tenure track assistant professors.

The critical review is a third-year review meant to ascertain whether the candidate is on track for successful promotion and tenure decisions. As such, it should be considered as a “dry run” for the promotion and tenure review. Candidates should familiarize themselves with the document *RPT Procedures in the SoM: Promotion to Associate and Tenure*. The present document will assume knowledge of procedures for the promotion and tenure review, and will focus mostly on the differences.

1. **Overview**

The Critical Review is a review of the candidate’s progress in research, teaching, and service. It is similar in format and procedure to the application for tenure, and it proceeds through the same levels of review, up to and including the President of the Institute.

The contents of the package are similar to that for the promotion and tenure review, with the exception that no outside letters are included, biosketches of reviewers and sample letter to reviewers are not relevant, and there is a statement from the Chair to the effect that outside letters were not solicited.

2. **Timing**

2.1. **Instigation.** Faculty who are in their third year of service, and who have not yet undergone critical review, will undergo critical review in mid-year. The Associate Chair will inform these faculty of the need to submit documents for the review.

In cases where a faculty member was appointed with credit toward tenure, the critical review should take place at least one year before the promotion and tenure review. Thus in some cases, the review may take place before the third year. Faculty in this situation should discuss their plans with the Chair in order to decide when to initiate the critical review, ideally during the discussion around annual review.

2.2. **Timetable.** The following table gives the approximate deadlines for the critical review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late fall</td>
<td>Candidates wishing to undergo critical review discuss this option with the Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate submits CV and Research/Teaching/Service statement to Ms. Cook, who distributes them to the JP&amp;T committee, DOTE, Chair, and Associate Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>DOTE submits teaching report to Ms. Cook, who distributes it to the JP&amp;T committee, Associate Chair, and Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JP&amp;T committee submits its report to the Chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Date:* November 26, 2012.
Chair prepares his or her recommendation.

January Package is delivered to the Dean’s office.

3. OUTCOMES AND FEEDBACK

3.1. Feedback. After the final decision is received from the President of the Institute, the Chair will meet with the candidate and to discuss the review. There are four possible outcomes which are discussed below.

3.2. Recommendation for Reappointment. According to the CoS Promotion and Tenure website:

- This decision means you are well on track for tenure.

In this case no further Critical Reviews will be conducted before the candidate applies for tenure. The candidate may apply for tenure in any upcoming year in which they are eligible. The candidate is advised to discuss the timing of the application for tenure with the Chair.

3.3. Recommendation for Reappointment with Counseling. According to the CoS Promotion and Tenure website:

- This decision means you are largely on track for tenure. However, there are some concerns that you need to address. You will go up for critical review again the following year.

The Chair will discuss with the candidate the areas of concern that have been identified during the critical review. Other parties, such as the DOTE, may be involved in this discussion when appropriate. Another critical review will be conducted in the next academic year.

3.4. Recommendation for Reappointment with Warning. According to the CoS Promotion and Tenure website:

- This decision means you are not on track for tenure. There are definite areas you need to work on. You will go up for critical review again the following year.

The Chair will discuss with the candidate the areas of concern that have been identified during the critical review. Other parties, such as the DOTE, may be involved in this discussion when appropriate. Another Critical Review will be conducted in the next academic year.

3.5. Recommendation for Non-Reappointment. According to the CoS Promotion and Tenure website:

- This decision occurs when you are clearly not making adequate progress. You will be issued a terminal appointment.

In this case the candidate is issued a one-year appointment for the following academic year. This appointment cannot be renewed.