

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
GRADUATE COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK

RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP)
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
FOR
TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

The Faculty Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee (RTP) is charged with responsibility for making recommendations to the Dean regarding faculty retention, tenure and promotion. The Constitution of the Faculty Association requires that in carrying out these responsibilities, the RTP Committee generate criteria and standards for faculty retention, tenure and promotion for adoption by the Faculty Association. At all times in the retention, tenure and promotion process, only full-time tenured faculty of the same or higher rank being sought may participate in the review and recommendation of action regarding tenure and promotion. This statement sets forth the criteria and procedures which are applied in assessing and evaluating faculty for retention, promotion and tenure.

A. Faculty Evaluation Criteria

1. Introduction

Faculty performance assessment and evaluation criteria stem from three considerations:

- a) The competence of faculty is judged and rewarded on the basis of demonstrated accomplishment relevant to the goals and objectives of the Graduate College of Social Work, University of Houston and the social work profession.
- b) The Graduate College of Social Work's mission of providing a nationally recognized, quality program in social work education for professional practice implies that the focus of faculty assessment and evaluation should be on faculty achievements in relation to teaching, research/scholarship, and service.
- c) According to the University of Houston's criteria for faculty promotion and tenure evaluations (refer to UH Faculty Handbook), faculty members must demonstrate excellence in the performance of teaching, research/scholarship, and service activities if national recognition of educating graduate social workers is to be achieved. The major criteria applied in the evaluation process are teaching excellence and scholarly excellence carrying equal weight of 40% each and service component weighted 20%.

2. Definitions

- a) **TEACHING** is defined to include: 1) classroom instructional activities; 2) design and planning of courses in the various curricular areas of the M.S.W. program; 3) directing doctoral dissertations, M.S.W. theses, and independent studies; 4) educational advisement of students; and 5) field liaison activities.
- b) **RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP** includes 1) sponsored and non-sponsored research projects completed and currently in progress; 2) published works including books, monographs, articles in refereed journals and published computer software programs, and 3) papers presented at scholarly meetings of the social work profession and related disciplines.
- c) **SERVICE** is defined as service to the University, the community, and the profession. Included are: 1) GCSW, UH, UH System Committee membership and chairpersonships; 2) GCSW and University administrative responsibilities; 3) non-remunerated services to human service agencies; 4) remunerated consultant services; and 5) non-remunerated services to the profession.

3. Criteria for 2nd, 4th, and 5th year Retention Reviews

- a) Second year retention reviews focus upon the faculty member's progress toward readiness for the third year review that is mandated by the University.
- b) Fourth and fifth year retention reviews focus upon the faculty member's progress toward readiness for the 6th year review for promotion and tenure.

4. Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

- a) A clearly demonstrated record of meritorious scholarship. In general, at least one article for each year in a refereed journal or its equivalent will be the initial basis for demonstrating a record of scholarship. Decisions about the merit of a candidate's total scholarship record are based on more complex and qualitative factors, including the number of articles (or equivalent), the quality of articles as judged by the committee and the external reviewers, the quality of the journals, the relative contribution of the author to co-authored articles, the number of solo authored articles, a consistent pattern of scholarship, the number, amount, and source of funded grants, and evidence of expertise in a topical area.
- b) A clearly demonstrated record of quality teaching with evidence of skill, rigor, thoughtfulness, and creativity. This can be reflected in high scores on student and annual evaluations, course syllabi, curriculum

development and papers on curriculum development, and other means of evaluation and documentation.

- c) A record of professional and public service of quality and recognized value, which may include service to the College, University, profession, community, and public.

5. Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor

In the case of promotion to full Professor the criteria set forth for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor in the Graduate College of Social Work will be more vigorously applied (sustained effort over the five-year period) and the individual faculty member must have demonstrated significant achievement and original contribution in his/her field of expertise. In addition, the faculty member must have attained national visibility and reputation as indicated by involvement within national professional organizations, governmental activities, number and quality of invited speeches, journal articles, special reports and presentations, etc. Also, academic leadership must be demonstrated in the areas of curriculum development, design of courses and chairing of significant academic committees within the academic unit. Promotion to Full Professor is a mark of high commitment and major contribution to teaching research, scholarship, and service.

B. Faculty Evaluation Procedures

The RTP Committee is responsible for evaluating the performance of all who hold faculty appointments in the GCSW and who are eligible for retention, promotion and tenure except for promotion to the rank of Full Professor (see below). Visiting faculty and lecturers with non-tenure track appointments are exempted. The Dean notifies the RTP Committee of the names of persons who are eligible for sixth-year mandatory promotion and tenure reviews and those who are eligible for first, second, third, fourth or fifth year retention reviews. This Committee is chosen according to the By-Laws of the Faculty Association.

The review committee for promotion to Full Professor will be composed of all Full Professors at the GCSW, excluding the Deans. It will consist of not less than four people and will elect its own chairperson. The Dean notifies Full Professors when there is a candidate for promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

The Chairperson of the relevant review committee asks the faculty member to supply the information in the candidate's portfolio (described below). The review committee also obtains the external reviews for faculty members being considered for tenure and promotion. The Dean provides to the Committee copies of the faculty member's student evaluations of teaching scores for all courses taught with comparative GCSW faculty data where available and appropriate.

C. Guidelines for a Candidate's Portfolio – In presenting their portfolios, candidates must include the following:

1. Background Information

- a) A Candidate's Statement must include a personal perspective on academic career goals, accomplishments, current professional and research interests, plans for scholarly activities during this academic year and the future. The candidate may describe how all facets of his/her career form an integrated, successful profile or identify goals, personal style and philosophy of work, and achievements separately in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
- b) A current curriculum vitae.
- c) Copies of previous reviews from GCSW RT&P committee, if any, and an explanation by the candidate of how prior year's recommendations have been addressed.
- d) An explanation of by the candidate any special workload arrangements with the Dean, such as buy-out of teaching or service during a particular semester; overload teaching assignments, and so forth.

2. Supporting Documentation

a) Teaching

- 1) Copies of the GCSW-supplied teaching scores, as provided by the Dean's office, for all courses taught for the year(s) under review.
- 2) A list of courses taught each semester with syllabi and assignments and the number of students enrolled in each course and information about responsibilities for doctoral dissertations, master's theses, and independent studies. List most recent ones first.
- 3) Descriptions of any courses or curriculum programs developed and/or revised.
- 4) Examples of teaching materials and methods developed and used may be provided. A description of field liaison responsibilities (agencies and numbers of students).

b) Research/Scholarship

- 1) A list of publications, including books, monographs, articles (marked with an asterisk if refereed), book chapters, with the

most recent ones listed first. Co-authors should be listed in the order that they appear in print. Works actually in press may be included. Correspondence verifying that works have been accepted for publication, but not yet published should be provided. Appendix A should be used to report refereed journal articles.

- 2) Copies of books, publications and articles in refereed journals and copies of reviews of publications.
 - 3) Copies of papers presented at scholarly and professional meetings. These should be distinguished according to whether they were (a) refereed or invited, (b) delivered to scholarly, professional, or lay audiences, and (c) delivered at national, regional, or state conferences or delivered in other settings.
 - 4) Copies of research and/or training grant proposal titles, summaries and abstracts. Identify the agencies to which proposal was submitted, the amount of money requested, and the role of the candidate in developing the proposal. List the principal investigator and all co-investigators. Indicate whether the proposal was or was not funded or is still under consideration and the relevant time period covered. If an unfunded grant proposal will be revised and resubmitted, this can be stated.
 - 5) Work under review for publication may be included.
 - 6) Technical reports.
- c) Service since Joining GCSW Faculty (indicate whether paid or voluntary). List most recent one first in four areas.
- 1) Service to GCSW
 - 2) Service to the University of Houston
 - 3) Service to the Profession
 - 4) Service to the Community or Public
- d) Release statement. A release statement giving permission to the Dean to share with the reviewing committee the candidate's:
- 1) Course evaluations by students
 - 2) Prior year's RT&P evaluations

3. Candidate for Tenure and Promotion (only)

- a) Names and affiliations of up to three nominations for external reference from professors at other schools of social work who are competent to evaluate the candidate's research/scholarship. The University requires a minimum of three and a maximum of six external references. The review committee will select one from the

candidate's nominations and the rest from the committee's own nominations.

- b) A release statement giving the Committee permission to contact external references.
4. The candidate's portfolio should be organized with the candidate's statement and curriculum vitae at the beginning and the supporting materials organized in different sections for teaching, research/scholarship, and service. Faculty being reviewed may continue to add materials to a portfolio as new publications are accepted or additional classes are taught or service provided. They may make appropriate revisions to a vitae until the GCSW review process is completed. However, the review committee can not consider materials that come in after a decision has been rendered and its report has been submitted to the Dean.

D. Review Process

In conducting reviews, the committee evaluates the cumulative performance of the faculty member. It is the sole responsibility of the faculty candidate to collect and present the evidence in the portfolio. The role of the review committee is one of judging (not gathering) evidence as presented in 1) the portfolio, 2) teaching evaluations provided by the Dean, 3) prior years' RTP recommendations to the Dean, and) 4) external references (for tenure and promotion candidates). The Committee does not gather additional evidence. The Committee meets and carefully applies the relevant criteria to evaluate the achievements of each applicant accordingly.

In making retention reviews, members of the RTP Committee may recommend to the Dean 1) continuance of the probationary appointment for the ensuing year (provided the ensuing year is not the final year of the probationary period), or 2) a non-renewable contract with appropriate notice.

When reviewing candidates for promotion and/or tenure, members of the Committee make one of two decisions: 1) to support the application of the faculty member for promotion and/or tenure, or 2) the denial of promotion and/or tenure for the faculty member.

A count of votes and the decision of the reviewing committee is submitted in writing to the faculty member being evaluated with a justification for the recommendation. The decision of the Committee is final and is forwarded to the Dean unless the faculty member appeals the decision within ten (10) working days of the time the Chairperson of the committee notifies the applicant of the Committee's decision.

A faculty member indicates a desire to appeal the committee's decision through memoranda to the Chairperson of the reviewing committee within ten days after being notified of the committee's decision. The committee is obligated to hear the appeal of a faculty member within ten (10) working days after the receipt of request for reconsideration of the decision. The faculty member is informed by memorandum of the time and place of meeting at which the appeal will be heard. Following the faculty member's presentation, the committee meets in closed session to review and consider its recommendation. After it has made its decision regarding the appeal, the Committee communicates the decision in writing to the Dean with a copy to the faculty member. Subsequent to the appeal, the decision of the committee is final. The committee's recommendation is considered to be independent of the Dean's recommendation. The Dean then makes his/her own decision and makes a recommendation to the Provost.

If there is disagreement between the reviewing faculty peer committee and the Dean regarding a third year review or a promotion or tenure review, this disagreement must be made known to the Provost along with a rationale for the Dean's action. The Provost then seeks the advice of the UH Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee, makes his/her decision and recommends action to the President. The President reviews files and recommends and forwards his/her recommendations to the Chancellor. The final decision of the Chancellor, President, and Board of Regents is communicated to the faculty member, usually in May.

E. Timetable and procedures for review of tenure track faculty in first year of hire

1. By March following the month of hire, first year faculty will schedule a meeting with the Dean to review the faculty member's progress to date.

F. Timetable and steps for submission of portfolios for review

1. Steps for 2nd, 4th, and 5th year Retention Reviews

Step 1: Candidates submit their portfolios to the Dean's Office by a date communicated by the Chairperson of the RTP to faculty being reviewed.

Step 2: Review of portfolio by the RTP Committee and report sent to each faculty candidate.

Step 3: Time allowed for optional 10-day appeal process

Step 4: RTP Committee Chairperson sends final report and recommendations to the Dean.

Step 5: Dean makes independent review and recommendation to each candidate.

2. Steps for Tenure and Promotion Reviews

Step 1: GCSW Dean asks faculty members facing mandatory reviews for tenure or promotion to Associate Professor and those planning to submit a non-mandatory request for tenure or promotion to a higher rank during the calendar year to inform the Dean in writing by the first day of class in the Spring semester.

Step 2: If there are faculty to be reviewed, the tenure-track GCSW faculty elect the RTP Committee by Feb. 1 of spring semester.

Step 3: Faculty to be reviewed submit to the Dean no later than March 1st of spring semester at least the following materials which can be used as a basis for the reviewing committee to nominate and select external reviewers:

- a. Personal vitae
- b. Narrative statement describing primary area of scholarship and research (*métier*) and a detailed listing of scholarship and research products.
- c. Copies of peer reviewed publications, especially those completed since joining the UH faculty.

Step 4: External reviewers are selected by the peer review committee for faculty candidates during spring semester.

Step 5: Faculty candidates for tenure and promotion update the vitae, narrative statements, copies of scholarly works, and other material that will be sent to external reviewers according to the University's schedule.

Step 6: Faculty candidates for promotion or tenure and those eligible for third year reviews submit their complete portfolios (including teaching and service as well as scholarship) to the Dean by the UH designated due date in the Fall semester. Faculty being reviewed may continue to add materials to a portfolio as new publications are accepted, or additional classes taught and service provided) and may make appropriate revisions to a vita until the GCSW tenure and/or promotion process is completed. However, the tenure and promotion committee can not consider materials that come

G. Retention Function of the Committee

The RT&P Committee has a retention function over and beyond its review function, particularly for junior faculty. In fulfilling this

function, The Committee may make separate recommendations to the Dean regarding specific types of support that might augment a faculty candidate's potential success in the College. Additionally, Committee members as individuals or as a Committee may offer suggestions to candidates before or after the review process on how to achieve success within the College. No such suggestions or advice may be given during the process itself, since the deliberations of the Committee are confidential.

Revised and approved on February 6, 1998,
 September 10, 1999,
 March 14, 2003,
 November 17, 2004
 April 7, 2006

Appendix A

Under dev. Initial draft completed		Solo author? (yes/no)	# co- authors including self	Your authorship rank (all equal? 1st, 2, 3rd?)
--	--	-----------------------------	---------------------------------------	---