

University of Houston
Graduate College of Social Work
Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)
Policies and Procedures for Tenure-Track Faculty

The Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (RTP) at the University of Houston Graduate College of Social Work (UH-GCSW) is charged with responsibility for making recommendations to the Dean regarding faculty annual reviews for retention and reviews for 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, tenure, and promotion.

At the GCSW, guidelines and policies are subject to policies promulgated at the university levels. In the case of tenure and promotion, guidelines provided by the Office of the Provost form the basis of all tenure and promotion decisions. While the GCSW may choose to implement more rigorous standards than those detailed in the university-level tenure and promotion guidelines, the GCSW may not implement policies that result implicitly or explicitly in the application of less rigorous standards than detailed in the university-level tenure and promotion guidelines. It is the obligation of the Dean to make all new tenured or tenure-track faculty members aware in writing of not only the university-level promotion and tenure guidelines but also any college or departmental level policies or procedures that may impact their tenure and/or promotion.

These guidelines for professional evaluation of tenured and tenure-track members of the GCSW are prepared as a general document without reference to particular individuals or configurations of accomplishment. They do not prescribe a uniform roster of accomplishments that must be achieved by all candidates for tenure or promotion. Rather, they suggest ways of evaluating accomplishments in research, teaching, and service by allowing flexibility in assigning relative weights to these three activities.

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 research/scholarship, teaching, and service.
- c) According to the University of Houston's criteria for faculty tenure and promotion evaluations (refer to *UH Faculty Handbook*), faculty members must demonstrate excellence in the performance of research/scholarship, teaching, and service

activities if national recognition of educating graduate social workers is to be achieved.

2. Definitions

- a) RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP includes 1) sponsored and non-sponsored research projects completed and currently in progress; 2) published works including articles in refereed journals, books, monographs, and published computer software programs, and 3) peer-reviewed, invited, and keynote papers presented at professional and scholarly conferences of the social work profession and related disciplines.
- b) TEACHING includes: 1) classroom, online, and other instructional or teaching-related activities; 2) design and planning of courses in the various curricular areas of the M.S.W. program; 3) directing doctoral dissertations, doctoral Teaching Internships, doctoral Research Internships, and doctoral and M.S.W. independent studies; 4) educational advisement of students; and 5) field liaison activities.
- 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) invited and non-remunerated services to human service agencies and nationally or internationally recognized organizations; 4) remunerated consultant services; and 5) non-remunerated services to the profession.

3. Criteria for Annual Retention Reviews

- a) First Year Reviews are the responsibility of the Dean and not of the RTP Committee.
- b) Second year retention reviews focus upon the faculty member's progress toward readiness for the third year review that is mandated by the University.
- c) Third year reviews are comprehensive reviews that are UH-mandatory.
- b) Fourth and fifth year retention reviews focus upon the faculty member's progress toward readiness for the tenure and promotion review.

4. Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

- a) A clearly demonstrated record of meritorious scholarship. On average, two or more articles per year in a refereed journal or its equivalent will be the initial basis for demonstrating a record of scholarship. Demonstrated efforts to secure funding to pursue research and scholarship should be emphasized. Decisions about the merit of a candidate's total scholarship record are based on more complex and qualitative factors, including the number, amount, and source of funded grants, the number of articles (or equivalent), the quality of articles as judged by the committee and the external reviewers, the quality and impact factor (or its equivalent) of the journals, the relative contribution of the author to co-authored articles, the number of solo-authored articles, a consistent pattern of scholarship, 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 contributions in his/her field of expertise. In addition, the faculty member must have attained national and/or international visibility and reputation as indicated by securing external funding for scholarly activities, the number and quality of referred journal articles, special reports, books, book chapters and presentations, implementation of sponsored and non-sponsored research projects, involvement within national and/or international professional organizations, governmental activities, and number and quality of invited speeches, 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 research, scholarship, teaching, and service.

B. Faculty Evaluation Procedures

1. The RTP Committee which is chosen according to the By-Laws of the Faculty Association is the review committee responsible for evaluating the performance of all who hold faculty appointments in the GCSW and who are eligible for retention, tenure and promotion, except for promotion to the rank of Full Professor (see B#2 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 tenure and promotion reviews and those who are eligible for second, third, fourth or fifth year retention reviews.
2. The review committee for promotion to Full Professor will be composed of all Full Professors at the GCSW, excluding the Deans. This full professor review committee will elect its own chairperson. The Dean notifies Full Professors when there is a candidate for promotion to the rank of Full Professor.
3. 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 the candidate being considered for tenure and promotion. External reviewers should have achieved: national recognition in their field and be a tenured Associate or Full Professor to be eligible to provide a recommendation

letter for promotion and/or tenure at the Associate Professor level; or national or international recognition in their field and be a Full Professor if providing a letter of recommendation for an Associate Professor seeking promotion to Full Professor. External reviewers must be scholars who are not current or former thesis/dissertation advisors, co-authors, former students, relatives, former collaborators, mentors, or close personal friends of the candidate. External reviewers must have demonstrated expertise or knowledge in the area of the candidate's scholarship.

4. The Dean provides to the review committee copies of the candidate's student evaluations of teaching scores for all courses taught with comparative GCSW faculty data when 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 research/scholarship, teaching, and service.
 - b) Letter of UH appointment
 - c) A current curriculum vitae that conforms to university guidelines.
 - d) Copies of previous reviews including the 3rd year review for tenure and promotion to the Associate rank from the GCSW RTP committee, if any, and an explanation by the candidate of how prior year's recommendations have been addressed.
 - e) An explanation by the candidate of any special workload arrangements with the Dean, such as reallocation of teaching or service responsibilities during a particular semester; overload teaching assignments, grant-related leaves, etc.
2. Supporting Documentation
 - a) Research/Scholarship
 - 1) A list of publications, including articles (marked with an asterisk if refereed), books, monographs, and 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.

- 2) Copies of articles in refereed journals, books, publications, and copies of reviews of publications.
 - 3) Copies of papers presented at scholarly and professional conferences or 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) Technical reports.
 - 6) A summary of evidence and/or indicators to support scholarship impact in the candidate's area of expertise.
 - 7) Other Research/Scholarship products.
- b) 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; a description of field liaison responsibilities (agencies and numbers of students).
 - 5) Other Teaching materials.
- c) Service since joining GCSW Faculty (indicate whether paid or voluntary). List most recent ones 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 review committee the candidate's:
- 1) Course evaluations by students
 - 2) Prior year's RTP evaluations

3. First Year Review

The first year review is conducted by the College Dean in the spring of the first year of tenure track appointment. The review assesses the candidate's initial work as a faculty member in the GCSW.

4. Candidate for Tenure and Promotion (only)

- a) The candidate will provide the review committee chair a list of 3-6 arms-length external reviewers, with a brief bio each and contact information (including email, phone number, and address). The University of Houston requires a minimum of three and a maximum of nine external reviewers. Typically, the review committee will collect 3 to 6 external reviews; at least one from the candidate's nominations and the rest from the committee's nominations.
- b) The review committee chair will contact the reviewers for external review. At no point in the process is the candidate allowed to contact any potential external reviewer.
- c) The candidate must provide a release statement giving the review committee permission to contact external reviewers.
- d) All external review letters received in response to the college's request must be included in the candidate's electronic folder. The candidate will not be shown or have access to external letters.
- e) The candidate's portfolio should be submitted online via the University's T&P website and organized according to the format required, with the candidate's statement and curriculum vitae at the beginning and the supporting materials organized according to the outline provided in the website. Faculty being reviewed may continue to add materials to the portfolio as new publications are accepted or additional classes are taught or service provided up until the deadline provided by the review committee. They may submit updates to the portfolio after the GCSW review process is completed by submitting any updates to the College Liaison to the Provost's Office.

D. Review Process

In conducting reviews, the review 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 evaluating (not gathering) evidence as presented in the portfolio and external references (for tenure and promotion candidates). The review committee does not gather additional evidence. The

review 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 review committee make one of two recommendations to the Dean: 1) to support the application of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure, or 2) to not support the application of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure.

The recommendation of the review committee is submitted in writing to the candidate being evaluated. The review committee's recommendation is final and is forwarded to the Dean unless the candidate appeals the recommendation within ten (10) working days of the time the Chairperson of the review committee notifies the applicant of the committee's recommendation.

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

If there is disagreement between the review 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 but before the start of the next academic year.

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

1. The first year review, which is based solely on the fall semester work, will be conducted in the spring of the first year of tenure track appointment by the College Dean with all subsequent reviews conducted by the RTP Committee.
2. 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: Candidate submit portfolio to the Dean's Office by a date communicated by the RTP Chairperson.

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

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

Step 4: RTP Committee Chairperson sends final report and recommendation 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 ready during the following academic year for 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 to inform the Dean in writing by the end of the Fall semester of the current academic year.

Step 2: If there are faculty to be reviewed, the tenure-track GCSW faculty elect the RTP Committee and then its chair by February 1 of spring semester to serve for the calendar year.

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

- a. Curriculum vitae
- b. Narrative statement describing primary area of scholarship and research (métier) and a detailed listing of scholarship and research products
- c. Copies of a minimum of five peer reviewed publications (or equivalent) and grant application/approval documentation, preferably completed since joining the UH faculty.
- d. Index of citations, scholarship impact, or other forms of national or international recognition

Step 4: External reviewers are selected by the 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 scholarship, teaching and service) 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 the dossier up until the deadline provided by the review committee.

G. Retention Function of the RTP Committee

The RTP Committee has a retention function over and beyond its review function, particularly for junior faculty. In fulfilling this function, the RTP 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, RTP 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
February 5, 2010
November 6, 2015
December 11, 2015