

Faculty Evaluation/ Annual Performance Review Policy
Department of Comparative Cultural Studies (CCS)
University of Houston

(Revised and adopted, April 2024)

All regular faculty members of the Department (full-time, tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure-track with full-time renewable contracts), whose teaching and service duties are at least 50% dedicated to the Department's curricular programs, and whose tenure home is NOT a different department, undergo an Annual Performance Review (APR). The review is conducted by no later than the end of each February. All regular faculty provide information on their research, teaching and service accomplishments for the previous calendar year, to be reviewed by the department's Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC).

In CCS, the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) consists of the three tenured faculty members, appointed by the Department Chairperson, with meetings facilitated by a designated Chair of the FEC (as appointed by the Department Chairperson). The Department Chair and the Committee Chair convene a meeting of the FEC where each department faculty member's progress is reviewed and scored. Following the Department's APR Scoring Guidelines, the FEC evaluates each member of the Department and makes recommendations to the Chair. (When the FEC discusses the performance of a member of the committee, that individual is recused from the evaluation process and may be asked to temporarily leave the meeting).

The evaluation is concerned with predominantly quantitative measures of performance and productivity, but the FEC may also take qualitative considerations into account. Additionally, in special cases, faculty may present evidence of their performance over more than one preceding year, so that more long-term projects may be considered as evidence of ongoing productivity.

For the purposes of the APR, tenured and tenure-track faculty members are customarily assessed according to the standard workload model, with the following weighted allocations: research activity and resulting publications (40%); teaching and mentoring students (40%); and departmental, college, university, and community service (20%) throughout the year. For non-tenure track instructional faculty members, teaching duties are paramount (60%) and outweigh research and resulting publications (20%) and service (20%). Each of these three domains is understood to be a workload domain, with the evaluation of performance within each domain understood to correspond to the respective percent allocations of the workload model. However, the standard workload model may be adjusted by the Department Chair for individual faculty members, in recognition of a redistribution of effort. For instance, when faculty performance is impacted by exceptional administrative duties, such as directing a curricular program, the FEC may be instructed by the the Department Chair to adjust these proportions to more appropriately account for extraordinary service contributions as part of a faculty member's overall performance evaluation. The standard workload model may be also adjusted by the Department Chair in special cases of exceptional Research or Teaching responsibilities. In cases of a partial or full release from teaching, to support either service or research, the workload model is

adjusted accordingly; for example, a teaching release for one course, reducing a faculty member's teaching load from four to three courses for the academic year, reduces the allocation for Teaching from 40% to 30%, with the corresponding 10% re-allocated to Service or Research as stipulated by the reason for the course release. Likewise, during a full-time research leave of absence, a faculty member's APR is scored exclusively for the Research domain.

Members of the FEC score the faculty member under discussion on a five-point scale in each area of consideration: Research, Teaching, and Service. According to the Scoring Guidelines, the faculty member earns points toward a maximum cumulative score of 5 in each category, to then also be allocated a cumulative APR score based on the corresponding weighted workload allocations. Scores in all distinct domains as well as the cumulative score are recorded.

Scores are attributed the following qualitative meanings:

- 0 [0 - 0.4 points] = Poor [Does NOT Meet Expectations]
- 1 [0.5 - 1.4 points] = Fair [Does NOT Meet Expectations]
- 2 [1.5 - 2.4 points] = Good [Satisfactory; Meets Expectations]
- 3 [2.5 - 3.4 points] = Very Good [Meets or Partly Exceeds Expectations]
- 4 [3.5 - 4.4 points] = Excellent [Exceeds Expectations]
- 5 [4.5 - 5.0 (or above) points] = Outstanding [Highly Exceeds Expectations]

The assessment of the individual faculty member's research activity takes into account both evidence of ongoing research, which may include as-yet unpublished manuscripts demonstrating work-in-progress, as well as the customary evidence of measurable research outputs, particularly resultant publications in academic or other public venues.

Publications are evaluated in terms of quantity as well as the prestige of the journal (articles) or the status of the publisher (books, book chapters), as well as level of contribution (authored works or edited volumes). Publishing (with substantial author contribution) in highly ranked, peer-reviewed journals in the field, or with a top-tier peer-reviewed academic presses, will contribute towards a higher overall evaluation. Because CCS is a multi-disciplinary department, there is no conclusive list of journals or publishers ranked as the most prestigious. Generally, members of the FEC will have a professional knowledge of the top journals and publishers in their fields, or can investigate these for assessing impact factor, rigorous peer review, composition of editorial board, among other considerations.

The FEC may also discuss untenured (tenure-track) faculty members' progress towards tenure and make recommendations that may be conveyed in the Chair's letter.

For each faculty member under discussion, the Chair records the committee's scores and accompanying comments, and then calculates the weighted average of the FEC members' scores to arrive at the faculty member's overall (cumulative) score for the APR. The outcome and any comments from the review may then be conveyed by the Chair to the faculty in writing.

While taking into consideration the peer review recommendations of the FEC, all provisional and final APR scores are determined at the sole discretion of the Department Chair, as required by UH policy and State law.

Once the Chair's letters are distributed, faculty members have a minimum of five working days to appeal the decision. In the case of an appeal from an individual faculty member, the final APR score is determined by the Department Chair.