

UNIVERSITY *of* HOUSTON

**Promotion and Tenure
Guidelines**

2008-2009

Office of the Provost

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Promotion & Tenure Review Schedule	Page 3
University Policies	Page 4
Procedures for Mandatory Reviews	Page 9
Procedures for Non-Mandatory Reviews	Page 11
Guidelines for Portfolios	Page 12
Portfolio Checklist	Page 16
Face Sheet	Page 17

**Promotion & Tenure Review Schedule
2008-2009**

ACTION	TO BE COMPLETED NO LATER THAN	STATUS
Deans notify faculty for whom there will be mandatory reviews and provide them with a timeline and college guidelines for promotion and tenure.	Third Monday in May (5/19/08)	
Deans confirm citizenship or permanent residency of candidates.	Third Monday in May (5/19/08)	
Deans submit list of tenure and promotion candidates to Provost's Office.	Third Monday in May (5/19/08)	
Faculty members submit CVs and representative works for external reviews.	Second Monday in June (6/9/08)	
Chairs/Deans request external reviews.	Last working day in June (6/30/08)	
Department committees, department chairs, college committees, and deans determine review guidelines and schedule review deadlines for possible negative recommendations.	First Monday in August (8/4/08)	
Candidates submit dossiers for on-campus review.	First Monday in August (8/4/08)	
Deans submit departmental and college policies.	Second Monday in August (8/11/08)	
Department committees complete reviews; candidates are notified of decisions; dossiers are forwarded to the college.	Last Monday in September* (9/29/08)	
If the department committee and/or chair recommend a negative decision, offer the candidate the opportunity for reconsideration.	Prior to last Monday in September* (9/29/08)	
College committee completes reviews; candidates are notified of decisions; recommendations are forwarded to the dean.	Second Monday in November* (11/10/08)	
If the college committee recommends a negative decision, offer the candidate the opportunity for reconsideration.	Prior to second Monday in November* (11/10/08)	
Dean completes review; candidates are notified of decisions; dean submits promotion and tenure materials to the Office of the Provost.	Last class day of fall semester* (12/5/08)	
If the dean recommends a negative decision, offer the candidate the opportunity for reconsideration.	Prior to last class day of fall semester* (12/5/08)	
University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee organizational meeting takes place.	After last class day of fall semester (12/5/08)	
University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee forwards recommendations to the Provost.	Monday after the MLK Holiday in January (1/26/09)	
Dean submits for Provost's approval any proposed revisions of college, school, department P&T policies and procedures.	Last working day in January (1/30/09)	
In case of a negative mandatory tenure decision, President/Chancellor notifies faculty member of decision for non-renewal of contract.	Last working day in May (5/29/09)	
Tenure and promotion decisions become effective.	September 1, 2009	

*Review should be conducted sufficiently early to allow time for reconsideration prior to this date.

Promotion and Tenure

These policies relate to the renewal or nonrenewal of appointments of all tenure track faculty and to promotion actions for all tenure track and tenured faculty members.

Definitions

Tenure

Tenure at the University of Houston is awarded by the Chancellor of the University of Houston System, upon the recommendation of the President, under the authority delegated by the Board of Regents and upon the basis of recommendations initiated by departments and reviewed carefully by the colleges, the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Provost. These recommendations result from an assessment of the individual's academic achievement and an estimate of future achievement. Tenure awarded at the University of Houston does not entail tenure at any other university of the University of Houston System. It is awarded on the basis of teaching, research, and service excellence to date, consistent with the mission of the university, and implies a high degree of confidence in the continuation and enhancement of this performance for the benefit of the university. An affirmative decision represents a positive judgment that the individual has contributed and will contribute to the development of excellence in the academic programs at the University of Houston, particularly within the context of the individual's college. Recommendations for promotion and tenure shall be transmitted annually from the Provost to the President, with all supporting documentation filed by May 1 of each year and shall be effective at the beginning of the succeeding academic year.

Tenure may be granted to faculty members upon the successful completion of a probationary period at the specific university of the University of Houston System. The service of tenured faculty shall be terminated only for adequate cause, except in cases of financial, discontinuance of programs, medical reasons, resignation, or retirement.

General Policies

The primary responsibility for faculty review lies within the candidate's department and college. It is, therefore, critical that the departments and colleges set their own criteria and quality standards. The promotion and tenure policies are designed to assure that high standards are maintained and that due process is followed. Due process consists of two elements. First, faculty have the right to know what is expected of them to be promoted and/or tenured. Second, candidates for promotion have the right to be heard, to clarify vagueness, and/or correct factual errors before any recommendation is forwarded to the next level of review.

The University of Houston policies are guided by principles delineated by the American Association of University Professors. To assure an equitable review, the following policies must be followed at each level and incorporated into departmental and college policies:

- A. Promotion and/or tenure review is a peer review process. For that reason, only tenured faculty should vote on tenure decisions; only full professors should review and vote on applications for promotion to professor. Exceptions must be stated in the appropriate policies that apply at the departmental or college levels.

- B.** Committee recommendations must be based on written tenure and promotion criteria and standards that have been previously approved by the Provost.
- C.** Committee recommendations must include the name, rank, and title of each member of the review committee. Faculty who vote on a candidate's file at one level may not vote on that candidate a second time at a higher level.
- D.** Committee deliberations shall be conducted in confidence and the committee's findings shared in writing with the applicant or the appropriate administrator.
- E.** Department chairs and deans conduct independent reviews and make written recommendations based on an examination of all portfolio materials, including external letters of review and committee findings.
- F.** Each subsequent review body is responsible for considering any procedural problems it identifies in the prior review and for making every effort to correct any errors caused by those problems.
- G.** Applicants are entitled to a reconsideration of the chair's, dean's, and Provost's decisions. Reconsiderations are limited to errors of fact and procedure. Other avenues of appeal may be available pursuant to department and/or college bylaws.
- H.** Candidates may update their portfolios before the materials are sent to the next level.
- I.** After the Provost's final decision, applicants may initiate a grievance within 30 calendar days of receipt of the Provost's letter.

Probationary Period

The *probationary period* is defined as the time a faculty member spends under annual appointment in a tenure track position prior to being awarded tenure. Tenure track faculty will be notified annually of decisions regarding continuing appointment. The probationary period for tenure shall not exceed seven academic years. The number of years and the terms of the probationary period shall be specified in the appointment letter. If a faculty member begins employment after the beginning of an academic year but prior to the end of the spring semester of that academic year, either the probationary period for that faculty member shall be less than seven years, or the faculty member shall serve in a non-tenure track position for the remainder of that academic year and shall then have a probationary period of seven years. Up to three years of prior full-time collegiate-level teaching at the rank of assistant professor or above may be credited to the probationary period. Credit towards the probationary period of an assistant professor is discouraged since this significantly shortens the length of time the faculty member has to achieve the teaching, research, and service accomplishments necessary to achieve tenure. For probationary appointments the final and mandatory review for tenure shall take place in the year prior to the final probationary year, e.g., year six of a seven-year probationary period. Requests may be made for early consideration of promotion and tenure.

During the probationary period, decisions to renew or terminate appointments or to deny tenure shall be made in accordance with the principles and procedures set forth in this Handbook.

A leave of absence shall not be considered as part of the probationary period for tenure unless a written agreement to the contrary is made between the faculty member and the dean of the college prior to the leave period.

Reviews During Probationary Period

Every tenure-track faculty will be reviewed annually by the department chair or appropriate administrator according to departmental procedures. Additionally, faculty whose appointment letters state that they have at least a four-year probationary period must undergo a thorough pre-tenure review. This review normally is conducted at the beginning of January of the faculty member's third year at the University of Houston. The faculty member must submit a portfolio in accordance with departmental/college policies and criteria for review by the departmental review committee. The committee informs the department chair, who conducts an independent review then writes a letter to the candidate detailing the strengths and weaknesses of the pre-tenure review portfolio. The chair sends a copy of the letter to the dean, who files the letter in the faculty member's personnel file. The letter then becomes part of the mandatory tenure review. Summaries of annual reports should be available to internal reviewers in promotion and tenure cases.

Nonrenewal of Appointment of a Tenure Track Faculty Member

The decision not to renew the appointment of a non-tenured tenure track faculty member is not a form of dismissal for cause. Nonreappointment of a tenure track faculty member without tenure does not require justification of professional inadequacy.

The decision to deny tenure shall be made no later than twelve months prior to the expiration of the probationary period, except as provided below. Written notice to the tenure track faculty that a probationary appointment is not to be renewed shall be given to the faculty member by the dean in advance of the expiration of the appointment, according to the following schedule of dates.

- A. For tenure track faculty in the first academic year of the probationary period, notice must be given not later than March 1 that their appointments will end at the conclusion of the current academic year; or, if a one-year appointment expires during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its expiration.
- B. For tenure track faculty in the second academic year of the probationary period, notice must be given not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service that their appointments will end at the conclusion of the current academic year; or, if an initial two-year appointment expires during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its expiration.
- C. For tenure track faculty in the third or later year of the probationary period, notice must be given not later than May 31 of the academic year preceding the academic year in which the appointment is to expire (e.g., non-reappointment at the end of third-year review) that their appointments will end at the conclusion of the terminal appointment.

Time In Rank

(For a basic definition of these ranks, see Faculty Handbook page 18.)

- A. Instructors** may be appointed to the tenure track. *(See Faculty Handbook pages 18-19.)* Time spent as an instructor on the tenure track at a specific university in the University of Houston System shall be counted as part of the probationary period. Faculty members may not be awarded tenure at the rank of instructor.
- B. Assistant professors** shall serve a probationary period not to exceed seven years. Promotion and tenure must be awarded concurrently. If promotion is not granted, the candidate may not be tenured.
- C. Associate professors** may be appointed with tenure, or alternately shall serve a probationary period not to exceed four years before tenure is awarded. In cases of exceptional merit, the probationary period specified in the appointment letter may be shortened by the Provost at the request of the dean or appropriate division head.
- D.** Promotion from associate to **professor** requires strong evidence of teaching, scholarship, and service as appropriate to the mission of the university. No specified time in rank is required for promotion from associate to full professor.
- E. Professors** are usually appointed with tenure but may be required to serve a probationary period not to exceed four years, which shall be stated in the appointment letter.

Extension of Probationary Period for Emergency Purposes

Family emergencies or other serious personal circumstances may on occasion justify a request for an extension of the probationary period not exceeding one academic year during the probationary period. Such requests may be granted by the Provost under the following general guidelines: all such requests must be in writing, must have the signed written recommendation of the department chair and the dean, after which they must be forwarded to the Provost, and must be submitted within a reasonable amount of time after the emergency or other serious personal circumstances arise, and shall not be considered after March 1 of the year prior to the tenure review period. In the event that an extension is granted prior to a mandatory probationary review, that review will be delayed for one year.

Criteria and Standards for Promotion and Tenure

University Criteria

The basic criteria and standards of the University of Houston reflect a commitment to academic excellence. It is the expectation that faculty members shall meet the highest standards of their disciplines within the domains of teaching, scholarship, and service. Specifically, candidates for promotion are to demonstrate their effectiveness as teachers and that they have advanced knowledge or creativity in their respective disciplines or made significant creative contributions in their academic areas. This should be substantiated by appropriate publications, reviewed

presentations or other appropriate publicly available communications. Service may involve contributions to departmental efforts, to campus-wide activities or to external professional organizations.

Criteria By Rank

Promotion to associate professor with tenure requires that faculty members have made high quality contributions to knowledge as a result of their scholarly and/or creative achievements, that they are effective teachers, and they have demonstrated an appropriate level of service. The evaluations of the candidates' portfolios are conducted by peers in the department and/or college with input from external reviewers who have not previously collaborated with the candidates. The evaluation must find that the candidate has demonstrated a commitment to academic excellence and that there is reasonable expectation that the candidate will meet the standard for promotion to professor in due course.

Promotion to the rank of professor requires significant contributions to the candidate's field that have had a scholarly or creative impact beyond the university. The application portfolio will document a record of accomplishments in scholarship/creativity, teaching, and service responsibilities that are distinguished by quality and significance over time.

Local Criteria

Departments and/or colleges are responsible for the application of the criteria and standards for promotion and tenure, consistent with prevailing standards of excellence in their own disciplines. Deans must review and approve written departmental criteria. The criteria and standards must be reviewed and approved by the Office of the Provost and distributed by the college and/or department to its faculty.

University Procedures for Tenure Reviews

Each spring, department chairs and deans review faculty appointment letters and inform all faculty with upcoming tenure reviews that their applications will be considered during the next promotion and tenure cycle. The Provost's Office will issue annual procedures by May 1 to all deans, directors, and department chairs. Before the end of the spring semester, these administrators will provide the web addresses of the department, college, and university procedures to all non-tenured, tenure track faculty.

Candidates may withdraw their applications for promotion/tenure without penalty at any time during the review process in the College. However, when the reviews are mandatory, the withdrawal must be accompanied by a resignation letter and a signed Separation Form.

Candidates must be advised of a decision not to award tenure at least 12 months prior to the expiration of the probationary period. After the Provost's final decision, should the candidate believe that there were serious procedural violations that subsequent reviews failed to correct, the candidate may file a grievance (see Grievance Procedures in Faculty Handbook).

Promotion and Tenure Procedures

Departmental Reviews

Prior to the Review

Not later than the last working day of January each dean must submit for the Provost's approval his/her Department/School and College promotion and tenure policies and procedures, including all printed statements about guidelines, standards, and criteria.

The candidate is responsible for assembling the portfolio with the exception of external review letters. See Applicant's Portfolio on page 12.

The department chair is responsible for requesting external review letters for the promotion and tenure candidates. The file must contain a minimum of three letters and no more than six letters from external referees, however, all letters received in response to a department's request must be included in the candidate's file. External reviewers should have achieved senior status (rank of professor) and national recognition. External referees must be scholars who are not former collaborators, mentors, or friends of the candidate. The file must contain one sample copy of the request letters to referees, a one-paragraph description of the qualifications of each external reviewer with the relation to the candidate clearly stated, and a list of the nominators of outside reviewers.

In requesting evaluations, the chair should ask the referees:

Does the candidate's work, taken as a whole, constitute a serious and significant contribution to the discipline?

What is your assessment of the candidate's contributions in the areas of research, scholarship or other creative activity?

Is the candidate currently known as a scholar whose work is likely to be known and respected by leaders in the field?

What is the nature of your professional contact with and knowledge of the candidate?

Would the candidate be promoted and/or tenured, as appropriate, at the referee's institution?

Does the referee recommend promotion and/or tenure?

Letters to referees should include a brief description of the candidate's department and its mission. Letters should also specify a date for return of the evaluation. Candidates will not be shown external letters as part of the promotion and tenure process.

During the Review

Departmental review committees are responsible for reviewing all persons eligible for tenure and promotion and for writing a justification of their recommendations. Department chairs are responsible for conducting an independent review that corrects any errors in the evaluation that were caused by procedural problems within the committee. Chairs write separate letters stating their own evaluations of the candidate. The letter from the department chair should address the

strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. Letters containing negative recommendations should explain reasons and specify areas of weakness that justify the negative recommendation. Justification for each recommendation should be clearly and fully stated. Moreover, justifications should address the merits of each individual case and should not be mere summaries or restatements of earlier assessments.

In the event of a negative recommendation, the candidates may ask for a reconsideration of the committee's and/or chair's decisions to rebut assertions made or to offer new evidence for the review. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the review body. After a reconsideration, the review body shall respond in writing.

The chair is responsible for forwarding to the dean the committee's votes and their justification, the chair's decisions, and any rehearing letters. University policy mandates that no extraneous materials be included.

College Reviews

Prior to the Review

Each college must have written policy statements that govern the promotion and tenure process at the college level. These policies state criteria for tenure and promotion and should give examples of evidence of criteria having been met; college procedures take precedence over departmental policies. In the case of clinical or research faculty, which are non-tenure track positions, differential criteria should be used to distinguish their work from that of other faculty. These differences should be conveyed to the candidates, and their portfolios should set out these distinctions. The policies must be submitted to the Provost for approval by the last working day in January. Once approved, they should be made available to every non-tenured faculty member.

During the Review

College review committees are responsible for reviewing all persons eligible for promotion and tenure whose files have been forwarded to the deans. Deans, in consultation with college faculty committees, are responsible for evaluating each application, correcting any procedural problems during previous reviews, and writing independent recommendations. Letters containing negative recommendations should explain reasons and specify areas of weakness that justify the negative recommendation. Justification for each recommendation should be clearly and fully stated. Moreover, justifications should address the merits of each individual case and should not be mere summaries or restatements of earlier assessments. Those evaluations, along with the vote of the college committee and its written justification for the recommendation, are included in the portfolios.

In the event of a negative recommendation, candidates may ask for a reconsideration of the committee's and/or dean's decisions. This process is designed for faculty members to rebut assertions made or to offer new evidence. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the review body. After the reconsideration, the review body shall respond in writing.

At the completion of the college review, the candidate must select from his/her portfolio the appropriate research, teaching, and service documentation that best reflects their highest

achievements. These items are placed in a three-inch (maximum) three-ring binder in the order specified in the university procedures. University policy mandates that no extraneous materials be included. Examples of extraneous materials include letters of support solicited by the candidate, information in the candidate's personnel file, letters from committee members expressing individual or minority opinions, etc. The dean then adds the internal and external review and letters requesting reconsideration and their responses and sends three copies of each portfolio to the Provost's Office by the last class day of the fall semester.

University Reviews

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee advises the Provost on all promotion and tenure candidates. The committee then provides its recommendation, accompanied by the votes and justification to the Provost, who conducts an independent review. The Provost may seek additional advice from members of his/her staff, the dean, or other appropriate bodies. The Provost informs each candidate of his/her decision.

In the event of a negative recommendation, candidates may ask for reconsideration of the committee's and/or the Provost's decisions, respectively to rebut assertions made or to offer new evidence. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the review body. After the reconsideration, the review body shall respond in writing to the Provost.

After any reconsideration, the Provost makes final recommendations and provides justifications to the Chancellor/President. The Chancellor/President reviews those recommendations and makes tenure decisions and recommends promotion actions to the Board of Regents, which makes the final promotion decisions. The promotion and tenure actions take effect at the beginning of the following academic year.

Procedures for Non-Mandatory Reviews

Faculty who would like to be considered for a non-mandatory promotion such as from associate to professor should contact the dean's office to obtain a copy of the University Guidelines. The timelines and procedures are generally the same as for Mandatory Reviews.

The review of the portfolio will be conducted as with applications for promotion to Associate Professor, with the exception of the external reviewers. The university recognizes that for promotions from Associate Professor to Professor the external reviewers may know the candidate. However, the department should assure that the reviewers are as objective as possible, in spite of possible professional relationships. Letters to the external reviewers should inquire about the nature of any collaboration. External reviewers should also be asked to evaluate the quality and significance of the candidate's contributions and whether the candidate is known and respected by leaders in the field.

Faculty members undergoing non-mandatory reviews who are unsuccessful may withdraw their applications without penalty at any time during the College-level review process.

Applicant's Portfolio

Since the major responsibility for review rests with the department and college, thorough documentation should be submitted as evidence for all items claimed in the candidate's vita. However, before the portfolio is sent for university-level review, the candidate should select no more than three examples that best represent his/her career highlights and submit three copies of the dossier in a three-inch (maximum) three-ring binders, including attachments.

A. Face Sheet

This form should be prepared by the candidate's department chair or dean and should accompany each set of materials sent forward.

B. Internal Letters

The final dossier should include any department or college committee evaluation reports, letters from chair to dean and dean to Provost, and any appeals letters. University policy mandates that no extraneous letters or materials be included.

Copies of the initial letter of appointment to the university and the results of probationary reviews must be included for candidates for mandatory review. Non-mandatory review candidates should include documentation of their previous promotions.

Letters from department chairs and deans should address the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. Letters containing negative recommendations should explain reasons and specify areas of weakness that led to the negative recommendation. Justification for each recommendation should be clearly and fully stated. Moreover, these letters should address the merits of each individual case and should not be mere summaries or restatements of earlier assessments. The dean's letter of recommendation is especially important.

C. External Review Letters

The file must contain a minimum of three letters and no more than six letters from external referees, however all letters received in response to a department's request must be included in the candidate's file. External reviewers should have achieved senior status (rank of professor) and national recognition. External referees must be scholars who are not former collaborators, mentors, close personal friends, or relatives of the candidate. The file must contain one sample copy of the request letters to referees, a one-paragraph description of the qualifications of each external reviewer with the relation to the candidate clearly stated, and a list of the nominators of outside reviewers.

Letters requested from thesis advisors, co-authors, or former students are not considered to be "arm's length" and will not be considered. The chairperson or dean should explain the method for selecting external references and provide the name, title, rank, position, and institutional affiliation of each referee. In requesting evaluations, the writer should ask the referees:

Does the candidate's work, taken as a whole, constitute a serious and significant contribution to the discipline?

What is your assessment of the candidate's contributions in the areas of research, scholarship, or other creative activity?

Is the candidate likely to emerge as a scholar whose work is currently known and respected by leaders in the field? (assistant professors)

What is the nature of your professional contact with and knowledge of the candidate?

Would the candidate be promoted and/or tenured, as appropriate, at the referee's institution?

Does the referee recommend promotion and/or tenure?

Letters to referees should include a brief description of the candidate's department and outline the general direction and/or mission of the department. Letters should also specify a date for return of the evaluation.

D. Candidate's Statement

The candidate may include a brief (no more than three pages) statement, including academic career goals, accomplishments, and directions for future work. The candidate may describe how all facets of his/her career form an integrated, successful profile or the candidate may identify achievements in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service separately.

E. Vita

The candidate should include a traditional vita with the categories below. Additionally, corroboration of the information in the vita should be included as follows:

1. Teaching and Student Learning

Documentation in this section includes evidence of a commitment to teaching and learning, including:

- a. Student Evaluations of Teaching.** Teaching evaluations of all classes are required by university policy. Student evaluation data should include summaries of teaching evaluations with comparative departmental data. Teaching effectiveness ratings should include all classes taught at the Assistant or Associate level. Candidates for full professor may include only those classes taught since the last promotion or in the last 10 years. Results should be summarized in a single table that includes evaluations for all courses taught and information about the instrument's items and response scale. In programs where individual classes, small studios, or performances are the norm, special care should be taken to assure full and comprehensive teaching evaluations.
- b. Peer Evaluation of Teaching.** Though not required in all departments, candidates may include formal or informal peer assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness.
- c. Course and Program Development and/or Revision.** Information about course, curriculum, and program development can provide evidence of a commitment to student learning. The candidate's contribution to course development may be

documented with sample course syllabi, teaching-grant proposal abstracts, courseware, cases and simulations, brief descriptions of student projects, examples of modifications for Instructional Television or Internet teaching, etc. Evidence of program development may include student recruitment, advising, and retention; directing graduate research; interdisciplinary program development, etc.

- d. Other Evidence of Teaching, Student Learning, and the Scholarship of Teaching.** Candidates may submit evidence that they have facilitated students' success. Examples may include contributions to students who have won awards, letters from community members who have benefited from student projects or internships, and other evidence that the candidate contributed to student learning. This section may also contain evidence of the candidate's commitment to enhancing his/her teaching ability. Professional development activities, scholarly approaches to evaluating teaching effectiveness, teaching excellence awards, and guest lecturing or team teaching or recruiting quality students should also be documented here.

2. Research, Scholarship and Other Creative Productivity

The research mission of the University of Houston is to create, discover, disseminate, and preserve knowledge and understanding by engaging in basic and applied research and scholarly and artistic activities that benefit students, scholars, and external constituencies. The following categories are suggested for candidates to document how they have carried out the university's research mission.

- a. Scholarly/Creative Work:** Completed works should be listed in the following order: books, monographs, journal articles (refereed journals should be marked with an asterisk), refereed proceedings, book chapters, other papers, juried exhibits, shows, recitals, awards, etc. Within each of these sections, the citations should be listed in reverse chronological order (starting with the most recent). Articles should be cited following the discipline style sheet and must include the exact title and the names of any co-authors in the order in which they appeared in print, and the page length. Citations of creative presentations must be listed as on public announcements. For exhibits, shows, recitals, etc., the information forwarded must include the dates and nature of the event(s). Copies of programs and reviews, if any, of each creative activity are also desirable. Works actually in press as well as works accepted or under review are to be listed below.
- b. Articles Accepted for Publication:** Include works in press and works accepted for publication.
- c. Representative Works:** Reprints of articles, published reviews, programs, and other substantial scholarly/creative products should be sufficient to demonstrate the scope and quality of the candidate's scholarly activities. Include samples of printed material, pictures of artistic creations, reviews, and other replaceable items in all three copies of the candidate's portfolio. Do not send books, compact discs, or other valuable samples to the Provost's Office.
- d. Published Reviews:** Copies of relevant reviews.

- e. **Other Work Products:** One copy of other substantial work products (e.g. books, slides of artistic creations, etc.).
- f. **Technical Reports:** The listing should specify the title, date, and length of the document, and the sponsoring agency or individual.
- g. **Research Proposals:** The following information should be included for each proposal:
 - (1) Name of the principal investigator and all co-investigators;
 - (2) Title of the grant proposal;
 - (3) Funding agency; and
 - (4) Amount requested
- h. **Research Grants:** The following information should be included for each grant:
 - (1) Name of the principal investigator and all co-investigators;
 - (2) Title of the grant proposal;
 - (3) Funding agency;
 - (4) Amount of the grant; and
 - (5) Time period of the grant.
- i. **Major Work(s) in Progress:** The information provided here should comment on the nature of the work(s) and identify anticipated date of completion. The solicitation letter to external evaluators should specifically request an assessment of major work(s) in progress.
- j. **Other Indicators of Scholarly Creative Work:** List book reviews, editorial contributions, citations, research awards, and other indicators of contributions to the discipline/profession, cited in the format of the discipline's style sheet.

3. Service

The candidate should provide a complete listing with documentation of the categories below.

- a. **Service to the Department, College, and University:** List committee membership, administrative roles, and other contributions to the university.
- b. **Service to the Profession/Academic Discipline:** Describe activities that strengthen the profession, including leadership in professional organizations.
- c. **Service to the Community or Public:** Document public involvement that is related to the candidate's area of expertise, including speeches, expert advice to community organizations, donations of creative or scholarly efforts to public institutions, consultations with private organizations, etc.
- d. **Other Contributions:** The candidate may provide evidence of other significant contributions that advance the profession/discipline.

PORTFOLIO CHECKLIST

2008-2009

NAME _____ DEPARTMENT _____ COLLEGE _____

(PLEASE CHECK THOSE ITEMS THAT ARE FORWARDED IN EACH CANDIDATE'S PORTFOLIO)

- I. _____ **FACE SHEET** (one with each portfolio)
- II. **INTERNAL LETTERS** (including any rehearing letters)
- A. _____ Dean, including a statement of expectations
 - B. _____ College Committee
 - C. _____ Department Chair, including a statement of expectations
 - D. _____ Department Committee
 - E. _____ UH appointment or promotion letter
 - F. _____ Probationary review letter(s)
- III. **EXTERNAL REVIEWS** (minimum of three "arm's length"; six maximum)
- A. _____ Statement of process for selecting outside reviewers, sample copy of letters of request to reviewers, one paragraph (1/2 page maximum) summary of the qualifications of each external reviewer (no CVs)
 - B. _____ Letters from outside reviewers
- IV. _____ **CANDIDATE'S STATEMENT** of accomplishments in teaching and student learning, scholarly/creative contributions, and professional service
- V. _____ **CANDIDATE'S CURRICULUM VITAE**
- A. **TEACHING AND STUDENT LEARNING**
 - 1. _____ Evaluations of teaching: summary table of student evaluations with comparative data (no raw data); teaching evaluation procedures and questionnaire; peer teaching evaluations
 - 2. _____ Course and program development and/or revision
 - 3. _____ Evidence of student learning
 - 4. _____ Other evidence of the scholarship of teaching
 - B. **SCHOLARSHIP AND OTHER CREATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS**
 - 1. _____ List work in the following order: books, monographs, articles (refereed articles marked with an asterisk), juried exhibits, shows, recitals, etc. (include works in press). Document work with representative reprints, published reviews, programs, and other substantial scholarly/creative products
 - 2. _____ List funded grants and contracts
 - 3. _____ Other indicators of scholarly/creative contributions (scholarly presentations, other publications, editorial work, published courseware, citations, technical reports, major work in progress, etc.)
 - C. **SERVICE**
 - 1. _____ Department, College, and University
 - 2. _____ Profession/Academic Discipline
 - 3. _____ Community/Public
 - 4. _____ Other evidence of professional service

FACE SHEET

Name: _____

College: _____

Department: _____

Action(s) requested:

- _____ Promotion to Full Professor
- _____ Promotion to Associate Professor
- _____ Promotion to Assistant Professor
- _____ Tenure

Present Status:

- a. Professor _____ Associate _____ Assistant _____
- b. Tenured: Yes _____ No _____
- c. Prior non-University of Houston teaching experience credited to probationary period: _____
- d. Initial University of Houston appointment:
Date _____
Rank _____
- e. Years in present rank at UH, including present year: _____
- f. Years tenure clock stopped for leave of absence: _____
(Provide documentation)

Department and College Recommendations (with votes):

	Approve	Disapprove	Abstain
a. Department Committee	_____	_____	_____
b. Department Chair	_____	_____	_____
c. College Committee	_____	_____	_____
d. College Dean	_____	_____	_____
e. Other (Please indicate): _____	_____	_____	_____
f. Department Rehearing and Action	_____	_____	_____
g. College Rehearing and Action	_____	_____	_____

_____ Department Chair

_____ Date

_____ Dean

_____ Date