University of Houston
Department of Comparative Cultural Studies

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Procedures

Committee Members:

Kenneth Brown, Janis Hutchinson, Keith McNeal

1. Introduction

The faculty of the Department of Comparative Cultural Studies (CCS) are trained in and work across a broad range of related fields that explore human diversity and experience across time and space. In their interdisciplinary efforts to understand the nature and culture of human diversity, CCS faculty utilize a variety of theoretical approaches, research methodologies and modes of scholarship. For example, anthropology itself is a broad discipline that bridges the sciences and humanities, and covers a variety of subjects, including ethnography, human biology, paleontology, history and archaeology. As a result, CCS faculty may employ research methods that are quantitative or qualitative, ethnographic or biological, archival or contemporary, historical or literary, laboratory-based or field-based, or any combination thereof. CCS Faculty therefore work across a wide range of disciplines, scholarly norms, and standards of distinction.

For heuristic purposes, there are two forms of research in CCS: the **social sciences paradigm (a)** and the **humanities paradigm (b)**.

a) In the *social sciences paradigm*, research is disseminated primarily in peer-reviewed journal articles, as well as authored books (single or multiple authors), monographs, reports, book chapters and well-documented datasets. The measure of quality in this paradigm is often the prestige or impact factor of the publication venue, and the rate/number of citations of the articles published. Researchers in the social sciences paradigm often publish co-authored articles, therefore the proportion contributed by each of the co-authors is typically noted. In the social sciences paradigm, a productive researcher would publish a number of multiple co-authored articles per year.

b) In the *humanities paradigm*, single-authored books are generally considered the highest standard of output, with the prestige of the book press and peer reviews subsequent to publication often serving as a measure of quality. The humanities paradigm also values journal articles, book chapters, and creative exhibits. A productive researcher in cultural anthropology averages one (or more) single-authored article(s) per year, with appropriate conversion taken into account for book writing. For those whose work articulates with creative fields, such as visual or museum anthropology, the expected and normal modes of scholarship may include public performances and exhibits.

Because CCS has researchers in both the social sciences and humanities paradigms, no single ranking of publication outlets, forms of productivity, or external funding can entirely

assess research productivity across all CCS faculty. The standards of performance in CCS need to be flexible, appropriate to the norms for achievement in their own research areas. Junior faculty should develop pre-tenure plans relevant to their own scholarly modes of inquiry.

2. Third-Year Faculty Review

The purpose of a third-year review is to advise a tenure-track professor and CCS as to whether the professor in review is making adequate progress toward their tenure review. While this review is mandated by University and Departmental By-Laws, it should be considered primarily as a document designed to evaluate the progress of a professor toward tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and to suggest possible areas of strengths and potential weaknesses that a candidate might wish to address prior to the actual review for promotion and tenure.

A professor undergoing their third-year review will submit their packet of materials to the Personnel Committee by approximately November 15 for review. The Personnel Committee will write an overall assessment letter, to be submitted to the CCS Chair by approximately December 15. The CCS Chair reads the Personnel Committee assessment and writes her/his own assessment. The Personnel Committee will address its review to the CLASS Dean, and the review should recommend how the tenure-track professor can strengthen his/her case for tenure in the years leading to the tenure review.

2.1. Third-Year Review Packet

The Third-year review packet will be assembled by the professor under review, although he/she can request advice and/or help from a tenured member of the CCS faculty to put together this packet should they choose to do so. The packet should include: a current curriculum vitae, all publications, instructional materials, and an overall narrative characterizing activities and accomplishments conducted within the three year period by the professor under review for each of the three areas of evaluation (research, teaching, and service).

2.2. Evaluation of Research

The review packet should describe the candidate's research, how the candidate has developed a research agenda, the significance of the research, and the plans to build their scholarship further. By the third year at U.H., the faculty in question should have begun to make a contribution to scholarship in their stated area of research. This contribution may take the form of peer reviewed journal articles, book chapters, or other products (see guidelines above). The professor may submit articles, book chapters, or other forms of scholarship that have been accepted for publication or are under review.

2.3. Evaluation of Teaching

The professor in review shall identify their philosophy of instruction and the ways s/he has developed their instructional abilities, thereby enhancing the teaching and mentoring missions of CCS and CLASS. In addition to describing his/her teaching activities both within and outside of the classroom, the professor should identify teaching activities s/he would like to engage in, including new courses and innovative methods of instruction or mentoring. The professor should

include summary teaching evaluations of all courses, copies of student comments as appropriate, evidence of undergraduate and/or graduate student mentoring as appropriate. If available, a peer-review of teaching in the form of a letter from a colleague at U.H. can also be placed in the packet by the professor under review.

2.4. Evaluation of Service

Service is defined broadly and includes contributions to committees within CCS, the university, professional societies, and the community (public talks, etc.). The professor in review will submit a description of their service and outline of plans for service in the future.

3. Guidelines for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor With Tenure:

The following guidelines for the professional evaluation of tenure-track faculty members of the Comparative Cultural Studies Department have been prepared as a general statement. As noted in the introduction to the document, these guidelines do not define a uniform set of requirements of each potential candidate for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure in the Department. Rather the following guidelines suggest a methodology for the evaluation of each candidate's accomplishments in the areas of research, teaching, and service. As a faculty, the members of the Comparative Cultural Studies Department believe that the *central focus* of this diverse department is *professional research*. Such research is an essential and integral part of teaching and interaction with students. Therefore, candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure will be expected to have established and maintained communication with their professional peers and colleagues, keep abreast of the research, and contribute to the knowledge base within their respective disciplines and sub-disciplines. Candidates for promotion and tenure will have demonstrated advancement in their professional expertise beyond the graduate-level. The Department members and the University in general require that tenured members of the faculty demonstrate a high level of accomplishment in communicating and interacting with students, their professional peers and colleagues both at UH and other institutions. All candidates will be evaluated in three categories: research/scholarship, teaching, and service.

3.1. Research/Scholarship

It is expected that the candidate will have established him-/herself as a credible research scholar with an emerging national profile through:
   a) The development of a coherent and sustained research program
   b) Publication in one or more of the following formats
      i.   peer-reviewed (inter)national journals
      ii. book presses relevant to the candidate's areas of expertise
      iii. creative media (e.g., museum exhibits, catalogs, major edited works)
   c) Submission of grant proposal applications for external funding of a research program and/or creative activities.

An expected level of productivity could be publication of one to two scholarly items per year (averaged over time in rank) along with obtaining adequate outside funding to support

her/his research program. Peer-reviewed articles, peer-reviewed books, edited or co-edited volumes, professionally refereed on-line locations and chapters in books are all considered scholarly publications. Research products may include reports for government agencies, whether or not these reports are available to the public.

CCS values interdisciplinary scholarship, research support, collaboration and publication. Faculty working on interdisciplinary topics may be more likely than others to acquire research support from internal center grants (e.g. shared equipment, research assistants or postdoctoral scholars), and they may be more likely than others to appear as senior personnel (rather than as Co-PIs) on proposals or to co-author publications and other scholarly work.

Some scholarly publications/products may have very broad impacts as indicated by internal and external peer evaluations (such as a significant book published by a prestigious press); the requirement of one to two publications per year may be waived in these cases. Evidence of emerging national recognition for research in the form of reviews, citations, awards, external letters of assessment, and other forms can help to demonstrate the candidate's level of recognition.

3.2. Teaching

It is also expected that the candidate be a competent instructor, as evidenced by:
a) Adequate scores on teaching evaluations,
b) Evaluation of teaching by a peer faculty member,
c) Submitted instructional materials (e.g., syllabi, assignments, web-based courses)
d) Participation in departmental curriculum and programmatic development,
e) And any other relevant criteria such as teaching awards.

On the basis of student evaluations, peer reviews, awards, and participation in university activities related to teaching, the candidate must show clear effectiveness as a teacher in the classroom, in student advisement, in limited mentoring of graduate students' work and supervision of independent studies or internships, and in other forms of instruction involving students. Candidates whose record reflects difficulty in teaching must also be able to document steps they have taken to correct these problems, and the record must reflect, in the form of student evaluations and peer evaluations, that significant improvement has occurred.

3.3. Service

Junior faculty are not encouraged to devote substantial time and energy to service activities, but are expected to provide limited service on Department committees. Service is interpreted to include activities that contribute to the life of the Department and the academic community defined broadly. Participation or leadership in professional organizations meets these criteria. Service may be reflected in reports developed in formal association with government agencies, in the case of reports archived by the government. At least one form of professional service in addition to reviews of manuscripts or grant proposals is expected.

4. Examples of Research Timelines for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The following are examples of 5-year research timelines for candidates hired soon after completing their PhD. The department will have a mentor available for each new hire during this period, although this is not mandatory (for faculty or new hire). These are examples of research timelines recommended by the department to facilitate faculty in research and publishing.

4.1. Example of research timeline: Social Sciences Model*

• Year 1: Revise dissertation, write some articles from dissertation to submit to journals, develop continuing research project beyond the dissertation

• Year 2: Apply for grant money, internal or external, for research beyond the dissertation or expanding upon it (laboratory, field, etc.); revise articles

• Year 3: Either continue field or laboratory work or begin new field or lab work; begin preliminary reports (e.g., meeting papers, consulting reports) for research completed

• Year 4: Write articles or reports based on new research; submit articles from new project to journals; apply for external grant money for research project

• Year 5: Further lab or field research, revise articles from 2nd project

4.2. Example of research timeline: Humanities Model*

• Year 1: Revise dissertation; write some articles from dissertation to submit to journals; Draft book prospectus

• Year 2: Send book prospectus to prospective publishers; revise articles

• Year 3: Send complete book to press, start new project; apply for fellowship or grant Funding (internal or external)

• Year 4: Book accepted, write and submit initial articles from new project

• Year 5: Book reviews are published, revise articles from 2nd project

* Other forms of scholarly productions may be factored into the promotion dossier.

5. Guidelines for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

A positive recommendation for promotion to Professor will normally require the candidate to demonstrate a continuation of both maturity in their knowledge of the discipline and the merit of their research/scholarship, teaching, and service beyond the granting of tenure.

5.1. Research/Scholarship

The research record must demonstrate a consistent progress in publications, research grant writing, and scholarly recognition within their chosen sub-discipline. The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee and other Full Professors within the Department will consider both the quality and quantity of a candidate's published research and/or professional output. However, there is no set number and/or type of publication or professional output that will guarantee promotion to Full Professor. At a minimum, the candidate should have produced scholarly materials equivalent to that of their earlier promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Each candidate is expected to have successfully completed an original research project or projects demonstrating that the candidate has moved beyond their earlier scholarship. Publication of this research is expected to include an original book-length study. Alternatively, in the case of other sub-disciplines with a tradition of publication in the form of peer-reviewed articles, research monographs, and/or web-based productions, the candidate must exhibit success in these traditional outlets.

It is expected that the quality of scholarly publications will have increased so that the candidate can demonstrate an established national and international recognition and respect for their contribution to a specific field of knowledge. Some indicators showing a candidate's recognition and respect might include:

a) Favorable assessment of published work by external evaluators reviewing the candidate's materials for promotion;
b) The publication of the candidate's book(s) and articles by critically demanding presses and journals;
c) Citations of the candidate's research and publications within the critical literature of their sub-discipline;
d) Favorable book reviews in quality professional journals;
e) Invitations to participate in and/or contribute to national and international symposiums and edited volumes;
f) Appointments to editorial boards or professional journals as well as invitations to review manuscripts and grant applications;
g) Successful application for significant external research grants from respected funding sources in the candidates sub-discipline.

5.2. Teaching

A candidate for promotion to Full Professor must have demonstrated a commitment to teaching and their attainment of a high level of competence in classroom and face to face instruction. It is expected that each candidate will also have demonstrated ability to work with students on an individual basis including the mentoring of students in research. Some indicators of a candidate's competence in the area of teaching might include:
a) Designing courses that add to the departmental curriculum;
b) Being asked to serve as a committee member (either chair or member) of Senior Honors Thesis, Master's Thesis, and/or PhD Dissertation committees both within

CCS and other departments at this or other institutions;
c) Receiving College, University, or other prestigious awards for teaching and/or mentoring;
d) Results of various forms of student evaluations.

5.3. Service

Consideration for promotion to Professor will include an evaluation of each candidate's participation in the Department's obligations in the area of shared university governance. This involves appointment to and participation on committees at the Departmental, College, and/or University levels, service as chair or sub-chair of the Department, and/or service as a program advisor for a Departmental component. Candidates for Full Professor are strongly encouraged to demonstrate willingness to service on local, regional, and/or international learned or cultural associations connected to their sub-discipline. Possible candidates for Full Professor should also have a demonstrated willingness to utilize their professional training and abilities within the local, regional, and/or national levels through participation and outreach to community boards, organizations, and societies where they are legally permitted to do so.