

**University of Houston**  
**Department of Political Science Bylaws**

**Section I: Composition of the Department, and voting provisions**

- A. The Department consists of all tenured, tenure-track, and full-time instructional members of the faculty in the department of political science, and formerly tenured faculty members who are on Voluntary Modification of Employment contracts (VMOE).
- B. Voting members of the department are those holding tenured, tenure-track, or full-time instructional appointments and formerly tenured faculty members who are on VMOE contracts, but instructional faculty and VMOE faculty may not vote on personnel matters. Members on leave for research or teaching duties are entitled to vote, but no votes shall be cast by proxy.
- C. Full-time instructional faculty and those on VMOE contracts may sit on every departmental committee except the Executive Committee and the Personnel Committee.
- D. Faculty are responsible for developing the curriculum and determining its effectiveness.
- E. The Department will occasionally invite faculty from other departments to be affiliated faculty. These faculty will not have voting status on any of the above. The procedures governing affiliated faculty are discussed in Appendix D.

**Section II: Meetings of the Department**

- A. Regular meetings of the department are held each month of the academic year. The chair convokes ordinary meetings of the department. A meeting may also be convoked by five departmental members. Notice of meetings will be announced at least 72 hours in advance.
- B. The chair (or chair designee) presides over meetings. A quorum consists of a majority of members in residence. Proceedings are conducted in terms of *Robert's Rules of Order*, unless the department has adopted special rules governing selected topics.

**Section III. Selection of Department Chair**

- A. The department chair is elected for a three year term by full-time tenured and tenure-track members of a department. The procedures for electing the department chair are detailed in the bylaws of the College.

B. If the upper administration directives prohibit the election of department chairs for three year terms, the department chair will be evaluated by the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the fall of the fourth year (on or about October 15<sup>th</sup>) following his or her initial appointment, and in the fall of every fourth year after this initial evaluation.

(1) the evaluation will be conducted by the executive committee, which will determine the form and substance of the evaluation. However, the evaluation must include a closed ended, vote of confidence item which reads

The following is a vote of confidence in the current chair. Please check one of the following

- I prefer the current chair to continue in office (vote of confidence)
- I prefer the current chair to step down, and for the department to select a new chair (vote of no confidence)

#### **Section IV: Department Administrative positions**

A. Department administrative positions consist of the Chair, Director of Graduate Studies, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Director of Technology

#### **Section V: Representatives to College and University Committees**

A. Representatives to college committees are appointed by the department chair.

B. If College or Universities bylaws require an election to a committee, the department chair will make a nomination for the position and ask if there are additional nominees. A nominee receiving 50% + 1 of the vote will be declared elected. If no nominee receives 50% + 1 of the votes, there will be a runoff among the two candidates receiving the most votes.

#### **Section VI: Department Chair**

A. The Chair is concerned primarily with general supervision and direction of the Department. The Chair represents the Department in its relationships with other Departments, the College and the administration of the Central Campus. The chair

- (1) administers the affairs of the Department
- (2) plans the general policies of the Department.
- (3) is responsible for recruitment of new departmental members

- (4) is responsible for graduate student assistants and fellows
- (5) is responsible for undergraduate students.
- (6) is responsible for the department budget

## **Section VII: Departmental Committees and other Officers**

### **A. Executive Committee**

- (1) The Executive Committee is composed of at least four members of the Department. It contains at least one member from both the full and associate professor ranks.
- (2) advises the Chair and department on promotion and termination decisions
- (3) advises the Chair regarding merit evaluations for members
- (4) advises the Chair on departmental policy questions. While the Executive Committee responds to the Chair's requests for advice, the Committee may also initiate topics for discussion with the Chair
- (5) recommends faculty for development leaves
- (6) conducts post-tenure review according to the standards and procedures spelled out in Appendix B.
- (7) monitors bylaws, handbooks and other Department, College, Campus and University documents for provisions that affect the members of the Department in their individual or collective roles.
- (8) advises the department concerning the relevance of all University of Houston documents, bylaws and handbooks to any policy initiatives by the Department or any of its members, and verifies observances
- (9) advises the department concerning the need of updating or amending the departmental bylaws when necessary to conform to policies at the College or campus level. These suggestions shall include language where appropriate,

### **C Graduate Committee**

- (1) The Graduate Committee is composed of the Director of Graduate Studies, who chairs the Committee and at least three other members of the Department
- (2) plans and directs the curriculum of the Graduate program,
- (3) receives and passes upon applications for admission to the program
- (4) develops the scheduling and program of graduate courses, under the general supervision of the department chair.
- (5) makes recommendations to the assignment of graduate teaching assistants

(6) along with the Director of the Undergraduate Committee reviews the assignment of teaching assistants by the Graduate Director

D. Undergraduate Committee

- (1) The Undergraduate Committee is composed of the Director of Undergraduate Studies, who chairs the Committee, and at least three other members of the Department.
- (2) plans and directs the curriculum of the undergraduate program,
- (3) under the general supervision of the Undergraduate Director, develops the scheduling and program of undergraduate courses, and recommends course scheduling to the Chair.
- (4) directs the normal operations of the undergraduate program. These operations include, but are not confined to, student advising, registrations, adding and dropping of courses, and necessary supervision of majors in political science.
- (5) establishes policy for the coordination and content of the introductory American government courses, in cooperation with department of political science members involved in teaching these courses.
- (6) administers the equivalency examination in American government.

E. Personnel Committee (Ad Hoc Committee, as needed)

- (1) The Personnel Committee is composed of at least four members of the Department.
- (2) develops procedures for the hiring of new members,
- (3) directs the search for an external department chair
- (4) makes recommendations to the Chair and the Department concerning other personnel policies, as needed.
- (5) The Chair of the committee directs the recruitment process.
- (6) The Committee makes recommendations to the faculty concerning new faculty appointments. The Departmental Chair consults the members of the Department concerning their preference prior to making a formal offer of appointment.
  - (a) Any full-time faculty member may make a motion calling for a vote of the faculty to express a preference on candidates for faculty positions. If that motion receives 50% + 1 of the votes cast, there will be a vote indicating faculty preference on candidates for faculty positions.
- (7) together with the Graduate and Undergraduate Directors, advises the Departmental Chairperson on the development of recruiting priorities.

F. The Technology Committee

- (1) is composed of a director and three additional members

- (2) is responsible for the operation of the social science data lab
- (3) director is the representative to the Inter-University Consortium for Social and Political Research
- (4) is responsible for all department technology matters
- (5) reports to the Chair about the technology needs of the department
- (6) is responsible for the interface a between the department and the library.

#### G. Committee-Department relationships

- (1) Members and Chairs of standing committees are nominated by the Departmental Chair. The number of members nominated by the Chair defines the size of the committee. Once the Department Chair has made nominations, other faculty members may make nominations. If such a nomination receives a second, there will be a vote with those receiving the most votes being declared elected.
- (2) The Departmental Chair is a non-voting *ex officio* member of all standing committees.
- (3) Standing committees report periodically to the Department, which may debate and accept, reject or modify the reports. Activity of standing committees may be expanded appropriately by the Departmental Chair.
- (4) The Departmental Chair may appoint *ad hoc* committees as necessary. The Department is advised of such actions.
- (5) The Department approves the formation of any new standing committees.

### **VIII. Tenure and Promotion for Tenured, Tenure-track and Promotion Eligible Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

A The Department's personnel policies are predicated on a commitment to professional accomplishment and excellence. Research scholarship, teaching and service are essential components of the undertakings of members of the Department. Each is necessary, but none is alone sufficient for tenure, promotion or salary increments. Instructional faculty are not expected to conduct research as part of their appointments, but if they do, they may request that it be considered as part of their annual evaluations.

B. Definitions and criteria of scholarship, teaching and service are described in the Appendix A to the bylaws. Appendix A is an integral part of the bylaws, and its procedures are employed in the application of policies relating to tenure and promotion.

## **IX. Annual Performance Reviews and Merit Salary**

A The Department Executive Committee conducts the annual reviews of all tenured- and tenure-track and instructional faculty (referred to here as “faculty members”, unless further differentiated). Based on the guidelines found in Appendix C and any additional guidelines provided by the Dean’s office, the Executive Committee will annually conduct merit reviews for all faculty, and make a recommendation to the Department Chair for each faculty member.

B. Full APR procedures and appeal policies are found in Appendix C.

C. Unless specific directions for merit raise calculations are issued by the Provost or Dean of the college, the department chair’s merit raise recommendations will be largely guided by the numerical combined scores earned in the annual performance review conducted by the Executive Committee.

(1) The chair may make adjustments to account for factors including, but not limited to, cumulative performance over several years, documented negative performance issues of which the Executive Committee might not be aware, or exceptional performance in research, teaching and/or service relative to academic rank.

## **X. Procedures for Personnel Action: Promotion and Tenure Decisions for Tenure-Track Faculty**

A. Standards for Tenure and Promotion. The standards for promotion and/or tenure are spelled out in the Appendix A to this document.

B. Nominations. Members eligible for tenure and/or promotion may be nominated by the Departmental Chair, by the Executive Committee, or by themselves. Nominations must be made by March 15th for consideration in the following academic year. In the case of nomination for promotion to full professor, the *ad hoc* committee of full professors will issue a non-binding advisory opinion no later than April 15th.

C. Outside Evaluations. At least four letters evaluating the nominee's record of professional accomplishment shall be obtained from persons in the nominee's field of specialization according the criteria spelled out in the "Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion" published by the Provost's office. The chair, in consultation with the executive committee, shall choose the evaluators. A candidate may present the chair and the committee with a list, for their deliberations, of potential evaluators the candidate believes would not provide an unbiased evaluation.

D. Eligibility to Vote in Tenure and/or Promotion Cases (ad hoc committees). All tenured faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor and above are eligible to vote in cases of tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor. All tenured Full Professors are eligible to vote for promotion to Full Professor.

E.. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

(1) Executive Committee Recommendation. At a date determined by the department chair, the Executive Committee will meet to vote and make a written recommendation regarding promotion to associate professor with tenure. If the vote is negative, the nominee has five working days in which to submit a written response to the Executive Committee's recommendation. If a reconsideration is requested, the Executive Committee shall consider the nominee's response and convey its verdict to the nominee. These documents become a portion of the dossier.

(2) Review of the Executive Committee's recommendation. The respective ad hoc Committees will meet on a date specified by the department chair to consider the Executive Committee's report, and the nominee's response (if appropriate). The individual dossiers will be available for at least three calendar days prior to the ad hoc Committee meetings. These meetings are announced to the members at least three working days in advance. The Chair, or a person designated by the Chair, presides at the ad hoc committee meetings. A recommendation is made by the ad hoc committee with a simple majority vote, taken by secret ballot. Members of the Executive Committee may participate in the deliberations and provide information about their recommendation, but they may not cast a vote in the ballot of the ad hoc committee.

(3) A tenured faculty member designated by the ad hoc committee will summarize the deliberations of the ad hoc committee and its vote, and this will be reviewed by the Ad Hoc committee. The committee will then provide a written copy to the nominee. If the vote is negative, the nominee has three working days in which to submit a written response to the Ad Hoc committee requesting reconsideration. If a reconsideration is requested, the Ad Hoc committee shall consider the nominee's response and convey its decision to the nominee. These documents become a portion of the dossier.

(4) The recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee is received by the Chair. The Chair is not a voting member of the ad hoc committee, but provides an opinion in

a letter to the Dean recommending for or against tenure and/or promotion.

F. Promotion to Full Professor

(1) Ad hoc committee recommendation. At a date determined by the department chair, the Ad Hoc committee will meet to make a written recommendation regarding promotion to full professor. Only those holding the rank of full professor may participate in these deliberations and in the vote. The individual dossiers will be available for at least three calendar days prior to the ad hoc Committee meetings. These meetings are announced to the members at least three working days in advance. The Chair, or a person designated by the Chair, presides at the ad hoc committee meetings. A recommendation is made by the ad hoc committee with a simple majority vote, taken by secret ballot.

(2) A tenured faculty member designated by the ad hoc committee will summarize the deliberations of the ad hoc committee and its vote, and will provide a written copy to the nominee. If the vote is negative, the nominee has three working days in which to submit a written response to the Ad Hoc committee requesting recommendation. If a reconsideration is requested, the Ad Hoc committee shall consider the nominee's response and convey its decision to the nominee. These documents become a portion of the dossier.

G. Chair's action. Upon receiving a recommendation from the Ad Hoc committee, the Department Chair makes a recommendation to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences regarding tenure and/or promotion of the nominee according to the schedule set by the College following the vote of the ad hoc committee. If the chair's recommendation is at variance with that of the ad hoc Committee, the Chair explains the reason to the ad hoc Committee. The Chair's recommendation becomes a part of the dossier. The Chair communicates his/her recommendation to the nominee.

(1) The nominee has three working days in which to submit a written response to the Chair requesting reconsideration. If a reconsideration is requested, the Chair shall consider the nominee's response and convey his/her decision to the nominee.

(2) In cases of adverse recommendation by both the ad hoc Committee and the Chair, if the nominee agrees, the dossier is not forwarded to the Dean.

H. Final action. Action on the departmental recommendations is taken by the Dean, the President of the Central Campus, and the Chancellor of the university as specified by



college and university policy.

I. Appeal and grievance. Grievance and appeal for reconsideration are conducted in accord with Faculty Handbook, "Appeal or Reconsideration."

J. Time table.

(1) It is the candidate's responsibility to review all departmental, college and university time tables and written guidelines including the "Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion" published by the Provost's office as well as the procedures and standards laid out in this document. It is the Chair's responsibility to inform the candidate of the existence of these documents and see that the guidelines are followed.

(2) By May 15<sup>th</sup> the chair, in consultation with the executive committee, will choose outside evaluators to review a candidate's file.

(3) By June 1st, the candidate must have his or her file ready to be sent out for evaluation. The file must include published works, works accepted for publication, and other written materials the candidate feels are appropriate for review.

(4) By the date specified by the Provost for that year the candidate must have his or her written statement ready for inclusion in the promotion and/or tenure dossier to be reviewed by the ad hoc committee.

## **XI. Promotion Procedures for Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

A. Standards for Promotion. The standards for promotion are spelled out in the Appendix A to this document.

B. Nominations. Members eligible for promotion may be nominated by the Departmental Chair, by the Executive Committee, or by themselves. Nominations must be made by March 15th for consideration in the following academic year. In accordance with university procedures, candidates for promotion to instructional association must be nominated no later than the spring of their fifth year. In the case of nomination for promotion to full professor, the ad hoc committee of full professors will issue a non-binding advisory opinion no later than April 15th.

C. Outside Evaluations. For promotion from Instructional Assistant to Instructional Associate Professor the Department shall obtain at least three reviewer letters, but no

more than six. At least one of these letters must be from outside the department but may be from within the university. For promotion from Instructional Associate Professor to Instructional Professor the Department shall obtain at least four letters (but no more than six) evaluating the nominee's record of professional accomplishment according to the criteria spelled out in the guidelines published by the Provost's office and set forth in the Faculty Handbook. At least one arm's length reviewer shall be from outside the University. For either inside or outside letters, no letters shall be accepted from co-PIs, co-authors, or from others with significant career links to the nominee. The chair, in consultation with the executive committee, shall choose the evaluators. A candidate may present the chair and the committee with a list, for their deliberations, of potential evaluators the candidate believes would not provide an unbiased evaluation.

D. Eligibility to Vote in Tenure and/or Promotion Cases (ad hoc committees). All tenured and untenured faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor and above are eligible to vote in cases of promotion to Instructional Associate Professor. All tenured Full Professors and (full rank) Instructional Professors are eligible to vote for promotion to Instructional Professor (full rank).

(1) Role of NTT faculty in process. The ad hoc committee of all voting-eligible faculty must include an NTT faculty member who holds at the rank (or higher) for which the nominee is seeking promotion. If the Department of Political Science does not include any NTT faculty member at this rank, the department will either find a suitable alternative to add to the ad hoc committee, drawing from another department or college within the University, or else will seek permission from the Office of the Provost to waive this requirement.

E. Promotion to Associate Professor for non-tenure track faculty

(1) Executive Committee Recommendation. At a date determined by the department chair, the Executive Committee will meet to vote and make a written recommendation regarding promotion to associate professor. If the vote is negative, the nominee has five working days in which to submit a written response to the Executive Committee's recommendation. If a reconsideration is requested, the Executive Committee shall consider the nominee's response and convey its verdict to the nominee. These documents become a portion of the dossier.

(2) Review of the Executive Committee's recommendation. The respective ad hoc Committees will meet on a date specified by the department chair to consider the Executive Committee's report, and the nominee's response (if appropriate). The individual dossiers will be available for at least three calendar days prior to

the ad hoc Committee meetings. These meetings are announced to the members at least three working days in advance. The Chair, or a person designated by the Chair, presides at the ad hoc committee meetings. A recommendation is made by the ad hoc committee with a simple majority vote, taken by secret ballot.

Members of the Executive Committee may participate in the deliberations and provide information about their recommendation, but they may not cast a vote in the ballot of the ad hoc committee.

(3) A faculty member designated by the ad hoc committee will summarize the deliberations of the ad hoc committee and its vote, and this will be reviewed by the Ad Hoc committee. The committee will then provide a written copy to the nominee. If the vote is negative, the nominee has three working days in which to submit a written response to the Ad Hoc committee requesting recommendation. If a reconsideration is requested, the Ad Hoc committee shall consider the nominee's response and convey its decision to the nominee. These documents become a portion of the dossier.

(4) The recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee is received by the Chair. The Chair is not a voting member of the ad hoc committee, but provides an opinion in a letter to the Dean recommending for or against promotion.

#### F. Promotion to Full Professor for non-tenure track faculty

(1) Ad hoc committee recommendation. At a date determined by the department chair, the Ad Hoc committee will meet to make a written recommendation regarding promotion to full professor. Only those holding the rank of full professor may participate in these deliberations and in the vote. The individual dossiers will be available for at least three calendar days prior to the ad hoc Committee meetings. These meetings are announced to the members at least three working days in advance. The Chair, or a person designated by the Chair, presides at the ad hoc committee meetings. A recommendation is made by the ad hoc committee with a simple majority vote, taken by secret ballot.

(2) A tenured faculty member designated by the ad hoc committee will summarize the deliberations of the ad hoc committee and its vote, and will provide a written copy to the nominee. If the vote is negative, the nominee has three working days in which to submit a written response to the Ad Hoc committee requesting recommendation. If a reconsideration is requested, the Ad Hoc committee shall consider the nominee's response and convey its decision to the nominee. These documents become a portion of the dossier.

G. Chair's action. Upon receiving a recommendation from the Ad Hoc committee, the Department Chair makes a recommendation to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences regarding promotion of the nominee according to the schedule set by the College following the vote of the ad hoc committee. If the chair's recommendation is at variance with that of the ad hoc Committee, the Chair explains the reason to the ad hoc Committee. The Chair's recommendation becomes a part of the dossier. The Chair communicates his/her recommendation to the nominee.

(1) The nominee has three working days in which to submit a written response to the Chair requesting reconsideration. If a reconsideration is requested, the Chair shall consider the nominee's response and convey his/her decision to the nominee.

(2) In cases of adverse recommendation by both the ad hoc Committee and the Chair, if the nominee agrees, the dossier is not forwarded to the Dean.

H. Final action. Action on the departmental recommendations is taken by the Dean, the President of the Central Campus, and the Chancellor of the university as specified by college and university policy.

I. Appeal and grievance. Grievance and appeal for reconsideration are conducted in accord with Faculty Handbook, "Appeal or Reconsideration."

J. Time table.

(1) It is the candidate's responsibility to review all departmental, college and university time tables and written guidelines including the "Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion" published by the Provost's office as well as the procedures and standards laid out in this document. It is the Chair's responsibility to inform the candidate of the existence of these documents and see that the guidelines are followed.

(2) By May 15<sup>th</sup> the chair, in consultation with the executive committee, will choose outside evaluators to review a candidate's file.

(3) By June 1st, the candidate must have his or her file ready to be sent out for evaluation. The file must include published works, works accepted for publication, and other written materials the candidate feels are appropriate for review.

(4) By the date specified by the Provost for that year the candidate must have his or her written statement ready for inclusion in the promotion and/or tenure dossier

to be reviewed by the ad hoc committee.

## **XII. Procedures Concerning Evaluations for *Assistant Professors***

### **Tenure-track Assistant Professors**

A. Persons receiving tenure track appointments in the political science must have all the work on their dissertations completed one year after their initial appointment. Failure to meet this standard means a one-year terminal contract will be awarded for the second year in residence.

B. An evaluation of assistant professors in the third year of their tenure-track residence is mandated by the University. The evaluation proceeds in a manner analogous to the procedures employed for promotion and tenure decisions. The process terminates with the Executive Committee. The person evaluated has right of reply to the evaluation. All materials are retained in the dossier.

### **Non-tenure track Assistant Professors**

A. The classroom teaching of each non-tenure track faculty member at the assistant professor level will be assessed annually by the Executive Committee. These assessments shall include observation of classroom teaching as well as a review of teaching materials and student evaluations. For classroom visits, the date of the visit(s) will be agreed upon in advance. Reports on the quality of instruction and suitability of course materials will be submitted to the candidate, the department chair and the executive committee. These reports will serve as part of the materials for a candidate's teaching portfolio for the third year review and for promotion to associate professor.

B. An evaluation of NTT assistant professors in the third year of their service is mandated by the University and will follow rules as set forth in the faculty handbook. This evaluation is conducted by the Executive Committee, which conveys its recommendation to the Department Chair. The Department Chair writes his/her own evaluation, and conveys both documents to the faculty member who is being evaluated. The person who is being evaluated has the right of reply to the evaluation. All materials are retained in the assistant professor's dossier.

## **XIV. Assignment of Offices**

A. Offices are assigned based on rank and seniority. The most senior full professor (the person who has served the longest in rank as a full professor) has first choice for any available office space, followed by the next most senior full professor, down to the least

senior full professor. The next choice is made by most senior associate professor, proceeding *seriatim* down to the assistant professor with least seniority.

B. In the case of ties, order of choice will be determined by lottery.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Guidelines on Promotion and Tenure Standards for Advancement in the Department of political Science at the University of Houston**

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

#### **I. GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION & TENURE OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

These guidelines for professional evaluation of tenured and tenure-track members of the University of Houston's Department of Political Science 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. Instead of prescribing a weighting scheme across activities, it is assumed that candidates for promotion will demonstrate a level of performance satisfying the Department's expectations for research, teaching and service as spelled out below.

The Department of Political Science applies the highest standards in scrutinizing tenure and promotion of its faculty. These guidelines are intended not only to convey those standards but also to assert the autonomy of the department's judgment in their application. The Department's policy is to facilitate different academic talents and interests; therefore, these guidelines should be viewed as a reference point encouraging the faculty to further the knowledge of the discipline through quality research, teaching, and service.

#### **A. TEACHING**

Teaching is an important component of all recommendations for tenure and promotion.

Satisfactory teaching is a necessary condition for tenure and promotion to associate professor. In accordance with University of Houston policy, standardized student evaluations are required in evaluating a candidate's entire teaching record. The expectation is that the candidate's teaching record will continuously improve to be at least average relative to all political science instructors in the four semesters prior to tenure. Since some required courses historically generate lower evaluations than the median regardless of the instructor, this historical pattern will be taken into consideration when evaluating student ratings.

Teaching will also be evaluated by less quantifiable materials. These include, first, evidence of course preparations and standards as reflected in syllabi, lecture outlines, reading requirements, examinations, standards of grading, and other material relevant to an individual candidate's teaching performance. Second, other activities should be noted that enhance the minimal teaching requirements (e.g., serving on comprehensive examination and dissertation committees). Of course, institutional recognition of outstanding teaching (i.e., teaching awards) are important indicators of quality teaching.

Recognition should be given for the design and implementation of innovative courses using new technologies. More generally, the evaluation of teaching should acknowledge special innovative efforts to enhance the department's instructional capacity. Such special efforts must, of course, complement a fair share of the regular departmental teaching obligation.

## **B. RESEARCH**

As a doctoral-granting program, the Department of Political Science is a research-oriented department. Candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to enhance the department's reputation for scholarship. Furthermore, since the department explicitly considers both the quality of the past research and the potential quality of future research, decisions concerning tenure are both retrospective and prospective in nature.

In evaluating the research of candidates for tenure and promotion, the department holds the principle of peer review to be paramount. Candidates should demonstrate that a meaningful part of their published research has successfully undergone the peer review process at journals and presses regarded in the discipline as being of good quality.

The commitment to research is demonstrated by a record of publications that constitutes progress toward fulfillment of a planned program of research. That program should be described in a candidate's third-year review statement. Candidates should demonstrate evidence of intellectual independence and the ability to sustain a coherent program of research. Candidates are advised that coauthored work with senior, well-established faculty will receive less weight than co-authorship with time-in-grade peers.



While minimal quantitative standards vary by sub-field, candidates for tenure must show work beyond that completed as a graduate student. It is expected that candidates will mine their dissertations for books and articles. But that process should be essentially complete by the third year review, and a post-dissertation research agenda should be in place.

Although it is difficult to offer precise quantitative standards for the number of publications necessary for tenure, past experience can shed some light on this matter. The examples described below are designed to provide a clearer idea about the department's standards for tenure and promotion to the untenured faculty and to the personnel committees of the department, college and university.

The actual path to tenure can vary greatly in our discipline; however, the common thread in all cases must be a sustained, scholarly effort leading to publication in quality refereed outlets. The following examples illustrate divergent paths one might take for tenure and promotion.

One path is journal publications. Without a published book, a candidate normally needs to publish a number of refereed journal articles. The exact number cannot be specified. Fewer articles in top quality journals may be equivalent to a larger number in less recognized or acclaimed journals. However, quantity cannot compensate for lack of quality under any circumstances.

Historically, the department has considered seven or eight articles (with at least half representing work completed after graduate school) constitute a *prima facie* case for tenure and promotion. However, the quality of these articles is the essential standard that transforms a *prima facie* case into one which would merit a recommendation for tenure and promotion.

A second path is typically where the candidate publishes his or her dissertation as a book. Candidates choosing this path should have all the work completed on the dissertation-to-book by the third-year review, although it is recognized that the actual publication date may be later. At the time of the third-year review, candidates should outline their post-dissertation research agenda. By tenure and promotion time, the candidate should be able to show substantial progress on a post-dissertation research agenda. Substantial progress means, for example, a completed second book or several other published works based on the research agenda outlined at the time of the third year review.

Qualitative standards are reflected in many ways. The most common criteria are books published by prestigious scholarly presses, and/or articles published in major refereed journals. For recognition of publication in specialized journals not generally known to the non-specialist, the author must provide information establishing the legitimacy and credibility of the outlet. For publication in a foreign language outlet to be recognized, a detailed abstract is necessary, and an English language version of the manuscript is desirable. Invited or contributed book chapters

and ambiguous evidence of quality unless full information is available concerning the author's relationship to the editor, the circumstances of the invitation and the nature of the review process. While quality article-length works should be submitted for peer review, there are often sound professional reasons for publishing works in edited volumes. It is, however, the burden of the candidate to explain in their written statement why the non-peer review outlet has been chosen.

The second mode of evaluating the quality of published material is provided by the invited assessments of outside referees. The "arm's length" standard for these referees is detailed in the bylaws of the provost's office. The referees must be recognized and well-regarded scholars of national and/or international reputation. Meeting this university requirement for positive evaluations by external referees normally means the candidate has carried out a focused body of research which, in turn, depends on having developed a specific, recognized area of expertise.

Papers prepared for annual professional meetings or ad hoc conferences do not count as evidence of scholarly accomplishment, but may be included as professional service or listed as work in progress if eventual publication is intended. Vitae filled with a record of convention papers with no evidence of likely publication are counterproductive. Overall, the record should reflect continued progress toward publication in a focused and sustained program of research which provides a basis for predicting future research productivity. Probationary candidates are strongly discouraged from writing textbooks.

Being awarded competitive grants is a positive factor in a candidate's evaluation, but it is the published result of funded research that will be weighted the most heavily. It is, however, recognized that funded research may not be published before the tenure clock expires.

### **C. SERVICE**

Service relevant to promotion and the granting of tenure occurs in (1) the institutional setting of the department, college and university; (2) the activities of the profession; and (3) in public affairs of the community. Beyond participating in faculty recruitment, probationary faculty are not expected to be heavily engaged in service activities during their first two or three years in a tenure-track position. Thereafter they are expected to carry their share of department, college, and university activities.

It is expected that candidates for promotion and tenure will be active participants in department activities. These include attending and participating in lectures by outside speakers, graduate student presentations, department meetings, as well as other professional events. Neglect of these responsibilities will diminish a candidate's chances for tenure and promotion.

Service to professional organizations is an important component of one's professional service record. This includes serving as an officer in local, regional or national organizations, serving as an active member of an editorial board or a program committee or otherwise devoting time and energy to organizational activities.

Community activities outside the university, involving a faculty member in a professional role as a political scientist, is recognized as a service contribution. Service activities for which one's scholarly expertise is not relevant does not count as part of the service record.

### **PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR**

Recommendation for promotion to Professor will normally rest on the continuation and maturation of activities that merit the granting of tenure. The research record should reflect consistent and persistent progress in publications and scholarly recognition. Demonstration of capacity as an independent scholar, scholarly maturity, and recognition is imperative. Because the department considers both the quality and the quantity of the candidate's published research, there is no set number of publications that can guarantee promotion to Professor. Additions to the publication record of an Associate Professor should at least approximate the quantitative standards of this document for the earlier promotion before a candidate is considered for promotion to Professor.

Although it is not necessary that the field of research expertise be the same as that for promotion from Assistant to Associate, it is more essential for promotion to Professor that the candidate establish national or, if appropriate, international recognition for contribution to a specific field of knowledge. Such recognition attracts talented graduate students and adds favorably to the growth and development of the department's national and international reputation. More than in the case of junior scholars, citations, scholarly reviews of books, research grants, and outside evaluations are vital evidence of the significance of scholarship.

Service activities, as with scholarly publication, should reflect the advanced status of candidates for promotion to Professor. Active participation in departmental, college, university and professional affairs is assumed. The criteria for promotion are oriented more to leadership roles in regional or national associations. This should complement responsible ad hoc roles in conferences or less formal group activities, such as active participation in an APSA Section or Affiliated Group.

Teaching remains an important function for senior members of the department. Maintenance of the high quality required for the earlier promotion is of continuing great importance. Innovative contributions to department teaching are expected of senior faculty members. Candidates may also distinguish themselves through sustained contributions to the

scholarly enterprise of teaching. Contributions beyond the scope of the department to the discipline at large and to other disciplines are particularly noteworthy. Contributions to the graduate program should be an established part of the candidate's professional agenda. The record should include providing a role model as a research scholar as well as mentoring of individual graduate students through the role of directed study, thesis, or dissertation adviser.

## **II. GUIDELINES ON RETENTION AND PROMOTION OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

These guidelines for professional evaluation of Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty members of the University of Houston's Department of Political Science are prepared as a general document without reference to particular individuals or configurations of accomplishments. They do not prescribe a uniform roster of accomplishments that must be achieved by all candidates for promotion. Rather, they suggest ways of evaluating accomplishments in research, teaching, and service by allowing flexibility in assigning relative weights to these three activities. Because NTT job duties vary, these weightings should reflect each candidate's contractual balance of teaching, research and administrative duties during the most relevant employment period. Within this guideline, it is assumed that candidates for promotion will demonstrate a level of performance satisfying the Department's expectations, as spelled out below.

### **A. TEACHING**

Faculty whose primary responsibilities are in the area of teaching are expected to demonstrate strong teaching competence. Teaching quality will be assessed by peer and student evaluation. In accordance with University of Houston policy, standardized student evaluations are required in evaluating a candidate's entire teaching record. Since some required courses historically generate lower evaluations than the median regardless of the instructor, this historical pattern will be taken into consideration when evaluating student ratings. Teaching will also be evaluated by less quantifiable materials. These include evidence of course preparation and standards as reflected in syllabi, lecture outlines, reading requirements, examinations, standards of grading, and other material relevant to an individual candidate's teaching performance. Institutional recognition of outstanding teaching (i.e., teaching awards) can be an important indicator of quality teaching. Recognition should be given for the design and implementation of innovative courses using new technologies. More generally, the evaluation of teaching should acknowledge special innovative efforts to enhance the department's instructional capacity. Such special efforts must, of course, complement a fair share of the regular departmental teaching obligation.

### **B. RESEARCH**

Non-tenure track faculty whose workload does not include research responsibilities are not required to demonstrate research productivity in order to be considered for promotion. However,

because good teaching requires professional competence with respect to current scholarship, non-tenure track faculty are expected to remain current in their field; one way to achieve this is by being research-active. Demonstrations of research efforts may count favorably towards promotion, as long as time spent on research efforts does not detract from the candidate's performance of the primary duties for which she or he was hired. Evidence of research engagement by NTT faculty may include academic publications and presentations in outlets including and beyond peer reviewed publications, such as chapters in edited volumes or research presentations at professional conferences.

### **C. SERVICE**

For an NTT faculty member, "service" potentially covers one or both of the following: administrative duties assigned as part of the candidate's workload, and the types of general service expected of all full-time faculty members. Service relevant to promotion occurs in (1) the institutional setting of the department, college and university; (2) the activities of the profession; and (3) in public affairs of the community. Non-tenure track faculty are expected to serve on department committees, and, when appropriate, on college and university committees. . It is also expected that non tenure track faculty will be active participants in department activities, including attending department meetings, as well as other professional events. Neglect of these responsibilities will diminish a candidate's chances for retention and promotion. Community activities outside the university, involving a faculty member in a professional role as a political scientist, is recognized as a service contribution. Service activities for which one's scholarly expertise is not relevant does not count as part of the service record.

## **Appendix B: Post Tenure Review**

1. *General Policy:* The Department of Political Science shall annually conduct a post-tenure review of its faculty in accordance with University policy. That policy mandates teaching as the dominant criterion in the evaluation but not the sole criterion. Thus the post-tenure review shall be weighted fifty (50) percent for teaching, thirty-five (35) percent for research, and fifteen (15) percent for service. A review mandating action by the department results when a faculty member is unsatisfactory in fifty (50) percent or more of his or her responsibilities using the weights described above. For example, being unsatisfactory in fifty (50) percent or more of a faculty member's responsibilities occurs when a faculty member is unsatisfactory (a) in teaching only; (b) in research and service, but not in teaching; or, (c) in all three areas. As indicated below, an unsatisfactory rating precipitates a mandatory Faculty Development Plan (FDP) designed by the faculty member and the department chair.

II. *Selection of Post-Tenure Review Committee.* The post-tenure review committee shall consist of four members. At the first faculty meeting in the fall semester, the chairman will nominate four tenured faculty members to serve as members of the post-tenure review committee and nominate one of the four members to be committee chair. The chairman will then ask for additional nominations from the floor. If there are none, the tenured faculty will vote to approve or disapprove the slate. If there are additional nominees, each tenured faculty member will cast one for each of four nominees. The four receiving the most votes will be declared elected. In the case of a tie there will be runoff. If the chair's nominee for the position of post-tenure review committee chair is not elected, the elected members will select a chair.

A. If the executive committee and post-tenure review committee are composed of different faculty members, the post-tenure review committee will meet with the executive committee during the annual merit review to discharge its responsibilities for post-tenure review.

### *III. An Unsatisfactory Performance in*

A. . . . teaching occurs when a faculty member exhibits incompetence and/or gross negligence in carrying out his/her teaching responsibilities. The post-tenure review process shall consider a variety of indicators to determine incompetence and/or gross negligence in teaching. These may include — but not be limited to — student evaluations; classroom neglect (e.g., such as chronic failure to meet classes, starting late and ending early, excessive absents, not holding office hours); failure to establish and maintain teaching standards (e.g., using seriously out-of-date materials; poorly designed syllabi), and failure to be attentive to the teaching enterprises (e.g., not evaluating class work in a timely fashion, failure to update exams or using out-of-date exams).

B. . . .research occurs when a faculty member abandons the scholarly enterprise. Each tenured faculty member is expected to maintain a research agenda that he/she consistently and persistently works towards. That pursuit may be demonstrated through publications (e.g., books, book chapters, and journal articles); progress on publications (e.g., as demonstrated by completed works submitted for publication, presentation of papers at professional conferences, or engagement in data collection and scholarly analysis that will lead to publications).

C. . . .service occurs when the faculty member neglects or abandons his/her university, professional, or community service obligations. Evidence that such neglect or abandonment has not occurred is demonstrated by university service (e.g., department, college, or university committee work or other jobs assigned by the chair); professional association activities (included, but not limited to, committee work in professional organizations, editorial board memberships, refereeing scholarly work for journals, book publishers, and granting institutions); and non-remunerated service to the community in the capacity of a professional political scientist.

IV. *The Post-Tenure Review Process* originates during the Executive Committee's annual merit review of faculty. Faculty members are evaluated on teaching, research and service. The value of zero is reserved to indicate unsatisfactory performance in each area. If a value of zero is assigned in any one year for teaching, research or service, the chairman will notify the faculty member, in writing, and provide an explanation for the unsatisfactory (zero) evaluation.

If a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory rating from an absolute majority of the committee in 50 percent or more of his/her activities, as outlined in paragraph I, the chair of the post-tenure review committee will ask the department chair to provide merit review files for the previous two years. If the faculty member received unsatisfactory ratings from an absolute majority of the post-tenure review committee in 50 percent or more of his/her responsibilities over the three year period, there must be a vote by an *ad hoc* committee on whether to or not to remand the person to a Faculty Development Plan. For example, if 7 or 12 post-tenure review committee members gave an evaluation of zero in 50% or more of responsibilities, as defined in paragraph I, the case goes to an *ad hoc* committee of all tenured faculty.

A. The chair of the executive committee is responsible for presenting the case to the tenured faculty requiring the person to enter a Faculty Development Plan.

B. The faculty member remanded for post-tenure review will have 10 working days for preparation to present his or her case in writing or in person to the *ad hoc* committee of tenured professors.

C. An absolute majority of the tenured faculty must vote in the affirmative for the

faculty member to be remanded into a Faculty Development Plan. This vote must be taken during one of the long (fall-spring) semesters.

D. With an affirmative vote, the faculty member must receive a written statement from the department chair that spells out the performance deficiencies supporting an unsatisfactory rating.

E. The department chair and the faculty member jointly establish a FDP. That plan must be approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences and the Provost of the University.

F. While a FDP is in place for two years, the faculty member receives post-tenure evaluations. Additionally, the department chair will be responsible for monitoring the FDP. After two years, the faculty member is again reviewed by the tenured members of the department to determine the outcome of the FDP. At this time, one of three actions will take place:

- (1) Performance is sufficiently improved to be considered satisfactory.
- (2) Performance is sufficiently improved to show cause for extension of the FDP for one additional year.
- (3) Performance is still unsatisfactory. This finding will result in disciplinary action that may include, at the initiation of the University administration, dismissal under Board of Regents Policy 11.07.



## **Appendix C**

### **Annual Performance Review of Faculty Members and Lecturers (Adjuncts)**

I. The Department Executive Committee conducts the annual reviews of all tenured- and tenure-track and instructional faculty (referred to here as “faculty members”, unless further differentiated). This committee consists of faculty members who are associate and full professors with tenure. The Executive Committee is elected at the first annual meeting of the department according to procedures spelled out in the department bylaws. The department chair is an *ex officio* member the Executive Committee, but not does not provide a numerical evaluation of faculty members as do members of the Executive Committee during the Executive Committee evaluation. The role of the department chair during this Committee process is to provide relevant information to committee members in making their evaluation.

- A. Annual reviews are conducted in January of each year. The Executive Committee evaluates performance in the preceding calendar year.
- B. The Executive Committee evaluates annual performance of each faculty member and produces numerical scores based on assessments of research, teaching and service.
  - (1) Committee members base their evaluations on materials submitted by faculty members, and on students’ class evaluations. Faculty are responsible for submitting a current CV and a completed Faculty Activity Report that provides information about their research, teaching and service activities.
  - (2) The Department Chair communicates the submission deadline and details about needed materials at least three weeks in advance of the submission deadline.
  - (3) Failure to submit the required materials by the deadline will result in a “Not Meeting Expectations” score.

### **Rating Procedure**

II. Each Executive Committee member independently rates each faculty member on a 0-10 scale for each of the relevant areas (research, teaching, service). These ratings are based on the performance expectations for faculty members, and might vary depending on different workload distributions faculty members might have. (Changes to workload distribution require discussion and approval by the Chair). The standard workload distribution for tenure and tenure-track faculty members is 50% research, 30% teaching, and 20% service.

Numbers on this scale can be interpreted as follows:

<b>Performance</b>	<b>Scoring Scale</b>
Outstanding	10
Excellent	8 - 9
Good	6 - 7
Acceptable effort	5
Marginal	3 - 4
Not meeting expectations	0 - 2

Note that scores for any single year cannot be directly translated into an assessment of a long-term cumulative record for promotion purposes. For example, a score of 5 is considered acceptable for a given year, but continuous performance at this level would probably indicate that the record was insufficient to support a case for promotion.

Committee members meet to discuss their scores, and may change their individual scores upon the basis of that discussion. Committee members do not evaluate themselves, and are not present in the room when their cases are discussed. There are three separate procedures: for tenured- and tenure track faculty, for instructional faculty, and for the department chair.

### III. Tenured and tenure-track faculty

Standards for assessing quality in research, teaching, and service are in line with those articulated in departmental by-laws concerning tenure and promotion standards. The expectations below are based on the standard workload distribution of 50% research, 30% teaching, 20% service.

Research: In evaluating research, primary credit for book publication is given in the year in which the book is published; credit for articles is given in the year in which they are accepted. Some credit should be given for ongoing major research projects which have not yet yielded publications, such as books or large collaborative projects or grants. The Executive Committee's evaluative scale should be interpreted in terms of the following general performance expectations, with the caveat that these general expectations do not capture the many different forms of research that scholars of Political Science produce. The Executive Committee and Chair thus have discretion in evaluating cases that fall outside of the norm.

Performance	Scoring Scale	Description
Outstanding	10	-Several journal publications and/or grants awarded in significant outlets, or -Monograph publication with a major university press
Excellent	8 - 9	-One journal publication and/or grant in significant outlet, or -Several journal publications and/or grants awarded in notable outlets, or -Monograph publication with a second-tier press
Good	6 - 7	-One or more journal article(s) and/or grants in peer-reviewed outlet, or -Textbook publication, or -Data publication, or -Publication of chapter(s) in edited volume, or -Significant progress on new projects.
Fair/acceptable effort	5	No published work but a good deal of research in progress, including, for example, -Conference presentations -Research talks -Grant or fellowship applications -Working papers, or -Book chapters in progress.
Fair/marginal	3 - 4	No published work and some evidence of research in progress
Not meeting expectation	0 - 2	No published work and no evidence of research in progress

Teaching: faculty's teaching responsibilities include not only their work inside the classroom but also mentoring and advising, outreach, and other supervisory activities. Evaluation of teaching focuses on two broad areas:

- (a) Classroom instruction, (e.g. student evaluations, development of new courses, innovative pedagogy)
- (b) Student engagement, advising, and outreach, (e.g. mentorship of undergraduate or graduate independent research, serving on exam committees, teaching efforts that will recruit students).

Teaching evaluations are incorporated into the evaluation, though the department takes into account that some courses historically generate lower scores and acknowledges that these scores are often biased. Successfully receiving teaching-related awards, grants, and scholarships provide evidence of exceptional teaching. The Executive Committee's evaluative scale should be interpreted in terms of the following general performance expectations. The Executive Committee and Chair have discretion in evaluating cases that fall outside the norm.

Performance	Scoring Scale	Description
Outstanding	10	Exceptional contributions to both areas of teaching responsibility.
Excellent	8 - 9	Substantial contributions to both areas of teaching responsibility, or exceptional contribution in one.
Good	6 - 7	Substantial contributions to one area of teaching responsibility, or good contributions to both areas.
Fair/acceptable effort	5	Good contributions to at least one area of teaching responsibility.
Fair/marginal	3 - 4	Marginal contributions to both areas of teaching responsibility.
Not meeting expectations	0 - 2	Poor performance in the main areas of teaching responsibility.

Service: faculty members are expected to perform service in three areas of service responsibility.

- (a) The primary area is service to the department. At a minimum, faculty are expected to participate in department committees.
- (b) Service to the university or college

(c) Service to external constituencies, particularly to the discipline of Political Science and other outlets that can raise the visibility of the department. At the same time, a greater service burden is expected of faculty at higher ranks. As such, the Executive Committee expects significant service by Full Professors, a large amount of service by Associate Professors, and a lighter burden by Assistant Professors. The Executive Committee evaluates faculty based on these expectations. The Executive Committee's evaluative scale should be interpreted in terms of the following general performance expectations. The Executive Committee and Chair have discretion in evaluating cases that fall outside the norm.

Criteria	Scoring Scale	Description
Outstanding	10	-Significant contributions to all three areas of service responsibility, or -Excellent service in key department leadership positions.
Excellent	8 - 9	Significant contributions to departmental service and one other area of service responsibility.
Good	6 - 7	-Significant contributions to departmental service, or -Good contributions to departmental service and one other area.
Fair/acceptable effort	5	Good contributions to departmental service.
Fair/marginal	3 - 4	Marginal contributions to all three areas of service responsibility.
Not meeting expectation	0 - 2	-Poor performance in the main areas of service responsibility, or -Failure to participate in department service

- A. An overall score for each faculty member is calculated by weighting the scores in each area based on each faculty member's workload distribution. The standard weighting is research 0.5, teaching 0.3, and service 0.2
- B. In the areas of research, teaching, and service, each faculty member's Annual Performance Review (APR) rating for each of the three areas is then calculated based on a three-year rolling average of Executive Committee scores. For example, a faculty

member's APR research rating for 2024 would be calculated by averaging his/her Executive Committee research ratings for 2024, 2023, and 2022.

- C. The Department Chair determines the final numerical ratings for each faculty member's APR. If the Chair's numerical ratings depart from the Executive Committee scores, the Chair should send a memo to the Executive Committee justifying the departure.

#### IV. Instructional faculty

A. Instructional faculty evaluations shall reflect the job duties to which they are assigned.

B. Standards for assessing quality in research, teaching, and service are in line with those articulated in departmental by-laws concerning promotion standards for instructional faculty. Instructional faculty whose job duties do not include research will not be assessed on research. However, because engagement with the discipline enhances good teaching, continued research activity is encouraged, and will count positively toward teaching.

(1) In evaluating research, primary credit for book publication is given in the year in which the book is published; credit for articles is given in the year in which they are accepted. Some credit should be giving for ongoing major research projects which have not yet yielded publications, such as books or large collaborative projects.

(2) An overall score for each faculty member is calculated using the following weighting, based on each faculty member's balance of teaching and service (including assigned administrative duties):

1. Teaching load 8 or more classes per year: teaching 0.8 and service 0.2
2. Teaching load 6-7 classes per year: teaching 0.7; service 0.3
3. Teaching load 3-5 classes per year: teaching 0.5 and service 0.5
4. Teaching load less than 3 classes per year: teaching 0.2 and service 0.8

#### V. Department Chair

A. The college Dean evaluates department chairs and awards merit raises, but in some years the department may wish to highlight the research accomplishments of the department chair. In those years, the chair of the Executive Committee, in consultation with the Executive Committee, shall write a brief informational letter to the college Dean, detailing the chair's recent research accomplishments and other matters that might bear upon the annual evaluation of the department chair.

B. The department chair will be shown the letter, and will have a right to appeal its wording to the full Executive Committee in a matter similar to that detailed below.

## **Communication of Ratings and Appeals**

VI. The Department Chair notifies each faculty member of his/her Annual Performance Rating in a confidential letter.

A. Each tenured or tenure-track faculty member is told his/her score in each of the three areas, as well as his/her weighted overall score. Letters also contain the departmental mean for the overall score for tenured or tenure-track faculty, as well as the standard deviation.

B. If there are 8 or more instructional faculty, each instructional faculty member is told his/her score in both areas, as well as his/her weighted overall score. Letters also contain the departmental mean for the overall score for instructional faculty, as well as the standard deviation. If there are fewer than 8 faculty in this category, such measures will not be computed or shared, in order to preserve confidentiality.

C. A faculty member who wants to appeal his/her rating should start the process by scheduling a meeting with the Department Chair to discuss the interpretation of the scores. The faculty member may then request a formal re-consideration by the Executive Committee, and may submit a document (up to one page) highlighting meritorious achievements that may have been overlooked. The Executive Committee then reviews the case and tells the Department Chair whether they want to revise the score or leave it unchanged. The Department Chair communicates this outcome to the faculty member.

1. Appeals need to be submitted and considered in a timely matter, with the entire process is to be completed no more than a month after the distribution of the APR scores.
2. A faculty member may grieve the outcome of the departmental appeal process to the CLASS Grievance Committee.

## **Annual Performance Review of Adjunct Faculty (promotion non-eligible)**

VII. Performance reviews of all promotion non-eligible faculty will be conducted on an annual basis.

A. These will be conducted by an Adjunct Evaluation Committee composed of the Department Chair, the Undergraduate Director and at least one member of the Undergraduate Committee.

B. Each adjunct faculty member will be evaluated in terms of satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance of their teaching duties. Adjunct faculty given a satisfactory

rating will be eligible to be re-hired as an adjunct; those receiving an unsatisfactory rating will not be re-hired.

C. Adjunct faculty will be assessed based on the quality of their teaching. Teaching is assessed by examining syllabi (which will be collected by the department at the start of the semester), and student evaluations. The committee may also consider other relevant factors, including student performance, drop rates, and observational data from classroom visits.

D. The Department will keep a record of annual evaluations, which will be consulted by the Department Chair and Undergraduate Director in future decisions about hiring adjunct faculty.



## **Appendix D**

### **Affiliated Faculty Rules**

I. Criteria for Affiliated Status: A prospective affiliated faculty member should have a PhD, and be a full-time faculty member at the University of Houston.

II. Process for Becoming an Affiliated Faculty Member: A tenure-track or tenured member of the POLS department nominates a prospective affiliated faculty member. All tenure-track and tenured members of POLS then vote to award affiliated status to the faculty member. Affiliated membership is reconsidered every two years by the department, and the department votes on whether to maintain or rescind affiliated member status.

III. Roles or Powers of Affiliated Faculty Members: Affiliated faculty contribute to, and benefit from, the intellectual life of the Department of Political Science. They are welcomed at events such as presentations by visiting speakers and department conferences. They may choose to be listed on the Department's web site.

A: Affiliated faculty members who are tenured or tenure-track may serve on dissertation committees as external readers. However, in some circumstances, these affiliated faculty member can serve as an "internal" member. To serve in this capacity, the chair of the dissertation committee should submit to the graduate committee a justification for the need for this affiliated faculty to be an internal member. The graduate committee will then vote on this request. No more than one affiliated faculty member can serve as a member of a dissertation committee. The majority of the dissertation committee must be composed of faculty from the Department of Political Science.

B: Affiliated faculty members do not attend faculty meetings, and do not vote on departmental business.

## **Appendix E**

### **History of Bylaws Revision**

Amended tenure process, Dept. approved 5/5/2015, Provost approved 9/1/2015  
Section I Amended April 28, 2016 (to add VMOE provisions)  
Amended APR and added NTT provisions Jan. 2017, approved 1/31/2017  
Added Affiliated Faculty status, approved 10/15/2018  
3 year rolling average for APR research rating, approved 4/24/2023  
APR revision, 9/30/2024