

#### Annual Performance Review

#### Annual Review Report

### 1. Introduction

The Annual Performance Review (APR) is an opportunity for faculty to reflect on accomplishments of the year and to consider the extent to which established objectives were met, and for the department chair to make preliminary recommendations for merit, should merit funding be available. It is not designed to be punitive but instead is for providing a reflective period to determine if goals were met and to work to set achievable goals for the next year. Reviews are based on workload plans collaboratively developed each year between each faculty member and the chair where the distribution of actual (%) effort across the domains of teaching, research, and service is established.

Minimum expectations for faculty at the ranks of associate and full can be found in Appendix C of this document.

### 2. Materials for Submission

The APR portfolio includes the following documents:

- A.** A completed annual performance review report following guidelines in Appendix A.
- B.** A current CV which will also be submitted with the most recent contributions for the evaluation year highlighted in yellow.
- C.** A completed self-evaluative rubric (see Appendix B). In circumstances where a domain is not relevant for the year's APR, faculty will note as such.
- D.** A paragraph explaining your status/trajjectory and a paragraph summarizing the impacts your work is having.

### 3. Review Process

- E.** By February 1 of each academic year, each faculty member will electronically submit an APR portfolio to the department chair. The portfolio should be submitted via email in ONE PDF document.
- F.** A team of peers will review all submitted materials, and, by March 1, submit a draft review letter to the chair and associate chair.
- G.** The peer review teams shall serve as ad hoc committees and membership/make-up will change each year. The ad hoc committees shall include all faculty who are not: 1) a member of either CUIN or COE leadership teams (chairs, associate chairs, directors); or 2) currently on Family Medical Leave or faculty development leave.
- H.** After the ad hoc review committees submit draft reviews to the chair and associate chair, the chair and associate chair will review and send draft letters to each faculty member by April 1.
- I.** During April, the department chair will meet individually with each faculty member to discuss the letter. Final letters will be provided to all faculty no later than May 1 of each year. For more detailed information on the peer review process, see Appendix D.
- J.** By May 15 of each academic year, each faculty member will meet individually with the department chair/associate chair to establish a workload plan for the upcoming year.

# UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Curriculum & Instruction

### APPENDIX A: ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW REPORT

#### Annual REVIEW Report

Name:

Calendar Year of Review:

Contract Type (NTT, TT, Lecturer):

Record your annual approved workload distribution below. The total amount for full-time faculty should equal 100%.

Work Domain	Percentage of Effort (%)
Teaching	
Research or Creative Activity	
Service	
Administration	

### I. TEACHING

List courses taught (do not include independent studies and dissertation hours—these should be included under advising as they are not part of your course load). If a course is cross-listed, *and/or has combined sections*, include ALL sections on the *same line*. (This information will be used to help understand context for your teaching work.).

Please note: teaching evaluation scores are included to align with Promotion & Tenure guidelines of the University.

**Do NOT include summer courses, overloads, or mini session courses for which you were compensated for the teaching.**

Semester	Course Number	Course Name	Enrollment	Credit Hours	New Prep (Y/N)	Field Experience (Y/N)	Grant Fund ed (Y/N)	Mean Score on Scales 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5						

**Additionally, download and attach your course evaluation PDFs.**

# UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

### Curriculum & Instruction

Other Course Information (This is optional evidence that will help your peer review committee and Chair/Associate Chair understand your work. You can list below where appropriate):

- Evidence of data-informed changes to course in response to course evaluations, student learning outcomes (SLOs), hallmark assessment tasks, and other course-based assessments:
- Participated in course and/or program recruitment activities (describe them here):
- Participated in peer observation (describe and provide evidence here):

Ongoing Funded Teaching Projects in Year of Review:

Project Title:

Role:

Source/Amount:

Timeframe:

Percentage of Teaching Time:

(repeat above if needed)

Teaching Recognitions:

Category	Name of Award/Recognition
Department Level	
College Level	
University Level	
State Level	
Regional Level	
National Level	
International Level	
Other	

Share 3-5 highlights or brief comments regarding teaching. If not already included above, consider highlighting from the categories listed below.

#### EXAMPLE ARTIFACT CATEGORIES RELATED TO TEACHING

- Incorporation of ESL approaches in all courses taught, as shown in syllabus or course calendar.
- Incorporation of innovative technology integration in all courses taught, as shown in syllabus or course calendar.
- Documentation of significant/meaningful changes made based on the faculty self-reflection/evaluation of teaching effectiveness.
- Teaching awards/recognitions.
- Significant course revision or new course development as evidenced by changes in syllabus and related artifacts.

# UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

---

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Curriculum & Instruction

Describe your 3-5 TEACHING highlights here and provide evidence (add space if needed):

**II. RESEARCH or CREATIVE ACTIVITY**

Publications (published in year of review):

List the citations in APA format (bold your name), indicate if Refereed (R) or Non-refereed (N), the publication's impact factor, if it is a Journal (J), Book (B), or Book Chapter (C), and describe the readership/audience.

Publications (under review or in progress in year of review):

List the citation in APA format (bold your name), indicate if Refereed (R) or Non-refereed (N), the publication's impact factor, if it is a Journal (J), Book (B), or Book Chapter (C), and describe the readership/audience.

Presentations (submitted or delivered in year of review):

List the citations in APA format (bold your name), indicate if Refereed (R) or Non-refereed (N), if Invited (I), and if Keynote (K).

Research Institute/Workshop/Panel/Symposia (indicate submitted, accepted, in progress, etc.):

Name of Institute:

Your Role (Chair, PI, advisory board member, etc.):

Refereed (Y/N):

Status (Submitted, Accepted, In Progress):

Funding Source:

(repeat if needed)

Grants and Funded Projects – Grant Preparation and Submission in Year of Review:

Title:

Designation: (PI, Co-PI, Consultant:

Role in Writing & Development:

Source:

Amount:

Intended Start & End Dates:

Status (in preparation, under review, funded, not funded):

Submitted (S), In Revision (IR), Funded (F), Not Funded (NF):

(repeat if needed)

Ongoing Funded Research Projects in Year of Review:

Title:

Role (e.g., PI, co-PI, Consultant, Evaluator, Researcher):

# UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Curriculum & Instruction

Source:

Amount:

Start & End Date:

Percent Effort:

(repeat if needed)

Additional Research Contributions:

- Interdisciplinary research projects with Collaborators/Students and Description
- Students involved in research with Collaborators/Students and Description

Research Recognitions:

Category	Name of Award/Recognition
Department Level	
College Level	
University Level	
State Level	
Regional Level	
National Level	
International Level	
Other	

Share 3-5 highlights or brief comments regarding research. If not already included above, consider highlighting from the categories listed below.

### EXAMPLE ARTIFACT CATEGORIES RELATED TO RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

- Author or co-author of additional books, book chapters, or articles in international/national peer-reviewed journals OR regional/state peer-reviewed journals OR refereed conference proceedings OR book reviews published in international/national peer-reviewed journal.
- Editor, co-editor, or associate editor of additional books or international/national peer reviewed journals.
- Membership on additional national/international editorial boards or active reviewer of additional journal articles.
- Creator of published curriculum materials (e.g., videos, DVDs, software, etc.).
- Key personnel of major external grant or contract.
- PI or Co-PI of an internal grant.
- Author of additional technical reports (e.g., NCATE, CAEP, AAQEP, SPA, SACS).
- Research award.
- Juried art exhibits.
- Keynote address or invited research panel

# UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

---

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Curriculum & Instruction

- Reviewer for national research grants (e.g., NSF, NIH, Spencer, others)
- Other you deem relevant.

Describe your 3-5 RESEARCH highlights here (add space if needed):

**II. SERVICE**

Advising Students

Undergraduate Teacher Education Interviews

Semester	Student Name

M.Ed. Student Advising/Capstone Review

Semester	Student Name

Doctoral Students- In Progress:

- Include Student, Program Committee Role, Dissertation Committee Role, and Student’s Work Completed in Review Period via Codes: A=Taking Courses; B=Completed qualifying exam/portfolio; C=Developing Candidacy Proposal; D=Defended Final Candidacy Paper; E=Developing Dissertation; F=Defended Dissertation Proposal; G=Defended Final Dissertation; H=Internship; I=Completed
- Provide Total

Student Name	Your Role (advisor, dissertation chair, committee member)	Student’s Work Completed in Review Period (Use legend: A – taking courses; B – completed qualifying exams/portfolio; C – developing candidacy paper; D – defended final candidacy; E – developing dissertation; F – defended dissertation proposal; G – defended final dissertation; I – completed all

# UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

### Curriculum & Instruction


Total # of Students Advising:

Doctoral Candidates – Completed during Review Period (include only students for whom you chaired or co-chaired Dissertation):

Student Name	Chaired or Co-chaired?	Dissertation Title	Date of Graduation

Mentored the following students who won awards or recognitions (List names, awards, and UG/G)

Student Name	Award/Recognition	Undergraduate/Graduate

Mentored the following students who published articles (List citation, bold student name(s) and UG/G)

Student Name	Citation	Undergraduate/Graduate

Mentored the following students who presented at conferences (List citation, bold student name(s) and UG/G)

Student Name	Citation	Undergraduate/Graduate

Service to the Profession:

Organization:

Nature of Appointment (elected, appointed, other):

Role/Function:

Contributions/Time Commitment:

(repeat if needed)

Specialization/Program Area Coordination/Leadership:

Specialization/Program Area:

Role:

Contributions:

Time Commitment:

Committees:

Department Committees:

Committee:

Role/Function:

Contributions/Time Commitment:

(repeat if needed)

College Committees:

Committee:

Role/Function:

Contributions/Time Commitment:

(repeat if needed)

University Committees:

Committee:

Role/Function:

Contributions/Time Commitment:

(repeat if needed)

Profession:

Organization:

Role/Function:

Contributions/Time Commitment:

(repeat if needed)

Community:

Organization or Event:

Role/Function:

Contributions/Time Commitment:

(repeat if needed)

# UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Curriculum & Instruction

## Assessment and Program Reports:

Include reports related to accountability (e.g., APAR, PRDs, SLOs) or program development (e.g., new Program Handbook)

Title of Report:

Submitted to:

Reviewed by:

Contributions/Time Commitment:

## Editing and Reviewing:

Name of Journal, Book, Grant, or Conference:

Role/Function: (journal reviewer, journal editor/co-editor, conference reviewer, conference committee, grant reviewer, etc.):

Number of Reviews/Issues (e.g., # of issues/manuscripts/conference/proposals/grant proposals, etc.):

Contributions/Time Commitment:

## Ongoing Funded Service Projects in Year of Review:

Title:

Role:

Setting/Content:

Source/Amount:

Start/End Dates:

% of Research Time (as indicated in PCF):

## Leadership Training or Professional Development Attended:

Name/Description:

Dates Attended:

(repeat if needed)

## Professional Development Provided:

Name/Description:

Date Delivered:

Audience:

(repeat if needed)

# UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

### Curriculum & Instruction

#### Service Recognitions:

Category	Name of Service Award/Recognition
Department Level	
College Level	
University Level	
State Level	
Regional Level	
National Level	
International Level	
Other	

Share 3-5 highlights or brief comments regarding service. If not already included above, consider highlighting from the LIST below.

#### **ADDITIONAL SERVICE CONTRIBUTIONS** in line with university mission and strategic plan

- Significant mentoring (e.g., mentoring new faculty, adjuncts and teaching assistants).
- Service Awards
- Participation with student organizations (e.g., sponsor/advisor, etc.).
- Participation with schools, school districts, and other educational organizations (e.g., workshops, consulting, etc.).
- Participation with community organizations
- Recommendation letters for scholarships, jobs, etc.
- External Reviewer for tenure and/or promotion
- Attendance at department, program, college meetings
- Attendance at graduation once per year
- Supporting a doctoral student in an internship
- Summer camps
- Program support via grading qualifying exams, qualifying portfolios, etc.
- Other you deem relevant.

Describe your 3-5 SERVICE highlights here (add space if needed):

# UNIVERSITY of **HOUSTON**

---

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Curriculum & Instruction

**III. ADMINISTRATION**

Position:

- Include Title (Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Associate Chair, Program Director)

Summary of Accomplishments (limit to one page):

\_\_\_\_\_  
Faculty Member's Signature                      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair's Signature                                      Date

Appendix B: EVALUATION RUBRICS

Instruction	
	Instruction
RATING	
<p>Distinguished/Exceeds Expectations (4)</p>	<p>This rating is reserved for those individuals whose performance in teaching, course development, and instructional support activities was broadly recognized as distinguished. The breadth and depth of expertise in Teaching is indicated by Instructor-provided artifacts or representative sample(s) that show evidence that the instructor implements practice-based and/or research-based teaching strategies appropriate to the field and to the course level. These artifacts may include course materials such as assignments or in-class activities that set high expectations for all students; revisions to syllabi; examples of written feedback to students; and/or other high leverage teaching practices that are appropriate to the field.</p>
<p>Proficient/Meets Expectations (3)</p>	<p>This rating is reserved for those faculty whose performance in teaching, course development, and instructional support activities was consistently judged of solid quality. These faculty perform in a skillful manner and the scope and substance of their work meets departmental standards. Where appropriate, the instructor identifies evidence of course syllabi alignment to state standards, national standards and/or program goals. The instructor provides evidence and rationale of the implementation of that alignment through class activities or assignments</p>
<p>Progressing/Partially Meets Expectations (2)</p>	<p>This rating is reserved for those faculty whose performance in teaching, course development, and instructional support activities was acceptable in some areas, but also demonstrated areas in need of improvement and is not meeting the department standard.</p>
<p>Unacceptable/Does Not Meet Expectations (1)</p>	<p>This rating is reserved for those faculty whose performance in teaching, course development, and instructional support activities was below the department standard. A clear pattern of poor performance was established and a general plan for improvement is needed as the faculty is not meeting the department standard.</p>

OVERALL RATING FOR TEACHING:

# UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Curriculum & Instruction

Research and Scholarship - Tier I	
RATING	DESCRIPTION
Distinguished/Exceeds Expectations: (4)	Faculty performance in research and scholarly writing is nationally/internationally recognized, shows depth in their expertise, and demonstrates a significant contribution to their discipline/field via a combination of peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, books, conference presentations, awards, citations, and/or invited talks. Evidence of grant funded projects is apparent.
Proficient/Meets Expectations: (3)	Faculty performance in research and scholarly writing demonstrates a contribution to their discipline/field in a combination of peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, books, conference presentations, citations, and/or invited talks. There should also be evidence of grant proposal submissions. While not as extensively involved as those rated as distinguished, these faculty would be counted on to perform quality work in a competent and respectable manner.
Progressing/Partially Meets Expectations: (2)	Faculty performance in research, scholarly writing, presentations, and grant proposal submissions is developing and demonstrates a need for growth in some areas. in need of improvement. This rating is reserved for those faculty whose performance in research and scholarly activities may be acceptable in some areas, but also demonstrates limited evidence in other areas.
Unacceptable/Does Not Meet Expectations: (1)	Faculty performance in research, scholarly writing, presentations, and funding proposals is in need of significant improvement. This rating is reserved for those faculty whose performance in research and scholarly activities needs greater development.

*OVERALL RATING FOR RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP:*

# UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

### Curriculum & Instruction

Service	
	Service: Institutional and Professional Service
RATING	
Distinguished/Exceeds Expectations: (4)	This rating is reserved for those individuals whose performance in institutional or professional service had a significant impact on the Department, College, University, and/or a professional organization. The faculty member accepted multiple institutional service responsibilities, showed initiative and creativity in service efforts and/or exercised leadership in these activities, or engaged in high quality advising of the department's M.Ed., Ed.D., and Ph.D. students. The time and effort committed to service went well beyond the usual expectation for a full-time faculty member.
Proficient/Meets Expectations: (3)	This rating is reserved for those individuals whose performance in institutional or professional service is satisfactory. The faculty member accepted some institutional service responsibilities and exercised leadership in these activities and/or engaged in student advising at the master's or doctoral level. The time and effort committed to service met expectations for a full-time faculty member (around 20% of contract expectations).
Progressing/Partially Meets Expectations: (2)	This rating is reserved for those individuals whose performance in institutional or professional service was acceptable in some areas but demonstrated some need for improvement. The faculty member accepted few service responsibilities or student advising at the master's or doctoral level, and/or the quality of his/her institutional service needs to be improved. The overall time and effort committed to service was below 20% of contract expectations.
Unacceptable/Does Not Meet Expectations: (1)	This rating is reserved for those individuals whose general performance in institutional or professional service was not acceptable. The faculty member accepted or followed through on little to no institutional service responsibilities. The overall time and effort committed to service was well below 20% of contract expectations. The department chair may establish a general plan for improving performance in conjunction with the faculty member.

*OVERALL RATING FOR KNOWLEDGE APPLICATION/SERVICE:*

*OVERALL COMPREHENSIVE RATING:*

## Appendix C Minimum Expectations

**Scholarship** (minimum expectations – or an equivalent approved by the Chair and Dean):

### Assistant Professor/Clinical Assistant Professor

**Publications:** Author or co-author on two paginated peer-reviewed publications (published or in press) per year. This includes mentored student publications where the student is the first author and the faculty member serves as the first professional author.

**Submitting Sponsored Projects:** Submitting at least one grant application per year as a CO-PI or PI and/or participating in ongoing or continuing funded research projects.

**Conference Presentations:** Presenting at least two academic forms of scholarship (i.e., posters, papers, symposia, and art exhibitions, etc.) at regional or state conferences or per year.

### Associate Professor/Clinical Associate Professor

**Publications:** First professional (or senior) author on two paginated peer-reviewed publications (published or in press) per year. This includes mentored student publications where the student is the first author and the faculty member serves as the first professional (or senior) author.

**Submitting Sponsored Projects:** Submitting at least one grant application per year as the PI/MPI (i.e., NIH)/Co-PI (i.e., NSF)/Co-I and/or participating in ongoing or continuing funded research projects.

**Conference Presentations:** Presenting at least two academic forms of scholarship (i.e., posters, papers, symposia, and art exhibitions, etc.) at state, national or international conferences per year.

### Professor/Clinical Full Professor

**Publications:** First professional (or senior) author on two paginated peer-reviewed publications (published or in press) per year. This includes mentored student publications where the student is the first author and the faculty member serves as the first professional (or senior) author.

**Submitting Sponsored Projects:** Submitting at least one grant application during a two-year period as the PI/MPI (i.e., NIH)/Co-PI (i.e., NSF). and/or participating in ongoing or continuing funded research projects as a co-PI with an assistant/associate professor.

**Research Expenditures:** Leading federal, state, or foundation funded sponsored projects. Participating in ongoing or continuing funded research projects as a co-PI with an assistant/associate professor.

Conference Presentations: Presenting at least two academic forms of scholarship (i.e., posters, papers, symposia, and art exhibitions, etc.) in at least 2 national or international conferences per year.

**Teaching/Instruction** (minimum expectations – or an equivalent approved by the Chair and Dean):

Assistant Professor/Clinical Assistant Professor

At the assistant level, provide one artifact or piece of evidence from at least two of the following:

Professional Responsiveness: Evidence of professional responsiveness based upon student feedback and self-reflection. Final scores on the rubric will not be influenced by Student Evaluations of Instruction means; however, candidate provides evidence of using the data from Student Evaluations to inform instruction.

Continuous Improvement: Faculty provides evidence of continuing education in teaching pedagogy.

Course Revisions/Development: Faculty provides evidence of one or more of the following: 1) significant course revision based on self-reflection and/or previous course evaluations; or significant research-based updates; or when appropriate or necessary; or 2) new course development in response to department, program, and specialization area needs; or 3) the first time teaching a new course preparation.

Demonstrated Record of High Quality Teaching/Teaching Effectiveness: Evidenced by peer observations, informal or formal student feedback, student evaluations, teaching awards, artifacts showing high quality assessments of learning, high quality of course materials such as syllabi, descriptions of innovative teaching techniques and/or use of technologies, descriptions of use of service learning or field-based learning.

Associate Professor/Clinical Associate Professor

At the associate level, provide one artifact or piece of evidence from at least three of the following:

Professional Responsiveness: Evidence of professional responsiveness based upon student feedback and self-reflection. Final scores on the rubric will not be influenced by Student Evaluations of Instruction means; however, candidate provides evidence of using the data from Student Evaluations to inform instruction.

Continuous Improvement: Faculty provides evidence of continuing education in teaching pedagogy.

Course Revisions/Development: Faculty provides evidence of one or more of the following: 1) significant course revision based on self-reflection and/or previous course evaluations; or significant research-based updates; or when appropriate or necessary; or 2) new course development in response to department, program, and specialization area needs; or 3) the first time teaching a new course preparation.

# UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

### Curriculum & Instruction

Demonstrated Record of High Quality Teaching/Teaching Effectiveness: Evidenced by peer observations, informal or formal student feedback, student evaluations, teaching awards, artifacts showing high quality assessments of learning, high quality of course materials such as syllabi, descriptions of innovative teaching techniques and/or use of technologies, descriptions of use of service learning or field-based learning.

#### Professor/Clinical Professor

At the full level, provide one artifact or piece of evidence from at each of the following:

Professional Responsiveness: Evidence of professional responsiveness based upon student feedback and self-reflection. Final scores on the rubric will not be influenced by Student Evaluations of Instruction means; however, candidate provides evidence of using the data from Student Evaluations to inform instruction.

Continuous Improvement: Faculty provides evidence of continuing education in teaching pedagogy.

Course Revisions/Development: Faculty provides evidence of one or more of the following: 1) significant course revision based on self-reflection and/or previous course evaluations; or significant research-based updates; or when appropriate or necessary; or 2) new course development in response to department, program, and specialization area needs; or 3) the first time teaching a new course preparation.

Demonstrated Record of High Quality Teaching/Teaching Effectiveness: Evidenced by peer observations, informal or formal student feedback, student evaluations, teaching awards, artifacts showing high quality assessments of learning, high quality of course materials such as syllabi, descriptions of innovative teaching techniques and/or use of technologies, descriptions of use of service learning or field-based learning.

**Service** (minimum expectations – or an equivalent approved by the Chair and Dean):

#### Assistant Professor/Clinical Assistant Professor

Service may include elected positions, volunteer positions, and appointed positions.

Evidence of service across 1-2 domains over a two-year period OR evidence of a significant time commitment in one domain (20%/8 hours per week).

Some evidence of service to the program area and department: (e.g., strategic planning, search committees, program leadership, etc.)

Minimal evidence of service at the college and university level.

Minimal evidence of service to the profession (state or national level).

No evidence of community or public engagement.

Associate Professor/Clinical Associate Professor

Service may include elected positions, volunteer positions, and appointed positions.

Evidence of service across all four domains across a two-year period, multiple institutional service responsibilities.

Evidence of service to the program area and department: (e.g., strategic planning, search committees, program leadership, etc.)

Evidence of service at the college and university level.

Evidence of service to the profession (state or national level).

Evidence of community or public engagement.

Professor/Clinical Professor

(Note: Leadership at the level of Professor refers to some evidence of serving as the Chair/Director/President/etc.)

Evidence of service across all four domains across a two-year period, multiple institutional service responsibilities and leadership in some of those responsibilities.

Service and Leadership in the Department and/or Program Area: (i.e., strategic planning, search committees, program leadership, department leadership, etc.)

Service and Leadership in the College and/or Community: (i.e., strategic planning, FEC, ad hoc committee, schools, community-based organizations, etc.)

Service and Leadership in the University: (i.e., faculty senate, congruency review committee, ad hoc committee, etc.)

Service to the Profession: (i.e., leadership in professional organizations, journal associate editor / editorial boards, grant review committees, etc.)

#### Appendix D

The CUI peer review process consists of the following:

1. Each faculty member will be assessed by a committee of three peers annually.
  - a. This committee will consist of one tenured faculty member/promoted non-tenure track faculty to serve as the committee chair and two members selected by the Department Chair. This Peer Review Committee may change by year.
  - b. Tenured/tenure-track (TT) faculty members will serve on peer review committees for other tenured/tenure-track faculty members and non-tenure track (NTT) faculty members will serve on peer review committees for other non-tenure track faculty.
  - c. In the case of tenure-track faculty, pre-tenure faculty will only review peer colleagues at assistant professor or associate professor rank without tenure. Tenured associate professors may review peers at assistant or associate rank with or without tenure. Tenured full professors may review peers at all ranks with or without tenure. In instances where there are not enough tenured full professors, associates may be assigned to review full professors, but the committee chair must be a full professor.
  - d. For non-tenure track faculty, the same process will be used: clinical assistants may review other clinical assistants; clinical associates may review clinical assistants and/or associates, and clinical fulls may review all ranks of NTT faculty. In instances where there are not enough clinical full professors, clinical associates may be assigned to review but the committee chair must be a clinical full professor.
  - e. Depending on the number of TT/NTT faculty to be reviewed, each faculty member may serve on no more than 5 peer review committees each year.
2. A peer review committee will individually review faculty's APR materials (due on Feb 1) and meet for each faculty member and draft a report in the second to third week of February. This report will include consensus scores of the faculty member's progress in teaching, research, and service following the approved CUI APR rubric, as well as written commendations and recommendations. Here are steps to follow:
  - a. Individual members of each peer review committee will examine the submitted APR materials before meeting with the other two members of the peer review committee to develop a consensus report.
  - c. During the meeting, each committee member will present their commendations and recommendations on the faculty's performance on teaching, research, and service, and then the committee chair will moderate the group discussions about the faculty member's progress in each evaluation category. The final consensus report of the committee, completed by the committee chair, should include the consensus written commendations and recommendations for each category.
  - d. This report will be signed by all three committee members by the last day of February. The report will include a confidentiality acknowledgement of peer review discussions. It is the committee chair's responsibility to moderate the discussions, report the final written comments, and obtain the signatures.
3. By March 1, the results of each completed peer assessment will be submitted to the department chair and associate chair as a pdf document. See the report template attached.
4. The department chair and associate chair will independently review faculty's submitted APR materials, review all peer evaluation commendations and recommendations, draft

individualized annual review letters, and send letters and peer review reports to faculty members by March 31.

5. During the first three weeks of April, the department chair and associate chair will meet individually with each faculty member to discuss the letter. Final letters will be provided to all faculty no later than May 1.

# UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION  
Curriculum & Instruction

## Revision Log:

Revision Title	Inserted Revision	Date and Recorded Vote of Faculty Approval (including vote of Chair)
Original development of full policy	Full policy	December 2018
Changed formatting to make the form more accessible		December 2018
Revised based on faculty feedback		1-30-19
Presented to faculty for review		2-1-19
Rubrics revised based on faculty feedback		2-26-19
POLICY APPROVED BY FACULTY VOTE		3-1-19 30 FACULTY MEMBERS VOTED (68% OF TOTAL NUMBER) 93% OF FACULTY WHO VOTED APPROVED
Approved by Dean of COE		
Approved by Provost		
Revised based on EPE at university level and based on use over 4 years		11/2022 – 5/2023
REVISED POLICY APPROVED BY FACULTY VOTE (Revisions based on UH EPE policy, to align rubrics to merit and promotion and tenure/promotion processes, and to include minimum expectations at all ranks)		5-7-23 20 FACULTY MEMBERS VOTED (62.5% of TOTAL NUMBER) 90% OF FACULTY WHO VOTED APPROVED  5/28/2023

Mark S.F. Clarke, Ph.D.  
Associate Provost, Faculty Affairs



Reviewed and Approved, 6-22-23

# UNIVERSITY of **HOUSTON**

---

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Curriculum & Instruction