

OFFICIAL BYLAWS

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
COLLEGE OF OPTOMETRY

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECTION I
ORGANIZATION:

The Dean of the College is its chief administration officer. Direction of professional studies curricula and programs is invested in the Associate Dean of Professional Studies. The Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Research has administrative responsibility for graduate degree programs and research. The Associate Dean for Clinical Education is responsible for the operations of the University Eye Institute and resident training. The Associate Dean for Professional Advancement has administrative responsibility for external education and outreach programs. The Executive Director of the Office of Optometry Relations has administrative responsibility for students in the professional program (recruitment and advising). The Chief Financial Officer and the College Administrator oversee the business and financial aspects of the College.

FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

Appointment is defined as the employment of an individual in a given capacity for a specified time period at a stated salary.

1. Tenure Track Positions

- a. Assistant Professor is normally a probationary rank. Probation is typically for a period of 6 years.
- b. Associate Professors may be appointed with tenure or, alternatively, may be required to serve a probationary period not to exceed 4 years before tenure is awarded.
- c. Professors are usually appointed with tenure, but may be required to serve a probationary period not to exceed 4 years which shall be stated in the appointment letter.

2. Non-tenure Track positions

- a. Clinical Faculty: Clinical faculty will consist of members with the following titles: Staff Optometrist, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor. The Clinical Faculty track is separate and distinct from the tenure track of the College and University and are governed by policies stated in the Clinic Science Department.
- b. Visiting Faculty: The visiting faculty will consist of members with the following titles: visiting assistant professor, visiting associate professor, and visiting professor. The term "visiting" is used for persons who assume a teaching responsibility at the University of Houston for a specified period and are usually appointed for either a semester or an academic year.
- c. Research Faculty: The research faculty will consist of members with the following titles: research assistant professor, research associate professor, research professor, research scientist, and senior research scientist. Individual at the research assistant, associate, and professor levels will have research experience and prestige comparable to that of tenure track faculty members at

the equivalent level. Research scientists should have similar qualifications with the exception that their experience and responsibilities may have been focused on the use of advanced instrumentation or technology. Research faculty are typically externally funded and will not be paid from the state budget.

d. Adjunct Faculty: The adjunct faculty will consist of members with the following titles: adjunct assistant professor adjunct associate professor, and adjunct professor. The term adjunct is used for persons who have a primary employment responsibility outside the university or in a different department in the university and who bring some specific professional expertise to the academic program.

ACADEMIC:

Academic functions of the College are divided into the following administrative units:

Vision Sciences Department
Clinical Sciences Department
Internal Clinical Education
External Clinical Education
Graduate Studies

Faculty members may serve in one or more than one academic unit. Members of the Faculty are appointed as Chairs of the Department of Vision Sciences and the Department of Clinical Sciences to oversee implementation of the curriculum and to coordinate their activities within the professional degree program.

SECTION II MEETINGS:

A. The Faculty shall elect a Chair and Vice-Chair of the Faculty for a one-year term.

1. It shall be the duty of the Chair of the Faculty to convene the Nominating Committee during the Spring Semester in order to prepare a slate of candidates for Chair and Vice-Chair. The Committee shall present the slate to the Faculty of the College of Optometry no later than 10 working days prior to the second scheduled Faculty meeting in the Spring Semester of each year. This notification will not only indicate the slate of candidates but will also include the procedure and timetable for election.
2. The Chair of the Faculty, at the second scheduled meeting in the Spring Semester, shall ask for additional candidates to be placed in nomination from the floor of the Faculty.
3. The Nominating Committee will distribute a ballot of the candidates for Chair and Vice-Chair after the second scheduled meeting in the Spring Semester to the voting members of the Faculty and allow Faculty members 10 working days to return their ballots to a designated teller (e.g., Dean's or Associate Dean's Administrative Assistant).

4. The Chair of the Nominating Committee together with the teller shall tally the votes cast. If one of the choices for each elected position receives a majority of the votes cast on the first ballot, the election will conclude.
 5. If a candidate for either position does not receive a majority of the votes cast, the Nominating Committee shall distribute a second ballot offering the two choices for the elected position in question that received the largest number of votes on the first ballot and will allow Faculty members another 10 working days to return their ballots to the designated teller.
 6. The election will conclude when one candidate for each elected position receives a majority of the votes cast. The Nominating Committee will report the result of the election to the College Faculty and to the Dean.
- B. Voting members of the Faculty are those who have greater than half time appointments at the level of instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor in the Clinical and Tenure Tracks, as well as those with appointments as Visiting Faculty, Research Faculty, Staff Optometrists, and full time, salaried Adjunct Faculty. However, only tenured and tenure-track members of the faculty may vote on any topic related to tenure and promotion, including the election of members to the College Promotion and Tenure and Post-Tenure Review Committees. Non-voting members of the Faculty are those in the above ranks who have half-time appointments or less and those with the designation of technical instructor, adjunct with less than full-time appointments and lecturers. Non-voting members of the Faculty are encouraged to attend Faculty meetings and to participate in discussions.
- C. The presence of fifty percent of the voting members of the Faculty shall constitute a quorum.
- D. A student representative shall be designated by each class of students in the professional program and by students in the graduate program. Student representatives are invited to attend Faculty meetings and to participate in discussions, except those involving sensitive matters relating to Faculty or students; with a simple Faculty majority concurring, the student representatives are excused from the meeting. Other persons may be invited to attend meetings by the Chair at the request of the Dean or members of the Faculty.
- E. Meetings of the Faculty shall be convened by the Chair or in his/her absence by the Vice-Chair. It shall be the duty of the Chair or Vice-Chair to:
1. Call a Faculty meeting two times each Fall and each Spring Semester and once during the Summer Semester. Additional meetings may be called at the discretion of the Chair or by written request to the Chair from the Dean or five members of the Faculty.
 2. Announce in writing to the Faculty at least 10 working days in advance of the meeting the date, time and proposed agenda. Faculty may place items on the proposed agenda by informing the Chair 5 working days before the date of the meeting.
 3. Appoint a clerk to keep minutes of the meeting and provide a written record of the minutes for the Chair to review and submit for approval to the Faculty.

4. The Chair of the Faculty shall convene the Nominating Committee during the Spring Semester but no later than March 1.
5. Conduct all proceedings in accordance to the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order.

ELECTION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS:

The Chair of the Faculty of the College of Optometry shall conduct the necessary elections of Department Chairs in the final year of each Chair's term according to the following general procedures.

- A. On or about March 1, or in the event of resignation or dismissal of a Department Chair, the Chair of the Faculty will meet with the Dean and with members of the Faculty from the Department involved to:
 1. announce whether the incumbent Chair is willing to stand for re-election.
 2. review the specific procedures by which the upcoming election will be conducted, as outlined in the sections below.
- B. As soon as possible thereafter, the Chair of the Faculty will notify the Department's members of the impending election for Department Chair. This notification will be in writing and indicate the conditions, procedures, and timetable for the election.
- C. The Chair of the Faculty will meet with the Faculty of the Department and solicit nominations for Faculty members of the Department to serve on the Nominating Committee for Department Chair. A minimum of three candidates from the Department must be nominated to serve on the nominating committee. Upon completion of the slate, the Chair of the Faculty will conduct an election within the Department and the two candidates with the highest plurality vote will serve as members of the nominating committee, along with the Chair or the Vice Chair of the Faculty.
 1. A candidate for Department Chair must be tenured in order to be eligible for the position of Department Chair.
 2. The Nominating Committee will solicit names of Faculty from the Department for Department Chair. As soon as the names of the Faculty willing to stand for election are known, the Nominating Committee will distribute a ballot to the voting members of that Department and allow Faculty members at least ten working days to return their ballots. Voting members of the Department will consist of tenure track Faculty, Clinical Track Faculty, Visiting Faculty, and Research Faculty who have at least a 51% time appointment.
 3. The election process will serve to "confirm" two eligible candidates for Department Chair to be presented to the Dean of the College of Optometry. A vote of "confirmation" is defined as more than 50% of the ballots cast by voting members of

that Department in the election. At least two thirds of the voting members of the Department must cast ballots for the election to be valid. For example, if the Department is comprised of thirty (30) voting members, at least 20 members must vote. If all 30 members vote, then 16 positive votes are required for a candidate to be "confirmed" as eligible for Department Chair. The two candidates "confirmed" as eligible for Department Chair with the highest majority vote will be put forward to the Dean, along with a report of their election results, for his/her selection of a Department Chair. A run-off will occur in the event of a tie that prevents the top two candidates from being identified unequivocally. If only one candidate from within the Department is confirmed it will be the job of the Nominating Committee to solicit additional acceptable candidates. The Dean appoints the Department Chair from the list of confirmed candidates.

4. The term of appointment for Department Chair shall be for four years. The appointment shall commence June 1st and shall end May 31 of the final year of appointment. The Chair may stand for re-election and serve without limitation provided the conditions for confirmation allow for continuation and the Chair's administrative reviews are favorable.
5. Duties of the Department Chairs. The Chair is both the chief academic and chief executive officer of a University unit and, as such, reports to the Dean who is the chief academic and executive officer of the College. The responsibilities of the Chair shall include the following:
 - a. After consultation with the Faculty and according to the applicable Department by-laws, recommend to the Dean all Faculty personnel actions including appointments, promotions, tenure, dismissal, salary increments, and actions that result from post tenure-review;
 - b. Organize Faculty searches through the Faculty Recruitment Committee;
 - c. Oversee the Department evaluation of each candidate;
 - d. Submit an independent evaluation of each candidate;
 - e. Promote Faculty development by mentoring or providing mentors to assist new as well as continuing Faculty;
 - f. Meet at least annually with Non-tenured and Clinical Faculty to discuss performance of the individual's teaching, research, patient care (where relevant), and service initiatives for the past and coming years and whatever salary increases (if available) a person will receive. If the Faculty member is an exceptional performer, the Chair may wish to examine how special rewards can be given (e.g., nomination for an endowed professorship, request for equity salary increase, etc.). If the Faculty member is not performing well, it is the responsibility of the Chair to inform that individual and to advise and assist the person to improve his/her performance;
 - g. Serve as an advocate to the Dean for Departmental needs and priorities;
 - h. Meet annually with department faculty to establish priorities to direct the annual department budget planning. Oversee the financial affairs of the Department, submit the annual plan and budget request developed with faculty input to the

- Dean, and administer the approved budget as a reflection of the Department's priorities;
- i. Oversee the Department's assessment process, such as during accreditation;
 - j. Represent, or select someone to represent the Department in matters concerning inter-departmental affairs;
 - k. Keep the Faculty of the Department informed of all events affecting the Department or the welfare of the Faculty;
 - l. Preside over meetings of the Department;
 - m. Distribute the various Departmental tasks to the Faculty on an equitable basis;
 - n. Take into advisement recommendations of the Development and Merit Review Committee on Department policies and reviews of Faculty performance for merit and/or salary compression considerations and matters concerning promotion of Clinical Track Faculty; consider requests for Faculty development leaves, and advises the Dean on recommendations of the issuance of terminal contracts made by the Development and Merit Review Committee.
6. Review of the Department Chair. The Chair will be reviewed on a regular basis by a Committee selected in accordance with the Departmental by-laws. When a Chair decides not to continue in the position, no review takes place. This committee will first discuss its findings with the Chair. After these discussions, the committee will provide a confidential report to the Dean. The Dean will use this evaluation to share with the Chair positive reports on the Chair's leadership, any concerns that are expressed and ideas that are proposed for improvement. The Dean may use the evaluation to indicate specific actions a Chair must take to retain a leadership position. Finally, the Dean meets with the Faculty, without the Chair, to discuss the results of the evaluation.

COMMITTEES:

- A. Standing Committees of the College, known as "College Committees", are established by the Dean on request of a majority of the Faculty. Standing Committees of the Faculty, known as "Faculty Committees", are established by the Chair of the Faculty on request of a majority of the Faculty. Standing Committees of the Departments, known as: "Department Committees" are established by the Department Chair on request of a majority of the Faculty of the Department. At the beginning of each academic year the Dean appoints all members of College Committees, except for the Promotion and Tenure Committee as described in Section B, 7. The Chair of the Faculty appoints all members of Faculty Committees, and the Department Chair appoints all members of the Department Committees, except for the Development and Merit Review Committee as described in Section D. The elected member(s) of the Promotion and Tenure Committee (see Section B 7 below) shall be selected by the second scheduled Faculty meeting in the Spring Semester and the appointed members shall be named by the Dean before the end of the Spring semester. The elected members of the Department Development and Merit Review Committees (see Section D, below) shall be selected by the second scheduled College Faculty meeting in the Spring Semester and the appointed members shall be named by the Department Chair before the end of the Spring Semester.

B. Existing Standing Committees of the College are:

1. Academic Committee. Develops rules and guidelines for academic performance of students; considers requests by students for leaves of absence; determines probationary status of students experiencing academic difficulty; serves as the hearing body to determine outcomes of student appeals of academic suspensions; evaluates allegations against students regarding academic dishonesty and/or unprofessional conduct to affirm or dismiss such allegations and deliver any associated consequences such as academic dismissal or repetition of course work. The committee shall consist of a faculty member who serves as the chair (non-voting), 5 additional voting faculty members, and 2 voting student members, all appointed by the Dean.
2. Admissions Committee. Develops and applies admission criteria and policies, and recommends to the Dean the order in which individual applicants should be admitted.
3. Patient Care Review Committee. The roles of the Patient Care Review Committee (PCRC) are to:
 - Interpret for the Clinical Faculty the criteria governing the review of patient care and define Clinical Faculty evaluation procedures in the area of patient care to the Clinic Faculty;
 - Perform peer reviews of Clinic Faculty performance in patient care (see Appendix 6);
 - Report to the Department Development and Merit Review Committees, the numeric results of the evaluation of patient care.
4. Grievance Committee. Considers the appeals of Faculty members who consider themselves aggrieved by actions taken by the College or its Departments (see Section IV).
5. Human Subjects Committee. Advises the Faculty with respect to the ethical treatment of human subjects in research, evaluates the potential of each formal research investigation for ensuring the rights and health of human subjects, and forwards approved proposals through the office of the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Research to the University of Houston Campus Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects.
6. Learning Resources and Teaching Excellence and Innovation Committee. Monitors library acquisitions and use and learning resources collections and their support and use; makes recommendations to the Dean and the Faculty concerning operation and management of the library, audiovisual, and other learning resource services. Establishes programs and activities designed to enhance instructional performance and productivity of Faculty members generally. Provides assistance to Faculty members who wish to improve their teaching skills or to develop new teaching methods. Coordinates the recommendation of Faculty members for University and extramural awards for excellence in teaching. This committee also works cooperatively with the Faculty to carry out personal development activities and recommends improvements of current Faculty development programs.

7. Promotion and Tenure Committee. The roles of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are to:

- Interpret for the Faculty the criteria governing promotion and tenure and define Faculty evaluation procedures to the Faculty,
- Perform third-year and other probationary reviews of Tenure Track Faculty(see Appendix 1),
- Make recommendations regarding promotion and tenure of Tenure Track Faculty,
- Meet with prospective members of the Faculty to apprise them of the criteria and procedures for annual review, promotion and tenure,
- Make recommendations to the Dean concerning the incoming rank and tenure status of prospective members of the Faculty.

Membership is reserved to those who have held tenured Faculty appointments for more than one year, whose administrative appointments are less than half time, and those not being considered for promotion. Because they provide input into the administrator's review of Faculty members, the Department Chairs and Associate Deans are ineligible for membership on the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Members will serve no more than two consecutive years. They may serve again after an absence of two years. Four members are appointed by the Dean and one member is elected by the Faculty each year to serve a two-year term. Members of the Committee elect a Chair and Vice-Chair. The Chair (or Vice-Chair, when the Chair is absent) is responsible for calling meetings.

8. Scholarship and Financial Aid Committee. Evaluates eligibility of students for cash awards, tuition remission or loans based on scholarship and/or need; makes recommendations to the Dean concerning allocation and disbursement of funds assigned to these purposes.

At least one student representative will be appointed by the Dean to each Standing Committee of the College except the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Human Subjects Committee, Patient Care Review Committee, and the Grievance Committee.

C. Existing Standing Committees of the Faculty are:

1. Faculty Affairs Committee. Provides a forum for the discussion of issues that involve both Faculty and Administration and issues recommended by the Faculty.
2. Faculty Recruitment Committee. Reviews the needs of the College for Faculty, as represented by the Dean, Associate Deans, Department Chairs, and the Faculty at large. Provides for the orderly recruitment of Faculty, including the appropriate advertising of

available positions (including assurance of equal opportunity), ensuring that the College Faculty have ample opportunity to interact with candidates for positions and to provide input to the committee, and making recommendations to the Dean with respect to hiring new Faculty members. Regular voting members of the Faculty Recruitment Committee are appointed by the Faculty Chair. At its discretion, the Committee may appoint additional faculty to augment its collective expertise in conducting specific Faculty searches. The Chair of the FRC is selected by the faculty chair. In addition, the Associate Deans, Department Chairs and Faculty Chair serve as ex officio, non-voting members.

3. Post-tenure Review Committee. Conducts an annual evaluation of all Tenured Faculty members. The evaluation will be based on a peer review process to confirm that Faculty members are meeting their responsibilities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and, patient care (when relevant). The committee members will be six, full-time, tenured Faculty, excluding the Dean, Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, Departmental Chairs, and other Faculty members holding 50% or more administrative responsibility. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will be elected at the second Faculty meeting of the Fall Semester. Only the Tenured Faculty will vote to elect Tenured Faculty members to serve on this Committee, each for a one-year term. Guidelines for Post-tenure Review are found in Appendix 4.

(Provost Statement) “The College of Optometry’s Post-Tenure Review Policy is subject to the University of Houston Post-Tenure Review Policy, approved by the Board of Regents April 16, 1998, and are void to the extent that they conflict with such policy.”

4. Nominating Committee. Presents a slate of candidates, minimum of one candidate per position, for the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Faculty during the Spring Semester of each year. This committee is comprised of the Chairs of the following standing College and Faculty Committees: Academic Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee, Faculty Recruitment Committee, Promotion and Tenure Committee (only if that Committee has been constituted and has elected a Chair), Grievance Committee (only if that Committee has been constituted and has elected a Chair), Human Subjects Committee, Learning Resources and Teaching Excellence and Innovation Committee, and the Scholarship and Financial Aid Committee. The Chair of the Faculty shall convene this committee and solicit from it the slate of nominees for the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Faculty. Although the Chair of the Faculty shall convene this committee, the Chair shall neither serve on the Committee nor attend its meetings.

D. Development and Merit Review Committee.

The roles of each Department’s Development and Merit Review Committee are to:

- Interpret for the Department Faculty the criteria for Faculty evaluation procedures;
- Perform development and merit peer reviews of Faculty performance (see Section III);
- Meet with the prospective members of the Department Faculty to apprise them of the criteria and procedures for annual/biannual reviews;

- Make recommendations to the Department Chair concerning development and merit peer reviews of Faculty performance;
- Make recommendations concerning terminal contracts for Faculty;
- Make recommendations concerning promotion of Non-tenure Track Faculty, e.g. Research Faculty and members of the Clinical Faculty Track;
- Interpret Departmental policy as set forth in applicable Department bylaws or as adopted by a majority of the voting Department Faculty;
- Communicate criteria for annual/biannual reviews and promotion and tenure to the Faculty;
- Conduct reconsideration hearings upon written request from a Faculty member seeking a reconsideration of a development and/or merit review as specified in the applicable Department bylaws.

Membership of the Development and Merit Review Committee of each Department shall consist of at least three tenured members of the Department's Tenure Track Faculty and up to three Non-tenured Faculty members of Associate level or higher in the Department with less than half-time administrative appointments.

Each member shall serve a two-year term and the terms are staggered. Four members are appointed by the Department Chair and two are elected by the department Faculty. When a members' term expires, he/she may serve again after an absence of one calendar year.

- E. Faculty Representatives to the University: At the first regular meeting (and no later than October 31) of the Fall semester, during which a vacancy occurs, the Faculty will elect the Senator to represent the College of Optometry in the UH Faculty Senate whose 3 year term begins on the following January 1. If a vacancy occurs during a term of office, a person will be elected at the next regular meeting of the Faculty to complete that term. Other non-appointed representatives to University Councils and Committees will be elected as directed by the University Faculty Handbook or as needed.

SECTION III

ANNUAL REVIEW, PROMOTION AND RETENTION PROCEDURES:

Developmental and Merit Reviews

These reviews shall be conducted by the Development and Merit Review Committees within each department of the College of Optometry.

Developmental review: An evaluation of teaching, scholarly activity, patient care (where relevant) and service of non-tenured faculty will be conducted for the purpose of providing feedback about performance in each area. The developmental review will include tenure track faculty who have not received tenure, clinical track faculty, other members of the faculty (visiting, research, adjunct or part-time) who requested peer review, and any member of the faculty for whom the Department Chair requests that an evaluation be conducted. Developmental review will exclude non-tenured

members of the faculty who underwent their third-year probationary review or evaluation for a decision on tenure during the same academic year.

Merit review: The evaluation of teaching, scholarly activity, patient care (where relevant) and service will be conducted annually (Clinical track faculty in all areas, and Clinical tenure-track faculty in the area of patient care only) or biannually for the purposes of providing feedback about performance (a developmental review) and for determination of merit increments of salaries. Merit review will include all full-time faculty members of each Department (including those with administrative responsibilities as specified in these bylaws) and all part-time faculty, visiting faculty, research faculty and professional staff whose appointments are for 50% time, or more. The period of time for the merit review will be the previous two calendar years, regardless of whether the faculty member underwent development review during the previous year. Faculty or staff who have been at the College for less than two years will be reviewed for their period of employment.

Merit reviews will be performed in the first year of the State's biennium budget and will evaluate performance during the preceding two years. Salary increments determined, as a result of the merit review, apply to the subsequent two years, prorated according to the available funding. Recommendations for increments will be based on the current merit evaluation and the merit evaluation for the previous biennium with weightings of 65% and 35%, respectively. These weights will be adjusted appropriately if an individual was not a member of the faculty for the whole of the previous biennium. Individuals who join the faculty within the current evaluation period will have a weight of 100% given to their current merit evaluation.

The developmental and merit reviews will involve 1) an administrators' review and 2) a peer review. Both reviews will encompass the areas of teaching, scholarship, patient care (where relevant) and service as outlined in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (see Appendix 1). Faculty members with administrative assignments will receive a separate review of their administrative performance (see Appendix 2) and will have their performance reviews weighted according to the relative effort in faculty and administrative roles. The period covered by the developmental and merit review is the preceding one or two calendar years (January 1 to December 31).

Administrators' Review.

Each faculty member's performance within the professional and graduate programs will be evaluated by the Associate Dean of Professional Studies (with appropriate input from the Clinic Director) and the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Research, respectively. Administrators' review of the Associate Deans and Clinic Director, should they have non-administrative faculty roles, will be by the appropriate Department chair and the College Dean. Administrators' review of the Department Chairs will be by the relevant Associate Dean, and the Clinic Director when relevant. Administrators' review of the College Dean will be by the Associate Deans. The procedures by which UHCO Administrators provide evaluations are set forth in the Guidelines for Annual Evaluation of Faculty (see Appendix 2). The administrators' evaluations will be forwarded in writing to the appropriate Department Development and Merit Review Committee. The Associate Deans will provide the Development and Merit Review Committee with weightings to

represent the extent of each faculty member's roles in administration, the professional program, and the graduate program.

Peer Review.

The Development and Review Committees will perform the annual peer review of performance for each faculty member, including those who comprise the Development and Review Committees and College administrators who also have faculty roles. The primary consideration of this committee is to evaluate each faculty member as compared to his peers at a similar level of development in the areas of teaching, scholarship, patient care (where relevant) and service. Guidelines for the peer review process are provided in Appendices 3 and 6; specific procedures will be established by the Department Development and Review Committees and distributed to the department faculty no later than November 1 of each year. The outcome of the peer review process will be a written evaluation, forwarded by the Development and Review Committees to the Department Chairs who shall then forward their recommendations to the Dean of the College for final consideration. The exceptions to this procedure are the Department Chairs, whose written evaluation shall be forwarded directly to the Dean of the College.

The Department Chairs will consider the administrators' and peer reviews in assigning salary increments and will provide each faculty member with feedback on his or her performance. Specifically, the Department Chairs will discuss the performance evaluations with each faculty member as soon as possible after the annual review process has been completed. The Department Chairs will meet with the Development and Review Committees to discuss any individuals for whom the administrators' and peer evaluations evidence discrepancy or for whom the Department Chairs intended action is at variance with the recommendations forwarded to him by the Committee.

TENURE TRACK PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

(Provost's Statement) "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 in the university-level promotion and tenure guidelines. It is the obligation of the chair of the department to make all new tenured or tenure-track faculty members aware in writing of not only the university university-level promotion beyond tenure guidelines but also any college or departmental level policies or procedures that may impact their tenure and/or promotion."

These guidelines for professional evaluation of tenured and tenure-track members of the University of Houston's College of Optometry 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."

Pre-tenure (Probationary) Review

Each tenure-track faculty member whose letter of appointment specifies a probationary period of 4 years or more will undergo a pre-tenure or probationary review. For an Assistant Professor whose probationary period is a 7 years, the pre-tenure review should occur during the third year of his/her appointment.

The Dean is responsible for identifying faculty members who are scheduled for pre-tenure review and for notifying both the faculty member and the College Promotion and Tenure Committee by July 1.

The College Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for conducting the pre-tenure review, considering information about the faculty member's scholarship, teaching, service and patient care (when applicable). Information to conduct the review will be obtained from the following sources: (1) a file established by the faculty member, including at least a curriculum vitae, copies of articles, books and other work products, and a complete listing of all teaching and service activities; (2) copies of all previous departmental developmental and merit reviews, provided by the Department Chair, (3) and letters of evaluation solicited by the Tenure and Review Committee from appropriate members of the College or University faculty and administration. The Tenure and Promotion Committee may consider additional sources of information that it deems relevant for any faculty member who undergoes pre-tenure review. However, letters of evaluation from arm's-length reviewers outside the University typically are not warranted.

The principal focus of the pre-tenure review is to evaluate the faculty member's progress toward tenure. The evaluation should indicate clearly both the faculty member's areas of strength and any areas that require improvement. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will provide a written copy of the evaluation to the faculty member and to the Dean, before the end of the Fall semester. If dissatisfied, the faculty member may request the Committee to reconsider one or more aspects of its evaluation, by petitioning the Promotion and Tenure Committee in writing within ten working days of receiving his or her written pre-tenure evaluation. The faculty member's petition should include a statement indicating the basis for his or her request and a summary of the relevant supporting evidence. If the faculty member remains dissatisfied after receiving a written report of the Committee's reconsideration, then he or she may appeal to the College Grievance Committee and, if necessary, subsequently to the University, following the procedure for grievances specified in the Faculty Handbook.

Tenure and Promotion.

Eligibility for Tenure. A Faculty member will be eligible for tenure at such time as may be specified in his/her original letter of appointment. At the latest, a Faculty member hired at the assistant professor level must be considered for tenure or termination during his/her sixth year of service, and a Faculty member hired at the Associate or Full Professor level must be considered for tenure or termination during his/her third year of service.

Eligibility for Promotion. A Faculty member will be eligible for consideration for promotion to the next higher rank either (a) at such time as may be specified in his/her original letter of appointment, or (b) after a minimum of three years as a full-time member of the faculty.

Long-Term Value to the College of Optometry. In addition to meeting the requirements for performance and service time described above and in Appendix 1, a Faculty member must be found to have long-term value to the College of Optometry. In determining long-term value the following factors will be considered:

- A. Teaching or research expertise in areas needed to meet the objectives of the College of Optometry and which do not unnecessarily duplicate existing expertise such that resources may be diluted.
- B. Ability to function harmoniously within the institutional structure of the College and University so that there is a reasonable probability that he/she can work effectively with fellow Faculty members and students so as to make positive contributions to the operation and advancement of the College.
- C. The relative availability and likelihood of obtaining Faculty members with better qualifications and capabilities in the optometry teaching profession.

It will be recognized that every member of the Faculty cannot produce a strong performance in all of the areas of teaching, scholarship, service and patient care (where relevant). The Committee will require for favorable action, however, that the Faculty member be superior in at least one of the first two major categories, and adequate in the others. No Tenure-track Faculty member may be completely exempted from service on committees that deal with the day-to-day functioning of the College of Optometry.

Basis for Recommendation for Tenure or Promotion

The Dean of the College of Optometry will transmit all appropriate recommendations and supporting data to the University administration in accordance with the timetable set forth by the University. Faculty members will be evaluated for promotion and tenure purposes on the basis of their value to the College of Optometry as judged by performance in the areas of research and scholarship, teaching, service and patient care (where relevant). Careful consideration must be given to the outcome of the developmental and merit reviews, because failure to notify a Faculty member of shortcomings at those times implies that his/her performance is satisfactory and that the Faculty member is progressing in such a manner as to lead to tenure and promotion. This is not a binding constraint, however, because the cumulative and long-term values of the individual must also be taken into account. Criteria for promotion in rank are described in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (see Appendix 1).

Procedure

The Dean's Responsibility. The Dean will assure that the Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will perform the promotion and tenure reviews, is formed by the end of the Spring semester for each academic year. By July 1, he/she will furnish this Committee with the names of individuals who are eligible for promotion and/or tenure or who seek early consideration, and will provide this Committee with all available supporting documentation. The Dean will receive the recommendations of this Committee and transmit them, along with his/her own recommendations

and such other documents as the University may require, to the appropriate officials in the University administration for final action.

The Committee's Responsibility. The Dean will convene the Promotion and Tenure Committee by July 1 for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews. This Committee has the final responsibility to determine the eligibility of individual Faculty members for promotion and/or tenure. If a Faculty member does not wish to be considered the Committee will not consider him/her unless a tenure or termination decision is required. When an eligible Faculty member indicates no preference as to consideration, the Committee will use its discretion. The Committee will identify arm's length reviewers from outside the College who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate's performance and solicit letters.

The Department Chair's Responsibility. The Department Chair will conduct a review of each candidate that is independent of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. This review will be summarized in a separate letter to the Dean that addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate.

Establishment of File. A file will be established for each Faculty member in the College of Optometry. It will be the responsibility of the Faculty member to be sure that this file is complete and current. Each file should contain: a curriculum vitae; copies of all articles, books or other work products; a current listing of all teaching and service activities; and other evaluative information which may bear upon the decision to be made. An evaluation of scholarship by at least three persons at "arm's length" from outside the College who are eminent in that area must also be part of the record of those proposed for tenure or promotion.

Evaluation by the Dean. The Dean's evaluation will include a cumulative assessment of the outcome of the developmental & merit reviews, an evaluation of the long-term usefulness of the Faculty member in terms of the projected needs of the College of Optometry, and an appraisal of the Faculty member's performance on the criteria for tenure and promotion (Appendix 1).

Evaluation by the Committee. The Committee's evaluation will also include a cumulative assessment of the developmental and merit reviews and an appraisal of the Faculty member's performance on the criteria listed in the promotion and tenure guidelines (Appendix 1). In evaluating teaching competence, the Committee must assure that both peer evaluations and student evaluations are considered. If applicable, written evaluations from participants in continuing education classes should also be considered. Members of the Committee may perform peer evaluations either directly or in conjunction with other peers who are not Committee members. However, all data gathered in this manner must be made available to the concerned Faculty member in a timely manner in case he/she wishes to prepare an argument in rebuttal.

In evaluating scholarship, the Committee should read as much of the published (and other) work of the candidate as possible, including work in press or under consideration. Evaluation by other Faculty members or persons of equivalent competence may be sought as well at the committee's discretion, especially concerning work products that have not necessarily resulted in publications.

Service should be evaluated from information in the file and from general knowledge. The Committee at its discretion may consider any additional information, and the Faculty member under consideration may submit such information to the committee, as he/she desires.

The evaluation of patient care (when relevant) should be based on the cumulative reports provided by the College Patient Care Review Committee and additional information about the Faculty member's clinical expertise.

Committee Decision. The Committee shall reach a decision in each case by majority vote with the Chair voting. In case of a negative vote on the question of tenure, the Committee Chair shall notify the Faculty member affected immediately in writing. The reasons for the negative decision will be explained to the Faculty member affected, by the Chair or other Committee members, as soon as practicable.

Reconsiderations. A Faculty member adversely affected by a negative decision of the Committee on the question of tenure or promotion may petition the Committee for reconsideration within 10 working days of notification. Such petition should provide the Committee with a written statement of the basis of the request and should indicate what evidence the Faculty member believes to be relevant to the request for reconsideration. During the reconsideration, the Faculty member or his/her representative shall have the opportunity to confront and rebut any information injurious to his/her case. An accurate and comprehensive record, but not necessarily a verbatim transcript, of the reconsideration proceeding, including any evidence submitted for further consideration, and a statement of the final decision and vote will be furnished to the Faculty member.

Dean's Action. The Committee recommendations and record of Faculty action will be forwarded to the Dean. The Dean will make his/her own independent recommendations and forward the file to the Provost in accordance with University procedures. In the case in which the Dean reaches a decision against tenure or promotion, the Faculty member affected shall be notified in writing immediately by the Dean. The Dean will explain the reasons for the negative decision to the Faculty member affected as soon as practicable thereafter.

Reconsideration. A Faculty member notified of an adverse tenure or promotion decision by the Dean under the conditions specified above may petition the Dean for reconsideration within 10 working days of notification. Such petition should provide the Dean with a written statement of the basis for the request, and should indicate what evidence the Faculty member believes to be relevant to the request for reconsideration. The Dean will expeditiously convene a meeting with the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Faculty member affected or his/her representative, who shall have the opportunity to confront and rebut any information injurious to his/her case. An accurate and comprehensive record, but not necessarily a verbatim transcript, of the reconsideration proceeding, including any evidence submitted for further consideration, and a statement of the final decision and basis for it, will be furnished to the Provost.

SPECIAL PROCEDURES

SECTION IV:

GRIEVANCE:

Anyone who feels aggrieved by actions taken within the College and for which the College or Departments has responsibility may appeal to the Dean if the issue is not resolved through regular process or discourse. If the Dean's decision is held to be unsatisfactory, the person affected may request a hearing before a special Grievance Committee of the Faculty of the College. At the beginning of each academic year the Optometry Faculty will elect eight members of the Faculty from among whom the Dean will select members to consider an appeal. These persons must be acceptable to the appellant. Recourse beyond the College may be taken by following the process approved for the University.

AMENDMENTS:

These by-laws may be amended at any duly called meeting of the Faculty by a two-thirds vote of the voting members present. A copy of the proposed amendment shall be given to members of the Faculty at least seven calendar days in advance of the meeting.

EFFECTIVE DATE:

These by-laws shall be in full force and effective after their adoption by a majority of a quorum present at a duly-called meeting of the College of Optometry Faculty and when those portions which require University review have been approved.

COLLEGE BYLAWS: APPENDIX 1

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
COLLEGE OF OPTOMETRY
UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON

COLLEGE BYLAWS: APPENDIX 2

GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY
BY UHCO ADMINISTRATORS

COLLEGE BYLAWS: APPENDIX 3

PEER REVIEW GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL AND BIENNIAL EVALUATION OF
FACULTY: DEPARTMENT DEVELOPMENT AND MERIT REVIEW COMMITTEES

COLLEGE BYLAWS: APPENDIX 4

PROCEDURES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

COLLEGE BYLAWS: APPENDIX 5

CLINICAL FACULTY TRACK POLICY

COLLEGE BYLAWS: APPENDIX 6

PATIENT CARE REVIEW

COLLEGE BYLAWS: APPENDIX I

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
COLLEGE OF OPTOMETRY
UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON

The overall mission of the College includes: (1) teaching in both professional and graduate degree programs; (2) laboratory research, clinical research, development and application of clinical technology; (3) improvement of patient care; and (4) public and professional service. These diverse responsibilities can only be met by a Faculty which collectively demonstrates a wide variety of competencies and interests in these areas. The College Faculty and Administrators will attempt to employ the same criteria and measures to the performance of all of these activities and not value one form of teaching, scholarship and research, or service more highly than another.

The purpose of the promotion and tenure process is to reward and give security to those members of the Faculty who meet high standards of performance and who play significant roles in fulfilling the College mission. It is a necessary process, and one in which the Faculty and administration must join with understanding of purpose and consensus concerning that process. Perhaps the purpose should be stated in its negative context as well; the College has the responsibility not to reward nor give security, but to identify and separate those probationary members of the Faculty who do not meet high standards of performance, or who have not played significant roles in fulfilling the College mission.

Evaluation of performance is divided into the following categories: teaching, scholarship, patient care (where relevant) and service.

TEACHING

I. Classroom Teaching

The College must have excellent teaching in the classroom. Teaching performance of those who serve in this role will be judged according to the quality of:

- . course preparation, including course organization, exams and grading
- . classroom delivery
- . attitude toward teaching, including enthusiasm and rapport with students
- . syllabi, exams, and other printed materials
- . teaching innovations
- . outcomes--to the extent such measures are possible
- . mastery of subject matter and keeping abreast of new knowledge and techniques
- . individual counseling and instruction

Student ratings of instruction are most useful in judging classroom delivery, attitudes toward teaching, certain aspects of course organization and examinations, and the effectiveness of individual instruction and counseling. Administrative evaluations should be most useful in

judging quality of syllabi and other materials, teaching innovations, qualities of dedication and attitude, preparation and mastery of subject matter. Peers should evaluate instructors' mastery and currency of subject matter and may be most helpful in forming judgments about outcomes.

II. Clinical Instruction

Clinical instruction is the second area of teaching that is essential in the College. Because relatively few students and peers are able to rate an instructor in a given term, it is important that ratings be collected over time and that patterns of development be allowed to emerge. Student ratings of overall teaching effectiveness should indicate the number and distribution of responses as well as individual and group means and SDs.

Administrators should judge how well the clinical preceptor understands and fulfills the responsibilities of the clinical course, including the quality of the instructor's assessment of all aspects of student performance including participation in the evaluation process, planning of remediation, etc.

Peers who observe the instructor's teaching directly may rate specific dimensions of performance such as: knowledge of alternative clinical techniques, application of health and vision sciences to clinical problem solving, and providing a professional role model for students.

III. Advising Graduate Students

A third area of teaching in the College is that of graduate student mentor. Every student, for whom a Faculty member serves as advisor in independent study, or as a member of a thesis or dissertation committee, should rate the quality of the instruction. Ratings by students and, perhaps more appropriately, by peers should attempt to discern how the mentor has contributed to the student's progress. Administrative judgment should involve the quality and the degree to which the Faculty member is involved in graduate courses and in serving as mentor.

IV. Laboratories, Continuing Education, etc.

Other teaching activities that are important contributions to the College mission are: development and design of laboratory courses and continuing education courses, serving as preceptor to residents, delivering continuing education, and presenting lectures to professional organizations. Any and all of these represent activities falling under the heading of teaching which are important to the College's mission. When these are identified as teaching activities performed by a Faculty member who is being considered for promotion or tenure, the extent and quality of performance in each must be evaluated.

SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship is essential, and in the College of Optometry can take two forms.

I. Research

For purposes of performance evaluation in this area, research may be defined as a four-step process in which (a) a question or problem is posed, the answer to which will advance the knowledge base in a given field, (b) a method for answering the question or solving the problem is designed, (c) the appropriate activity (experiment or other effort) is conducted, (d) the results are reported.

II. Other Creative Activity

Other creative activity carried to conclusion may also be termed scholarship. This might include:

- preparation of a textbook or another instructional modality, which organizes knowledge or information in a new and useful way;
- publication of case reports that present unique clinical information of interest to practitioners and colleagues in academic institutions;
- creation and/or evaluation of diagnostic or treatment procedures, optical devices, instrumentation, and other products of this sort;
- development of innovative computer applications that lead to more efficient and effective clinical practices;
- designing or participating in clinical trials, or other clinical research.

Scholarly publications in refereed journals, presentations at meetings, and grant applications will be among those things considered as evidence of scholarship. Both the extent of activity and the quality of products produced by scholarship will be the basis for determining performance.

PATIENT CARE (where relevant)

A Faculty member who is involved directly in patient care must be an outstanding Clinician or on a path to becoming an outstanding Clinician by delivering the highest quality patient care. A Clinician's ability to provide quality patient care encompasses many parameters, some specific to the area of expertise and some common to all areas of patient care. The areas of commonality include: expertise, knowledge, skills, communication, creativity, productivity, and credentials and education.

SERVICE

This includes all activities exclusive of those considered under teaching, and research and scholarship, but which serve one or more College purposes.

- Service on College Committees - the most important considerations are that the Faculty member performs well and willingly.
- Service on University Committees and to professional organizations - little activity here is required when considering Faculty members for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. Increasing participation at the Associate Professor level is essential to qualify for higher rank, particularly among Faculty members not involved heavily in research. Peers who are also involved in the activity or who have observed performance in some other context assess the extent and quality of such activity.
- Service to the College and University in non-committee activities - these might include such diverse attributes and enterprises as a willingness to help where and when needed, to initiating and carrying out a selected project.
- Service to the profession - these activities might range from contributing time to continuing optometric education at a local society meeting to officer of a national professional organization.
- Public service - any way in which the Faculty member's expertise in his/her discipline serves the public at large. Examples: talking to school/ parent organizations, volunteering to consult with non-optometric organizations, serving as an appointee to government committees concerned with education, science, or health care.

PROCEDURES

The Dean will consult with each Faculty member who is scheduled for probationary review, promotion, or tenure as a result of University policy or negotiation at time of appointment. Anyone who wishes to be considered for promotion or tenure at any other time should contact the Dean prior to July 1 of the year during which he/she wishes the evaluation process to take place. The Dean's office will assist the Faculty member in preparing a file which includes, as a minimum, an updated CV and a self report of activities in teaching, research or scholarship, and service.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee will meet to begin the evaluation process by the beginning of July. The Committee will collect all pertinent information concerning the quality and quantity of the candidate's teaching, research and scholarship, patient care (where relevant) and service, including ratings by peers and students in certain specified areas. They will also solicit external reviews concerning the quality of research and/or scholarly activities and, where relevant, service external to the College. The Committee will then formulate an evaluation of performance in all areas. After giving the Faculty member an opportunity to read their preliminary report, the Committee will meet with the Faculty member in order to hear his/her viewpoint. The Committee

will then prepare a final report and send it to the Dean no later than indicated in the Provost's timetable for promotion and tenure review. The Dean will then consult with the Faculty member before sending his/her recommendation to the Provost.

Procedures and criteria for the third year review and any other reviews during the probationary period will be the same as those during the promotion or tenure evaluation.

STANDARDS

PROBATIONARY REVIEW

Teaching: the Faculty member must exhibit potential for becoming an outstanding teacher in at least one area: classroom or laboratory instruction, clinical teaching, or graduate mentorship. If problems of teaching performance have been identified in earlier years, there must be evidence of improvement. The Faculty member must have demonstrated dependability in preparation, meeting classes, and preparing course materials. There must be evidence that there is up-to-date mastery of subject matter, good student ratings of effectiveness, and keen interest in developing as a teacher.

Scholarship:

I. Research

The product must be of sufficient caliber that the Faculty member in due time is expected to meet research standards for full professorship, i.e., his/her work will be recognized and respected nationally, and he/she must be independently creative.

II. Creation of New Knowledge

If other measures of scholarship are to be judged, there must be a record of activity in process and completed so that quality may be evaluated. Performance must meet the mean or better for Faculty at the same rank, and there must be reasonable expectation of gaining national prominence in some aspect of scholarship. There must be conclusive evidence that the Faculty member is creative and will continue to produce products of scholarship based on original conceptions.

Patient Care (where relevant): The Faculty member must be an outstanding Clinician or on a path to becoming an outstanding Clinician with recognition for clinical competence by delivering the highest quality patient care.

Service: The Faculty member must have established a record of service sufficient to permit judgments concerning quality of performance and attitudes concerning responsibilities for service. It is not essential that the Faculty member have a history of service activities beyond the College, but some assessment should be made concerning expectations about future prominence in professional or public service.

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE

Teaching: continuing development must be demonstrated. Superior performance as a teacher in at least one of the modes must have been clearly established.

Research and Scholarship: continuing development must be demonstrated. Performance must have been productive and of high quality for at least three years prior to this evaluation. There should be an indication that research and scholarship will continue to be productive throughout the period of tenure. Independent creativity must have been demonstrated and sufficient research or scholarly projects must have been completed so that external as well as internal reviewers can make assessments of quality.

Patient Care (where relevant): The Faculty member must be an outstanding Clinician by who has achieved or is on the way to achieving national recognition for clinical competence by delivering the highest quality patient care.

Service: increasing service to the College should be demonstrated since the mid-probationary period review. Significant service of high quality to the University, the profession, and the public should have been performed or be in process.

The Committee should establish that satisfactory career progress has been made in all areas, and that performance in either teaching or research and scholarship is judged to be excellent.

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Teaching: there must be a long and consistently outstanding record.

Research and Scholarship: there must be a consistent record of research sufficient in quantity and quality to gain for the Faculty member broad recognition and high respect nationally and internationally by scientific peers; or the record of scholarship must have led to obvious national prominence in one or more areas of scholarship and/or in clinical expertise.

Patient Care (where relevant): The Faculty member must have national or international recognition for clinical competence based on a long and consistent record of delivering the highest quality patient care.

Service: a distinguished record of service to the College, appointment to campus-wide committees or other service groups must be evident; service to national scholarly or professional organizations is expected.

COLLEGE BYLAWS: APPENDIX 2

GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL AND BIENNIAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY
BY UHCO ADMINISTRATORS

1. Evaluation of Faculty performance. In accordance with the College Bylaws, the Associate Deans will employ the following process in evaluating Faculty member performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, patient care (where relevant) and service.

The Associate Deans, in consultation with the Department Chairs, will collaborate in providing a single evaluation of each Tenure Track Faculty member (except for the Dean of the College, the Associate Deans, and the Department Chairs) who devotes any of his/her time to non-administrative activities.

The work period evaluated will be the preceding one or two calendar years (January 1 through December 31) for developmental and merit review, respectively. Word products that carry forward into the new year may also be considered in the evaluation.

The Associate Deans will adjust their evaluation appropriately in those cases where a substantial modification in work assignments has been provided for a Faculty person in order to foster some aspect of his/her professional development.

A written evaluation will be generated for each Faculty person covering each of the performance areas (i.e., teaching, scholarship, patient care (where relevant) and service). In addition, a numerical value will be provided for each Faculty person.

The Administrator's evaluation of Faculty performance will be forwarded simultaneously to the Dean and to the Faculty member reviewed. The Associate Deans will provide the Development and Merit Review Committees with a listing of each Faculty member's percentage of effort in the professional program, the graduate program, and on administrative duties, to be used in the annual peer review process.

2. Evaluation of administrative performance. For each Faculty member who is assigned specific administrative duties within the College, the Associate Deans will forward to the Dean an evaluation of administrative performance, separate from the review of Faculty performance. Each Associate Dean will evaluate Faculty members whose administrative activity they directly supervise (e.g., Department Chairs and Clinic Service Directors). The Dean of the College will evaluate the administrative activities of the Assistant and Associate Deans. Each Faculty member whose administrative performance is evaluated will receive a copy of his/her evaluation from the Dean.

COLLEGE BYLAWS: APPENDIX 3

PEER REVIEW GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL AND BIENNIAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY: DEPARTMENT DEVELOPMENT AND MERIT REVIEW COMMITTEES

The Development and Merit Review Committee of each Department undertakes the peer review of performance of all Faculty members in its Department, including the Department Chair and other members of the College who also have administrative appointments. When the Development and Merit Review Committees review their own members (using the same procedures and criteria as for other Faculty), the Committee member shall be excused from the meeting room; when the Chair of the Development and Merit Review Committee is excused, the Vice-Chair will head the committee.

In performing its evaluation, the Department and Merit Review Committees and other reviewing entities will consider that various members of the Faculty have different roles in carrying out the diverse missions of the College. Performance and achievement within the four areas of teaching, scholarship, patient care (where relevant) and service, considered within the context of each Faculty member's role in the College, are the bases for peer review. Each member of the Faculty is expected to participate and contribute in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service and patient care (where relevant). Information considered by the Development and Merit Review Committees in their evaluation will include a self report of activities compiled by each Faculty member, student ratings of instruction and participant evaluations of continuing education activities sponsored by the College, and the extent of participation in the professional program, the graduate program, and in administration (provided by the Associate Deans).

As the result of its evaluation, the Development and Merit Review Committees will prepare a written descriptive summary of each Faculty member's performance during the past year (for annual reviews) or the past two years (for biennial reviews), recognizing both achievements and deficits. The summaries for the Department Chairs and the Associate Deans will be forwarded simultaneously to the College Dean and to the Faculty member reviewed. For all other members, the summary will be forwarded simultaneously to the Department Chair and to the Faculty member reviewed. The Chair will subsequently discuss the comments from the Development and Merit Review Committee and from the administrator's written evaluations with each Faculty member in meetings held as soon as possible after the review process has been completed. For the Department Chairs and the Associate Deans, the College Dean will serve this function.

Although the development and merit reviews are by definition, limited to performance during the prior one or two calendar years, the Development and Merit Review Committees should consider also the cumulative progress of Faculty members. When appropriate, the Development and Merit Review Committees should include a description of such progress in its summary evaluation so that the Department Chair and the College Dean can discuss this information with Faculty members who are considering promotion in rank.

In addition to the evaluation by the Department Development and Merit Review Committees, the appropriate Associate Dean, in consultation with the appropriate Department Chair, shall perform independent reviews of the Faculty members within each Department. Each of these

administrators shall submit their written evaluations to the Dean. The appropriate Associate Dean shall also evaluate the Department Chairs and forward these evaluations to the College Dean. Similarly, the appropriate Department Chair shall evaluate the Associate Deans. These evaluations will also be provided in writing to the College Dean.

As for the Department Chairs and the Associate Deans, the faculty performance of the Dean of the College shall be evaluated by the relevant Department Development and Merit Review Committee, using the same criteria used for evaluating other members of the Faculty.

COLLEGE BYLAWS: APPENDIX 4

PROCEDURES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

The Post-Tenure Performance Review Policies are grounded in the three principal academic values: peer review, academic freedom, and due process. In an attempt to reduce committee workload, the outcome of the biennial merit review will be forwarded to the College Post Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) (associated original documentation may be requested by the PTRC). The PTRC will be a faculty committee elected by tenured faculty with equal representation from both departments within the College. Each department will elect three tenured faculty members (with non-administrative appointments) from within the department to serve on the PTRC. Evaluations shall be directed toward the professional development of the Faculty member and based on performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service, patient care and administration [where relevant].

According to the Board of Regents Policy 21.11: *“A comprehensive performance evaluation process, which must include peer review, shall be conducted for each tenured Faculty member no more often than once a year, nor less often than once every 6 years after attaining tenure.”*

The outcome of a satisfactory biennial (i.e. every 2 years) performance merit evaluation (as reviewed by the PTRC) will serve as a successful post tenure review. The merit review committees in both college departments shall be comprised of at least three tenured faculty members who will vote separately on all performance evaluations of tenured faculty members in their respective departments.

Outcomes of Biennial Merit Performance Review

A. Satisfactory performance as specified in Board of Regents Policy 21.11: This outcome occurs when *“a faculty member meets or exceeds the unit level performance standard and remains in the regular review process with possibility of merit pay raises.”*

B. Unsatisfactory as specified in Board of Regents Policy 21.11: This outcome occurs when *“a faculty member’s overall performance or his/her teaching performance falls below the unit standards. This establishes teaching as the dominant criterion in the evaluation.”*

C. Consequences are as specified in Board of Regents Policy 21.11: *“An unsatisfactory rating provides mandatory entrance into a Faculty Development Plan (FDP)”* with the Department Chair and subsequently forwarded to the Dean.

D. *“A rating of unsatisfactory does not establish a presumption that the faculty member has given “cause” for dismissal.”*

Only when the PTRC identifies an apparent performance problem does it proceed to a further evaluation of performance on the basis of the absolute performance standards determined by the College of Optometry’s tenured Faculty. Absolute performance criteria may be developed by the PTRC and presented to the Faculty. Newly developed criteria must be distributed to the tenured faculty two weeks prior to a regularly scheduled faculty meeting in which the criteria are to be

discussed. Absolute performance criteria must be passed by a 2/3 majority vote of all tenured faculty prior to their implementation. Any procedures identified for remediation will be in accordance with those outlined in the University of Houston Faculty Handbook regarding an unsatisfactory performance and the formulation of a Faculty Development Plan (FDP).

COLLEGE BYLAWS: APPENDIX 5

6/22/01 Clinical Faculty Passed Unanimously
7/02/01 College Faculty Passed Unanimously
8/23/01 Final edit approved by Provost

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
COLLEGE OF OPTOMETRY
CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY POLICY

I. Introduction and Rationale

The College of Optometry has the primary mission to educate and train a highly qualified optometric workforce for the State of Texas and portions of the Southwestern United States. Clinical education and patient care are cornerstones of this education system which utilizes extensively a preceptor model for much of the process. The highest quality clinical faculty are required, those with extensive patient care training and experience; in addition, special considerations must be made in order to recruit, develop and retain the best clinical faculty members in appropriate career tracks. It is the intent of this policy to lay out a plan and process for the development and growth of clinical faculty members, utilizing a non-tenure track process for the selection, recruitment, appointment, development and promotion of highly qualified clinician educators.

II. Definition

Members of the Clinical Track Faculty of the College of Optometry hold non-tenure track appointments. Clinical track faculty members may hold the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor. The Clinical Faculty track is separate and distinct from the tenure track of the College and University.

III. Qualifications for Appointment

Individuals appointed to Clinical Track Faculty positions will be recruited and selected by the same process utilized for all full-time faculty members at the College. In addition, the appointee must have or be eligible to have a full-privileged license to practice optometry (as defined by the College credentialing criteria), medicine or a related healthcare discipline in the State of Texas and, in most cases, must have completed a residency or advanced training program in the appropriate disciplines. Extensive clinical experience and/or clinical education experience may suffice to meet this criterion. All clinical faculty members must, within their first appointment year, meet the credentialing requirements of the University Eye Institute. Clinical Track Faculty members will report to the Chair of the Department of Clinical Sciences and on a day-to-day basis to the Director of the University Eye Institute for patient care duties.

IV. Appointment Procedure

Upon recommendation by the Faculty Recruitment Committee, an appointment as a member of the Clinical Track Faculty, including the specific offer and all related conditions, will be the responsibility of the Chair of the Department of Clinical Sciences and the Dean of the College. Appointments to the Clinical Track Faculty must be reviewed and approved by the Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs. Appointment and reappointment letters will stipulate specific roles and responsibilities, which will also serve as the basis for annual performance reviews.

V. Duration of Appointments

Appointments to the Clinical Track Faculty of at least 0.5 FTE are benefits eligible, non-tenure track positions and may not be converted to tenure track. Clinical Track Faculty members will not be considered for tenure; therefore, no instructional time in any rank as a member of the Clinical Track Faculty will be counted toward tenure. However, members of the Clinical Track Faculty are eligible to apply and compete for open tenure track faculty positions. Appointments at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor are typically for one academic year, although a shorter appointment is possible, based upon the needs of the College. Appointments will be evaluated annually and may be renewed subject to positive reviews and programmatic needs. After three consecutive positive annual reviews, appointments at the rank of Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor may, with the approval of the Dean of the College and the Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs, include a three-year renewal period. Subsequent renewals depend upon positive annual reviews and the needs of the College.

VI. The Role of Clinical Track Faculty

Specific roles and responsibilities of clinical faculty in the optometry program will be based on the needs of the program and overall needs of the College. The initial roles and responsibilities for a particular faculty member will be outlined in the position description, as well as stipulated in the formal appointment letter. Responsibilities may include classroom teaching, laboratory teaching, clinical teaching, individual one-on-one instruction, patient care, curricular development, clinical rounds, or a combination of these. In view of these diverse roles and responsibilities, appointments to the Optometry Clinical Track Faculty do not carry the same expectations for scholarly activity as do tenure track appointments. However, in all other respects, Clinical Track Faculty will be expected to participate fully in order to carry out the mission, goals and objectives of the College and the University.

VII. Privileges

Clinical Track Faculty will have the same general privileges as tenure track faculty at the University and at the College of Optometry. Clinical track faculty will have full voting

privileges at Faculty meetings in the College of Optometry and will be able to serve on all College committees. They may also serve on task forces and ad hoc committees appointed by the Faculty Chair, Department Chair or the Dean. However, clinical track faculty members may not confer in cases of tenure and promotion in tenure track decisions. Clinical Track Faculty will have equal rights and privileges as College faculty to serve on appropriate University councils, committees, task forces, ad hoc committees and to be eligible for election to the Faculty Senate. Clinical track faculty may compete for research grants and awards and teaching awards for which they are eligible.

VIII. Evaluation of Clinical Track Faculty

Clinical Track Faculty at the College of Optometry will have annual reviews. Criteria for evaluation will vary based on the specific expectations of the faculty member's position.

Sample Evaluation Criteria: The following examples are illustrative but not exhaustive:

A. Patient Care

The faculty member must be an outstanding clinician or be on a path to becoming an outstanding clinician by delivering the highest quality patient care. The method for judging this is set forth in the "Patient Care Evaluation Overview" (APPENDIX 6) which describes the patient care evaluation process adopted by the Faculty of the College of Optometry.

B. Classroom Teaching

Where applicable, the quality of teaching will be evaluated based on end of semester course and instructor evaluations conducted by students and assessments completed by the Department Chair and peer faculty members. Quality of teaching also includes the quality of the faculty member's syllabi, presentations, tutorials, seminars, rounds, etc., and adherence to the program's curricular requirements.

C. Curricular Development:

Where applicable, a faculty member may be assessed on the quality of his or her work in curricular development as related to the clinical training program. Factors to be considered may include the development of creative or innovative approaches to clinical instruction and the development of useful teaching strategies.

D. Supervision of Personnel

Where applicable, the evaluation process will also assess the faculty member's efforts to train, supervise, and advise Residents and clinical staff members.

E. Scholarship

The scholarly requirements of Clinical Track Faculty members are different in nature and quantity than those for tenure track faculty members. Where publication is an applicable responsibility for a member of the Clinical Track Faculty, the evaluation process will assess the faculty member's publications in professional journals and presentations at clinical science meetings. In addition, the development or invention of unique patient care methods, techniques and/or instrumentation may be considered scholarship.

F. Service

Service to the faculty, college, university and the profession are expectations of all faculty at the College. The nature of the service is often dictated by the needs of the Department or College. In every case the Clinical Track Faculty members are expected to fulfill this important responsibility adequately and to be good academic citizens.

G. Professional/Program Development

Where applicable, the faculty member's evaluation will assess his or her participation in professional/program development. The evaluation may consider involvement in local, national or regional optometric or discipline-specific organization activities and/or the programs of the American Academy of Optometry, the American Optometric Association or its affiliates, or similar organizations of the discipline. Where appropriate, participation may include attendance at professional meetings or functions along with presentations to those professional organizations and/or the delivery of continuing education.

IX. Promotion

Faculty at the College of Optometry are eligible for promotion within the clinical ranks. Distinctions between and among the clinical ranks will initially be based on the level and quality of clinical and/or teaching experience held by the appointee. In seeking promotion, a clinical track faculty member at the College of Optometry must demonstrate excellence. The standard for promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor is the achievement of a national reputation for excellence. For promotion to Clinical Associate Professor, the candidate should have a record showing that there is every expectation that the candidate will meet the standard for promotion to Clinical Professor in due course. Promotion from one clinical rank to a higher rank may occur only after an appropriate time in rank and a formal review by the Department Chair and by the Department's Development and Merit Review Committee. The Department Chair forward recommendations in writing to the Dean. The Dean will conduct his/her own review and make a recommendation independent of the initial recommendations. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs must approve all promotions in rank.

X. Compensation

Clinical Faculty members who are re-appointed and/or promoted for the next academic year will be considered for salary increases in accordance with the university's guidelines for persons classified as benefits eligible faculty.

XI. Exceptions

Any exception to this policy requires written approval of the Dean and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

COLLEGE BYLAWS: APPENDIX-6

PATIENT CARE EVALUATION OVERVIEW

Objective:

To evaluate the patient care that is delivered by specific Faculty/Clinicians within the UHCO and its affiliated clinics.

Justification:

Patient care is the cornerstone of what Clinical Optometry is and does. The primary mission of UHCO is to train students in the art and science of patient care. The Clinical Faculty must possess skills in a number of different areas. The Clinician/Teacher must possess the special skills associated with teaching as a requirement for their role as a Faculty member. In addition, inherent in the clinical educator's repertoire is the art and science of patient care. The ability of a Clinical Faculty to provide quality patient care is at the heart of their duty as a mentor, and role model to developing students, and to their obligation as a patient care provider. The process of evaluating patient care is elusive at best, partly because of the diversity that exists within the clinical arena. Although significant diversity exists, common threads tend to run through most activities that are considered as excellent patient care. The synthesis of these threads can be loosely interpreted to appraise the quality of patient care.

Evaluation Categories:

A clinician's ability to provide quality patient care may encompass many parameters, some specific to the area of expertise, and some common to all forms of patient care. The areas of commonality include: expertise, knowledge, skills, communication, creativity, productivity, and credentials and education. Each of these areas are further defined below:

Expertise

An overall measure of a Clinician's abilities. This measure could be considered a global index, synthesizing all of the elements below. (Incorporates know-how, skill, knowledge, proficiency, capability, etc.)

Knowledge

An assessment of a clinician's overall knowledge. Should include the depth and breadth of knowledge both in an area of specialty and in related areas.

Skills

An assessment of the ability, talent and handiness of a Clinician. Should include the assessment of either the performance of procedures or the aptitude with which procedures are performed.

Communication

A measure of the clinician's ability to communicate with patients, other professionals, staff and students.

Creativity

A measure of a Clinician's ability to cleverly solve patient problems. Examples might include the unique application of contact lenses for special functions, or the application of low vision devices to solve a patient problem, or the unique management of a medical condition.

Productivity

A measure of a Clinician's efficient and gainful output. This measure can be derived from existing computer data from patient fee slips adjusted for the percentage FTE, level of student being supervised or specialty area(s) being staffed.

Credentials/CE

A measure of the acquisition of new knowledge through continuing education, through specialized training programs, the acquisition of credentials such as diplomate status in the AAO or other unique certifying bodies. Also, of note should be special awards recognizing clinical excellence.

Miscellaneous

Any other activities of the Clinician that have an impact on patient care. Activities might include programs to enhance patient volume at UHCO affiliated clinics, programs to increase awareness of issues associated with the public health, or other activities reported by the Clinician.

Sources and Types of Data

Data within each of the categories above can be drawn from several different sources. Included in the data sources are peers, patients, students and a self-report. Not all categories can be collected from every data source. Some data sources are appropriate for some categories and not others.

The types of data are also diverse, they may include a number of behaviors and activities that can be measured or at the least reported for evaluation by a committee of peers. The types of data and the methods of documenting those data are summarized below.

Parameter	Description	Method of Documentation
------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------

1	External Consultations	consults on patients and problems from outside of the College. The patient is not necessarily seen by the consultant	email, phone logs, written communication
2	Internal Consultations/Floor Consultations	consults on patients and problems from inside of the College. The patient may or may not be seen by the consultant. Reports may need to be generated	email, phone logs, written communication
3	External or Internal Referrals	Referrals of patients for management by the evaluatee. Reports may need to be generated	email, phone logs, written communication, Patient Reports, Managed Care Referral sheets
4	Activities to increase patient volume	Participation in screenings, events or marketing efforts to increase the quality or quantity of patient care at UEI	Self Report
5	Patient feedback	Outcome questionnaire, patient comments, requests for a specific doctor or number of patients who respond to a recall notice	Sampling Questionnaire, Thank you notes from patients, Computer data documenting patient requests and recall response
6	Student feedback	Student comments, part of the student evaluation having to do with patient care	Student Evaluations
7	Acquisition of new skills or knowledge	Development of new skills through workshops, CE, clinical research or experience	Documentation of CE, Training Courses, Focused CE vs Quantity of CE
8	Additional patient care workload	Spending additional hours in clinic to manage patients, seeing more patients than normally scheduled or documenting non assigned time spent on patient care activities (I.e writing letters, making phone calls, etc)	Self Report
9	Awards and Certificates	Clinically related awards or recognition	Self Report
10	Clinic Income	Tabulation of direct and indirect income derived from a doctors clinical activity	Computer report of income proportionate to FTE
11	Peer respect measure	Solicitation of level of perceived competence and respect from peers	Questionnaire

A meshing of data types or parameters with evaluation categories produces a table which represents the source and type of data that is able to describe and some cases assess the quality of patient care in a universal fashion. (see table below)

Evaluation Catagories	Peer	Patient	Student
------------------------------	-------------	----------------	----------------

Expertise	1) External Consultations 2) Internal Consultations/Floor Consultations 3) External or Internal Referrals 11) Peer respect measure	N/A	6) Student Feedback
Knowledge	1) External Consultations 2) Internal Consultations/Floor Consultations 3) External or Internal Referrals 11) Peer respect measure	N/A	6) Student Feedback
Skills	1) External Consultations 2) Internal Consultations/Floor Consultations 3) External or Internal Referrals 11) Peer respect measure	5) Patient Feedback	6) Student Feedback
Communication	1) External Consultations 2) Internal Consultations/Floor Consultations 3) External or Internal Referrals 11) Peer respect measure	5) Patient Feedback	6) Student Feedback
Creativity	1) External Consultations 2) Internal Consultations/Floor Consultations 3) External or Internal Referrals 11) Peer respect measure	5) Patient Feedback	6) Student Feedback
Productivity	3) External or Internal Referrals workload	8) Additional patient care 10) Clinic Income	
Credentials/CE	7) Acquisition of new skills or knowledge Awards or Certificates	9)	

Method for Patient Care Evaluation

It is recognized that participation within the UHCO clinics is restricted to competent clinicians. The current measure of competence is the credentialing process necessary to gain and maintain privileges within the UEI and associated clinics. Successfully satisfying the credentialing criteria is considered a measure of the *expected* quality of patient care by participating clinicians. The evaluation of the patient care parameters as set forth above is considered *above expected* performance in patient care. It is the intent of the patient care evaluation process to constitute a Committee of Clinician peers to evaluate patient care performance according to the parameters and criteria as stated above. The peer Committee should loosely follow the criteria above to categorize the performance of clinicians being reviewed, much like the Faculty review process. The Committee should assign a tiered value as part of the clinical review of patient care. This value should be reported to the Department's Development and Merit Review Committee to be factored into the Faculty's regular evaluation as an added performance measure, much like the reported overall teaching evaluation score. This value also should be provided to the College

Promotion and Tenure Committee when tenure-track members of the Faculty who are involved in patient care are under probationary review or are under consideration for tenure or promotion.

Constitution of Patient Care Evaluation Committee

A Patient Care Evaluation Committee will be constituted annually, and will consist of six members with staggered terms. To be elected to serve on the Patient Care Evaluation Committee the Faculty member must be a member of the Clinical Faculty. The Clinical Faculty will elect two members and the Dean of the College will appoint three members from the Clinical Faculty and one member from the non-clinical Faculty. Members of the Patient Care Evaluation Committee cannot serve on a higher review body. An attempt will be made to balance the Committee through the appointed members to represent diverse areas within the Clinical Faculty. Terms will be for two years and may not be consecutive. Faculty members may serve again after an absence of two years. Department Chairs, Service Directors and Associate Deans are ineligible for membership on the Patient Care Evaluation Committee. A Chair and Vice-Chair are elected by members of the committee. The Chair (or Vice-Chair, when the Chair is absent) is responsible for calling meetings. The first time the Patient Care Evaluation Committee is constituted one elected position will be for a term of one year and the second elected position will be for a term of two years. Likewise, the Dean of the College will appoint four members, two for one-year terms and two for two-year terms. Appointment to the Committee in years to follow will consist of election of one member and appointment by the Dean of two members.

ADOPTED APRIL 1981

AMENDED AUGUST 1984
AMENDED OCTOBER 1985
AMENDED NOVEMBER 1986
AMENDED JULY 1990
AMENDED SEPTEMBER 1992
AMENDED JULY 1995
AMENDED AUGUST 1996
AMENDED SEPTEMBER 1998
AMENDED FEBRUARY 1999
AMENDED APRIL 1999
AMENDED NOVEMBER 2000
AMENDED OCTOBER 2002
AMENDED APRIL 2006
AMENDED AUGUST, 2007
AMENDED SEPTEMBER, 2015