

2014-2015 PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY AT UH MĀNOA (Revised 2014)

Board of Regents Bylaws and Policies, Section 9-13 establishes guidelines for periodic evaluation of faculty. These guidelines state that procedures for review of faculty must: 1) provide safeguards for academic freedom, 2) provide for participation of faculty peers in the review process, 3) provide for the evaluation of every faculty member at least once every five years, and that they may 4) provide for exempting faculty who have undergone a review for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, or who have received a merit salary increase during the five-year period. The policy further calls for the developing of procedures for such review that incorporate these principles.

PREAMBLE

Evaluation can be a positive force when used to encourage members of the university community to continue their professional growth and thereby improve the delivery of their professional services. To this end, institutional resources must be committed to incentive programs which support faculty development in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

Evaluation of faculty must not undermine the concepts of academic freedom and tenure which are essential to the university. There is a presumption of competence on the part of each tenured faculty member. Thus, the evaluation process must operate independently of an individual faculty member's tenured status. The review undertaken within the evaluation process must reflect the nature of the individual's field of work and must conform to fair and reasonable expectations as recognized by faculty peers in each department or discipline. The review will not be conducted in an arbitrary or capricious manner and will be in accordance with agreed-upon procedures.

PROCEDURES

1. **Departmental expectations and review of personnel.**
 - a. **Department:** Through a collegial process, the faculty of each department shall develop written statements that specify the range and level of professional activities expected of faculty in each rank ("departmental expectations"). The faculty may restate departmental expectations from time to time.
 - i. **Review:** The department chair shall forward departmental expectations to the dean. The dean shall verify that they meet or exceed applicable UH and UHM standards. By **September 30th** of each year, deans shall forward current departmental expectations to the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (OVCAA). OVCAA may conduct an additional review and shall forward a complete, approved set of departmental expectations to the University of Hawaii Professional Assembly (UHPA). Departmental expectations that do not meet UH and UHM standards or are not in line with the established mission of the School or College shall be referred back to the department for revisions.
 - ii. **Delivery to faculty:** All faculty members, including new hires, shall be provided with a copy of current departmental expectations.
 - b. **Review in non-standard departments:** In colleges, schools, programs, research units and institutes using different titles, the terms "department", "chair", and "dean/director" shall apply to the most analogous personnel. Where there is not

department chair but there is a DPC, the chair of the DPC shall act as “chair” under these procedures.

- i. **Review of department chair or DPC chair.** Where a department chair is to be reviewed, the chair of the DPC shall conduct the review. When the DPC chair is to be reviewed, but there is no department chair, the DPC shall designate a reviewer.
- ii. **Review in small units.** In units where there is not a department chair or a standing DPC, or is not covered above, the review of the faculty member’s record will occur in one of the following ways: 1) by a senior bargaining unit faculty member holding at least an equal or higher rank, within the department; or 2) by a senior bargaining unit faculty member holding at least an equal rank or higher rank within the school or college; or 3) by a senior bargaining unit faculty member holding at least an equal or higher rank in a related school or college. UHM and UHPA shall jointly designate the faculty member to conduct the review.

2. **Preparation of academic profile for review.**

Faculty members scheduled for review shall prepare an up-to-date written curriculum vitae, resume, or “academic profile” that addresses departmental expectations. The academic profile should include information on teaching, research, service, and other professional activities, appropriate to their position. The academic profile may include work in progress, or anticipated. Information in the academic profile may be used by the UH to publicize university achievements.

3. **Schedule.**

Each academic year, the OVCAA, in consultation with the dean and the department chairs, will schedule faculty members for review. By **September 1**, the department chair will notify each faculty member to be reviewed, and solicit an academic profile. The reviewed faculty member will provide an academic profile to the department chair by **December 1**.

4. **Selection of faculty for review.**

Each faculty member shall be reviewed at least once every five academic years. In calculating the five year period, the following events count as a review:

- a. Granting of promotion
- b. Positive recommendation for promotion by department chair, although promotion was not granted by the UH
- c. Granting of tenure
- d. Granting of a special salary adjustment for merit

The following events postpone a review that would otherwise be timely, for the academic year in which they are scheduled:

- e. Application for promotion, tenure, or special salary adjustment for merit
- f. Faculty who submit forms to retire by June 30 of the year s/he is eligible for review will be exempt from the review process. However, if the faculty member rescinds the application for retirement, s/he must submit documents for review within 30 days of the rescission.
- g. Sabbatical or leave without pay

5. **Review of academic profile by department chair.**

The department chair will review the academic profile provided by the faculty member. By **February 1**, the department chair will prepare a written report for the faculty member and the dean. The report will state whether the faculty member's activities meet departmental expectations, and if not, what deficiencies exist.

Where the chair has found that the faculty member's activities meet departmental expectations, but considers that there are opportunities for development, or areas of concern, that are not deficiencies, the chair need not include these items in the report, but will discuss them with the faculty member and identify ways to address them.

Where the chair's report does not identify deficiencies, the review process is concluded.

Where the chair has found that the faculty member's activities do not meet departmental expectations, the chair's report shall identify deficiencies.

6. **Response to identification of deficiencies.**

The faculty member will, in writing, agree or disagree with the chair's identification of deficiencies.

Where the faculty member agrees with the chair's identification of deficiencies, the faculty member and the chair will develop a mutually-agreeable professional development plan (PDP) to address them.

Where the faculty disagrees with the chair's identification of deficiencies, the dean will determine, in writing, by **March 1**, whether the faculty member is meeting departmental expectations. If the dean determines that the faculty member is meeting departmental expectations, the review is concluded.

If the dean determines that the faculty member is not meeting departmental expectations, and the faculty member disagrees in writing, the matter will be referred to OVCAA so that a Manoa Faculty Evaluation Review Committee (MFERC) can be formed. The MFERC shall determine whether departmental expectations have been met, and if not, specify any deficiencies. The OVCAA will expeditiously constitute the MFERC as identified herein; if the MFERC cannot be developed by **April 15**, OVCAA shall notify UHPA.

7. **Manoa Faculty Evaluation Review Committees.**

A Manoa Faculty Evaluation Review Committee (MFERC) is established for each case in which a faculty member disputes a department chair's identification of deficiency. The UH and UHPA will jointly appoint five persons from the Manoa Faculty Personnel Panel (FPP), established by the collective bargaining agreement, to the MFERC. The faculty member may exclude 10 members of the FPP from the MFERC in the manner provided in Article XV, paragraph C., of the collective bargaining agreement. The MFERC is the final authority under these procedures on whether a department chair has correctly identified deficiencies. The MFERC shall render their decision no later than one month after they are convened.

8. Professional Development Plans (PDP).

A PDP shall be in writing and be signed by the faculty member, the chair, and the dean. Each PDP must include: a) identification of deficiencies, b) objectives to address the deficiencies, c) specific activities to implement the PDP, d) timelines for meeting expectations, e) a process for annual progress review, and f) source of funding (if required).

PDPs may call for a variety of activities that require special resources, e.g., leaves of various types, attendance at special workshops or institutes, assistance in the reparation of grant applications, availability of computer hardware or software or of training in their use, or special assistance in new approaches to teaching. Successful PDPs will require both initiative on the part of the faculty member and assurance that every effort is made to provide the necessary support from out of available university resources through departments, colleges or schools, and the central administration.

If a PDP is not developed by **April 15**, the dean may refer the matter to the OVCAA. The OVCAA shall determine the elements of the PDP by **May 15**.

Faculty members may consult with the Manoa Faculty Development Program, defined elsewhere herein, for advice in drafting a PDP.

9. Conclusion of annual review.

Deans will report the status of all reviews to the OVCAA by **May 31**.

Deans, in consultation with the department chair and the faculty member, will review progress on each PDP annually, beginning March 30. The purpose of the review is to determine whether or not the plan is on course, and, if not, what modifications must be made to meet expectations. A copy of the review should be filed in the office of the dean, with copies to the chair and the faculty member, by **May 31**.

Deans may declare that a PDP has been successfully concluded.

Deans may declare that a PDP has been unsuccessful, and terminate it. In such a case, the UH may take steps in its discretion, subject to law and the collective bargaining agreement.

10. The Manoa Faculty Development Program.

The Manoa Faculty Development Program will consist of seven to nine faculty members with a record of expertise and helpfulness to their colleagues, jointly appointed by the VCAA and UHPA. These faculty mentors may assist with the development and implementation of the PDP. The interaction between the mentors and faculty member is intended to be supportive and may include, if requested, working informally with the faculty member to develop ideas and strategies for the PDP prior to discussions with the chair. The pool of mentors may be selected from previous winners of the Regent's and Chancellor's Medal for Excellence in Teaching as well as previous recipients of the Francis Davis Award for junior faculty, who have gone on to receive tenure. The Director of the Office of Faculty Development and Academic Support (OFDAS) will be an ex-officio member of this committee.

11. **Staff support.**
The OVCAA will provide staff support to the Manoa Faculty Evaluation Review Committee and the Manoa Faculty Development Program.

12. **Review of procedures.**
UH and UHPA will meet on the call of either party during the pendency of the collective bargaining agreement to consider whether these procedures need revision. Revision of these procedures shall require agreement of the parties in writing.