

APPROVED:

James D. Kardash 3/24/2015
UHPA Date

APPROVED:

[Signature] 4/2/2015
Mānoa Chancellor's Office Date

Department of Atmospheric Sciences Policy and Procedures

1. Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal

I. Criteria

A. General Considerations

Department of Atmospheric Sciences criteria for tenure, promotion, and contract renewal evaluations are based on:

1. Pertinent articles of UHPA/University contract.
2. UHM Executive Policy E5.221 - Classification of Faculty (May, 2011).
3. UHM Criteria and Guidelines for Faculty Tenure and Promotion Application (September, 2010)
4. Directives issued by the Dean of the School of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology (SOEST).

For favorable tenure and contract renewal considerations, a candidate must possess proven ability in teaching, research, and service. He/she should have the ability to establish and maintain close and effective working relationships with faculty and students, and there must be evidence of continuing value of his/her services to the department.

For favorable promotion consideration, there should be a significant degree of satisfactory performance and accomplishment in teaching, research, and service. Demonstrated accomplishment in other activities appropriate to his/her field and rank, that are consistent with UHM Executive Policy E5.221 and the Manoa Criteria and Guidelines for TP Application, will be considered as a supplement to one of the above categories.

For tenure and contract renewal the emphasis is on ability and potential, whereas for promotion the emphasis is on accomplishment. Tenure and contract renewal may be affected additionally by:

1. The candidate's relationship with faculty and students (compatibility); and
2. His or her present and future value to the department.

B. Teaching

A faculty member's teaching ability and performance occupy a fundamental place in recommendation for tenure, promotion, and contract renewal. Account is taken of the fact that there are various methods and types of teaching, and even within one discipline special opportunities for different approaches occur due to the makeup of classes, level of instruction, degree of specialization, objectives of the particular course, and the goals of the individual instructor. Instructors are expected to adopt goals and methods reflecting the objectives of the particular courses they teach as well as their own particular interests. The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) will, therefore, take into account the objectives a

faculty member sets for himself/herself, as well as the more obvious features of his/her performance.

The specific questions to which the DPC will seek answers will include these:

1. Does the faculty member exhibit an adequate command of the subject, and a grasp of the objectives and values of the discipline and its relationship to other fields of knowledge?
2. Does he/she show evidence of continued growth, and an ability to keep current with developments in the field?
3. Does he/she show ability to present materials in an organized and logical manner?
4. Is class discussion encouraged and guided effectively in the subject?
5. Does he/she seem willing, where appropriate, to innovate and experiment with techniques which may improve his/her effectiveness?
6. Is there evidence of a willingness and an ability to advise students on both the undergraduate and graduate level?
7. Does he/she receive and react positively to assessments by students and colleagues?

The types of evidence of teaching ability and accomplishment that may be furnished by the faculty member in support of his/her case should include as many as possible of the following:

1. Summaries of student questionnaires, such as those prepared and administered by the Department of Atmospheric Sciences and those prepared by The Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching and administered by the Course And Faculty Evaluation (CAFE) Office. (See Section 11. C. below.)
2. Written comments by colleagues and students.
3. Syllabi, notes, and other instructional materials used in his/her classes.
4. His/her own statement of objectives and procedures in his/her courses.
5. Evidence of updating and incorporation of current developments in the field, drawn from his/her own research or from perusal of current professional literature.
6. Compilation of theses or student reports for which faculty member was the principal advisor or supervisor.
7. Evidence of teaching effectiveness in introductory nonmathematical survey courses as well as in the technically advanced courses of his/her specialty.

C. Research

A faculty member's ability and accomplishment in research occupy an important place in tenure and promotion reviews. Research is accorded equal weight with teaching in evaluating the overall performance of a candidate.

Criteria for assessing ability and accomplishment in research activity should include the following items (not in order of importance):

1. Published works in refereed journals, books, and monographs. The relative level of contribution will be assessed for papers with more than two authors by the place of the candidate in the authorship list. Candidates whose students are first authors will be given credit equal to first authorship.

2. Quality and number of books, articles in peer-reviewed journals and peer-reviewed book chapters, monographs, review articles, technical reports, other non peer-reviewed literature. Quality and significance will be assessed by examination of reprints, original referee's or editor's comments, published reviews, and frequency of citation. Articles that are not peer reviewed will in general not be given as much weight as those that are peer-reviewed.
3. Assessments of research results by independent evaluations, unsolicited testimonials, and awards.
4. Grants including their source, their review process, and amount.
5. Work in progress, specifically manuscripts nearing submission to professional journals.
6. Presentations in departmental seminars and interdepartmental symposia, lectures to professional organizations, papers delivered at professional meetings.
7. Number of citations, and other quantitative aspects of the publication record such as impact factor, h-index, etc. will be considered.
8. The candidates ability to serve as PI and direct a team of researchers including students as well as ability to serve on a team involving other faculty and students under the direction of a PI.

D. Service

An assessment of the service contribution of a faculty member is a part of the overall review by the DPC. Although it is recognized that faculty participation in a service capacity is often time consuming and frequently voluntary on the part of the faculty member, service contribution is normally not weighted as heavily in the overall review as is teaching and research.

The service contribution would be determined by such activities as the following:

1. University service--cooperation with other departments and with units such as the East-West Center, Center for Pacific Islands Studies, Center for Hawaiian Studies, etc.; also service as a member of the College Senate,
2. Faculty Senate, and special boards or committees convened for review and evaluation of programs, tenure and promotion review, and for other specific purposes either academic or administrative.
3. Professional service--consultant services, cooperation with the National Weather Service and Armed Forces Weather Service, offices held in the American Meteorological Society, and advising interested individuals or groups concerning meteorological observations, scientific equipment and procedures, climatological data.
4. Community service--lectures to community organizations, presentations in public and private schools, and participation in school science fairs.

II. Procedures

A. The candidate's responsibility

A faculty member, who is a candidate for tenure, promotion, or contract renewal, is required to assume the responsibility of providing the material necessary to address the

criteria set forth. If the material presented to the DPC is inadequate, or if the content appears to do an injustice to the case, the DPC will return the material to the candidate, pointing out the deficiencies and making recommendations for amending portions or including additional material.

B. Procedures undertaken by the Department Personnel Committee (DPC)

Only DPC members of equal or higher rank may vote on application for promotions. For tenure and promotion, the department chair, in consultation with the DPC must solicit letters of reference from respected scholars who are experts in the candidates field from outside the university. The external reviewers should have no conflict of interest in evaluating the candidate. The candidate is asked to provide in writing three to five names and addresses of respected scholars in related fields of Atmospheric Sciences who are not at the University of Hawaii, Manoa.

It is the obligation of the department to secure external evaluations. The candidate should not contact possible external evaluators.

The department chair, in consultation with the chair of the DPC, should request letters from at least 3 to 5 of the people on the candidates list and at least 5 known external scholars proposed by the DPC who can evaluate the candidates work.

The following paragraph will be included in the letter to external evaluators:

“Your review of Professor _____ is for the sole purpose of helping the faculty and administration of the University of Hawaii at Manoa to evaluate this faculty member for promotion and/or tenure (use appropriate phrase). Your identity as a confidential referee will not be shared with this candidate and we will do our best to maintain the confidentiality of your evaluation. The faculty and administration of the University of Hawaii greatly appreciate your willingness and efforts in evaluating and commenting on the work of this faculty member.”

The procedure for handling the evaluation includes the following:

- a. Mark the letter “Confidential” as soon as it arrives. Do not show the letter to the candidate at any time.
- b. Make seven (7) copies of the letter and assemble eight (8) sets of confidential letters (original + 7 copies). One set of confidential letters should be included with each copy of the dossier.
- c. Place the confidential letters in eight (8) manila envelopes marked “CONFIDENTIAL” and with the candidate’s name. Include inside each envelope a listing of the reviewers, their institutional and disciplinary affiliations and whether they came from the candidate’s or the department’s list. Also include a copy of the letter sent to external reviewers.
- d. On page 5.2, Department Assessment (Section E, Confidential Letters of

Evaluation), indicate the number of confidential letters solicited by the department and the number of confidential letters received by the department. Do not list the authors of the confidential letters in this section.

- e. If the details of UH Manoa's procedures change, the spirit of items (ii) through (iv) shall be maintained.
- f. In the *summer of the following year*, when the final decisions are announced, a brief letter should be sent to each of the external reviewers informing them of the disposition of the case and thanking them once again for their efforts on behalf of the department, the college, and the UH Mānoa. In the case of a negative decision, departments must confirm with the Mānoa Chancellor's Office that any appeal has been resolved prior to contacting the reviewers.

For tenure, promotion, and contract renewal, the DPC will evaluate the material supplied by the candidate, the letters from the meteorological community, student reviews, and other unsolicited letters that may shed light on the candidate. If it is felt necessary or if the candidate requests it, the DPC may arrange a personal interview with the candidate. All or part of the committee may conduct such interviews.

For contract renewals, written departmental recommendations are provided to the faculty member under consideration prior to forwarding to the Dean. The faculty member may provide a written rebuttal and request a personal interview with the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Chair, as in section B.

C. Class evaluations--comments and procedures

The summaries of student questionnaires, such as those administered by the Department of Atmospheric Sciences and the Course and Faculty Evaluation Office, form an important part of the materials submitted by a candidate for tenure, promotion, and contract renewal. The candidate must summarize these evaluations and detail the overall scores as well as highlight the positive and negative comments made by the students in his/her dossier.

2. The Department Personnel Committee (DPC)

All tenured faculty within the Department, save the chair, will serve on the DPC committee. Voting members of the DPC must be at equal or higher rank than the applicant being voted on. The head of the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) shall be a full professor, and shall be elected by and from the DPC. The DPC is constituted whenever there is a tenure, promotion, and contract renewal case to be considered.

The DPC has the responsibility of producing a written review of the candidate. They also must have a final vote by secret ballot and record this vote in the candidate's dossier.

Finally, upon receipt of the DPC review and vote, the Department Chair will write his/her own assessment of the candidate. All materials are then sent to the Dean's Office for further consideration.

3. **Department Chair**

The Department Chair may not participate in any way in tenure or promotion deliberations conducted by the DPC.”

4. **Other Matters**

The Department has voted to include non-tenure track faculty to participate in the establishment of DPC policies and procedures. However, they may not take part in discussions of the DPC regarding personnel actions.

The faculty should continue to perform at the level commensurate with their rank.

The department will periodically review faculty following the "Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty at UH Manoa (revised 2014)".