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SECTION A. PROCEDURES & CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION & TENURE

I. PREAMBLE

This statement outlines the specific procedures agreed upon by the Faculty of the Department of Chemistry to be employed in preparing its recommendations for promotion and/or tenure. Such recommendations represent one of the mechanisms whereby the department is expected to maintain and further increase its present strengths and to overcome its weaknesses.

II. PROCEDURES

A. A faculty member will be considered for promotion and/or tenure in accordance with the Executive Policy on Faculty Personnel (E5.221), the Manoa Guidelines and Criteria (issued yearly) and this document, using the time scale published by the Administration.

B. The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) shall be responsible for reviewing the evidence and for making a recommendation relating to promotion and/or tenure.

1. The DPC shall consist of all tenured members of the faculty. Neither the Department Chair (DC) nor any candidate may serve on the DPC.

2. The DPC shall elect its own chair from among its members.

3. The candidate may opt to exclude a member of the eligible faculty from serving on the DPC. This exclusion option may only be exercised when the candidate will be considered for tenure and/or promotion, not annual review. The name of the excluded faculty member shall be forwarded to the DC by the candidate by September 1.

4. The DPC shall have an odd number of members. If the DPC membership from eligible, non-excluded Chemistry faculty is even-numbered, then a tenured UHM faculty member (from another department) will be appointed to the DPC by the Dean of the College of Natural Sciences, after consultation with the DC.

C. The candidate shall prepare a file of evidence which the candidate wishes the DPC to consider. It shall consist of:

1. A detailed CV showing:
   - Brief biographical data
   - Complete data on education and training
   - Academic appointments showing all changes in rank and tenure status


- Other professional positions
- Publication list ("bibliography")
- List of professional activities, including dates (invited papers, lectures, symposia, organizations, chairing of meetings, consultancies, advisory appointments, etc.)

2. Copies of publications, including those in press and in preparation. Candidate should include all publications that reflect work as a UH faculty member.

3. Summary of research activities including grant applications, grants received, etc. Candidate should include pertinent information on grants, including sponsor, funding levels, and his/her role (PI, co-PI, etc.).

4. Summary of courses taught at Manoa, including dates, and results of teaching evaluations and appraisals. Candidates should clearly indicate the courses taught since the beginning of the faculty appointment (for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor) or since last promotion (for promotion to Professor).

The student evaluations are an important part of the dossier. The results of the student evaluations are required for all lecture courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels. A copy of the survey questions should be included, and the candidate is strongly encouraged to prepare the responses to the questions in a tabulated form. A summary of student comments should also be included. Unedited comments should be included in the "Supplemental Material" that is submitted with the dossier.

5. Titles and dates of theses by students who have worked under the candidate's direction at UHM. Data on postdoctoral students' accomplishments.

6. Summary of service activities

7. Letters of support provided by the candidate. The candidate may also solicit letters of support that he/she may add to the dossier. Unsolicited letters may only be added to the dossier, according to Article XII.G.2 (UH-UHPA Collective Bargaining Agreement, 2009-2015): "Prior to the DPC review, Departments, Department Chairs, TPRCs or UH administrators shall not accept unsolicited information for inclusion in the tenure dossier without providing the information to the candidate and then giving the candidate the opportunity to provide a written response."

See Sections III and IV to review the criteria for promotion and/or tenure, as they pertain to research, teaching, and service.

D. A minimum of five (5) reports from outside referees will be obtained in accordance with the following policy:

1. The outside referees will provide a view of the candidate's research program from the perspective of a senior member of the (candidate's) research community. Each of the referees must be an expert in the candidate's research area. The majority will likely be tenured, senior faculty at Research-1 institutions, but these experts may also be identified at smaller academic programs or national laboratories, including the NIH.

The DPC will request the names of at least five (5) possible outside referees from the candidate. The DPC shall identify at least 3-5 additional names of possible outside referees. The DC will contact these scientists to determine their availability and willingness to make the evaluations. The reviewers should be roughly divided between names from the candidate's and DPC's lists. There shall be a minimum of
five (5) reports, and at least two (2) must be names from the candidate’s list. If needed, the DC will request more names from the candidate and/or the DPC.

The candidate’s Ph.D. and postdoctoral advisors should be excluded as outside referees, as there is a direct conflict of interest with these individuals.

After determination of the external reviewers, materials shall be sent to them, as described in the next section. All referee reports will be provided to the DC in writing.

2. The candidate shall select materials to be sent to the outside referees. These materials should provide the outside referees with enough information to write an informed opinion of the candidate’s research program and overall research productivity. Useful materials may include a curriculum vitae, reprints and preprints of publications, and selected critiques of research proposals.

3. The referee reports should be solicited with the understanding that they will be treated as CONFIDENTIAL. The original referee reports will be made available to the DPC and kept on file in the Department. The original reports will also be made available to the Dean, the TPRC, the Chancellor and the President.

E. The Committee will transmit a draft copy of its proposed recommendation to the Department Chair and to the Candidate. The candidate may at that point request reconsideration. This request, and any additional supporting information, will be transmitted to the Committee through the Department Chair within 7 calendar days of receiving the draft recommendation. The Committee is obligated to reconsider the case and render a final decision within 7 calendar days of receiving the candidate’s written statement. The final report of the Committee will then be sent to the candidate and to the Department Chair for transmittal to the Dean.

III. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

Promotion may be recommended on the basis of professional growth as evidenced by the quality, effectiveness, and continuity of the candidate’s performance in all three of the following areas: Research, Teaching and Service. Since we recognize that each individual case must be decided on its own merits, we herewith provide general guidelines rather than rigid criteria.

A. Research. Faculty members should be recognized by colleagues for the depth and scope of their contributions to the advancement of knowledge in their disciplines.

Per UHM Guidelines, candidates for promotion to Associate Professor “must demonstrate a level of scholarly achievement and output which reflects stature as an established scholar in comparison with peers active in the same discipline”. Candidates for promotion to Professor must provide evidence that “clearly place the faculty member at the forefront of the discipline or field.”

As with other portions of the dossier, greatest emphasis should be placed on the accomplishments made since the start of the faculty appointment (for promotion to Associate Professor) or since the last promotion (for promotion to Professor).

The kinds of evidence to be considered, in order of decreasing importance, are:

1. Research publications in refereed journals. Other publications, including monographs, invited book chapters, and review articles.
Although all papers from previous appointments should be included in the list, the greatest emphasis should be placed on the work done as a UHM faculty member. The candidate should be a senior author on the majority of the publications.

The candidate should also include information to assist the DPC, DC, TPRC, and others in the review process, including a brief explanation of authorship conventions. Generally speaking, however, the great majority of peer-reviewed publications will have 2 or more authors with the candidate as the corresponding author. In most of these cases, the senior author or lead investigator will be either first or last in the author list.

2. *The ability to obtain extramural research funding.*

   The DPC and DC will consider the source(s) of funding, funding levels, and the candidate’s role on the grants. While seed or starter grants are an excellent marker in the early stages of an Assistant Professor’s career, they are not indicative of long-term research productivity. As such, major research funding from a federal agency or private foundation is considered to be evidence for the latter. To demonstrate their independence and standing in the field, the candidate must also be the PI on at least one of these major grants.

3. *Appraisals from external reviewers* (see section IID).

4. *Recognition of professional reputation,* such as fellowships and other prizes, invitations to organize or participate in symposia, invited or contributed research seminars, invitations to consult for governmental agencies, industry or professional societies including the review of manuscripts and research proposals, and/or election to honorary societies.

B. **Teaching.** A faculty member should be recognized by students, alumni and faculty as a stimulating, inspiring and effective teacher. Per Manoa Guidelines, the candidate “must provide evidence of a mature level of performance as a teacher and the versatility to contribute to all levels of the departments instructional program”.

   The candidate must provide the results of standardized student evaluations and other evidence for excellence in teaching (see section II.C.4). In addition, there should be evidence to show that the candidate has made a substantive contribution to the teaching mission of the Department, as follows in points 1-3:

1. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor should be able to demonstrate proficiency at two or more levels:
   a. Lower-division undergraduate (100- and 200-level courses)
   b. Upper-division undergraduate (300- and 400-level courses)
   c. Graduate coursework in CHEM, excluding seminars and directed research

2. Candidates for promotion to Professor must demonstrate proficiency at all three levels.

3. The candidate should provide a description of any additional substantive contributions to the teaching mission of the Department, such as:
   a. Developing and teaching a new course.
   b. Authoring a well-received textbook.
c. Teaching part of a team-taught course.

C. Service. A faculty member is expected to render service to the Department, the University and the community, as appropriate.

Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor "should have participated in the academic affairs of the university, such as through service on appropriate faculty committees and should have shown a willingness to use professional competence in the service of the profession and the general community" (per UHM Guidelines). In Chemistry, it is expected that the candidate has demonstrated willingness to contribute to the general well-being of the department and University. Typically, service may include one of the following:

- Serving on a Chemistry committee (e.g., GRAC, Graduate Committee, faculty search committee).
- Undergraduate advising.

Candidates for promotion to Professor "should be a leader in the academic affairs in the University, should have shown a willingness to use professional competence in the service of the profession and the general community" (per UHM Guidelines). Evidence of such activities may include:

- Service as Chair or Associate Chair of Chemistry.
- Chairing major committees in Chemistry, such as GRAC, Graduate Committee, and faculty search committees.
- Undergraduate advising.
- Serving as member on Chemistry committees.
- Serving on College, Manoa, or University committees.

In addition, exceptional community service of a professional nature may be recognized, as evidenced by news publicity, letters of appreciation, certificates of merit and like.
IV. CRITERIA FOR THE AWARD OF TENURE

The awarding of tenure is the single most important personnel decision affecting the career of a faculty member. Equally important is the effect of this commitment of the University on the future of the department. Thus, the decision is based not only on the candidate's record and potential for continued career growth, but also on the needs of the department toward fulfilling its long range goals in teaching and research. The overall performance of the department can be improved only if each candidate to be awarded tenure is (or is likely to become) a more effective teacher and a more productive researcher than the average of the current faculty.

The evidence upon which the tenure decision is based is the same as that for promotion (described above), but it must be judged in the light of deep-seated commitment of the candidate toward scholarly activities and concern for students. The successful candidate must be able, willing and very likely to contribute to the continued development of the department. In making this judgment, the quality of the candidate's research program is the most important factor. The candidate should have demonstrated creativity in undertaking new lines of research (other than simply a continuation of old programs) and should have been successful in obtaining adequate support from appropriate sources. If some or all of the candidate's work is a collaborative effort, the candidate's personal contribution must be delineated. A description of future plans and probable directions is essential. The candidate must demonstrate continued and projected growth in scholarship. This is most often measured by publications in refereed journals and grants received.

Under no circumstances will a tenure commitment be made unless there is clear documentation that the candidate is an able and diligent teacher. The candidate must have demonstrated a command of the subject and be able to present it with force and clarity in a logical, organized fashion. The candidate's manner should be enthusiastic and arouse curiosity in students. The candidate should make students and colleagues aware of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge. Presumably each candidate is a specialist in some area and to some extent will be teaching colleagues. In judging teaching, the DPC will pay attention to the variety of demands placed on new instructors by the types of teaching called for and will consider the total performance.

In general, a non-tenured member of the faculty is given every opportunity to establish a research program while assuming a normal teaching load. Opportunities to serve the University and the community are, and should be, fairly limited, and service will be judged primarily on departmental "citizenship", interaction with other members of the faculty and willingness to work for the good of the department rather than just oneself. (Also see Section IIC).
V. APPLICATION TO I AND R FACULTY

A. Full time faculty in the I classification shall be judged by the teaching, research and service criteria described above.

B. Faculty in the R classification have no teaching duties, so that the teaching criteria are inappropriate. For those employed on grant funds, the primary criterion is research, in particular, accomplishment of the goals of the grant.

C. Permanent faculty in the R classification shall be judged on the research and service criteria outlined in IV above. They are not required to contribute to the research or education of graduate students, but they may well do so. If so, this shall be a positive factor in favor of tenure and promotion.

VI. GENERAL TIMETABLE

The following timetable is given for the general information of the candidate. The specific deadlines which will be used will change somewhat from year to year and are established annually by the University administration.

September:  Early  Convene DPC. Candidate informs DC of excluded faculty member, if any, by Sept. 1st.

Throughout  Candidate prepares dossier.

Mid  Candidate gives names of ≥5 outside referees to DC & DPC.

Late  DPC selects names of outside referees, who are contacted by DC (to secure commitment).

October:  Early*  Candidate submits dossier to DC.

*Deadline is usually the 2nd Friday of October.

Early  Candidate prepares material to be sent to outside referees. DC sends material for review to them.

November:  Early to mid  Outside letters are received.

Early to mid  Meeting of at-rank and tenured faculty is held.

15th  Preliminary recommendation of DPC to candidate & DC.

December:  1st  Recommendation of DPC and DC goes to the Dean.
SECTION B. PROCEDURES FOR CONTRACT RENEWAL OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

I. Probationary faculty includes all eligible faculty in permanent tenure-track positions in the probationary period.

II. Performance evaluations of probationary faculty are conducted in Years 2 and 4, i.e., when the faculty member's contract is due for renewal, in accordance with Article XII of the UHPA agreement.

The probationary faculty member is strongly encouraged to submit materials for a performance evaluation in non-contract renewal years, to allow for additional opportunities to get feedback from the Department's tenured faculty about his/her activities and progress towards tenure and promotion. The timetable for the submission of the self-evaluation document and the review by the DPC and/or DC should be the same as observed in contract renewal years.

III. The probationary faculty member will prepare and submit a self-evaluation document to the Chair of the DPC by October 31 of each year. The self-evaluation document should describe teaching, research and service activities of the faculty member that are relevant to the Criteria for Promotion (Section A.III). The self-evaluation document should include summaries* of student evaluations for all classes taught, copies of manuscripts either published or submitted, and a status report on all proposals submitted since joining the faculty at the University of Hawaii.

*The faculty member is strongly encouraged to prepare tabulated summary data of the evaluations, which are typically reported as survey data (numbers), plus a brief narrative that includes quoted student comments. Unedited student evaluations should be provided as an appendix.

IV. Members of the DPC will review the self-evaluation document and will assess the reported activities of the probationary faculty member. Attachment A ("Probationary Faculty: Annual Evaluation/Contract Renewal Recommendation") should be used as a guide. Every year, the DPC will prepare a written narrative that evaluates teaching, research, and service (Attachment A, Part A).

In the years that the contract is due for renewal, the DPC will take a vote by secret ballot to determine the responses to (Attachment A, Part B) overall rating (satisfactory or unsatisfactory), (Part C) future need for the position (yes or no), and (Part D) recommendation for contract renewal (renewal or non-renewal). The DPC Chair will then transmit the self-evaluation document, the completed section of Attachment A, and the DPC's written assessment to the Department Chair by December 1.

In non-contract renewal years, the DPC Chair will meet with the faculty member to review the DPC assessment. Hardcopy of the assessment will be given to the faculty member by the DPC Chair at this meeting. The faculty member will sign and date...
Attachment A to indicate receipt of the information. The DPC Chair will forward Attachment A and the DPC assessment to the DC, after this meeting.

V. The DC will review the self-evaluation document and the DPC assessment to write an independent assessment of the faculty member’s performance in teaching, research and service activities. In contract renewal years, the DC will complete Parts (A)-(D) of Attachment A. If not a contract renewal year, then the probationary faculty member may request an evaluation from the DC. If so requested, the DC will meet with the faculty member to review his/her assessment. Hardcopy of the assessments will be given to the faculty member by the DC at this meeting. The faculty member will sign and date Attachment A to indicate receipt of the information.

VI. In contract renewal years, the DC will meet with the faculty member to review the assessments of the DPC and the Chair. Hardcopies of the assessments will be given to the faculty member by the DC at this meeting. The faculty member will sign and date Attachment A to indicate receipt of the information.

VII. The DC will forward Attachment A and the written assessments by the DPC and DC to the Dean by December 20, in accordance with Article XII.E in the BOR-UHPA Collective Bargaining Agreement.
SECTION C. PROCEDURES & CRITERIA FOR PERIODIC REVIEW

I. PREAMBLE


All faculty will be evaluated at least once every five years. Specifically exempted from this type of evaluation are faculty who have undergone review for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, or who have received a merit salary increment during the previous five-year period. The evaluation will be carried by the Department Chair using the "Procedures" and "Criteria" below.

II. PROCEDURES

At the beginning of the academic year, the OVCAA will notify the Dean’s office about the faculty who are eligible for Periodic Review (formerly called "5-Year Review", a form of post-tenure review). Exemptions from review may be made at that time.

By the end of September, The DC will notify the Dean’s office of faculty who will undergo Periodic Review, as well as any exemptions.

Faculty who are undergoing Periodic Review will prepare an “academic profile” for the Dean and DC. The profile should include:

1. A detailed CV showing:
   - Brief biographical data
   - Academic appointments showing all changes in rank and tenure status
   - Other professional positions
   - Publication list ("bibliography")

2. Summary of research activities including grant applications, grants received, etc. Candidate should include pertinent information on grants, including sponsor, funding levels, and his/her role (PI, co-PI, etc.).

3. Summary of courses taught at Manoa, including dates, and results of teaching evaluations and appraisals. Student evaluations are required for all lecture courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Candidate will include a copy of the survey questions, with the responses to these questions in tabulated form. A summary of student comments should be included. Full, unedited comments should be included as an appendix.

4. Titles and dates of theses by students who have worked under the candidate’s direction at UHM. Data on postdoctoral students’ accomplishments.

5. Summary of service activities

Items 2, 3, and 5 should focus on activities in research, teaching, and service, respectively, that have occurred since the last review or promotion.

By early February, the Chair shall prepare a written review, based on the academic profile provided. The Chair’s review is then forwarded to the Dean.
III. CRITERIA

A. Research. Faculty members should be recognized by colleagues for the depth and scope of their contributions to the advancement of knowledge in their disciplines. Per UHM Guidelines, a Associate Professor "demonstrate(s) a level of scholarly achievement and output which reflects stature as an established scholar in comparison with peers active in the same discipline". A Professor is "at the forefront of the discipline or field." In writing the review, the Chair will assess research productivity and contributions, noting publication record, extramural funding, and various types of peer (or higher) recognition including fellowships, awards, invited lectures or other distinguishing activities.

B. Teaching. A faculty member should be recognized by students, alumni and faculty as a stimulating, inspiring and effective teacher in the undergraduate and graduate programs. The Chair will write an evaluation of the faculty member's teaching activities. The student teaching evaluations should be utilized in this evaluation. Professors must demonstrate proficiency in teaching at all three levels (lower-division undergraduate, upper-division undergraduate, graduate), whereas Associate Professors will demonstrate competence at for a minimum of 2 of the 3 levels. The Chair will also comment on any additional, substantive contributions to the teaching mission of the Department, such as the development of new courses or textbooks.

C. Service. A faculty member is expected to render service to the Department, the University and the community, as appropriate. An Associate Professor "should have participated in the academic affairs of the university, such as through service on appropriate faculty committees and should have shown a willingness to use professional competence in the service of the profession and the general community" (per UHM Guidelines). Candidates for promotion to Professor "should be a leader in the academic affairs in the University, should have shown a willingness to use professional competence in the service of the profession and the general community" (per UHM Guidelines). The Chair will comment on the nature of service activities in the Chemistry Department, the as well as those serving others in the University and the community, including scientific community.

SECTION D. PROCEDURES FOR SELECTION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR

Per Article X (UH-UHPA CBA, 2009-2015), the determination of the Chemistry Department’s recommendation for DC to the Dean of the College of Natural Sciences shall be based on a majority vote of all tenure-track and tenured faculty.