DEPARTMENT OF MOLECULAR BIOSCIENCES AND BIOENGINEERING
Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion, Contract Renewal, and Five Year Review
(June 2016)

General Statement
This document defines the organization and functions of the Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC) of the Department of Molecular Biosciences and Bioengineering (MBBE). It stipulates the procedures and criteria in departmental tenure and promotion evaluation. It is understood that contents of this document must be in harmony with the university tenure and promotion policies and with the current Contract Agreement between the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly and the Board of Regents of the University of Hawai‘i.

Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Contract Renewal

I. Organization of DPC
A. The DPC shall consist of five members and two alternative members who are tenured faculty.
B. By August, the DPC chair of the previous year will convene a meeting of all eligible faculty for DPC service (refer to I.C below). At this meeting, they will decide on the annual DPC membership by discussion and, if necessary, by voting. The committee should include a broad range of expertise that reflects the varied backgrounds of the faculty of MBBE.
C. Eligibility: Only tenured faculty members are eligible to serve as DPC members. Eligible faculty must consider the rank of faculty to be evaluated for the upcoming year. Faculty of rank 4 cannot evaluate the promotion of faculty of the same rank. For this reason, it is often convenient to have all members be of Rank 5. If there is an insufficient number of qualified faculty from the Department, qualified faculty member(s) from other department(s) shall be selected by the DPC Chair of the previous year in consultation with other MBBE faculty, the DC and the Dean.
D. Membership may not include the DC or those holding executive/managerial appointments, those being evaluated, or those on leave during the given year.
E. DPC members will also elect a Chair in their first meeting.

II. Evaluation Procedures
A. Procedures for tenure and promotion
1. The DC shall inform both the DPC and the applicant for tenure and promotion of all deadlines and provide the Applicant with current application forms and other pertinent information as soon as these are available.
2. Applicants who wish to be considered for 'early tenure' or 'early promotion' may do so in accordance with the current university tenure and promotion policies. (There is a separate procedure to get approval from the Dean to apply for early tenure or promotion). Faculty members choosing this option are responsible for being aware of the deadlines and should make their intentions known to the DC in writing well in advance of deadlines.
3. As a part of the application for tenure/promotion, each Applicant will submit a list of appropriate external reviewers (see below).
4. Dossiers shall be considered privileged information. When the DPC has questions concerning items in the dossier requiring clarification, the DPC may schedule an interview with the applicant to address the items of concern. Any such information shall also be considered privileged.

5. Only Faculty Members at, or above, the rank to which the applicant is aspiring will be eligible to vote on applications for tenure and promotion. A majority vote of all members of the committee shall prevail, but any minority reports will also be included as part of the DPC assessment. The Committee shall vote by secret ballot.

6. The DPC shall submit each dossier with the assessment of the Applicant's strengths and weaknesses to the DC, who after review and consideration, shall make his/her independent assessment and recommendation and forward the DPC’s and DC’s assessments to the Dean.

B. Procedures for external evaluation

1. In order to complete the review process in a timely manner, the Applicant will provide names, mailing addresses, telephone numbers and e-mail addresses of five to seven external reviewers to the DC three months before the deadline for dossier submission. The external reviewers are expected to be established experts, research scientists, and educators in a field related to that of the Applicant's, and of equivalent or higher ranks. The University guidelines on naming the potential external reviewers should be observed with preference for at least half from Research I universities or equivalent. Careful consideration should be given to avoid conflicts of interest and minimize perceived conflicts of interest when choosing external reviewers.

2. The DPC will meet by mid-August and provide names of five to seven additional external reviewers. The DPC Chair will finalize a list of at least eight external reviewers with equal numbers chosen from the candidate’s and the DPC’s lists.

3. The Applicant shall provide copies of: (1) an updated CV, and (2) a description of programs, scholarly activities and other relevant material (such as reprints and preprints) for independent evaluation of the depth and quality of Applicant's programs and publications by the external reviewers.

4. The DPC chair or the DC will write a letter to each external reviewer requesting candid evaluation of the Applicant's scholarship in research, teaching and services. The letter will be written according to the guidelines from the UHM Criteria and Guidelines for Faculty Tenure and Promotion Applications. In this letter, the reviewer will be assured of the confidentiality of the review process and of his/her identity. The letter, CV and other material for review, and a copy of the Department's criteria for promotion and tenure will be forwarded to the reviewers no later than August 30. This should give the external reviewers sufficient time to review the material and provide a written report. The DPC Chair or the DC will ensure that an equal number of evaluation letters (from both the DPC’s and candidate’s lists) are actually received. This will require follow-up communications and reminders to the external reviewers to maximize the response rate and letters received.

5. The external evaluation reports will be kept confidential and made available to the DPC for assessment. These will be then forwarded to the DC, College Dean and UHM administration, and the other committees (TPRC, etc.) with the dossier.
III. Procedures for Contract Renewal

A. Contract renewal for faculty members in the probationary period is initiated by the DC in accordance with the schedule set in Article XII of the UHPA Agreement. The DC will provide the contract renewal form to the probationary faculty member and transmit the completed material to the DPC for assessment and recommendation.

B. The DPC and DC will make separate assessments and recommendations.

C. The DC will show the assessments and recommendations to the faculty member concerned before forwarding the document to the Dean.

Evaluation Criteria for Tenure, Promotion and Contract Renewal

I. General

In keeping with the unique mission of CTAHR, criteria for tenure and promotion for R, I and E faculty within MBBE emphasize a broad view of scholarship comprised of creative intellectual activity and the development of new knowledge, which is validated by peers and communicated via publication in scientific journals or books, conference and symposia presentations, workshops organized, grant-writing activity, consulting activities, and patents. The general conventions of publication authorship in the broad field of MBBE include the highest ranking given to first and last authors, respectively, followed by second, third authors etc. In the majority of cases, the last author is regarded as the chief project director and supervisor who oversaw the project’s goals, provided direction and conceived the research ideas. The first author generally conducted the most work effort in the research. The faculty member under evaluation should provide a breakdown (i.e. percentages) of research effort, writing and conceptualization contributed by each author. In addition, the department values credible non-published efforts of an applicant, which directly or indirectly lead to the development and application of new technology, patents and copy-written intellectual property and university and public-service activities. This implies that scholarly activities also include practical applications of research discoveries to solve problems in society through efforts developed from the creation of new knowledge. The communication and instruction of knowledge to learners is also valued as scholarship and will be evaluated as described in section II.B. Overall, the faculty member will be evaluated based upon their classification (I,R, E) and the percentage distribution of the applicant’s FTE in each of the areas of research (R), instruction (I) and extension (E).

In addition to the general criteria for tenure and promotion as set forth by the university, the following departmental criteria will be applied to applicants for tenure and promotion.

II. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion

A. Research

1. Evaluation of research projects relative to: (1) the "state of the art" in the Applicant's particular area, (2) the contribution to the scientific knowledge of the applicant's field of research, and (3) industry, college, and/or departmental priorities and long-term goals.

2. Merit of publications during period under consideration.

   a. Depth, impact, and worthiness of publications including journal articles, books and book chapters. Publications in peer-reviewed national or international journals will
rank highest and non-refereed publications lowest. Impact factors of the journals and citation index counts (discussed in section "d" below) of the publications will also be considered.

b. Contribution made by the Applicant toward the work reported in the publications.

c. Number of publications relative to what should be expected in the Applicant's field based on the type of work and time assigned to research. The expected number would be two peer-reviewed journal publications (or equivalent) per year on average for a 75% research FTE appointment. However, the Department is mindful that some journals require more data and results to create a full paper than other journals. And review papers, books and book chapters represent significant scholarly activity. The type of journal, its impact, the amount of data published and the amount of writing (i.e. reviews, books) are considered in meeting the publication criteria.

d. Number and quality of references to Applicant's published work as determined by citation index listings (i.e. Scopus H-index, Science Citation Index-SCI, PubMed, Medline, Biosis, Web of Science, Google Scholar), reprint requests, or other evidence of literature citations as provided by Applicant.

3. Patents applied for or granted.

4. Processes put into practice.

5. Extramural grants.
   a. Preparation of extramural proposals. (The Applicant should submit reviewers' comments of funded and unfunded proposals provided by the granting agency to aid in evaluation of the Applicant's competence in this area).
   b. List of funded extramural proposals.
   c. List and synopsis of reviewed but un-funded proposals.

6. Evaluation of research in progress such as manuscripts in preparation. (This is especially important because the time between planning, execution and publication may be excessively long.)

7. Indications of state, national, or international reputation as evidenced by: Being a recipient of awards, panelist in symposia, conference presentations, or grant review panels, invited lecturer, referee for scientific journals, reviewer of grant proposals, member of the editorial board, elected officer in scientific societies, coordinator or planner of conference or workshop, or other comparable measures.

B. Instruction

The faculty of MBBE recognizes that the education of students in scientific decision-making, research methodology, problem solving and the application of science and technology represents some of the highest forms of instruction. Therefore, the following criteria are to be considered.

1. Effectiveness of teaching and student motivation as determined by students' advancement in knowledge and stimulation of interest in the subject taught. This will include student evaluations for all courses (i.e. E-Café) conducted in accordance with current university guidelines. Observation of a faculty member's teaching by other faculty and the DC will also be made and feedback given to the faculty member.

2. Workload in graduate and undergraduate instruction. This will take into consideration number of courses taught, student credit hours in lecture and/or laboratory courses with special consideration for directed research (MBBE499, MBBE699), advising, and counseling, and additional out of class activities with students.
3. Course development and/or thoroughness of course revision and updating.
4. Listing of graduate students (Ph.D., M.S-Plan A and B), directed or currently under direction with theses/dissertation titles and dates of research projects.
5. Listing of undergraduate students, supervised/mentored post-doctoral associates, junior researchers, visiting scholars and their research project titles.

C. Service to University, Profession, and Community
   1. Committee work for department, college, university, regional/national, and professional organizations.
   2. Community activities related to the profession and expert testimony to the legislature, public hearings or meetings as a representative of the university.
   3. Assistance to projects other than those to which the applicant is assigned.
   4. Analysis and technique development.
   5. Consulting and advisory work.
   6. Officer or board member of a professional society.
   7. Editor of a publication or serving on a review board for publication.
   8. Recognition/Award and other.

D. Professional Improvement
   1. Attendance, participation and presentation as scientific meetings.
   2. Professional workshops attended.
   3. Classes taken for skill improvement in research or teaching.
   4. Sabbatical leave, travel/study projects.

E. Additional Consideration for Extension Appointments
   Due to the unique nature of the Extension appointment, the DPC emphasizes the following three criteria in evaluating that promotion application:
   1. Production:
      a. Organizing and conducting workshops, demonstrations, field days, conferences or training programs.
      b. CTAHR circulars, miscellaneous publications, technical films.
      c. Newsletters, leaflets, newspaper articles, TV and radio appearances, presentations and lectures to industry and various groups.
      d. Problem solving and technical assistance to stakeholders.
   2. Professional activities:
      a. Formal course work for professional improvement.
      b. Attendance at national professional meetings.
      c. Serving as officials in professional societies.
      d. Recognition: awards, fellowships, honors.

III. Evaluation Criteria for Tenure
   A. The tenure evaluation aims to determine whether indefinite retention of the Applicant is in the best interest of the department and the college. Tenure is granted only to those applicants whose record of scholarly achievement justifies the expectation that their lifelong retention will strongly benefit the overall research and educational goals of the department and the college.
   B. MBBE seeks evidence for steady growth in evaluating the Applicant's application for tenure. The successful applicant will have broken new ground in his/her field of endeavor, as
evidenced by peer-reviewed publications, patents, invited lectures, consulting activities, and other forms of peer recognition.

C. In addition to items A and B above, the criteria for promotion will be applied to applicants for tenure.

IV. Evaluation Criteria for Contract Renewal

A. In general, the criteria for tenure and promotion are applied to the evaluation of contract renewal. With consideration of the time factor, however, emphasis should be on the potential - rather than the accomplishments - of the applicant in the initial years.

V. Recommendation of Faculty to Serve as Department Chair.

A. Only tenured faculty are eligible to serve as chair. The faculty will send a memo to the Dean requesting the Dean to conduct a confidential survey of the faculty to solicit their recommendations for the Chair’s position. Alternatively, faculty members of the bargaining unit shall meet to discuss and vote to recommend a tenured member to serve as Chair. The recommended faculty shall have a majority vote of the faculty members of the department, and his/her name will be submitted to the Dean. In either situation, the Dean shall ultimately determine who is appointed as department Chair.


A. In August, the Dean’s office will notify the DC of tenured faculty who have served the five-year period and will be eligible to undergo a post-tenure evaluation termed the “five-year review”. The DC will give written notice to the faculty to be evaluated in the current year cycle and provide the review criteria in this document. The criteria follow the above guidelines as for promotion and tenure. The faculty member to be evaluated will submit to the DC his/her updated CV, resume, teaching activities, course evaluations, academic documents appropriate for their field of endeavor that address departmental expectations and any additional appropriate information.

B. This review is conducted by the DC. If the DC does not identify any deficiencies, then he/she will notify the faculty member and the Dean, and the review is thus completed. If deficiencies are identified, the DC will inform the faculty member in writing of the deficiencies. If the faculty member agrees with the deficiencies, then a professional development plan will be developed by the DC, the Dean and the faculty member according to UH guidelines. The DC will annually review the faculty’s progress in meeting the goals of the professional development plan. If the faculty member disagrees with the DC’s assessment, the case will be referred to the Dean for attempted resolution. If resolution is not achieved, then the matter is referred to the Manoa Faculty Evaluation Review Committee.

C. If the DC is scheduled for the five-year evaluation, the DPC chair will conduct the review according to A and B above.
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TRANSMITTAL MEMO
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