

APPROVED:

*James D Kardush* 5/12/16  
UHPA \_\_\_\_\_ Date

October, 2015

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_ 5/12/16  
Mānoa Chancellor's Office \_\_\_\_\_ Date

Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Management (NREM)

College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources (CTAHR)

University of Hawai'i

Departmental Procedures Governing Tenure, Promotion, Contract Renewal, and Five  
Year Review of Tenured Faculty

This document defines the procedures of the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Management in dealing with contract renewal, tenure and promotion, and five year review actions. All policies and procedures stated here are consistent with tenure and promotion policies and procedures of UH and those covered under the Agreement between UHPA and the Board of Regents of UH.

Constitution of the DPC

The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) shall be composed of five (5) tenured faculty (Bargaining Unit 07) at any rank who are not current applicants for tenure, promotion or contract renewal. In voting for DPC members, faculty should consider diversity in gender, faculty classification (R, S, I, A), rank and geographical location. Voting DPC members should at a minimum hold the rank the applicant is applying for. The Department Chair (DC) conducts the election of DPC members at the end of the spring semester of every academic year and informs the faculty and administration of the election results.

Members of the DPC serve a two-year term. Based on election results, two alternate members are designated. Alternates may be called to replace DPC members who, for any reason, cannot fulfill their DPC duties.

The DPC elects a Chair for a one-year term. A faculty member can serve no more than 2 consecutive terms as DPC Chair. The DPC Chair convenes DPC meetings, assigns responsibilities to DPC members and interacts with the DC as needed.

The DC may not participate by voice, vote, presence, or any other form of communication in the deliberations of the DPC over individual tenure and promotion applications. If there are insufficient qualified faculty in the department, the Dean will form an ad hoc Faculty Personnel Committee, in consultation with the DC, as stipulated in Article XII. G. 2. m of the Agreement.

Members of the DPC will treat all personnel discussions, materials and evaluations in strict confidence. After completion of each personnel action, the entire dossier shall be returned to the DC.

#### Revision of Departmental Procedures

The DPC is responsible for periodic review and recommendation to faculty of any necessary revisions to departmental procedures regarding contract renewal, tenure and promotion. Proposed amendments shall be sent through the Dean via the Chair to the Chancellor for review and approval, per Article X. D. of the Agreement.

#### Faculty Expectations

Faculty are hired with the expectation that they will succeed. Senior faculty are expected to provide leadership and mentoring to junior faculty. Junior faculty are expected to seek clarification and mentoring from senior faculty to ensure that their performance is consistent with department, college and university expectations.

#### Contract Renewals

Candidates for contract renewal must submit, by the deadlines established by the Department, CTAHR and UH, the required materials including:

1. A current job description, and if applicable past job description(s), that are relevant for the time period covered by the evaluation.
2. A dossier that includes a description of the candidate's instructional, research and/or extension program and a summary of the candidate's accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research, extension, other scholarly activity and service. Dossiers should be prepared in accordance with the UH Mānoa Criteria and Guidelines for Tenure and

Promotion. It is strongly recommended that candidates attend UH workshops on preparing Tenure and Promotion dossiers.

3. In general, the order of authors on a publication is an indication of the amount of effort or contribution to the publication, whereby, the first author provides the largest contribution and the last author, the smallest contribution to the publication. If the candidate for contract renewal elects to follow a different convention then he/she should provide a detailed explanation of the convention followed in the dossier to facilitate review.

The DPC will evaluate contract renewal applications according to UH tenure and promotion guidelines, and based on the candidate's classification (I, R, E) and the percentage distribution of the candidate's FTE in each of the areas of research (R), instruction (I) and extension (E). The document "NREM Expectations of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty" (August, 2014) will serve as a guide of expectations for candidates preparing material for contract renewal. After discussion of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, the DPC will vote by secret ballot to recommend or not recommend the candidate for contract renewal. A written summary of the discussion leading to the vote will be prepared by the DPC. The DPC evaluation and vote summary will be forwarded to the DC. The DC shall process the contract renewal application according to the procedure in Article XII of the Agreement.

### **Promotion and Tenure**

The DC shall notify all faculty annually of the contract renewal and promotion and tenure review schedule. The candidate may seek a preliminary review of his/her Statement of Endeavors by the DPC three months prior to the submission deadline. Candidates shall submit the required application dossier prior to the submission deadline.

Two months before the dossier submission deadline, the DC will request from the candidates the names and contact information for people to serve as external reviewers.

1. The DC will also request the applicant to submit a preliminary Statement of Endeavors and/or informative expanded curriculum vitae to send to external reviewers that includes a description of the candidate's instructional, research and/or extension program and a summary of the candidate's accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research, extension, other scholarly activities, and service.

2. In general, the order of authors on a publication is an indication of the amount of effort or contribution to the publication, whereby, the first author provides the largest contribution and the last author, the smallest contribution to the publication. If the candidate for tenure and/or promotion elects to follow a different convention then he/she should provide a detailed explanation of the convention followed in the dossier to facilitate review.

For candidates with R, I, and E appointments, external reviewers should be in similar professional positions at comparable institutions and at a rank equal to or higher than the rank that the candidate is seeking. External reviewers should be professionally capable of assessing the candidate's work objectively and commenting on its significance in the discipline. Careful consideration should be given to avoid actual or perceived conflicts of interest when choosing external reviewers.

The DC and DPC Chair shall jointly select reviewers from the candidate's list, add additional reviewers and draft a cover letter. The DC shall send the cover letter and the materials supplied by the applicant to all external reviewers. The DC should follow up with external reviewers to ensure that they return their comments in a timely fashion.

The number of external reviewers solicited for Agents, Specialists, Researchers and Instructors is ten (10) and include five (5) from the candidate's list and five (5) from the DC/DPC's list. Every effort will be made to ensure that equal number of external reviews come from the candidate's and DC/DPC's lists.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion must submit, by the deadlines established by the Department, CTAHR and UH, the required material, including:

1. A current job description, and if applicable, past job description(s), that are relevant for the time period covered by the evaluation.
2. A dossier (application for tenure and/or promotion) that provides objective evidence that the candidate meets required qualifications and performance criteria. Dossiers should be prepared in accordance with the UH Mānoa Criteria and Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion. The document "NREM Expectations of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty" (August, 2014) will serve as a guide of expectations for candidates preparing material for

promotion and tenure. It is strongly recommend that candidates attend UH workshops on preparing Promotion and Tenure dossiers. Candidates for promotion and tenure should provide their percentage contribution to each publication (e.g., books, chapters in books, journal articles, conference and symposia presentation, reports, etc.) as part of their application dossier. In particular, the proportion of the total effort contributed by the candidate (i.e., percentage contribution) to the scholarship and publication process should be indicated in the publication reference and briefly described in the dossier.

3. A folder or box containing reprints or photocopies of the major publications and other professional outputs referenced in the dossier. This will be kept in the department office for review and shall be returned to the candidate after the tenure and promotion cycle is completed. Alternatively, supporting materials may be copied to a DVD or memory stick or posted on a secured portion of the candidate's website for review only by the DPC.

The DPC is expected to evaluate a candidate's dossier based on the candidate's classification, the percentage distribution of the candidate's F T E in each of the areas of research (R), instruction (I) and extension (E), other scholarly activity and service. Other scholarly activity is understood to consist of "creative intellectual activity which is validated by peers and communicated". Service can take several forms, e.g., to the university, profession and/or community. After a discussion of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, the DPC will take a vote, by secret ballot, to recommend or not recommend the candidate. Only faculty members at or above the rank the applicant is seeking will be eligible to vote on applications for promotion. The DPC must include a minimum of five (5) faculty to vote on a candidate: if there are fewer than five (5) faculty on the DPC who are eligible to vote because of their rank, the chair will ask the alternate members of the DPC to serve. In the event that the alternate members are ineligible to serve, the DC will ask eligible members of the remaining faculty and then the cooperating faculty to serve. If this process does not result in five (5) eligible members, the voting will proceed with those members (less than five). A written summary of the discussion leading to the vote will be prepared by the DPC. The DPC chair will forward the evaluation and vote summary to the DC.

#### Five Year Review for Tenured Faculty

The DC will evaluate the tenured faculty identified by the Dean's office for a five year review according to the *Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty at UH Mānoa*. In addition, the evaluation will be guided by "NREM Expectations of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty" (August, 2014) document which provides specific guidance on the departmental criteria to be met for satisfactory performance. If the DC is scheduled for an evaluation, the DPC Chair will conduct the review.

#### **Selection of Department Chair**

The department shall vote by secret ballot to recommend one candidate for department chair to the dean. The recommendation shall be based on a majority vote of faculty (Bargaining Unit 07) members in the department.

August 21, 2014

### **NREM Expectations of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty**

Expectations relative to the performance of research, extension and instructional faculty are presented here. These are intended to provide more specificity at the departmental level than those outlined in the general UHM "Criteria and Guidelines for Faculty Tenure/Promotion Application" and the CTAHR "Workload Policy." This document is also intended to serve as expectations for candidates preparing material for contract renewal. In the ensuing discussion of each of the areas of responsibility in research, extension and instruction, any mention of quantitative measures refers to a 100% FTE in that area.

#### ***Research***

The candidate is expected to describe her or his research program, in terms of:

- 1) the contribution to the scientific knowledge of the candidate's field of research; and
- 2) the State, university, college, and/or departmental priorities and long-term goals.

Research faculty is expected to lead a productive research program. In general, faculty moving from rank 3 to 4 is expected to be an established scholar in his or her field and faculty going from rank 4 to 5 is expected to be clearly a recognized leader in his or her field. The following section details the evaluation criteria and departmental expectations that will be used to determine if a research program is productive.

Faculty with Specialist appointments of .5 FTE or higher may also have research time, although they are not considered to be research faculty. Such faculty are expected to engage in applied research in support of their extension program, which should be designed to address stakeholder needs. They should describe their research or applied research accomplishments in both the research and extension sections of their dossier. For the extension section, they should describe some or all of it as applied research done in support of their extension program.

#### **1. Merit of publications during period under consideration.**

- a. The number of publications expected is relative to the candidate's field based on the type of work and time assigned to research (e.g., a few high impact publications versus many lower impact publications). In general, four peer-reviewed publications (see item c below for various types) are expected per research FTE annually and a candidate can meet this expectation based on an average number over the entire evaluation period. For example, a faculty member with a .5 Research FTE is expected to publish 2 peer-reviewed research publications a year and would meet this expectation if an average of 2 peer-reviewed research publications were produced per year between time of hire and application for tenure.

- b. Evaluation of the quality and depth of the candidate's research contribution should reflect the standards of the profession and emphasize peer-reviewed publications. The factors that reflect the research quality include:
    - The quality of the publication outlet, which is the quality and stature of the journal (such as an Impact Factor) in the case of articles and the quality and stature of the press in the case of books;
    - Citation index listings, reprint requests, and/or translations of candidate's published research;
    - Published evaluations of candidate's work;
    - Awards, honors, invitations to participate in conferences;
    - The candidate's documentation of the impact of her or his research, such as her or his H-index;
    - Letters from distinguished faculty in the candidate's area of specialization; and
    - Other evidence provided by the candidate.
  - c. Peer reviewed publications include the following:
    - Articles published or accepted for publication in international or national peer reviewed journals;
    - Books of original scholarship;
    - Chapters in books;
    - Edited volumes;
    - Peer reviewed articles in other periodicals;
    - Peer reviewed reports;
    - Peer reviewed conference proceedings; and
    - Other peer reviewed scholarly products, such as software, video, websites, and film.
  - d. Unpublished work should also be described to provide information about the candidate's plans for the future of her or his research program.
2. While peer-reviewed publications are of first importance in establishing scholarly achievement, research that is utilized by and influences the community can also be important in assessing the candidate's research contribution. These include but not limited to the followings:
- a. Patents applied for or granted.
  - b. Processes or methodologies developed by the research program and put into practice by agencies, relevant stakeholders or landowners.
3. Extramural Funding.
- a. Extramural proposals funded with an expectation of one significant funded extramural research grant per evaluation period for tenure and/or promotion.
  - b. Extramural proposals submitted but not selected for funding.



- Candidates should submit reviewers' comments as provided by the granting agency to aid in evaluating the candidate's competence in this area.
- c. The number of graduate students supported with an expectation that at least one graduate student is supported during the evaluation period.
4. Evaluation of research in progress. This can be important as the time between planning, execution and publication can be long for some research areas.
5. Evidence of state, national or international reputation, including:
- Awards.
  - Reviewer of grant proposals.
  - Referee for scientific journals.
  - Member of editorial boards.
  - Elected officer in scientific societies.
  - Other evidence of the candidate's standing in the field.

### ***Extension***

While research programs are targeted at peers, extension programs are targeted at various stakeholder groups in the community and the program outputs are targeted to them. The candidate is expected to describe her or his extension program in terms of:

- stakeholders served;
- the stakeholder needs that will be addressed;
- the inputs that supported the program;
- the program outputs that were designed to address these needs; and
- the short, medium or long-term impact of the program on the stakeholders that resulted or will result.

The following section details the evaluation criteria and departmental expectations that will be used to determine if an extension program is thriving.

1. Outputs are events, services, and products that reach people and are designed to produce these programmatic impacts. They may include:

- Conferences and workshops organized.
- Presentations at conferences and workshops.
- Stakeholder meetings attended and site visits.
- Peer reviewed extension publications and fact sheets.
- Surveys conducted and published.
- Participatory stakeholder collaborations.
- Websites and blogs developed and maintained.
- Videos, archived slide presentations, and photo galleries developed.
- Extension curricula developed.

- Demonstration sites developed.
- Patents for novel techniques developed.
- Pesticide use labels and clearances.
- Social networks that facilitate learning in stakeholder communities.
- Other extension publications, such as newsletters and newspaper articles, authored or edited.
- Description of the applied research completed to support the extension program, which can reiterate and/or extend what may have already been described in the research section of the dossier.

The candidate is expected to document the review process used for each output. This documentation will assist in determining the quality of the review process.

2. The candidate is expected to document a short, medium or long-term impact of her or his extension program over the period of evaluation in at least one Hawaii community. The candidate applying for promotion and/or tenure must demonstrate short-term programmatic impact for her or his extension program. Candidates for contract renewal should be able to document stakeholder needs and outline a program that is designed to address these needs and their likely impact on stakeholders. Short-term (learning) outcomes provide awareness and motivation by sharing knowledge with stakeholders. Medium-term (action) outcomes include positive changes in stakeholder behavior, decisions and practices supported by program educational and/or technological outputs. Finally, long-term (consequential) outcomes are progressions of stakeholder actions resulting in measurable paradigm shifts with positive social, economic and environmental implications.

The information used to indicate the quality of the candidate's extension program's output and to demonstrate short, medium or long-term impact may include:

- Stakeholder adoption.
- Stakeholder direct and in-kind support (investment as a medium-term outcome) and other forms of cost recovery.
- Information on usage/quality of peer reviewed extension publications by stakeholders or peers.
- Information on usage of other extension publications.
- Stakeholder evaluations.
- Stakeholder testimonials.
- Stakeholder survey results of changes in knowledge, skills, and attitudes (short term impact).
- Stakeholders' survey results of changes in behaviors and practices (medium term impact).
- Information on changes in environmental or economic factors as a result of the extension program (long term impact).
- Stakeholder queries/response, such as phone calls, e-mails or web site hits.
- Third party recognition, such as interviews in the local press.
- Invited presentations to stakeholders or peers.

For example, a specialist may put up a website or YouTube video to raise awareness of a new technology (short term impact demonstrated by number of hits), document use of the technology by stakeholders through surveys (medium term impact demonstrated by a change in behavior), and eliminate 700 acres of the most invasive plant in Hawaii (long-term impact demonstrated by an increase in environmental quality and possibly by an estimated increase in the value of ecosystems services).

### 3. Extramural Funding.

- Direct and in-kind program support through stakeholder collaboration.
- Programmatic cost recovery based on fees paid by stakeholders or peers (e.g., RCUH account payments).
- Donations (e.g., UH Foundation account contributions).
- Extramural proposals prepared.
  - Candidates should submit reviewers' comments as provided by the granting agency to aid in the evaluating the candidate's competence in this area.
- Extramural proposals funded with an expectation of one significant funded extramural extension/research grant per evaluation period.
- List and synopsis of approved and unfunded proposals.

### *Instruction*

The candidate is expected to describe her or his instructional philosophy and role in training of students in scientific decision-making, research methodology, problem solving and the application of science, which is key to NREM's instructional program.

#### 1. Instructional activities.

This includes many forms of professional contact between faculty members and students, including:

- Class instruction;
- Guest lectures;
- Seminars;
- Academic advising, mentoring, and serving on thesis and dissertation committees; and
- Advising student organizations.

Candidate is expected to report all formal credit hours taught and provide evidence of her or his ability to be an effective instructor. Effectiveness of candidate's teaching is supported by students' increase in knowledge and stimulation of interest in the topic. Various methods of evaluation, such as peer evaluation of classroom teaching and e-cafe results, can be used to demonstrate quality. Evidence of teaching effectiveness should include a summary of the candidate's evaluations.

The candidate should summarize in detail all advising, mentoring, thesis and dissertation committees chaired and served on, and post doctorate associates supervised. Evidence to support the quality of student output can include the student's publications based on the thesis or dissertation, and other evidence relating to the quality of a student's work.

2. Other instructional activities. Other instructional activities may include:

- Designing new courses and revising existing courses;
- Development of new teaching methods;
- Introduction of new delivery methods;
- Publishing textbooks, software and other instructional materials;
- Curriculum development; and
- Promoting the NREM program and/or courses.

The candidate should provide evidence of other instructional activities.

### **Service**

As outlined in the UHM "Criteria and Guidelines for Faculty Tenure/Promotion Application", the candidate is expected to participate in the academic affairs of the University and demonstrate willingness to use professional competence in the service of the profession and the general community. The candidate should provide evidence of service activities at the Department, College, University, professional, and community levels. For example, the candidate is expected to serve on one or more of the department's major committees such as the graduate program committee, personnel committee, curriculum committee, search committees or others as needed to facilitate a productive and collegial department.