

APPROVED:

James D. Kardash 9/29/15  
UHPA Date

APPROVED:

[Signature] 1-17/2011  
Manoa Chancellor's Office Date

Revised 12/2014

**DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE  
AND PROMOTION DEPARTMENT OF OCEANOGRAPHY  
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT MANOA**

**Preamble:**

**Minimum qualifications for tenure and promotion as defined by the University apply in all cases. The Department's criteria are additional to the minimum qualifications of the University.**

**I. Basic Faculty Performance**

It is expected that each faculty member will find the mixture of research, teaching, and service that best suits his/her classification (I, R, or S), abilities, and inclinations. However, unless specifically employed to do otherwise each faculty member will do all of the following:

- A. Conduct scientific research relevant to oceanography and publish the results.
- B. Regularly offer and effectively teach courses designed to meet the needs of the Department or University.
- C. Be valuable in graduate education through conscientious advising and evaluation of students and through assisting student research.
- D. Participate in the functioning of the Department and its programs.

**II. Criteria for Recommending Tenure**

A tenure recommendation will rest on both the performance of the candidate and the goals of the Department.

- A. The candidate shall have met the basic performance criteria in Section I.
- B. A necessary condition is that an Assistant Professor's performance in this Department will have justified his/her promotion to Associate Professor as that rank is described in Section III.

C. A necessary condition is that an Associate Professor or Professor will have performed, while in this Department, in a manner consistent with the description of the rank in which he is to be tenured (description in Section III).

D. The tenure review process is to decide whether indefinite retention of the candidate is in the best interests of the Department. Here are considered such things as the candidate's attitudes towards his/her work and towards students and fellow faculty members, and the likelihood that his/her professional future will be valuable to the Department and the University. It will be considered whether tenuring the candidate will best serve the overall research and educational goals of the Department. Thus, while a candidate's performance should be excellent, there is no recipe or sequence of steps by which a person can assure himself/herself of tenure.

### **III. Qualification for Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor Ranks**

The following descriptions tell what is generally expected of persons who are promoted to or tenured in the ranks of Associate Professor or Professor:

#### **A. Associate Professor.**

The candidate will have met the basic performance criteria of Section I. In addition, he/she will have shown excellence in education, research, or some combination of these together with service.

1. Excellence in education is characterized by producing extraordinary value for students. As examples, it might be evidenced by:
  - a. Course evaluations (Section V. F. gives Departmental policy on course evaluations) showing that students feel the candidate's courses are of exceptional quality.
  - b. Student's testimony that the candidate has been especially valuable and helpful to them as an advisor or committee member.
  - c. Special efforts by the candidate to meet student needs and interests (developing new courses, giving informal courses or instruction on topics of special interest, etc.).

**2. Excellence in research is characterized by a high rate of production of significant work published in refereed journals.**

- a. Rate and significance are assessed by the peer group (the Department Personnel Committee, which in turn solicits opinions from scientists in the candidate's field, both locally and at other institutions). The quality of the work in terms of creativity, difficulty, and importance is the main consideration in assessing significance. These same factors will be considered heavily in the rate assessment. The value of the works themselves, the length and difficulty of the projects, etc., are important, whereas mere numbers of publications are not. It is impossible to give rules defining for all cases what will be an adequate or a high rate of significant research production, especially in Oceanography, which embraces quite diverse possibilities. Very roughly, one to two major pieces of work in three years, perhaps augmented by a few minor projects, might be in the "adequate" range, whereas three or more major works, again perhaps with some minor ones, could be getting into the "highly" productive range. It is also possible that during the same period a single project with results of great, widely recognized significance could be "highly" productive. Although quality work and productivity are hard to define precisely, their presence is clearly recognizable; a faculty member concerned about his/her rating in this area may ask the Department Personnel Committee for preliminary assessments and guidance.**
- b. It is expected that the results obtained from a faculty member's work will be published in refereed journals.**
- c. The ability of a faculty member to obtain research funds from agencies that employ peer review will also be considered.**
- d. Research results obtained in connection with consulting will not be counted unless they stem from work clearly beyond the scope or prior to that for which the consultant was hired.**

**3. Service is unremunerated professional effort given to the Department, the University, or the community at large.**

- a. Service to the Department is effort beyond committee membership or small, routine duties.**
- b. Examples of important service beyond the Department are working in college or university faculty governance bodies, task**

groups, etc.; assisting elementary or high school programs in science; evaluating environmental impact statements advising governmental bodies; acting as a reviewer for journals and funding agencies; and helping to organize or administer scientific conferences or cooperative research programs.

4. As stated above, the associate rank implies excellence in education, research, or a combination of these together with service. Although the faculty member may neglect none of these areas (see Section I), he/she is free to choose his/her own major endeavors in the field of oceanography (with the exception of I faculty who, in consultation with the Department Chairperson, may be assigned teaching duties in order to balance the teaching needs of the faculty member and the Department). Qualification will mean the candidate's performance is more than adequate in each area and when considered as a whole can be classified as excellent.

#### **B. Professor.**

This rank will be recommended as a consequence of the stature and recognition, which a faculty member has earned beyond the confines of the Department.

1. Recommendation does not result from length of service. In fact, the Department values and respects the contributions of its Associate Professors, and it is possible that some could serve indefinitely in this rank.

2. Recommendation will be made on the basis that the faculty member's activities have produced lasting and significant effects that are recognized and esteemed outside the Department. Examples in each area might be:

a. In research: Respected scientists at other institutions feel that the candidate's work has had a definite and valuable influence on his field. His/her results have stimulated or been of use to other workers on numerous occasions. He/she received appointments that indicate scientific stature--such as certain journal editorships, chairmanships or important scientific committees, etc.

b. In education: The university community (faculty in other departments, administrators, etc.) feels that the candidate has

made special and significant contributions to the educational process. Former students testify that their contact with the candidate had special or lasting influence. The candidate receives appointments or awards that reflect outside recognition of his/her contributions as an educator.

c. In service: People in the university or outside communities testify that the candidate's efforts have had a significant and beneficial impact in some area such as faculty governance, environmental quality, etc.

3. Although a single, spectacular achievement might bring great recognition and stature to a faculty member, it is expected that most candidates will earn this by making a number of significant contributions over a period of years. In most cases the faculty member will have a fairly accurate idea of his/her own stature and may inform the Department Personnel Committee whether he/she is ready or not ready to be considered. Those having questions may ask the Department Personnel Committee for informal assessments and guidance.

#### **IV. Evaluation of Multiply-Authored Work**

The following is an addendum to the departmental criteria for tenure and promotion: From its members who have served on college and university personnel committees, the Department has learned that at these levels there is a tendency sometimes to raise certain questions:

-If a candidate's bibliography contains only singly-authored papers, does this show lack of involvement with students or an inability to cooperate productively with other scientists?

-If a candidate's bibliography consists almost totally of multiply-authored papers, does it reflect a lack of independent creativity?

Of these extremes, the second would be regarded as more serious, and particularly in relation to promotion to full professor.

At the departmental level, the first of these questions has not been a concern for the DPC because cooperation among scientists often arises in our field and because co-authorship with students is encouraged and widely practiced. However, the second question is a concern, and the DPC feels that certain points need to be made:

**A. When assessing cooperative research in relation to a candidate's individual creativity, the DPC focuses on the candidate's own specific contributions to such projects. The committee does not merely assume that credit for intellectual creativity belongs to all co-authors of a paper or to all members of a research team.**

**B. Individual contributions to scientific projects are generally of two types:**

- **Scientific support functions: data collection, laboratory analyses, computations, etc.**
- **Intellectual creations: ideas, insights, and syntheses that produce new understanding or new methods or tools of study.**

**Contributions of the first type can establish a person's high level of knowledge, effort, and technical skill. Those of the second type establish a person's creativity and lead to his thoughts having a direct influence on his field.**

**C. The DPC feels that all faculty members need to have intellectual creations in their records. But beyond this, when a faculty member is seeking to establish full- professional stature on the basis of research, an impressive case for intellectual creativity needs to be present. This is not because support-type activities are not legitimate and valuable contributions to science; it is because such activities do not contribute to professional stature as the term is defined by the Department (and by higher review levels as well).**

**D. The faculty member should establish explicit evidence for individual, intellectual creativity. Two useful types of evidence are:**

- 1. Occasional publication of one's own ideas alone or with perhaps a single coauthor.**
- 2. Testimony from co-authors of a group publication attributing particular intellectual contributions to the candidate.**

**Further, and very important: When background data or supporting testimony is needed to establish the significance of an item in the faculty member's bibliography (as with 2 above), the individual should see that he/she or the DPC attends to it in the years prior to his/her candidacy for tenure or promotion. This is because such data collection can often take more time than the DPC will have during the formal evaluation process.**

E. When a candidate's grant support is being viewed for evidence of intellectual creativity, the same basic ideas apply. Higher value is attached to instances where the individual's good ideas were directly responsible for funding in a competitive area. At the other end of the spectrum, little credit for intellectual creativity is attached to receiving funds for carrying out projects specified by agencies or institutions.

## **V. Procedure for Personnel Action**

### **A. The Personnel Committee.**

The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) will be selected at the end of the spring semester from all available department Bargaining Unit 07 members. All Bargaining Unit members will have the opportunity to vote for five candidates in a secret ballot. The DPC will consist of the five candidates receiving the highest number of votes, subject to the following constraints:

1. If they are available, the DPC Chairperson and one other member of the previous year's DPC will be on the committee. The latter will be determined by the vote tally.
2. The Department Chairperson may not participate in any way in tenure and promotion deliberations conducted by the DPC.
3. The new DPC Chairperson will be elected by the DPC at its first meeting.
4. The vote tally will be used to name alternate members for the committee as necessary. At least three members must be present when the DPC takes action on any personnel matter.

### **B. Open announcements.**

When the Department Personnel Committee is going to consider cases of promotion, or tenure, it shall announce these cases in advance to the faculty and students of the Department, inviting written input; however, only faculty members will be allowed to view the candidate's dossier. All letters must be signed and letters shall be made available to the candidate for response. Upon receipt of letters and prior to the DPC's written summary and evaluation of the file, the DPC Chair will notify the candidate that a letter

has been received and the candidate will have opportunity to view and provide written rebuttal if the candidate chooses to do so. The letters and the candidate's rebuttal will be included as part of Section 5 of Tenure and Promotion application, separate from the externally solicited letters. The letters and any responses will be available to the DPC, the Chair, the Dean, the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee (TPRC), and the Chancellor through the various stages of the file's review.

#### **C. Materials used by the Department Personnel Committee.**

It is the responsibility of the faculty member alone to keep his/her personnel records up to date, and to save, collect and present to the Department Personnel Committee any specific materials he/she wants to have considered. The Department Personnel Committee may solicit letters of opinion relevant to the dossier from any source it sees fit. It will also solicit such letters from any reasonable number of sources named by the candidate.

#### **D. External Review of Dossiers**

1. External evaluations must be solicited by the Department Chair in consultation with the Chairperson of the DPC.

2. The tenure and/or promotion candidate is asked to provide in writing at least three names and addresses of respected scholars in related fields who are not at the University of Hawaii, Manoa. It is the obligation of the department/institute to secure external evaluations. The candidate should not contact possible external evaluators.

3. The Department Chair (Director), in consultation with the Chair of the DPC, should secure letters from at least two of the people on the candidate's list and a comparable number of letters from known scholars proposed by the department/institute, who can evaluate the candidate's work. Scholars having a personal or professional relationship with the applicant that would reduce objectivity should be avoided.

4. 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 Hawai'i at*

*Mānoa to evaluate this faculty member for promotion and/or tenure (use appropriate phase). 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 Hawai‘i greatly appreciate your willingness and efforts in evaluating and commenting on the work of this faculty member”.*

5. Mark the letter “Confidential” as soon as it arrives. Do not show the letter to the candidate at any time.

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. In *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.

#### **E. Voting Procedures**

The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) will prepare the cases and preliminary DPC recommendations for all personnel actions involving

tenure or promotion decisions and call a meeting of the faculty for the purpose of discussing the cases. All Departmental Faculty (except the applicant and the Department Chairperson) will be allowed to attend and participate in these discussions. Only tenured faculty (except the Department Chair) may vote on applications for tenure. For applications for promotion, the eligible voting faculty will be the Departmental Faculty (excluding the Department Chair) who hold equivalent or higher rank than that sought. The eligible faculty will vote by written secret ballot, giving absentees also an opportunity to vote. The vote of the eligible faculty will be the official DPC vote recorded on the promotion and tenure application forms and it will be shared with the voting faculty. Following the vote tally, the DPC will prepare an initial recommendation that reflects the discussion and the vote.

#### **F. Teaching Evaluations**

Course evaluations are important to the Department in its efforts to see that its students are well served. The evaluations are also the most important and effective form of evidence the Department Personnel Committee can have where it cites teaching performance in recommending a personnel action. Courses in the Department will be evaluated each time they are taught.

Three members of a Teaching Evaluation Committee (TEC) collectively represent expertise in the areas of biological, marine geology/geochemistry and physical oceanography. Terms will be for three years and will be staggered so that at least one member is replaced at the beginning of each academic year. In addition, a student member of the committee will be elected by the Oceanography Graduate Student Organization, Na Kama Kai, at the beginning of each academic year. The TEC will select a committee chair at the start of each academic year.

The functions and responsibilities of the TEC are defined as follows:

At the end of each semester the TEC will: (1) Ensure that existing departmental course evaluation procedures are carried out for all courses. (2) Circulate evaluation summaries to the course instructors and the Department Chair. Instructors will have the option of appending comments to the file copy of the evaluation summary. (3) Review the course and instructor evaluations and discuss them with individual instructors (as needed). (4) Keep records of instructor and course evaluations and take special note of courses with recurring problems in teaching effectiveness and/or content. Work with the Department Chair and the instructor to try to bring about

desired improvements. (5) Failing such improvement, the TEC may make recommendations to the Division Heads and Department Chair for changes in teaching assignments.

#### **G. Disclosure and Rebuttal**

1. A candidate will be shown copies of the initial recommendations of the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Chairperson before they are sent out of the Department.
2. A candidate may offer a rebuttal to the Department Personnel Committee and/or Department Chairperson after reading their respective recommendations.
3. The Department Personnel Committee and/or Department Chairperson may act on a rebuttal in whatever manner they deem appropriate to the individual case. Upon request, the candidate will be given copies of final recommendations after any reconsiderations have taken place.

#### **H. Responsibility for Correction of Procedural Errors**

1. Copies of this document will be kept available in the Department office, and it is the responsibility of each faculty member to be aware of its existence and content.

### **VI. Policies and Procedures for selecting Department Chair**

The Department Chair is elected every three (3) years by the Oceanography faculty. The election process proceeds by faculty submitting nominations before the previous appointment period ends, which is July 1 of the election year. The recommendation for Department Chair forwarded to the Dean must be based on a majority vote of all BU07 members in the Department.