

APPROVED:

*Michael Bruno*

1/27/2022

Mānoa Provost's Office

Date:

## **Criteria for Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty (Rev. 9/9/21)**

The following guidelines apply to the five-year post-tenure review of full-time tenured Electrical and Computer Engineering faculty members. They should not be used for promotion and/or tenure evaluation nor for non-tenured faculty contract renewal consideration.

I. Purpose: The primary objective of the tenured faculty in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering is to maintain the highest possible standards in its teaching, research, and service programs. To realize this objective, members of the tenured faculty must function as a team while recognizing the diverse talents of the individual faculty members. Consequently, the Department's primary concern in the evaluation of tenured faculty is their contribution to the success of the team effort in achieving excellence and professional recognition as judged by national accreditation committees and other external reviews. In the conduct of this evaluation, it is acknowledged by all parties concerned that there are numerous and diverse ways for a faculty member to make contributions to the Department's programs. In particular, it is recognized that some faculty members who contribute heavily to instructional programs of the Department, or to administrative duties of the Department or College, may not contribute in equal measure to its research activities.

II. Expectations: In view of the above, and for the purpose of the University mandated five-yearly periodic review of tenured faculty, the Department has defined a set of minimum and normal expectations as outlined below. The application of these expectations in the review process is intended to ensure that:

1. each member of the tenured faculty continues to contribute his/her fair share to the activities of the departmental team throughout his/her career at the University; and
2. efforts to achieve continued effective participation in departmental programs are administered by the department possible within the spirit of academic congeniality.

---

### **Minimum Performance:**

**Teaching:** Scores on the question "general evaluation of the instructor's teaching effectiveness" (or equivalent question; this criterion also assumes this question is scored on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 as the maximum score) should be averaged among all courses taught during the review period. This is an unweighted average, given by:

$$average = \frac{\text{sum of scores for all classes taught during review period}}{\text{number of classes taught during review period}}.$$

To meet the minimum performance standard, the average should be at least 3. If this standard is not met, the faculty member may request consideration of evaluations performed by the UH Center for Teaching Excellence or course materials submitted to the Dept. Chair. Faculty member must also keep courses and labs up to date. Other contributions include development of courses and labs, and supervising X96 projects.

More details on calculating the average teaching evaluation score:

- Prior to Fall 2018 when the University adopted the Course Evaluation System (CES), the Department released evaluations for some courses, such as EE x96 and EE 499, every few semesters on an aggregated basis. In this case, the whole aggregate should count as a single course if the last course in the group falls in the review period. Ex: if the review period is Fall 2016 to Spring 2021, a block of scores for Fall 2014 to Spring 2017 counts as a single course in the review.
- Courses with multiple sections such as EE 211 and EE 213, which are evaluated by CES individually by section, should treat each section as a separate class in the overall average.

**Research:** evidence of research activities with activities in at least one of the three areas.

- i) publication of one refereed journal paper, or two reviewed conference papers, or the equivalent during the review period;
- ii) supervision of one Ph.D. student or two M.S. students during the review period;
- iii) receiving one multi-year extramural grant of at least \$150,000 as a PI or co-PI.

**Service:** performing department and/or university committee work and student advising and counseling duties conscientiously as assigned.

## Good Performance

**Teaching:** Good teaching evaluations: average score (defined above) on the question "general evaluation of the instructor's teaching effectiveness" (or equivalent question; this criterion also assumes this question is scored on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 as the maximum score) of at least 3.7. If this standard is not met, the instructor may request consideration of evaluations performed by the UH Center for Teaching Excellence or course materials submitted to the Dept. Chair. It is expected that there will be other contributions in terms of course and lab development, and /or supervising X96 students.

**Research:** evidence of research activities with activities in at least one of the three areas.

- i) publication of two refereed journal papers, or one refereed journal paper and two reviewed conference papers, or four reviewed conference papers;
- ii) supervision of one Ph.D. student;

- iii) receiving one multi-year extramural grant of at least \$150,000 as a PI.

**Service:** performing department and/or university committee work and student advising and counseling duties conscientiously as assigned.

---

### **Excellent Performance**

**Teaching:** Excellent teaching evaluations: average score (defined above) on the question "general evaluation of the instructor's teaching effectiveness" (or equivalent question; this criterion also assumes this question is scored on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 as the maximum score) of at least 4.3. Faculty member will have other significant contributions in terms of course and lab development, and /or supervising X96 students. Other factors include getting College and University teaching awards.

**Research:** research activities in all three areas.

- i) publication of four refereed journal papers;
  - ii) supervision of one Ph.D. student to completion;
  - iii) receiving multi-year extramural grant(s) totaling at least \$500,000 as a PI.
- 

III. Teaching Option: Faculty members without research are expected to carry a heavier teaching load (e.g., they will teach one to two courses more per year than tenured faculty that meet good performance metrics in research activities). In this case, evaluation of research performance can be waived.

### IV. Overall Evaluation

1. An excellent performance in teaching or research can compensate for some deficiency in another category;
2. Appropriate consideration will also be given to relevant academic achievements not explicitly mentioned in the above, and to prior performance

### V. Ratings

Review by the Department Chair: Please refer to the current "Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty at UH Manoa" document for the review procedure. The 2020-2021 procedures are as follows (but are superseded by the most current revision of this document):

The department chair will review the academic profile provided by the faculty member. By February 1 [this deadline subject to change], the department chair will prepare a written report for the faculty member and the dean. The report will state whether the faculty member's activities meet departmental expectations, and if not, what deficiencies exist.

Where the chair has found that the faculty member's activities meet departmental expectations, but considers that there are opportunities for development, or areas of concern, that are not deficiencies, the chair need not include these items in the report, but will discuss them with the faculty member and identify ways to address them.

Where the chair's report does not identify deficiencies, the review process is concluded.

Where the chair has found that the faculty member's activities do not meet departmental expectations, the chair's report shall identify deficiencies.

If *good performance* is not met, the chair will inform the faculty member being reviewed that performance has been rated satisfactory, but does not meet *good performance*. The faculty member and chair shall then propose a plan for addressing weaknesses which have been identified, and a time frame for implementing the plan.

#### VI. Administrative Assignments

1. For faculty members with a half-time administrative appointment, teaching load and research expectations will be appropriately modified.
2. The Department Chair will be evaluated by the Department Personnel Committee chair.