

PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY AT UH MĀNOA (Revised 2024)

Board of Regents Policy, RP 9.213 establishes guidelines for periodic evaluation of faculty. These guidelines state that procedures for review of faculty must: 1) provide safeguards for academic freedom, 2) provide for participation of faculty peers in the review process, 3) require the evaluation of every faculty member at least once every five years, and that they may 4) provide for exempting faculty who have undergone a review for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, or who have received a merit salary increase during the five-year period.

PREAMBLE

Evaluation can be a positive force when used to encourage members of the university community to continue their professional growth and thereby improve the delivery of their professional services. To this end, institutional resources must be committed to incentive programs which support faculty development in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

Evaluation of faculty must not undermine academic freedom or tenure which are essential to the university. There is a presumption of competence on the part of each tenured faculty member. Thus, the evaluation process must operate independently of an individual faculty member's tenured status. The review undertaken within the evaluation process must reflect the nature of the individual's field of work and conform to fair and reasonable expectations as recognized by faculty peers in each department or discipline. The review will not be conducted in an arbitrary or capricious manner and will be in accordance with agreed-upon procedures.

PROCEDURES

1. Departmental criteria and review of personnel

- a. Department: Through a collegial process, the faculty of each department shall develop written statements that specify the range and level of professional activities expected of faculty in each rank ("departmental criteria"). The faculty may review and update department criteria, including those for periodic review from time to time.
 - i. Review: The department chair shall forward departmental criteria to the dean. The dean shall verify that they meet or exceed applicable UH and UHM criteria. Deans shall forward departmental criteria to the office of the Vice Provost for Academic Excellence (OVPAE). OVPAE may conduct an additional review and shall forward a complete, approved set of departmental criteria to the University of Hawai'i Professional Assembly (UHPA). Departmental criteria that do not meet UH and UHM standards or are not in line with the established mission of the School or College shall be referred back to the department for revisions.
 - ii. Delivery to faculty: All faculty members, including new hires, shall be provided with a copy of current departmental criteria. If a department does not have approved criteria, a copy of current college and/or UHM criteria should be sent to all faculty members.

- b. Review in non-standard departments: In colleges, schools, programs, research units and institutes using different titles, the terms “department”, “chair”, and “dean/director” shall apply to the most analogous personnel. Where there is no department chair but there is a DPC, the chair of the DPC shall act as “chair” under these procedures.
 - i. Review of department chair or DPC chair. Where a department chair is to be reviewed, the chair of the DPC shall conduct the review. When the DPC chair is to be reviewed, but there is no department chair, the DPC shall designate a reviewer.
 - ii. Review in small units. In units where there is not a department chair or a standing DPC, or is not covered above, the review of the faculty member’s record will occur in one of the following ways: 1) by a senior bargaining unit faculty member holding at least an equal or higher rank, within the department; or 2) by a senior bargaining unit faculty member holding at least an equal rank or higher rank within the school or college; or 3) by a senior bargaining unit faculty member holding at least an equal or higher rank in a related school or college. UHM and UHPA shall jointly designate the faculty member to conduct the review.

2. Preparation of academic profile for review

Faculty members scheduled for review shall prepare an up-to-date written curriculum vitae, resume, or “academic profile” that addresses departmental criteria. If a department does not have approved criteria, the profile should address how the faculty member’s accomplishments during the review period meet college and/or UHM criteria. The academic profile should include information on teaching, research, service, and other professional activities, appropriate to their position. The academic profile may include work in progress, or anticipated. Information in the academic profile may be used by the UH to publicize university achievements.

3. Schedule

Each academic year, department chairs, in consultation with their dean and OVPAE, will schedule faculty members for review. By the third Friday in September, the department chair will notify each faculty member to be reviewed, and solicit an academic profile. The reviewed faculty member will provide an academic profile to the department chair by the first Friday in December.

Off-cycle periodic reviews may be called when the Department Chair and/or Dean identifies performance concerns that must be addressed. It is recommended that a review commence upon identifying concerns over a faculty’s substandard performance. Off-cycle reviews will follow the below procedures beginning with #6 and adjusting due dates relative to the date when a faculty member is notified of a finding of deficiencies. This review is an opportunity to engage with the individual whose performance has raised concerns so that they may be guided towards achieving satisfactory performance standards.

4. Selection of faculty for review

Each faculty member shall be reviewed at least once every five academic years.

In calculating the five-year period, the following events count as a review:

1. Granting of promotion
2. Positive recommendation for promotion by department chair, regardless if promotion was granted by UH
3. Granting of tenure
4. Granting of a special salary adjustment for merit

The following events postpone a review that would otherwise be timely, for the academic year in which they are scheduled:

1. Application for promotion, tenure, or special salary adjustment for merit
2. Sabbatical or leave without pay
3. Faculty who submit forms to retire by June 30 of the year they are due for review. However, if the faculty member rescinds the application for retirement, they must submit documents for review within 30 days of the rescission.

5. Review of academic profile

The department chair will review the academic profile provided by the faculty member. By February 1, 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, college-level and/or UHM criteria, and if not, what deficiencies exist.

Where the chair has found that the faculty member's activities meet applicable criteria, 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.

(Note that for Spring 2020, during the COVID-19 transition to online learning, faculty and students were not required to participate in evaluations. As such, the absence of course evaluations for Spring 2020 shall not be held against any faculty member in any personnel action, including tenure, promotion and periodic reviews.)

6. Response to identification of deficiencies

The faculty member will, in writing, agree or disagree with the chair's identification of deficiencies by February 15.

Where the faculty member agrees with the chair's identification of deficiencies, the faculty member and the chair will develop a mutually-agreeable professional development plan (PDP) to address them.

Where the faculty disagrees with the chair's identification of deficiencies, the dean will

determine, in writing, by March 1, whether the faculty member is meeting all applicable criteria. If the dean determines that the faculty member is meeting all applicable criteria, the review is concluded.

If the dean determines that the faculty member is not meeting applicable criteria the faculty member will, in writing, agree or disagree with the Dean's identification of deficiencies by April 1. If the faculty member disagrees, the matter will be referred to OVPAE so that a Mānoa Faculty Evaluation Review Committee (MFERC) can be formed. The MFERC shall determine whether the faculty member has met all applicable criteria, and if not, specify any deficiencies. The OVPAE will expeditiously constitute the MFERC as identified herein. If the MFERC cannot be formed by April 14, OVPAE shall notify UHPA.

7. Mānoa Faculty Evaluation Review Committees

A Mānoa Faculty Evaluation Review Committee (MFERC) is established for each case in which a faculty member disputes a department chair's identification of deficiency. The UH and UHPA will jointly appoint five persons from the, established by the collective bargaining agreement, to the MFERC. The faculty member may exclude 10 members of the FPP from the MFERC in the manner provided in Article XV, paragraph C., of the collective bargaining agreement. The MFERC is the final authority under these procedures on whether a department chair has correctly identified deficiencies. The MFERC shall render their decision no later than 30 calendar days after they are convened.

8. Professional Development Plans (PDP)

A PDP shall be in writing and be signed by the faculty member, the chair, and the dean. Each PDP must include: a) identification of deficiencies, b) objectives to address the deficiencies, c) specific activities to implement the PDP, d) timelines for meeting expectations, e) a process for annual progress review, and f) source of funding (if required).

PDPs may call for a variety of activities that require special resources, e.g., leaves of various types, attendance at special workshops or institutes, assistance in the preparation of grant applications, availability of computer hardware or software or of training in their use, or special assistance in new approaches to teaching. Successful PDPs will require both initiative on the part of the faculty member and assurance that every effort is made to provide the necessary support out of available university resources through departments, colleges or schools, and the central administration.

The Chair should work with the faculty member to develop a PDP acceptable to all parties. In situations where an MFERC has not been convened, the Chair and the faculty member should strive to establish a PDP by April 14. If the Chair and the faculty are unable to agree on a PDP by April 14, the matter shall be forwarded to the Dean. The Dean will consider both the Chair and faculty perspectives on the development of the PDP and will provide to the Chair and faculty member their determination for the PDP by April 24. The faculty member will indicate in writing, agree or disagree with the Dean's PDP determination by May 8. If a faculty member disagrees with the Dean's PDP determination, the

dean may refer the matter to the OVPAE. The OVPAE shall determine the elements of the PDP by May 15. These deadlines may be modified if an MFERC is convened.

Faculty members may consult with the Mānoa Faculty Development Panel, defined below, for advice in drafting a PDP.

9. Conclusion of annual review

Deans will report the status of all reviews to the OVPAE by May 31.

Deans, in consultation with the department chair and the faculty member, will review progress on ongoing (previously approved) PDPs annually, beginning March 31. The purpose of the review is to determine whether or not the plan is on course, and, if not, what modifications, if any, could be made to enable the faculty to meet criteria. If there are no modifications that could be made, Deans may declare that a PDP has been unsuccessful, and terminate it. In such a case, the UH may take steps in its discretion, subject to law and the collective bargaining agreement.

If the faculty member met all criteria, Deans may declare that a PDP has been successfully concluded. A copy of the review should be filed in the office of the dean, with copies to the chair and the faculty member, by May 31.

10. The Mānoa Faculty Development Panel

Staff support: The OVPAE will provide staff support to the Mānoa Faculty Evaluation Review Committee and the Mānoa Faculty Development Program.

The Mānoa Faculty Development Panel will consist of seven to nine faculty members with a record of expertise and helpfulness to their colleagues, jointly appointed by the VPAE and UHPA. These faculty mentors may assist with the development and implementation of the PDP. The interaction between the mentors and faculty member is intended to be supportive and may include, if requested, working informally with the faculty member to develop ideas and strategies for the PDP prior to discussions with the chair. The pool of mentors may be selected from previous winners of the Regent's and Chancellor's Medal for Excellence in Teaching as well as previous recipients of the Francis Davis Award for junior faculty, who have gone on to receive tenure. The Director of the Office of Faculty Development and Academic Support (OFDAS) will be an ex-officio member of this committee.

11. Review of procedures

UH and UHPA will meet on the call of either party during the pendency of the collective bargaining agreement to consider whether these procedures need revision. Revision of these procedures shall require agreement of the parties in writing.