MEMORANDUM

TO: Mānoa Deans and Directors

FROM: Beverly A. McCreary
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

SUBJECT: 2013-2014 Procedures and Timetable for Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty at Mānoa

August 30, 2013

In line with the general delegation of faculty personnel review to the Deans and Directors, you are requested to identify faculty in your units who are due for a review in 2013-2014. As described in the attached 2013-2014 Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty at UH Mānoa (revised July 1997) (Procedures), this review provides for the evaluation of faculty at least once every five years. Faculty who were last reviewed for tenure, promotion, five year review, or last received a merit salary increase during academic year 2008-2009 should undergo five year review in academic year 2013-2014.

There are exemptions from the review in AY 2013-2014:

1) Faculty who have been reviewed for tenure and/or promotion within the last five years (in other words, last reviewed AY 2009-2010 or later) or have received a merit salary increase within the last five years.

2) Faculty who have been reviewed in the five year review process within the past five years (in other words, last reviewed AY 2009-2010 or later).

3) Faculty who have retired or state in writing their intention to retire within the next two years (on or before June 30, 2015). In these cases, please inform the faculty member in writing that should they decide not to retire, they will undergo review during the next review cycle.

4) Faculty on sabbatical or leave without pay during AY 2013-2014 who would otherwise be eligible for review this cycle. These faculty reviews may be deferred until 2014-2015.

5) Faculty who have submitted an application for a special salary adjustment based on merit or have submitted a dossier for promotion may have their review deferred until 2014-2015. If the application is denied, the faculty will be evaluated during the next cycle.

Faculty who may apply for promotion this year (2013-2014) should not be removed from the list. Later, when the application period for promotion is closed, this list may be amended.
Please refer to the Academic Personnel Website, for the listing of faculty potentially eligible for review. After you have logged-on to the website, please go to the Five-Year Review Report and indicate the reason for exemption and year for review from the drop-down menu. Please identify faculty who are subject to the 2013-2014 review by **Monday, September 30, 2013**. For each of the faculty listed, indicate a reason for exemption (and specific review cycle) in the column to the right of the faculty member's name. If left blank, we will assume that these faculty are up for review in 2013-2014. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green, Sue</td>
<td>P&amp;T 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayashi, Mary</td>
<td>Five year review 2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Eric</td>
<td>Promotion 2011-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Max</td>
<td>Merit salary increase recd 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong, Ted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *Procedures* stipulate that your chairs or appropriate unit heads should notify these faculty who will be reviewed this coming year by **Friday, August 30, 2013**. These faculty must receive a copy of the *Procedures*, as well as the departmental expectations by which they will be assessed. Please ensure that these notification procedures are followed accurately and in a timely way. Faculty should submit their academic profiles to their chair by **Monday, December 2, 2013** and chairs should complete their review by **Friday, January 31, 2014** (see attached “Due Dates” and forms).

Should you need to propose special exemptions for individual faculty who would be otherwise eligible for this review, please forward these to me in writing by **Monday, September 30, 2013**. We will consider each case on its merits and we will notify you if an exemption can be made.

As stipulated in the *Procedures*, statements of departmental expectations for five year review are to be forwarded to my office. However, it is only necessary to forward these documents if they have been revised since last year. If so, please forward the latest version by **Monday, September 30, 2013** (attention Dr. Beverly McCreary, Hawai‘i Hall 209).

Should you have any questions about the five year review procedure, please contact Dr. McCreary (956-9429 or bmccrear@hawaii.edu). Thank you for your assistance on this matter.

Attachments

c: Chancellor Apple
    Executive Director Musto
2013-2014 PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY AT UH MĀNOA
(Revised July 1997)

Board of Regents Bylaws and Policies, Section 9-15 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) provide for 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. ¹ The policy further calls for the developing of procedures for such review that incorporate these principles.

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 the concepts of academic freedom and 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 must 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 expectations.** Board of Regents (BOR) Bylaws and Policies, Section 9-2, gives general statements of the duties and responsibilities as well as the minimum qualifications for each class and rank of faculty. The faculty of each department² shall, through a collegial process, develop statements specific to their own units which make clear the range and level of professional activities that can be reasonably expected of faculty in each rank. These statements will be reviewed periodically by the department. These expectations, once agreed upon by the departmental faculty, shall be reviewed

¹Also exempt from review are faculty who submit a written intent to retire within two years. However, if the faculty member rescinds the decision to retire, he/she will be evaluated during the next cycle.

²The terms “department,” “chair,” and “dean” apply to similar titles and functions in colleges, schools, programs, research units and institutes where size and organization may determine the application of other nomenclature.
by the dean to assure that they are in keeping with the established mission of the School or College and that they do not fall below the expectations set out in the Duties and Responsibilities statements of BOR Policy Section 9-2. These expectations shall be provided in writing to all faculty members in the department and to new members when they join the department. By September 30 of each year, deans shall forward copies of the departmental expectations to the Mānoa Chancellor’s Office, who will compile and forward a complete set to the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly.

2. **The academic profile.** Faculty members are in a unique position to know the full range of their professional activities. Faculty who are to be reviewed will prepare an up-to-date curriculum vitae, resume, or other “academic profile” appropriate to their field of endeavor which addresses departmental expectations. This document should include information on their teaching, research, and service or other professional activities, as appropriate to their classification. This should be considered part of the routine collection of information for use by the university community, as well as the providing of information on achievements to the larger community.

3. **Notification and submission of materials.** The Mānoa Chancellor’s Office, in consultation with the dean and the department chairs, will determine the list of faculty members whose work has not been reviewed for contract renewal, promotion, tenure, or receipt of a merit salary increase during the preceding five years, and who are therefore due to have their professional activities reviewed during the coming academic year under BOR Bylaws and Policies, Section 9-15. By August 30 the chair will notify each faculty member on the list and will solicit from the faculty member an academic profile and any additional information (concerning, for example, work in progress or activities scheduled for the year) which the faculty member wishes to bring to the attention of those reviewing her/his professional activities. All such information should be in the department office by November 27 of the academic year in which the review is to be conducted.

Faculty who will be on sabbatical or leave without pay during the academic year in which they are scheduled for evaluation shall have the review deferred until their return from leave. Faculty who are subject to evaluation in the same year in which they are applying for promotion shall be determined to be meeting departmental expectations if the department chair, acting independently of the department personnel committee, makes a positive recommendation on the promotion application prior to November 27. Otherwise, the chair will proceed according to Section 4. In other words, for promotion applicants, if the department chair’s recommendation is positive, indicate that the five-year review is positive; if the department chair’s recommendation is negative, go to Step 4.

---

\(^3\)Faculty who have submitted a written intent to retire within two years are also exempt.
4. **The review by the department chair.** The department chair will review the record made available for each faculty member scheduled for evaluation. When a department chair is scheduled for review, the chair of the department personnel committee will conduct the review of the department chair. This review shall be concluded by **January 31**.

4.1 **Where no deficiencies are identified.** When the department chair determines that the professional activities of a faculty member being evaluated meet reasonable expectations as established by the faculty of the department, she/he will so inform the faculty member and the dean, and the review is concluded.

4.2 **Where deficiencies are identified.** When the department chair determines that the professional activities of a faculty member being evaluated do not meet the reasonable expectations as agreed to by the faculty of the department, the department chair shall specify in writing the deficiencies that have been identified. If the faculty member does not contest the assessment of the chair, the faculty member shall sign that he/she agrees with the statement of deficiencies. The faculty member, the department chair, and the dean shall confer to create a Professional Development Plan which addresses the deficiencies. The final plan shall be in writing and signed by the faculty member, department chair, and the dean.

**The Professional Development Plan.** The faculty member will confer with the department chair and the dean to develop a mutually agreeable plan for addressing deficiencies which have been identified and a time frame for implementing the plan. The plan provides a means by which the faculty member can meet expectations in a systematic manner over a period of time. Each plan must include: a) identification of deficiencies, b) objectives to address the deficiencies, c) specific activities to implement the plan, d) time lines for meeting expectations, e) a process for annual progress review, and f) source of funding (if required). Faculty may consult with the Mānoa Faculty Development Committee for advice in drafting the Plan (see 6. Faculty Development Program below). The plan shall be developed by **March 31**.

**Where there is disagreement over the details of the development plan.** Should the faculty member, department chair, and dean not be able to agree on specific features of any part of a proposed plan, the issue(s) will be referred to the Mānoa Chancellor by the dean by **April 15** for a determination as to which aspects of the respective proposals will constitute the approved plan. The Chancellor’s decision will be rendered by **May 15**.

---

4In units that do not have a faculty member serving as department chair, the review is to be conducted by the chair of the department personnel committee.
Absence of a development plan. Cases in which there is failure to accept the approved plan by May 30 will be referred to the dean for appropriate action.5

4.3 Where there is disagreement as to the finding of deficiencies. If the faculty member does not agree with the assessment of the department chair, the case will be forwarded to the dean for attempted resolution. If the dean determines that the faculty member is meeting departmental expectations, she/he shall so state in writing, and the review process is concluded. If the dean agrees with the department chair that departmental expectations are not being met, she/he shall so state in writing. If the faculty member disagrees with the dean’s decision, the question will be referred to a Mānoa Faculty Evaluation Review Committee. The dean’s review shall be concluded by February 28.

Mānoa Faculty Evaluation Review Committees. These committees will be established for this sole purpose of resolving disputes over whether departmental expectations are being met and what specific deficiencies, if any, exist. Each will consist of five faculty members chosen from the Mānoa Faculty Evaluation Review Panel. The Panel will consist of thirty senior faculty members from the Mānoa Faculty Personnel Panel who are broadly representative of the range of disciplines and professions to be found at Mānoa. The membership of the Mānoa Faculty Evaluation Panel shall be mutually agreed upon by the Mānoa Chancellor and the President of the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly or their designees. The faculty member may exclude up to three names from the Mānoa Faculty Evaluation Review Panel prior to the selection of the committee by the Mānoa Chancellor’s Office in consultation with the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly. Such committees shall be formed and convened expeditiously and their decisions rendered no later than one month after their convening.

The Mānoa Faculty Evaluation Review Committee will decide whether or not it concurs with the assessments of the department chair and the dean that deficiencies exist. The committee shall, if it concurs, specify the areas identified by the department chair in which it also finds deficiencies. If the committee does not concur that there are deficiencies in any of the areas identified by the department chair, the review is concluded. The decision of the committee will be final and binding and will be reported to the Mānoa Chancellor’s Office, which will in turn inform the parties concerned: the faculty member, the department chair, and the dean.

5Absence of a plan itself is not a deficiency, rather failure to meet established expectations constitutes the basis for appropriate action.
4.4 The dean will report to the Mānoa Chancellor’s Office by May 30 as to the status of the completed review.

5. **Monitoring the plan.** An annual review of progress on the plan will be conducted by the dean, in consultation with the department chair and the faculty member, commencing April 1 of each year the faculty member is on the plan. The purpose of the review is to determine whether or not the plan is on course, and, if not, what modifications must be made to meet expectations. The review will be reported on the attached form (Professional Development Plan Status Report) and sent to the Mānoa Chancellor by May 30. A copy of the review should be filed in the office of the dean, with copies to the chair and the faculty member.

6. **Faculty Development Program.** The Mānoa Faculty Development Committee is composed of faculty members and/or emeriti faculty with an established record of expertise and helpfulness to their colleagues. The interaction of the committee with faculty members is intended to be positive and supportive. All members appointed will be mutually agreed upon by the Mānoa Chancellor and the President of the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly or their designees.

The Mānoa Faculty Development Committee will assist with the development and implementation of the professional development plans. The committee: a) provides peer review of requests to the Faculty Evaluation and Development Fund for supplemental funding for the plans approved by the chair and the dean; and b) may, if requested, work informally with the faculty member to develop ideas and strategies for the plan previous to discussion with the chair.

Plans developed by faculty members in consultation with the chairs of their departments, their deans, or the Mānoa Faculty Development Committee 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 training in the use of the same, or special assistance in new approaches to teaching. Successful plans will require both initiative on the part of the faculty member and assurance that every effort is made to provide the necessary support from out of available university resources through departments, colleges or schools, and vice presidential offices.

7. **Oversight and continuing evaluation.** Supervision of faculty evaluation and development will be provided by the Mānoa Chancellor’s Office which will provide staff support to the Mānoa Faculty Development Committee and the Mānoa Faculty Evaluation Review Committee.

To monitor these evaluation procedures and their implementation, and to furnish continuing direction and guidance, representatives from the university administration and from the leadership of the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly shall meet at least once each year or at the call of either party.
# DUE DATES FOR FIVE YEAR REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

## 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri. Aug 30</td>
<td>Deadline for chairs to notify faculty to be reviewed and to distribute 2013-2014 Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty at UH Mānoa, (revised July 1997).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon. Sept 30</td>
<td>Deadline for deans/directors (D/D) transmittal of revised departmental expectations to the Mānoa Chancellor’s Office (MCO), attention: Dr. Beverly McCready, Hawai‘i Hall 209.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon. Sept 30</td>
<td>Deadline for returning printouts and exemption requests to MCO, attention: Dr. Beverly McCready.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri., Oct 4</td>
<td>Deadline for MCO to compile and forward departmental expectations to UHPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., Dec 2</td>
<td>Deadline for faculty to submit academic profile to chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri., Jan 31</td>
<td>Deadline for chairs to complete review of academic profiles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If no deficiencies are found, the chair notifies the faculty member and the D/D. The review is complete. Chair notifies D/D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If deficiencies are identified, see Step 4.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri., Feb 28</td>
<td>Deadline for D/D’s review (conducted when there is disagreement as to the finding of deficiencies, see Step 4.3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., Mar 3</td>
<td>Deadline for D/D to submit names of faculty and outcome of reviews to MCO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., Mar 31</td>
<td>Deadline for faculty member, chair, and D/D to complete formulation of Professional Development Plan (PDP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri., Apr 4</td>
<td>D/D begins review of progress of ongoing PDPs and completes “Professional Development Plan Status Report” (attached).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues. Apr 15</td>
<td>Deadline for D/D’s referral to Chancellor on specific features of PDP disputed by dean, chair, and faculty member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs., May 15</td>
<td>Deadline for Chancellor’s decision on aspects of the PDP disputed by D/D, chair, and faculty member.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date ________________

2013-2014 Professional Development Plan (PDP) Status Report

Name: ____________________________________________________________

Faculty rank: ______________________________________________________

Affiliation: _______________________________________________________

(College/Department)

Date PDP approved ______________________________

Projected/Actual date of completion ________________________________

Date of notification when PDP is completed* __________________________

If retired/resigned, please provide date of separation___________________

Amount of funds allocated toward PDP completion _____________________

Source(s) of funds ________________________________________________

I. Briefly outline specific accomplishments called for in the PDP.

II. Extent of progress towards completion of the PDP.

____ No progress
____ Minimal progress
____ Progress, some accomplishments
____ Significant progress
____ Plan completed

*For completed PDPs, formal notification must be made to faculty members with a copy to the Chair.

(over)
III. For a PDP not yet complete:

1. What actions have been taken to support the completion of the PDP?

2. If expectations within the time line of the PDP have not been met, what actions have been taken?

3. Are resources needed to assist the faculty member in completing the PDP over the next academic year? If so, what arrangements have been made?

4. If the PDP has been revised, please so indicate.

__________________________
Signature (Dean/Director)    Date

Original to be submitted to MCO with copies to the dean/director, the chair and the faculty member by **Friday, May 30, 2014** (attention: Dr. Beverly McCreary, Hawai‘i Hall 209).
# Dean/Director’s Summary: Professional Development Plan Update 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Date PDP completed* / Date of Resignation or Retirement</th>
<th>Estimated Date of Completion</th>
<th>Progress Expected by 6/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature (Dean/Director) ____________________________ Date ____________

* For completed plans, formal notification must be made to faculty members with a copy to the chair. Original to be submitted to MCO by **Friday, May 30, 2014** (attention Dr. Beverly McCreary, Hawai‘i Hall 209).