

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I WEST O'AHU

EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY PROCEDURES

[UHWO Faculty Senate Resolution 99-1, 2/12/99, Revised by Faculty Senate 9/1/06*]

Board of Regents Policy Section 9-15 established guidelines for the periodic evaluation of faculty members (*in this document, the term "faculty" includes all instructional faculty, librarians, research faculty and specialist personnel in Unit 07 at UH-West O'ahu*). These guidelines set forth the review procedures that must provide for: (1) safeguards of academic freedom, (2) participation of faculty peers in the review process, (3) the evaluation of every faculty member at least once every five years, and (4) exemption for faculty members who have undergone a review for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or who have been evaluated for a merit salary increase during the past five-year period.

REVISION NOTE: The UHWO Faculty Senate and the University of Hawai'i Professional Assembly clarify that faculty approval of this procedure is based on the understanding that it is not a tenure review or reapplication procedure.

PREAMBLE

Evaluation can be a positive force when used to encourage all faculty members in the University community to continue their professional growth throughout their careers and thereby improve the delivery of professional services to the students, the university and the community. Faculty development must be proactive as well as reactive. In addition to providing for the development of the faculty member found to be performing below the established standards, sufficient funding should be provided to encourage and support quality teaching, scholarship, and other professional activities appropriate to the faculty member's field of endeavor. This should include, among other kinds of support, funds for travel to professional meetings.

The evaluation of faculty must support the concepts of academic freedom and tenure, which are essential to the University. There is a presumption of professional competence on the part of each tenured faculty member. The evaluation process discussed here, therefore, will have no impact on an individual faculty member's tenured status.

The review undertaken within the evaluation process must consider the nature of the faculty member's field of work and must conform to fair and reasonable expectations as established by faculty peers in each *Division* and *Unit* (hereafter the term *Division* will be used to designate both Division and Unit, and the term Division Chair will be understood to designate both Division Chairs and Unit Directors).

PROCEDURES

1. The UH-WO Criteria and Guidelines for Faculty Promotion/Tenure provide general statements concerning the duties and responsibilities of faculty at the University of Hawai'i - West O'ahu as well as the minimum qualifications for each class and rank described in BOR Policies and Procedures, Section 9-2,b. (1-2). To complement these statements, each Division may develop its own statement of professional expectations. The Division may, of course, adapt such statement from existing sources specific to their constituent disciplines--statements that make clear the range and level of professional activities that may be reasonably expected of faculty in each rank. These expectations, whether contained in the Criteria and Guidelines for Faculty Promotion/Tenure, the above cited BOR Policies, or specifically developed by the faculty of a division, shall be brought by the Division Chair or Director to the attention of all faculty in the division, especially new members.

2. Any Division which develops its own statement of faculty performance expectations shall file a copy of the statement with the Chancellor. Once established, changes to this statement must be made in consultation with the Chancellor and the University of Hawai'i Professional Assembly. All such changes must be filed with the appropriate offices and distributed to faculty in the Division one full academic year prior to their implementation.
3. Faculty members are in the best position to know the full range of their professional activities. Faculty who are to be reviewed will prepare an up-to-date *curriculum vita*, or other academic profile appropriate to their field of endeavor, which addresses Divisional expectations. This profile should include information relative to teaching, scholarship, service, and other professional activities, as appropriate to their classification and field of endeavor. The profiles should be considered part of the routine collection of information for use by the university community, as well as for providing information on faculty achievements to the larger community.
4. Before the close of each academic year, or May 15th, whichever is earlier, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will develop a list of faculty members whose performance has not been reviewed for purposes of contract renewal, promotion, tenure, or a merit salary adjustment during the preceding five years. In addition, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will notify the relevant Division Chairs of this list. Faculty members whose names appear on the list are those who are due to have their professional activities reviewed during the coming academic year.

By September 1 of each year the Division Chair will notify those faculty members who are due for evaluation and will request from them an academic profile and any additional information (concerning, for example, work in progress or activities scheduled for the year) that the faculty member would like brought to the attention of those reviewing his/her professional activities. All such information should be in the hands of the reviewer by December 1st of the academic year in which the review is to be conducted.

Faculty who will be on sabbatical or other leave during the academic year in which they are scheduled for evaluation will 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 will be evaluated through the promotion process, rather than this process.

5. The review of faculty members providing instruction at more than one campus will be confined to the campus on which they occupy a tenure-line appointment or the campus on which they have primary teaching responsibility.
6. Faculty who expect to retire within eighteen months of their scheduled evaluation date will be exempt from evaluation provided that they submit an official notification of retirement, with termination dates, to the Chancellor. Should they subsequently decide to postpone retirement, they will be scheduled for review in the next annual cycle.

7. When a Division Chair or Librarian is scheduled for review, the Chair of the Faculty Senate shall select one of the other Division Chairs to conduct the review in accordance with the deadlines and procedures outlined below for instructional faculty. (This procedure supercedes Faculty Senate Recommendation 95-1).
8. If the Division Chair determines that the professional activities of the faculty member **meet the expectations** established by the faculty of his/her Division, the Division Chair will so inform the faculty member and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Upon such notification, the review process will be completed. This process should be completed no later than February 1st.
9. If the Division Chair concludes that the professional activities of the faculty member **do not meet the expectations** established by the faculty of the Division, the Division Chair(s) will meet with the faculty member to develop a mutually agreed upon Professional Development Plan (PDP) for meeting the Division's expectations. The PDP will provide a means by which the faculty member can meet expectations in a systematic manner over a specified period of time. The contents of a Professional Development Plan should include the following:
 - a) identification of deficiencies,
 - b) objectives to address the deficiencies,
 - c) specific activities to implement the plan,
 - d) time lines for meeting expectations,
 - e) process for annual progress review,
 - f) sources of funding (if required).

The PDP will be signed by the faculty member and the Division Chair. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will be given a copy of the PDP. The process will be completed no later than March 15th.

10. Where the faculty member does not concur with the determination of the Division Chair, the review will be sent to a campus-wide Faculty Personnel Committee (see # 11). For the purposes of this secondary review, the committee chair shall be from a different division than the faculty member being reviewed.
11. One tenured faculty member from each Division will serve on a Faculty Personnel Committee for the purpose of hearing disputed cases. The process for selection of the Division representatives shall be left to the Division. The committee shall be comprised of no fewer than three members.

12. If the Faculty Personnel Committee determines that the professional activities of the faculty member **meet the expectations** established by the faculty of her/his Division, the Committee Chair will so inform the faculty member, the Division Chair and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Upon such notification, the review process will be completed. The process will be completed no later than April 15th.
13. If the Faculty Personnel Committee determines that the professional activities of a faculty member **do not meet the expectations** as established by the faculty member's Division, the Chair of the Committee will meet with the faculty member and the Division Chair to develop a mutually agreed upon Professional Development Plan (PDP) for meeting the Division's expectations. The PDP will be signed by the faculty member, the Division Chair and the Chair of the Faculty Personnel Committee. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will be given a copy of the PDP. This process should be completed no later than May 15th.
14. If a PDP cannot be agreed upon, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will attempt to mediate the matter and arrive at a new or revised PDP that is acceptable to the faculty member and the Division Chair and/or Faculty Personnel Committee.

OVERSIGHT & CONTINUING EVALUATION

Administrative oversight for scheduling and keeping records regarding faculty evaluation and development will be in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. To monitor evaluation procedures and their implementation, and to furnish continuing direction and guidance, representatives from the leadership of UHPA may be invited to review those procedures at the request of administration or any faculty member.