MEMORANDUM

TO: Robert V. Cooney
   Chair, Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Reed Dasenbrock  
   Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Faculty Professional Development Committee

January 20, 2012

It has recently come to my attention that we have not been in compliance with the attached Faculty Review policy which was approved in 1997. Two parts of the policy seem to me to raise issues that I would like MFS input on.

First, this policy envisions a review of faculty every five years and lays out procedures to be followed if in the judgment of the faculty member's department chair, the work of the faculty member is identified as having "deficiencies" in some respects. Faculty who fall into this category are requested under this policy to work with the Mānoa Faculty Development Committee, but it seems as if this committee has never actually been formed.

I think this failure to implement our own procedures is a mistake that should be rectified, as it would seem to me that such a committee might play an important function on campus, not just by fulfilling the specific role assigned it under this policy. I do not think this committee was envisioned as a Faculty Senate committee, as appointments to it need to be jointly approved by the Mānoa Chancellor and by UHPA, but I would welcome the SEC's thoughts on the membership of this committee, both its structure and individual names that you think I should forward to UHPA for its concurrence.

I would think the Director of OFDAS should be on the committee, given the central role her office plays in faculty development efforts on campus, but how to constitute the rest of the committee is something I don't have a definite vision of. One thought would be to select from faculty who have won teaching awards on campus, as they might be an invaluable resource for how we can support efforts to improve teaching and learning across campus. I would like to get the committee formed during Spring 2012, so I look forward to your thoughts on this matter soon.

Second, the policy refers to the creation of "The academic profile," and what it seems to envision is something that we have talked about in other contexts, such as gathering information for NRC rankings, which is a simple, standard form on which we could collect information about a faculty member's activities in the areas of teaching, research, and service. I would like input from MFS on this issue, and if you agree that this would be a useful form to develop, I would like MFS representation on a working group (including representatives from Institutional Research and probably other offices on campus as well) to develop such a form (which would be brought back through channels for approval).
2011-2012 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. 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 department 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 by

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.
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 September 1 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 December 1 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 December 1. 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.**

---

3Faculty who have submitted a written intent to retire within two years are also exempt.
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 February 1.

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 30.

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 13 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.

---

In 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 31 will be referred to the dean for appropriate action.  

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 March 1.

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.

4.4 The dean will report to the Mānoa Chancellor’s Office by May 31 as to the status of the completed review.

---

5 Absence of a plan itself is not a deficiency, rather failure to meet established expectations constitutes the basis for appropriate action.
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 **March 30** 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 31**. 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.