University of Hawaii at Hilo
College of Business and Economics
Guidelines for Candidates for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Post-tenure Qualification

Ratified by Unanimous Vote of the CoBE Faculty Senate, 3/5/2010
Amended by Majority Vote of the CoBE Faculty Senate, 9/23/2020
Amended by Unanimous Vote of the CoBE Faculty Senate, 10/11/2023
*Last Amended by *** Vote of the CoBE Faculty Senate, */*/*****

Guiding Principles for Evaluation Policies

The following policies for faculty seeking tenure, promotion, and post-tenure qualification are intended to be consistent with the evolving strategic directions of the University of Hawaii at Hilo and the College of Business and Economics with attention to the growing diversity of faculty expertise in the College. In addition to recognizing traditional academic and professional contributions, the policies below reflect an appreciation for a broad spectrum of faculty activity as it aligns with any of the strategic directions of the University and the College. These strategic directions may include active pedagogy, place-based learning, research innovation, community impact, interdisciplinary activity, and the maintenance of third-party accreditations.

I. Policy for the Evaluation of Teaching[1]

The essential question in the evaluation of teaching is whether the candidate contributes in an effective, creative, and appropriate way to the teaching mission of the College. Attention should be paid to the varieties of demands placed on instructors and the range of teaching activities called for in various disciplines and at various levels. It is imperative that clear documentation of, and a compelling case for, high quality teaching be included in all tenure and promotion cases. While no two cases will be alike, there are several recurring themes which may be addressed in the preparation of the teaching component and several useful techniques for verifying performance in these areas.

A. Aspects of Teaching to be Evaluated

Teaching plays the primary role in decisions regarding tenure and promotion at UH Hilo. Therefore, an explicit discussion of the teaching performance of a faculty member is essential. The following components of teaching may be evaluated in a personnel review decision.

Design and redesign of courses. Does the course "work"? Are the course objectives reasonable? Are course requirements clearly stated and communicated to students? Is the course continuously updated to reflect recent developments in the field?

Presentation of material. Does the teacher convey enthusiasm for the subject matter? Does the teacher present material with logic and clarity, arousing curiosity in beginning students and stimulating advanced students to creative work?

[1] Adapted from "Policy for the Evaluation of Teaching". Berkeley, 1987. Website. Academic Policy Document. UC Berkeley Senate Committee on Teaching. November 13 2009. <https://teaching.berkeley.edu/campus-and-office-president-policies-evaluating-teaching>.

Command of the subject. Is the instructor knowledgeable in the subject matter of the courses he or she teaches? Does the instructor engage in reading or research in the subject matter of the course in order to keep up to date with current research developments?

Contributions to curriculum and instruction. Has the teacher developed instructional materials, such as textbooks, videotapes, computer courseware, slides, publications related to teaching, or the like? In what ways has the teacher participated in program or campus curriculum design, assessment, and development efforts? How active is the teacher in guiding independent studies and student projects?

Advising. What formal advising duties or informal advising has the teacher undertaken? How much time does the teacher spend consulting with students? Does the teacher demonstrate concern for the development of the whole student?

Given the multi-dimensional nature of high-quality teaching and the inherent difficulty of its evaluation, candidates should provide evaluations from a variety of perspectives – self, peer and student.

B. Sources and Methods for Evaluating Teaching

The candidate's **faculty colleagues** who have appropriate expertise in the discipline are best able to evaluate the scholarship that informs the design and organization of courses and curriculum, the choice or development of texts and other instructional materials (syllabus, handouts, etc.), the nature of examinations and assignments, and so on.

Current students can comment on an instructor's ability to communicate clearly, the extent and level of the instructor's course preparation, whether the instructor makes effective use of class time, how sensitive and responsive the instructor is to difficulties students may be having in the course, the workload, and so on. Students should not be used to judge the adequacy, relevance, and timeliness of the course content nor the breadth of the instructor's knowledge and scholarship.

Former students can comment on the long-term effectiveness of the candidate's teaching: for example, the role of the instructor's courses in preparing the student for advanced study or work related to the discipline.

Self-evaluations can be both descriptive and evaluative and may address such issues as teaching goals and philosophy, involvement in curriculum projects, efforts to improve teaching, and so on.

Various methods can be used to gather data from these sources: rating forms or detailed questionnaires, written appraisals (letters or responses to open-ended questions on rating forms), interviews, observations, and so on. Combining sources and methods, it is possible to collect a variety of information about a faculty member's teaching. For example, colleagues can evaluate instructional materials or observe an instructor's classroom teaching. Students can complete evaluation forms at the end of a course, participate in individual or group interviews, or fill out surveys when they graduate.

C. The Teaching Dossier

The candidate is responsible for presenting a carefully organized, comprehensive, and thoughtfully reflective teaching dossier to enable reviewers to evaluate fairly the quality of the teaching contribution. A teaching dossier may include, but is not limited to, any or all of the following items:

Candidate's statement. It is helpful if candidates provide a written statement of their teaching approach, including the goals of specific courses and choices of teaching strategies. They may also comment about their efforts to improve instruction and respond to concerns regarding their teaching performance made in prior reviews by the Personnel Committee, Department Chair, Dean, or students in end-of-course evaluations. This statement should also describe how the candidate has addressed the Aspects of Teaching listed in part I of this document.

Description of courses taught. A list of courses by course number and enrollment should be included. The candidate may wish to comment on the courses indicating which are new, team-taught, and so on.

Description of special student work directed. Candidates may want to describe their role in directing student reading or research projects, either as class projects or as independent studies.

Description of advising activities. Candidates may describe the number of advisees they take responsibility for, the frequency of meetings with them, etc. Other advising activities such as supervision of student clubs and groups or student recruitment efforts may also be described.

Peer evaluation. Reports or letters about the candidate's teaching performance from faculty colleagues familiar with the content could be included in the dossier. The letters should cite the basis and evidence for judgments made (observation, review of instructional materials, and so on).

Student evaluation. Some form of student evaluation data (e.g., end-of-semester student ratings) for each different course taught in the period under review should be presented. The data should include both summaries of student evaluations of teaching and sufficient "raw" data (i.e., representative student comments) to allow the reviewers to see the candidate's teaching from the students' point of view. In addition, the dossier can include letters from current students or summaries of interviews.

Alumni evaluation. Former students can provide information about the candidate's teaching performance. Dossiers may include letters, results of group interviews, or summaries of surveys of alumni that specifically address the candidate's teaching.

Self evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Candidates may provide samples of student work, with or without instructor comments, examples of course development efforts, comparisons of student performance to course learning objectives, or other indicators of student mastery of course material or individual development in academically-relevant skills.

II. Policy for the Evaluation of Research/Scholarship

The standards described in this section are intended to define competence, substantial excess over competence, and high quality in Research/Scholarship. A candidate is expected to present evidence of the quantity and quality of scholarly or creative activities.

A. Requirements for Reappointment:

A probationary faculty member must demonstrate that there is a reasonable probability of satisfying the scholarship requirements for promotion to the rank of associate professor in the period prior to mandatory review. If the probationary faculty member has the rank of associate or full professor, there must be a reasonable probability of meeting the scholarship requirements for promotion to that rank prior to mandatory review for tenure.

Evidence of Research/Scholarship can be provided in a variety of different ways. A list of acceptable scholarly or creative activities is given in Appendix A.

B. Requirements for Promotion to Associate Professor and/or Tenure:

Promotion to Associate Professor and/or granting of tenure requires unambiguous evidence of sustained scholarly activity in the faculty member's field of study. In cases of documented high-quality impact, fewer publications could satisfy the requirement for tenure and/or promotion in scholarly or creative activity.

• Competence in scholarly/creative activities: The contribution of five scholarly or creative products, one of which must be a peer-reviewed article in an academic journal (PRJ). Otherwise, evidence of equivalent activities must be demonstrated. (See "Guidance" below)

• Scholarly/creative activities that substantially exceed the minimum requirements of competence: The contribution of five scholarly or creative products, two of which must be PRJs. Otherwise, evidence of equivalent activities must be demonstrated.

• Scholarly/creative activities of high quality: The contribution of five scholarly or creative products, three of which must be PRJs. Otherwise, evidence of equivalent activities must be demonstrated.

C. Requirements for Promotion to Professor:

Promotion to professor requires unambiguous evidence of continuing scholarly activity in the faculty member's field of study since the last promotion. In cases of documented high-quality impact, fewer publications could satisfy the requirement for tenure and/or promotion in scholarly or creative activity.

• Competence in scholarly/creative activities: The contribution of five scholarly or creative products, one of which must be a PRJ. Otherwise, evidence of equivalent activities must be demonstrated. (See "Guidance" below)

• Scholarly/creative activities that substantially exceed the minimum requirements of competence: The contribution of five scholarly or creative products, two of which must be PRJs. Otherwise, evidence of equivalent activities must be demonstrated.

• Scholarly/creative activities of high quality: The contribution of five scholarly or creative products, three of which must be PRJs. Otherwise, evidence of equivalent activities must be demonstrated.

D. Requirements for Post-tenure Review:

A faculty member who meets the criteria for academic qualification will be considered to have satisfactory productivity for the purposes of post-tenure review. (See Academic Qualification Standards for UH Hilo College of Business & Economics Faculty policy statement).

E. Guidance:

Evidence of equivalent activities may be established by using the following equivalencies: one PRJ counts for at least two published non-PRJ items, and one PRJ with substantial quality counts for at least two PRJs or at least four published non-PRJ items. Regardless, any successful candidate must have at least one PRJ.

Some suggestions for providing evidence that a published work is of substantial quality include:

1. Demonstrating the quality of an article through the ranking of the journal as measured by the
    a. Australian Business Deans Council List (ABDC)
    b. Financial Times' Journal List
    c. Journal's h-index
    d. Journal's Thompson Impact Factor
    e. Refereed Articles that Rank Journals
2. A peer reviewed article appearing in a journal generally recognized to be rated "B" or higher is of substantial quality.
3. Demonstrating the quality of an article by the citations to the work
4. Review by a panel of scholars at comparable institutions in the candidate's field. (The panel should be appointed by the DC or DPC chair after consultation with the candidate)

Other methods of demonstrating quality may be equally acceptable but the burden of proof will lie with the candidate.

III. Policy for the Evaluation of Service Contributions

Under current University and CoBE policies regarding promotion and tenure, faculty members are expected to participate in service activities in support of the College and University Missions as part of their normal responsibilities. Candidates may present evidence that supports evaluation of service activities at three ascending levels:

1. Competence in service
2. Substantially exceeds the minimum of competence in service
3. High quality contributions in service

Internal faculty service contributions can be made at the departmental, college, campus, and UH-system levels. External faculty service contributions occur primarily within professional associations and in the local, regional, national and international community. Generally, external service contributions should be related more to the candidate's university role, function, and professional expertise than to his or her private affiliations. Compensated consulting services may be considered as a contribution to a candidate's academic qualification for accreditation purposes, but not as a community service.

A. Documenting Service Activities

Factors to be taken into account in assessing the service contribution include, but are not limited to:

- Awards/recognition received
- Number of service contributions
- Outcome of the service effort
- Responsibilities of the position
- Time commitment required
- Visibility of the position
- Whether a course release or other compensation was received (Compensation carries with it the expectation of more significant outcomes.)

Evidence of Service Contributions can be provided in a variety of different ways. Exemplary and acceptable service activities are listed in Appendix B.

B. Sources and Methods of Evaluating Service Activities

Determination of the level of a candidate's service contribution would require assessment of both quantitative and qualitative measures.

Quantitative measures of internal service activity could include the number of committees on which the candidate has served, as well as the number of times the committees meet during the year. Qualitative measures could include whether the candidate served as committee chair (i.e., level of responsibility), whether the committee's work was especially important to fulfilling the mission(s) of relevant academic units, and whether there was a measurable outcome, such as a report that was approved and implemented to produce a program improvement. Student mentoring and advising student clubs are important internal service contributions, though academic advising should be considered as a contribution to teaching.

For external service, the number, as well as the quality, of external service contributions is relevant, especially those that garner public visibility, recognition, and awards. Community and public service activities may take place locally, regionally, nationally, or internationally. Each

level may provide increased visibility and recognition to the individual and the institution, and will be evaluated on that basis.

In determining the level of service contribution, measures of performance should reflect both internal and external service dimensions, although not all candidates are expected to divide their efforts equally between internal and external service activities.

1. The level of *competence in service* could be demonstrated through active involvement in committee work at the College or Department level, and the advising of student groups or other activities of a similar nature. Competence in external service would be reflected in active involvement with academic or professional associations in the candidate's field and/or provision of discipline-based expertise to community members. This is the minimum acceptable level of contribution in service activities.
2. Candidates who *substantially exceed the minimum required level of competence in service* would demonstrate internal service activity across several units within the university. Positive results of this service should be documented. External professional service activities (e.g. by serving as track or session chairs, discussants, and/or journal, conference, or external grant reviewers) or community service activities could be at the local, regional, or national levels.
3. A *high quality service contribution* would be based on an exceptional level of demonstrated responsibility and impact within the college or university, and/or recognition/impact of service to the profession or community. Taking a leading role in faculty governance activities that involves program review and documented program improvement would constitute high quality internal service. Serving as a board member or officer of a national and/or regional academic or professional association and/or as an editor or editorial review board member for an academic journal are examples of high quality external service.

Documentation of service activities can be problematic, in that records of actual time spent or the quality or significance of verbal contributions to discussions are rarely measured and recorded. Candidates are encouraged to seek evaluative letters from committee chairs, other members, or persons outside the University that may be in a position to observe the candidate's contributions. Documents produced by committees can be submitted as evidence of service contribution, but candidates must indicate their contributions to the documents and other outcomes of the committee's work.

As a practical matter, junior faculty seeking promotion and tenure are encouraged to pursue *competence* in service or, at best, the intermediate level of *substantially exceeds minimum competence*, given the lack of opportunity for achieving high quality internal and/or external service early in the candidate's career. Seeking promotion based heavily on a record of high quality service performance is more appropriate to tenured faculty.

Appendix A.

The list of acceptable scholarly or creative activities:

1. Publication of an original research/scholarly/creative article in a refereed journal.
2. Full article or extended abstract in peer reviewed conference proceedings of a major national or international organization.
3. Publication in peer reviewed conference proceedings
4. Article, case study, or book chapter published in a journal, magazine, newspaper, book, or trade magazine.
5. A book or monograph based on original research or creative activity that makes an original contribution.
6. A published textbook.
7. Additional certification or credentials, typically by a recognized professional organization, that maintains, enhances, or supplements the applicant's standing in their area of expertise.
8. Study at other institutions toward an advanced degree beyond the degree UH Hilo requires for the discipline.
9. Professional practice, management of an active business or non-profit organization, and/or professional development necessary to maintain competency and credentials.
10. Merit or achievement awards from professional societies in recognition of scholarly activity, research, or creative endeavors.
11. Grant awards from private, local, state, or federal agencies.
12. Invention culminating in a patent.
13. Grant proposals for research, training, or creative activities.
14. Work conducted under a consulting contract that is at the same level as the above university grants.
15. Publicly available working paper to be submitted.
16. Work in significant progress to be verified by inclusion in the dossier.
17. Fellowship.
18. Conference presenter, panel or seminar participant.
19. External or internally reviewed technical reports.
20. Non-reviewed technical report based on original research or creative activity in either print or online format depending on the standards of the discipline.
21. Published field guide.
22. A published video, feature film, computer simulation, or equivalent, contracted to air on a commercial or public network television station and/or distributed commercially for use in classrooms, interpretive or industrial instruction.
23. Book review published in a book or journal.
24. Database published in a book or journal.
25. Computer program that is demonstrably used by various groups outside the candidate's department.

Appendix B.

The list of exemplary service activities:

1. Chairing a committee or special project at the campus or system level.
2. Chairing or vice-chairing the College Senate.
3. Serving as an officer or member of the UHH Congress.
4. Serving as a college director or department chair.
5. Serving as a department or college academic and/or career advisor.
6. Chairing a personnel committee, e.g. contract renewal, tenure or promotion of UHH faculty.
7. Chairing the UHH Research or Graduate Council.
8. Chairing a search committee.
9. Performing significant administrative duties at or above the department level (planning, decision-making and implementation, including securing funding).
10. Serving as an editorial board member of a professional journal or book publisher.
11. Organizing a conference.
12. Organizing a national or international panel, seminar or workshop.

The list of acceptable service activities:

1. Serving on a committee or special project at the campus or system level.
2. Serving on the UHH Research or Graduate Councils.
3. Serving as an academic and/or career advisor.
4. Serving as an advisor for a student club or organization.
5. Serving as the primary contact for an academic program.
6. Serving as an editorial board member of a professional journal or book publisher.
7. Serving on federal grant review panels (e.g., NSF, NIH, CDC, FDA, etc.).
8. Serving as an officer or board member of a registered professional or service association/organization.
9. Serving on a committee or special project in a professional association.
10. Planning conferences, seminars, and workshops.
11. Producing research reports for a professional association.
12. Serving as a consultant to an institution or professional association (e.g., program evaluations at other institutions).
13. Training activities on behalf of a professional or licensing association.
14. Serving as an appointed member of a State-level task force or commission.
15. Serving on personnel committees, e.g. contract renewal, tenure or promotion of UHH faculty.
16. Participating in standing committees, search committees or special projects for UHH.
17. Performing significant administrative duties at or above the department level (planning, decision-making and implementation, including securing funding).
18. Serving as presenter or panelist for a professional or local workshop or event at UHH.
19. Serving as presenter or panelist for a local workshop or event at UHH.
20. Serving as UHH liaison or adjunct to other programs or organizations.
21. Reviewing manuscripts for a peer-reviewed national or international journal.
22. Participating in a panel discussion (community, state, national, or international) separate from a research presentation.
23. Providing service to volunteer organizations in area of expertise.
24. Performing significant administrative duties on behalf of a non-UHH entity related to your field.
25. Uncompensated consulting to local government agencies or community associations/agencies in area of expertise.

26. Serving on advisory boards or equivalents for community associations.
27. Editorial work for a community publication.
28. Presenting on National, State, or Local television or other public venue in support of UHH or profession.