

Basic Policy on Preparation of Review Standards for Tenure Review and Post Review, and
Unified Handling in Reviews

February 25, 2019
Approved by the President

1. Basic Policy on Preparation of Standards

The basic policy on the preparation of standards for the tenure review implemented by departments, etc. (meaning the tenure review prescribed in Article 14 (1) of the Hiroshima University Regulations for the Tenure Track System; hereinafter, the same applies) under the new tenure-track system that is to apply from fiscal year 2020 (hereinafter referred to as the “new tenure-track system”) and of standards for the post review implemented by departments, etc. (meaning the post review prescribed in Article 20 (1) of the Hiroshima University Regulations for the Internal Promotion System (Draft); hereinafter, the same applies) under the internal promotion system shall be as follows.

- (1) Indices and levels for the accomplishment of the objectives of the University shall be set for each field of expertise and each position rank.
The minimum unit of each field of expertise shall be each of its categorized constituent units, and the standards for granting tenure and the standards for the post review shall be the same (items and levels).
- (2) The standards concerned shall be composed of basic standards and performance standards. With regard to the tenure review (final review), the completion of subjects approved by the FD Committee (mandatory ones and those designated by the mentor) shall be the requirement for receiving the tenure review (final review).
- (3) As the “basic standards,” indices and levels shall be set for the minimum standards for the tenure review in each field in light of the “Hiroshima University Minimum Standards for Hiring Faculty Members and Minimum Standards for Granting Tenure (by Field), and Regarding Specified Specialist Faculty Members and Leading Faculty Members.”
- (4) As the “performance standards,” the five evaluation items (educational activities, research activities, acquired external funds, social-contribution activities (including medical care), and university administration activities) under the “Hiroshima University Basic Policy of Individual Review of Faculty Members” (Approved by the Executive Board on December 24, 2014) shall be categorized into the following three levels: Acceptance (A), Concern (C) and Deficiency (D).
- (5) For the standards for granting tenure, the item of “medium- and long-term plan and future prospects (medium- and long-term research plan)” shall be set in the performance standards as an item that enables comprehensive evaluation of not only achievements during the tenure-track period but also the details and accomplishment level of an approximately 10-year medium- and long-term research plan, and future prospects.
- (6) Among the evaluation items of the performance standards, the acquisition of A for both the items of educational activities and research activities and for at least another evaluation item shall be the mandatory requirement to be accomplished. For the standards for

granting tenure, a standard to review the accomplishment status through comprehensive evaluation with the “medium- and long-term plan and future prospects (medium- and long-term research plan)” taken into consideration shall be set.

- (7) In order to prevent the excessive burden of preparing review records and other similar duties, records to be used shall be minimal, and a standard that enables evaluation based on the utilization of existing data, etc. shall be set.
- (8) For specified specialist faculty members, standards shall be individually prepared with indices and levels according to their expert qualifications and skills, their specialized work, and the characteristics of position ranks, which shall be applied upon confirmation by the Personnel Committee.

2. Unified Handling in Reviews

The unified handling of the tenure review and post review implemented by departments, etc. shall be as follows.

(1) Evaluation aspects

Evaluations shall be carried out from the following two aspects:

- (i) Accomplishment status of the basic standards
 - A performance evaluation shall be carried out to check the accomplishment status of the basic standards.
- (ii) Accomplishment status of the performance standards
 - A performance evaluation shall be carried out to check the accomplishment status of the performance standards.
 - In the tenure review, the “medium- and long-term plan and future prospects (medium- and long-term research plan)” shall be reviewed in a comprehensive manner by appropriate means (document review, interviews, etc.).

(2) Review methods

The review method of the intermediate review and that of the final review implemented by departments, etc. shall be as specified below.

(Intermediate Review)

With a central focus on the evaluation aspects under (1), show the current status of achievements, etc. as of the commencement of the intermediate review, and provide instructions and make improvements where necessary.

(Final Review)

On the basis of the evaluation aspects under (1), determine the acceptance or non-acceptance of the results of the tenure review or post review implemented by the department, etc. in relation to achievements, etc. as of the commencement of the final review, and report the selection process and results to the University with the applicable Review Result Report Table (the report in connection with Article 16 (1) of the Hiroshima University Regulations for the Tenure Track System or Article 22 (1) of the Hiroshima University Regulations for the Internal Promotion System) (Appended Table 1, Appended Table 2).

(Acceptance shall be given only where the required levels of both the basic standards and

the performance standards have been reached.)

Table: Final Review Pattern

(1) Basic Standards	(2) Performance Standards	Judgment (Final Review)
○ (Accomplished)	○ (Accomplished)	Acceptable
	× (Unaccomplished)	Unacceptable
× (Unaccomplished)	○ (Accomplished)	Unacceptable
	× (Unaccomplished)	Unacceptable

3. Standards for granting tenure (example)

The standards for granting tenure (example) are as shown in Appended Table 1.

4. Standards for the post review (example)

The standards for the post review (example) are as shown in Appended Table 2.

5. Other

The definition of “department, etc.” in relation to this handling is to be revised following the transition to the new administration organ.

