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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The five proposed amendments were regarding</th>
<th>CPM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. delegated authority for approving waivers (p.4)</td>
<td>CPM recommends that the UHMFS support amendment #1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. articulation of authorship conventions (p.7-9)</td>
<td>CPM requests additional time to better address the comments from UHM faculty on amendment #2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. associate professor and researcher tenure and promotion language (p.10-11)</td>
<td>CPM requests that VCAA’s Office provide the origin of the “well on their way” phrase and rationale behind the proposed modification. With the origin of wording and rationale, CPM will recommend that the UHMFS support amendment #3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Deans’ authority to consider dossier after TPRC assessment (p.15)</td>
<td>CPM requests that amendment #4 be revised to reflect the exact language of the UHPA contract on p.24 rather than an interpretation of the contract language. We also ask that the following be inserted after the contract language. “Consideration by the Dean is for review only. This step is not an opportunity for the Dean to provide an additional assessment.” With that change, we also recommend that UHMFS support amendment #4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. relationship of external evaluator to faculty applicant (p.19)</td>
<td>CPM requests additional time to better address the comments from UHM faculty on amendment #5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In our October 19, 2010 and November 15, 2010 reports, the Committee on Professional Matters (CPM) made previous conclusions and recommendations. On February 16, 2011, the UHMFS voted to pass items 1, 3, and 4.

We present here our final findings and recommendations for item 2 articulation of authorship convention and item 5 relationship of the external evaluator to faculty applicant.

CPM continued to discuss the challenge of crafting standard authorship and external evaluator statements that would fit all disciplines across the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. We found it to be practically impossible to do, especially after our survey of UHM faculty in September 2010. We found one common theme amongst all of our conversation and deliberations, that the responsibility of defining discipline or field specific authorship conventions lay with the department and college. It is at the departmental personnel committee (DPC) level that nuances of authorship and meaning of order, placement, contribution, and merit are best understood. Therefore, those nuances, if any, should be clear in DPC guidelines.

The same argument can be made of external evaluator criteria. Though a true blind external evaluator is deemed in most cases as preferable, there are disciplines such as Native Hawaiian studies in which all scholars know each other. In some cases, an external evaluator might also not be at a comparable university, but may be
someone of repute at the United States Department of Agriculture or Smithsonian Institution National Museum of Natural History. Those who work on specific research such as the NOAA POES contains a Medium Energy Proton and Electron Detector may have all, at one point or another, written papers together. For that reason, we removed the long list of external evaluator restrictions and replaced it with objectivity language.

In addition to our past meetings with VCAA Dasenbrock and Dr. McCreary, we also invited members of University of Hawaii Professional Assembly (UHPA) to meet with CPM to share any concerns they might have had with the proposed amendments. **CPM members Nguyen and Chesney-Lind along with SEC Liaison Zaleski met with James Kardash, Associate Executive Director of UHPA, on March 4, 2011.** JN Musto stopped in to show his support for the purpose of our meeting, but was unable to stay for discussion. At the meeting, Dr. Kardash thanked CPM for inviting UHPA’s opinion and also thanked us for our work on reviewing the document at hand. We were informed that UHPA goals are like ours, that the very important document had been seen, viewed, reviewed, vetted, and approved by the faculty. We shared our Fall 2010 survey process, talks with VCAA Dasenbrock, and final suggestions on authorship and external evaluator wording. We left with the positive sense that UHPA supports CPM’s suggestions.

**Recommendations**

If our proposed revisions to the authorship and external evaluator language are accepted and incorporated, CPM recommends that we vote to approve all proposed amendments to the *Criteria for Tenure and Promotion of University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Faculty.*

In addition to our suggestions for current proposed revisions to the *Criteria for Tenure and Promotion of University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Faculty,* we strongly suggest the following for all DPCs.

- CPM strongly suggests that any DPCs that have not reviewed and renewed their tenure and promotion guidelines since the approval of the 2009-2015 UHPA contract do so and submit it for approval by their Dean and Chancellor’s Office.

- CPM strongly suggests that DPCs revise their criteria for tenure and promotion to include a STATEMENT REGARDING AUTHORSHIP CONVENTIONS particular to their field. Otherwise, TPRC members may use the same criteria by which they judge the merits of publications of their own disciplines.

- CPM strongly suggests that DPCs revise their criteria for tenure and promotion to include a STATEMENT REGARDING EXTERNAL EVALUATORS particular to their field. Otherwise, TPRC members may use the same criteria by which they judge the external evaluators of their own disciplines.