Report from Committee on Professional Matters
University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Faculty Senate
October 19, 2010

Regarding Proposed Amendments to
Criteria for Tenure and Promotion of University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Faculty

In Spring 2010, proposed amendments to the Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Guidelines were presented to the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Faculty Senate (UHMFS) by Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) Reed Dasenbrock. After review and considered by the Committee on Professional Matters (CPM), the full Senate was unable to fully consider CPM’s comments and recommendation on the proposed amendments on May 5, 2010. It was tabled until September 2010.

On July 28, 2010, VCAA Dasenbrock asked the UHMFS Executive Committee to pull the aforementioned Criteria and Guidelines and consider a new draft. CPM received the new draft on August 27, 2010. In consideration that CPM consists of only nine members and was not represented by all college and units, we decided to design a survey and disseminate it online.

UHM Faculty Survey
The survey was open and available to UHM faculty from September 15, 2010 to October 11, 2010 at http:// surveymonkey.com/s/amendments_tandp. A printed copy of the survey can be seen in Appendix A.

Three notices were sent to UHMFS Senators to ask their colleges and units to respond. The dates of the reminders were September 18, 2010, September 28, 2010, and October 7, 2010. It is not known how many of those were forwarded on to respective Senator’s faculty. CPM also contact JN Musto of UHPA for some clarifications on September 15, 2010.

The five proposed amendments were regarding
1. delegated authority for approving waivers (p.4)
2. articulation of authorship conventions (p.7-9)
3. associate professor tenure and promotion language (p.10-11)
4. Deans' authority to consider dossier after TPRC assessment (p.15)
5. relationship of external evaluator to faculty applicant (p.19)

The following is a not a comprehensive analysis of responses to the proposed amendments to the Criteria for Tenure and Promotion. Rather, it is presented as a summary to promote further discussion about this critical document.

Respondents
After one month, 125 faculty members provided responses to the survey. The breakdown of faculty types can be seen in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Librarian (B)</th>
<th>Professor (I)</th>
<th>Librarian (L)</th>
<th>Medicine (M)</th>
<th>Research (R)</th>
<th>Specialist (S)</th>
<th>Law (J)</th>
<th>Extension Agent (A)</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses regarding delegated authority for approving waivers (p.4)
Generally, faculty did not object to the wording change here. Some concerns shared included the passive voice construction of the statement; the suggestion to make it only Dean/Director approval; concerns about the time lag when the Chancellor is consulted; and the suggestion to use “terminal degree” rather than Ph.D. as many disciplines have other types of terminal degrees.

Responses regarding articulation of authorship conventions (p.7-9)
Generally, faculty were divided in their opinion about the wording change here. Some concerns shared included precise statements of proportion being inaccurate; that departments should include a specific statement addressing this area because one statement cannot be used for all; a semicolon insertion after disciplines, and; expansion of the definition of publications to include works like exhibitions, films, projects, designs, experiments, etc.,

Responses regarding associate professor and researcher tenure and promotion language (p.10-11)
Generally, faculty did not object to the wording change here. Some concerns shared included statements that many faculty who do not have specific teaching duties or are not paid to teach and should not be expected to demonstrate a mature level of performance as a teacher; that “well on the way” is too vague; “well on the way” should be established scholar at this level; comparison group no longer has a reference to peer group.

Responses regarding Deans’ authority to consider dossier after TPRC assessment (p.15)
Generally, faculty were opposed to this change in language. The proposed change reads as if the Dean has the authority to comment again after TPRC review.

Responses regarding relationship of external evaluator to faculty applicant (p.19)
Generally, faculty were opposed to the language as stated and made many recommendation for modifications. Common themes amongst the modification included acknowledging that some external WILL know the candidate so should not be excluded because of the specificity of the field; that external reviewers be sought from institutions outside of academia; that external review NOT be allowed from outside of academia because those should be letters of support, not review; that eliminating all UH System external reviewers places a hardship on extension agents, specialists, etc (esp at lower ranks), whose primary work may be service to the UH community, and; that there is no rationale for broadening exclusion from UHM to the entire UH system.

CPM Discussion
Last year, CPM made two recommendations. First, we added the words “personal or professional” before the word relationship to the external review language. Second, we inserted the word “should” to the sentence “Departments should seek external evaluations of each applicant’s work.”
CPM did not make any other additions or modification. All other modifications are from the VCAA’s office and rationale’s were sought or need to still be provided for each. CPM’s stance is that each change to this critical document requires rationale.

**Asst to Assc Instructional and Research Faculty language**

“well on their way”

When asked, about this phrase, VCAA Dasenbrock explained that it came directly from other official language. He indicated that sentiment came from a Director who stated that it takes years for a book to be published, so someone going from assistant to associate is NOT yet considered well established. And, the language only applies to I and R faculty.

**Authorship conventions**

- Need rationale for the changes from VCAA.
- Encourage the departmental faculty to review the DPC guidelines pertaining to authorship conventions, if applicable, to their discipline.

A recommended paragraph from CPM is as follows: Collaborative research and joint and shared publications may be the norm in some fields or disciplines. The candidate's departmental faculty are encouraged to review the DPC guidelines pertaining to authorship conventions, if applicable, to their discipline. Where department guidelines do not include a discussion of authorship conventions – including the significance of authorship order – the applicant...

**Dean’s authority to “consider”**

CPM is strongly against the phrase “...and provide an additional assessment as warranted.” We suggested using language directly from the contract language on page 24 of 2009-2015 UHPA Contract. “At UH-Manoa, the TPRC shall review the dossier and make a recommendation, then return it to the Dean/Director for consideration and transmission to the Chancellor.”

- “Consideration” needs to be defined. Is not for action, but for review only. This is not an opportunity for the Dean to reassess the dossier.
- TPRC is supposed to be the neutral ground and where the democratic process occurs.

**External Reviewers**

CPM reconsidered VCAA’s suggestion to remove people examples “…co-author…and others” and keep “who may reduce objectivity.” We agree with that suggestion. We also recommend and earlier timeline for external reviewers; more time to review may contribute to greater chance of people agreeing to review. Perhaps external reviews can be contacted in the early spring rather than fall. We agree with the VCAA that the point of external reviewers is to acquire objective review letters, not support/fan letters. CPM would like the VCAA to pull together some language from other peer institutions.

**Conclusions and Recommendation**

*The Committee on Professional Matters does not recommend that UHMFS support the revisions as proposed.* Below, we articulate each of our recommendations.

<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>The five proposed amendments were regarding</td>
<td>CPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</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>