

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI‘I SYSTEM REPORT



REPORT TO THE 2020 LEGISLATURE

Report on University of Hawai'i Faculty Classification Review

SR 149 SD1 (2019)

December 2019

REPORT TO THE 2020 LEGISLATURE

Review of the UH faculty classification

Pursuant to SR 149 SD1, 2019, the University of Hawai'i respectfully submits its report on the review of the University's faculty classification to ensure greater alignment with the mission and purpose of the university. In addition to the classification of faculty, the resolution also requested a review of teaching equivalencies to determine "what is proper, reasonable, and fair" for the equivalencies "to be consistent with and in furtherance of the mission of the university unit and program." Further, the resolution called on the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa to incorporate into its strategic plan the membership indicators of the Association of American Universities. The resolution asked that the university consult with the University of Hawai'i Professional Association, the exclusive bargaining agent for university faculty, in the review of these matters and that it make comparisons with the practices at similar universities.

Faculty Classification

The university established a working group composed of the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy, the Provost/Vice Chancellors of the three four-year campuses and the executive director of the University of Hawai'i Professional Association to review the faculty classification system in use at these campuses. We did not include representation from the University of Hawai'i Community Colleges because they utilize a classification scheme that recognizes only a single category of "faculty".

Board of Regents Policy 9.202 recognizes 11 general categories of faculty that may be used¹. Executive policy 5.221 identifies the specific categories to be used at the three four-year campuses. There are four ranks, indicating levels of advancement within categories. This policy also identifies the duties, responsibilities and minimum qualifications for faculty in each category as well as rank for non-compensated faculty. Most of the categories are established for the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, while only a single category, with several ranks, is established for the University of Hawai'i at Hilo, University of Hawai'i at West O'ahu and the University of Hawai'i Community Colleges. Over the years, additional categories, borrowed from the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa scheme, have been introduced in practice at UH Hilo and UH West O'ahu. Faculty in each category may receive either 9- or 11-month appointments.

The working group has examined the faculty classifications at the peer and benchmark universities for the three 4-year campuses (UHM: 9 peer and 9 benchmark campuses; UH Hilo: 16 peer institutions; UH West O'ahu: 8 peer institutions). These are the institutions each 4-year campus uses to compare their performance against. None of the peer or benchmark institutions have a faculty classification system as elaborate as UH. In general, 15 of the 18 peer and benchmark institutions for UH Mānoa only provide tenure for faculty in the

¹ Instructional, Law, Medicine, Researcher, Specialist, Librarian, Agents, GA, Lecturer, Clinical Professor, Affiliate (non-comp).

instructional category (Instructor, Assistant, Associate and Full Professor), The remaining three include librarians in their tenure track faculty classification and one also includes extension agents and specialists. Eight of the 16 peers for UH Hilo only recognize categories of faculty in the strict sense while the remaining eight also include categories for librarians, extension agents, counselors or researchers. All eight of UH West O'ahu's peers only recognize faculty categories in the strict sense. Many peer and benchmark schools recognize the possibility of summer appointments, but the characteristics of these appointments differ. For each set of peers/benchmark institutions, categories UH lists under "faculty" are recognized, but they are either not tenure-eligible (e.g., research faculty) or are in separate classifications (e.g., librarians, student affairs specialists).

The working group is preparing a concept paper that will propose an alternative classification for faculty at the University of Hawai'i that is more consistent with the practice at our comparison institutions. A draft concept paper will be shared with faculty and Regents for consultation before drafting new policies.

Teaching Equivalencies

A working group was established by the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy and the Provost of the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa to examine how units report faculty work. Working with the Institutional Research, Analysis, and Planning Office (IRAPO) and several pilot colleges, we developed and tested a common template for recording the various forms of faculty assignments. In addition, IRAPO called together the campus course schedulers from all ten campuses to establish standard reporting formats for types of teaching situations where we noticed variation across campuses. Both tasks have been completed and we are prepared to standardize faculty work reporting across the 4-year campuses.

The next part of our examination of teaching equivalencies entails developing a standard model of faculty work that can be used to accurately describe the work they do. At the time we began this part of our examination, we received a class grievance from the University of Hawai'i Professional Association requesting that we work with them to establish such a standard model. We have had several hearings with the union on this grievance and we believe this process will lead us to a standard model each side can accept.

Incorporation of Membership Indicators of the Association of American Universities in the University of Mānoa Strategic Plan

The University of Hawai'i at Mānoa's draft strategic plan includes performance metrics that reflect membership indicators of the Association of American Universities. The draft states that UH Mānoa will measure

“The impact/quality of research and scholarship using multiple indicators including:

- Extramural awards and expenditures

- Refereed publications
- Citations
- Faculty honors, awards, distinctions
- Number of undergraduate students engaged in faculty mentored research
- Existing technology transfer metrics

Data for these indicators may be gathered on a unit-by-unit basis in order to help guide investments and assess performance. Ideally, such performance assessments would be driven by peer comparisons in order to remove the influence of external factors (positive and negative) such as Federal funding levels, as well as variations in benchmarks across disciplines.”