

Tenure Task Force  
October 29, 2021  
Meeting #4

Present:

Kendra Oishi  
Debora Halbert  
Debi Hartmann  
Ernie Wilson  
Vassilis Syrmos  
Randolph Moore  
David Lassner  
Christian Fern

The meeting began with a discussion of the attachments under development for the report. Data acquired between the last meeting and this one was reviewed and included.

The conversation considered how to identify data related to peer institutions and what is available. SCR 201 requests information on the percentage of faculty in various classifications that are tenure/tenure track, for UH compared to its peers. AAUP and IPEDS have information in aggregate on tenure track faculty versus non-tenure track. However, because UH's classification scheme is not replicated anywhere else, the comparison is difficult if not impossible. If we can compare Instructional faculty percentages with peers we are in the same ballpark. We can say that out of our instructional workforce at Mānoa, AAUP reports a 55% tenure/tenure track rate and UHM is 50%. Please note that AAUP reports only for what UH calls "I" faculty – if considered for UHM overall and all classifications our tenure numbers are higher. Thus, we look at least somewhat similar to available national data despite the fact we cannot compare faculty across the multiple classifications. VP Syrmos will draft a reply to this part of the SCR.

We then looked at the SCR 201 request for "an explanation on the reasonableness, necessity, and feasibility" of UH's composition. The analysis that will be developed for percentages of faculty on tenure/tenure track will help answer this question. However, it was emphasized that UH must be clear that for the purposes of comparison, our peers and benchmarks do not distinguish between Researchers and Instructional faculty and so for them Faculty include *both* research and instruction. Our bifurcated classification system creates the perception that Instructional faculty do less research and Research faculty don't teach. Both are inaccurate statements. Our narrative response will need to include the fact that R faculty do instruction and Instructional faculty are actively engaged in research.

When it comes to Specialists, it is a challenge to develop any sort of description of what their jobs include because these positions are often so specific to the individual and to the unit. Generalizable data is not currently available for Specialists so the TF again discussed how we might get such information. It was noted that even without the SCR, there are advantages to understanding better the full scope of Specialist positions because some mirror Instructional faculty, some are required to complete teaching, scholarship, and research as if they were an Instructional faculty despite being hired to do a specific task in addition to the typical

requirements of an I faculty member. It may be possible to use “instructor of record” information from Banner to identify Specialists who are teaching, assuming they are listed as the primary instructor. The Task Force determined it might want to ask the CCs to survey the work of their non-instructional faculty as well, since many perform duties similar to Specialist faculty at the university campuses.

**David Lassner, Debbie Halbert and Vassilis Syrmos will craft an instrument and send it to supervisors to identify how Specialists are used. It may include the following inquiry regarding Specialist workload:**

Activity	Percent of time spent
Instruction – classroom instructor of record	
Research	
Student support	
Academic support	
Administrative support	
	100%

Information about UH tenure policies across the system was provided for inclusion in Appendix 4 of the SRC. We need to include the tenure policies for the four UH units in a format similar to those used for the benchmark and peer institutions. Questions: Can we describe any differences between the UH tenure system for instructional faculty and UH tenure system for researchers and non-instructional faculty?

Attachment 6 focuses on proposed amendments to UH’s tenure system and compensation structure for Researchers and other non-instructional faculty identified by the Task Force as the heart of the report. The task force wants to continue to collect data before suggesting any amendments. UHPA is reviewing the “whereas” clauses in the SCR and has not completed its analysis. The TF noted that in reality, Manoa (and other UH campuses) do not have significant problems with tenure as a system. Everyone acknowledged that improvements to the processes would be welcomed, but the root challenge is UH’s idiosyncratic classification system and how it is currently implemented.