

Tenure Task Force  
10/22/21  
Meeting #3

Present:

Christian Fern  
Debi Hartmann  
Randolph Moore  
Vassilis Syrmos  
Kendra Oishi  
Ernie Wilson

This meeting focused on the necessary data to respond to the SCR request.

It was noted that the resolution requires some data not normally collected but that this effort can help us better understand our own processes and may highlight issues we will need to address that had not been identified before. For example, accessing data related to tenure and tenure track faculty in non-instructional categories for peer institutions will not be possible because they do not classify faculty in the same way. The same is true for sources of funding for faculty salaries from peer institutions.

Faculty specialists remain a challenging category because of the range of different job descriptions included in the category. During this meeting the TF also discussed what kinds of faculty positions are actually in policy and where they can be hired. And the history of why some of the classifications were created was considered in the context of relevant HLRB decisions. It may be useful to do additional investigation into how specialists are divided by type of work assigned. It was noted that generally there appear to be four categories into which the percentage of workload for specialists fall: classroom, research, student support, and academic support. To acquire data on Specialists, supervisors will have to be surveyed because there is no consistency across this category. There are non-instructional CC faculty as well and so identifying their job descriptions will also be relevant.

It was also noted that identifying classroom instructors who are classified as either R or S should be possible using the instructor of record in Banner. IRAPO will be asked to identify these numbers.

In terms of percentages of a position by the source of funding, VP Syrmos will get data for the last fiscal year and summer. For sources of financing for peer institutions, the best available information will be policy related, not specific funding divisions. One policy measure is the course buy-out process for peer and benchmarks and the cost of such a buy-out.

It was decided that any proposed recommendations will wait until after the data has been gathered and discussed, as well as after initial faculty input is received. The TF will attempt to identify ideas that can improve UH other than just no change at all.