

Friday, December 3, 2021
SCR201 Task Force – Meeting #9

Members in attendance: Christian Fern, Debbie Halbert, Debi Hartmann, David Lassner, Randy Moore, Ernie Wilson

Administrative Support: Jamie Go

I. Review Draft Report Outline
A. Introduction

It was noted that Chair Moore rewrote the introduction to correspond to recommendations made to date.

Questions were raised about numbers being updated on tables within the document. It was noted that the issues with the tables were related to ensuring ADA compliance which is difficult to do. Deb Halbert stated that this issue has been addressed.

B. Attachment 1

Attachment 1 has been fixed for ADA compliance issues, completed, and posted.

C. Attachment 2

Attachment 2 has been fixed for ADA compliance issues, completed, and posted.

D. Attachment 3

- a. President Lassner will ask campus administrators to gather data for specialist activities
- b. Chair Moore updated attachment 3 with data provided by VP Syrmos.

Additional information on Specialists and their job assignments will be sought but will not be included in the report because it goes beyond what the SRC requests.

Task force members agreed that this would be good information to have for future discussions but that it was not necessary for the report and therefore attachment 3 is completed.

E. Attachment 4

Deb Hartman reported that there were multiple incidences of redundancy contained within attachment 4 since similar information was presented in both a chart and reading/language format. Although the reading/language format has slightly more detail than the chart form, task force members preferred the chart format for its ease of readability.

It was pointed out that the document should be as simple and clear as possible. It was also noted that the comparative analysis between UH and its peer institutions was well done and highlighted the rigors and expectations of the university with respect to tenure regardless of who was seeking tenure.

Deb Hartman will work with Deb Halbert in consolidating attachment 4 into a single format.

F. Attachment 5

Chair Moore reviewed changes made to this attachment since the last task force meeting.

President Lassner noted on typo on page 24 with the term "protection" misspelled as "prototection".

Other than the typographical error, task force members were amenable with attachment 5.

G. Attachment 6

a. Matrix on pp 25-26

Chair Moore reviewed changes made to the document since the last meeting stating that he rewrote the recommendation section. He also asked whether the report should note that tenure practices do not always correspond to policy (eg. Specialists existing at UHH and UHWO).

Discussions occurred on whether it was in the best interest of the university to note inconsistencies in practice versus policy. Perhaps it would be better to frame this issue as a need to institute more robust training for university personnel charged with the responsibility for implementing policies on tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, etc.

Discussion also took place on the value of professional development (PD) and the need to include more PD opportunities, especially for APTs and non-tenured staff. It was suggested that the university should have in-house PD staff particularly since the university is such a large institution. It was also mentioned that while more PD was good, there also needed to be a cultural shift among faculty and staff to want to seek PD.

President Lassner noted that Item 5 in the table on page 27 was inaccurate as not all researcher salaries are paid for with extramural funds (some researchers are paid with general funds). Chair Moore stated that he would amend the sentence to end it at the term instruction and remove language that states “and reserve the R classification for those whose salaries are wholly paid from extramural funds.”.

The next steps to be taken portion of attachment 6 were reviewed as follows:

President Lassner noted that, with respect to the first bullet, he needed to have a discussion with Christian on how to accommodate concerns raised with respect to the termination of consistently underperforming tenured staff.

Discussions ensued on the clarity of the second bullet. Task force members suggested that this bullet be framed in more general terms such as language stating that “a faculty classification system will be developed that is more in line with peer institutions” which would signal that the university is moving away from the multi-faceted classification system currently in place.

Task force members also spoke about the importance of educating legislators and others that reorganizing an institution as large as the university is unlike reorganizing an office. It takes time to complete such a monumental task.

Chair Moore stated that he would work on revising language and send his revisions to the task force members. He also noted that 2 pages of comments were received from the ACCFSC on how tenure can be improved. He would add his comments to those received from the ACCFSC and send that document to task force members as well.

It was also noted that questions were raised about attachments mentioned in the task force notes but not readily available. Chair Moore stated that he would prepare a statement about each attachment to address these questions.

H. Attachment 7

No discussion occurred on attachment 7.

II. Faculty Engagement

- Final report due to Legislature December 30.
 - Consensus was reached at the Nov. 24 meeting that the report submitted to the Legislature by the Task Force will be in final form.
- A. Christian, David, Ernie, and Randy have participated in various meetings with faculty senate groups in mid-November.

No discussion.

- B. Comments from a UHM faculty member regarding classifications and tenure – covered in the report or are management issues, not policy issues.

No discussion.

III. Next Meeting

Friday, December 10, 2021, 11:00 a.m.