I. Introduction

The UHH Faculty Congress Academic Policy Committee (APC) has been working to identify the problems and concerns of our academic community regarding the Tenure and Promotion process.

The Chair had discussions with a number of faculty, DPC members, Division Chairs, TPRC members, and the Deans of the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business and Economics, College of Agriculture, Forestry and Natural Resources Management, College of Continuing Education, and College of Pharmacy. The APC also received a number of electronic communications from faculty expressing their concerns and providing suggestions. The Committee met regularly and carefully reviewed them all. After a broad study of the current situation, we identified a number of issues at all levels of the process that should be addressed.

The APC reviewed three documents:

2003-2009 Contract Articles Relating to Tenure and Promotion


It became clear that due to the urgency and complexity of the existing problems, there needs to be several stages in the modification process, in order to ensure meaningful improvements at all levels. For example, the Academic Policy Committee Application still needs to address guidelines and classification issues for non-teaching faculty (librarians & specialist).

The members of the APC prioritized these issues with regard to urgency. Suggestions and recommendations on all other issues have also been made, although we understand that given more time and resources further issues could be addressed and more improvements could be made.

II. Urgent issues

This year’s evaluation process has already begun, so, candidates for Contract Renewal and T&P have submitted their dossiers and committees have begun their review processes. The APC reminds the Congress that the following rules are in the present 2003-2009 Contract Articles Relating to Tenure and Promotion (the text in bold emphasizes on the issues that are of highest concern for UHH faculty to be strictly followed):

Article X, Section A of the current contract:

Each Department or Division, or comparable unit within the University, shall reduce its committee procedures on tenure, promotion and contract renewal to writing. If such procedures have not been written and approved within six months of the execution of this Agreement, the Employer shall develop such procedures for the Department or Division.

Article X, Section B:

Written Department or Division Personnel Committee (DPC) procedures shall at a minimum provide for:

a) secret ballot voting at all final votes;

b) strict exclusion from voting for any individual who is not a tenured bargaining unit member over the tenure or contract renewal of another faculty member;
c) allowing only faculty of equal or higher rank to vote on applications for promotion.

d) procedures for the orderly review of dossiers at the department or division level

Non-tenure track bargaining members may participate in the establishing of DPC policies and procedures, and they may also take part in the discussions of the Personnel Committee if the Department or Division has voted to include these faculty Members in such deliberations.

Article X, Section C:

Written DPC procedures shall be submitted through the Dean or Director to the appropriate Chancellor and the union for approval.

III. Related APC Recommendations to the Congress

Regarding the CR and T&P guidelines that the Programs/Departments are now working on, the APC advises the Congress of the following:

1. Once these guidelines are proposed they must be discussed and accepted by the Department (based on Article X, scn. B)

2. Each Program/Department should determine whether discussion and approval of the guidelines will be restricted to tenured faculty, or will include all faculty members (based on Article X, scn. B)

3. Once the Program/Departments have their guidelines finalized and accepted, they should be submitted to the Dean, to the VCAA and the union for approval (according to Article X, scn. C)

4. Once the guidelines are approved by all levels they should be provided to the faculty of the Program/Department/Division.

5. A copy of the guidelines will be given to each faculty applying for a CR or T&P (article XII, scn F addresses the applicants for tenure: Guidelines for filling out and processing tenure application shall be established by the Employer, Criteria shall be in writing and shall be distributed in the guidelines and procedures provided to the applicant along with the tenure application forms and shall be the basis on which judgment for consideration of tenure shall be made on all levels of the review process.

6. A copy of the Program/Department guidelines will be made available at the Dean’s office.
7. The review committees must be able to obtain a copy of these guidelines for each candidate whose dossier they review.

8. APC recommends that the candidates be encouraged to include a copy of their Department/Division guidelines in their personal dossier.

9. Regarding faculty with joint appointment, the APC recommends that the guidelines to be followed be made clear at the time of hire.

IV. Faculty Identified Main Areas of Concerns (ordered by the level of significance for the faculty)

Faculty Survey - February, 2008

1. Do you support having broad requirements for T&P that could further clarified internally by the individual colleges to meet their unique missions? Yes - 85.5%

2. The current level of departmental input into the T&P process is unsatisfactory - 75.9%

3. Personnel Committee decisions are inconsistent from one year to the next - 74.5%

4. Requirements for meeting T&P criteria are unclear - 71%

5. Personnel Committee decisions are inconsistent with published T&P guidelines criteria - 68%

6. The current value placed on service in the T&P process is unsatisfactory - 61%

7. Would you support changing the definition of “DPC” in the UHH review process form “Division Personnel Committee” to “Department Personnel Committee” and “DC” from “Division Chair” to “Department Chair”? Yes - 60%

8. The current value placed on scholarly activities in the T&P process is unsatisfactory - 55%

9. Selection of TPRC is unsatisfactory 54.1%

V. APC observations, findings, comments, and recommendations to the Congress regarding the 2008 Faculty Survey results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Identified Main Concerns</th>
<th>APC Findings, Observations and Comments</th>
<th>APC Recommendations to the Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you support having broad requirements for T&amp;P that could further clarified internally by the individual colleges to meet their unique missions? Yes - 85.5%</td>
<td>Colleges, divisions and departments are already working on their individual guidelines. The following units have their drafts: CAS Humanities Political Science. CAFNRM Note: These are the units that had come to at least a draft stage of their guidelines and had provided APC with copies of their drafts.</td>
<td>To have the draft guidelines of each unit provided for discussion and approval of all members of the unit. Once the guidelines have been approved by the unit to submit them to the Dean (The Employer) To clarify what is the process following submission of the approved guidelines to the Dean. To recommend to elect/appoint an appropriate academic body to review the submitted individual guidelines and ensure that they are consistent across the colleges and the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The current level of departmental input into the T&amp;P process is unsatisfactory - 75.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>To encourage the units to have a departmental input component required in their guidelines. To have such a requirement in the university T&amp;P document (also see later recommendations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personnel Committee decisions are inconsistent from one year to the next - 74.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>To provide guidelines for DPC. To have DPC chairs and at least one member of the DPC to serve for (at least) two consecutive years to ensure consistency and continuity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Requirements for meeting T&amp;P criteria are unclear - 71%</td>
<td>The individual units’ guidelines will provide clear and detailed guidelines for their faculty. APC is in process of reviewing the UHH document. Some suggestions to improve the document have been made (later in this document). Further consideration will be needed.</td>
<td>Recommendations: To provide assistance to the VCAA’s office in making corresponding changes in the UHH document posted on the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5. Personnel Committee decisions are inconsistent with published T&P guidelines criteria - 68% | Confirmed by faculty and number of former DPC members in personal discussions with APC Chair /members | Once the UHH document has been improved and the individual units’ guidelines agreed upon and accepted, the T&P review committees at all levels must consider those criteria when making their final decisions.

To ensure that each member of the review committees at all levels is expected to be able to justify their votes based on the requirements provided by the candidate’s unite. |

| 6. The current value placed on service in the T&P process is unsatisfactory - 61% | Confirmed by faculty, acting DCs and former DPC members in personal discussions with APC Chair | See APC suggestions later in this document |

| 7. Would you support changing the definition of “DPC” in the UHH review process from “Division PC” to ” Department PC” and “DC” from “Division Chair” to “Department Chair”? Yes- 60% | Confirmed by faculty in discussions with APC members | To encourage the departments to create their own DPC (as of now only few departments have not enough (6) full-time faculty members to do so). See further APC suggestions later in this document.

To give the candidates for T&P an option to submit their dossiers to the Division PC (instead of the Department DC) if they so prefer

See more on the Department and/or Division PC later in this document |
8. The current value placed on scholarly activities in the T&P process is unsatisfactory - 55%

Confirmed by faculty in email and in-person discussions with the APC Chair

See APC suggestions later in this document

9. Selection of TPRC is unsatisfactory 54.1%

Confirmed by number of faculty in confidential discussions with APC and APC Chair

The APC recommends that a discussion be open to clarify the mandate of TPRC

VI. Additional issues with the existing T&P document at UHH (marked in bold).

p.6, The following table summarizes the review process for untenured faculty hired as Professors beginning in the 2007-2008 academic year and applying for promotion and tenure during the second year.

Recommendation: Cancel “promotion and” as unnecessary in this case

p.7. The application and dossier are initially submitted to the DPC. The DPC can be a Departmental Personnel Committee or Division Personnel Committee depending and the size of the department...

Recommendation: Cancel “and”, replace it by “on”.

To suggest adding the following (or similar) more specific examples of different activities or outcomes that might be appropriate as evidence of academic achievements in the three areas of endeavor.

It will be up the individual faculty to decide which of these activities will best suit their academic strengths and talent, and allow them to make the most significant contributions.

Teaching

- Excellence in Teaching Awards –local, regional, national
- Appointments to serve as judge of the teaching work of others (NSF panels, others)
- Teaching related proposals submitted
- Teaching related grant received
- Invited teaching related presentations
- Involvement in establishing and/or development of new programs for teaching at college, or department level
- Peer evaluations
• Teaching Portfolio including:
  Teaching evals (as just one part of the teaching portfolio)
  Teaching Philosophy
  Development of new institutional programs and/or materials
  Developing of new teaching methods, techniques
  Development/ teaching of new courses
  Involvement in curriculum development
  High quality teaching materials (syllabi, supplementary materials, graded work)
  Student work (projects, papers)

• Impact on students as a teacher and as a mentor
• Evidence of student achievements (awards, national competitions, grad schools, scholarships)
• Participation in Faculty Development professional events
• Participation in professional meetings for educators (presentations, publications)
• Appointments to review textbook from major publishing companies

Research

• Awards for research - local, regional, national, international
• Best research paper awards, honors in professional societies
• Research related books (or chapters in book)
• Research appointments in prestigious research institutions—national, international
• Appointments to serve as judge of the research work of other (NSF panels, others)
• Research proposal submitted
• Research grants received
• Invited research presentations
• Research Book reviews
• Creation/Development of new products related to the faculty area of expertise (arts, computer software, performances in juried exhibitions)
• Publications in refereed journals
• External reviews from recognized experts in faculty’s field of expertise
• Evidence of influential work (such as Impact factor or equivalent objective evaluation of the quality of work (art)
• Citation Index or equivalent objective indication of the significance of the work (impact on others in the field)
• Invited consultant reports
• Graduate students supervised
• Student success: student research publications, research presentations, demonstrations at professional meeting

Service

• Department- level of involvement, duties and responsibilities (f.i. a member of a Departmental search committee vs Chair of a search committee etc)
- College - level of involvement, duties and responsibilities (f.i. Senate member vs. Senate Chair)
- University - level of involvement, duties and responsibilities (f.i. Congress member vs. Congress Committee Chair)
- National Academic Community
- International Academic Community
- Leadership role in faculty service
- Leadership in professional organizations
- Referee for National/International Professional Societies
- Referee for professional journals
- Professional consultant for other institutions

Recommendation: Add appropriate text that requires accountability of everybody involved at any level of the review process

Recommendation: Review sections “Duties and Responsibilities” for each rank, provide more detailed list of expectations

Recommendation: Review “Duties and Responsibilities” for Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor.

Recommendation: Add “Service to the local community” under Service

In the existing document the “Duties and Responsibilities” for Assistant Professor and Associate Professor are identical.

The “Duties and Responsibilities” for Associate Professor and Professor are almost identical. The only differences is the duty and responsibility of a Professor to “exhibit professional and academic leadership”

In the “Minimum Qualifications” section for both Associate Professor and Professor, scn. 4 it says:

High quality contribution in at least one of the following areas and demonstrated competence in the other or some equivalent combination of contributions:
   A) Scholarly contributions and/or creative contributions in the individual’s field appropriate for the rank and the standards of the specific campus.

Nothing says what is considered “appropriate for the rank”, nor what are “the standards of the campus”.

Related recommendations:

1. Distinguish the Duties and Responsibilities for Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Full Professor reflecting the difference between the ranks.
2. Provide specific instructions for the Minimum qualifications of each rank, such as what is “Scholarly contributions and/or creative contributions” that are appropriate for the rank.

As it is well-known in the academic world, promotion to Associate Professor and to Full Professor require different standards. In general, promotion to Associate Professor requires a significant accomplishment on local/national level and demonstrated potential of the attainment of a distinctive academic reputation in the field, whereas, promotion to Full Professor requires evidence of influential work and significant contributions to the academic field, as well as indisputable evidence of distinctive academic reputation.

3. Provide instructions regarding the academic standards of the campus.

4. Provide clear and detailed specific instructions in both sections “Instructions for Preparing the contract Renewal Dossier:” and “Instructions for Preparing the Tenure and Promotion Dossier”

VII. APC identified additional issues with the existing T&P process in the UHPA-UH Contract

Article X, Scn. B:

Department or Division Chairs, and other bargaining unit members serving in similar capacities such as those with title director, shall not participate by voice, vote, presence, or in any other form of communication in the deliberations of the DPC over individual tenure and promotion application.

VIII. Issues related to the BOR Policies

APC found a number of instructions in the UHH T&P document that are not in synchrony with the BOR Policies and vice versa, some of the BOR policies do not necessarily match the practices at UHH.

The following example has been brought to our attention: In the BOR Policies document, Article IX, Personnel, http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/borpch9.pdf it says that one of the Minimum qualifications for Professor is:

“A minimum of five years of full-time college or university teaching at the rank of associate professor or higher.”
If strictly followed, this requirement would mean that a faculty member who is awarded promotion to Associate and takes a sabbatical (which is usually the case) might not be considered eligible for promotion to Professor without teaching an addition semester or year after 5 years in the rank of Associate.

Note: The corresponding minimum qualification requirement for a professor at UH Manoa is “A minimum of five years of full-time college or university teaching at the rank of associate professor or higher”.

Recommendation:

To recommend to BOR to change the 5 years requirement for UHH to “A minimum of four years of full-time college or university teaching at the rank of associate professor or higher”.

In the BOR Policies among other minimum qualifications for Associate Professor at UH Manoa is: “ability to serve as a role model for students and junior colleagues; poise and good address for meeting and conferring with others”.

The corresponding minimum requirement for Professor at UH Manoa is: “demonstrated capacity for leadership in the department and scholarly discipline; poise and good address for meeting and conferring with others”.

Based on numerous concerns and shared disappointments regarding professional and personal ethical issues by UH faculty and their strong desire such issues to be properly addressed, the APC finds it appropriate to make the following

Recommendation:

In the corresponding requirements for Associate Professor and Professor at UH Hilo to be included a text that addresses the high personal moral and professional ethics.

IX. Further APC recommendations to the Congress

One of the major concerns of the UHH faculty has been already addressed by having departments/divisions/colleges create their own guidance for the T&P.

In addition to the recommendations made previously, the APC found appropriate to make the following recommendations to the Congress:

1. To create/elect/appoint a faculty academic body (could be called Faculty Academic Council) that will:

   • Review all individual units’ guidelines and ensure consistency in academic standards, with the college guidelines and from unit to unit
(provided that the employer has already included in the guidelines a text clarifying “the academic standards of the campus”, as previously recommended)

(APC is aware that some units have already prepared drafts that have some inconsistency with the university policies)

2. To ensure that all changes made to the UHH guidelines are made at least six months prior to beginning of the T&P process in the fall. If changes are made in a later time, they should be applied for the next T&P cycle.

Note: In the 2003 - 2009 Agreement between the University of Hawaii Professional Assembly and the Board of Regents of the University of Hawaii, Article XIV. Promotion, it says:

B. PROCEDURES FOR RECOMMENDING PROMOTION

(2). Should there be a substantial change in the promotion criteria in the year of application, the candidate shall have the option of being considered under the criteria contained in the guidelines distributed in the preceding year.

3. To ensure objective evaluation and accountability of the reviewers at each level of the review process

4. To consider an alternative of the existing situation if/when the TPRC decision is dispute, the dossier goes back to the same TPRC)

In the UHH document the Employer provides a choice of one of the two tracks for Promotion to Full Professor

- Outstanding Teaching and Research, competence in service
- Outstanding Teaching and Service, competence in research

5. Recommendation: To have the Employer define “competence in research” and “competence in service”

6. Based on reports from faculty, some Department chairs and some Division Personnel Committee members APC recommends to the UHH document to be added a text addressing “Collegiality and Team Work” as a requirement for contract renewal as well as for T&P. This issue could be addressed as follows:

- Dept provides comments
- The candidate makes his/her case.
- If information is not provided, this is already information for the reviewers
7. In addition to the previous recommendations APC specifically encourages creating a mechanism that will ensure that the T&P process is **fair, professional, and respectful**

- Have guidelines developed not only for the faculty applying for T&P, but also guidelines for DPC members, DC, and TPRC members

- Once such guidelines are created and agreed upon, have all levels of the review process follow these guidance DPC, DC, DEANS, TPRC

- Make sure there is continuity and consistence from year to year; from DPC to DPC and from TPRC to TPRC

8. APC also finds that it will be very helpful to create a mechanism and/or a corresponding faculty body that will see to providing assistance to everybody involved in the process:

- Workshops and mentoring for junior faculty by well respected senior faculty on how to prepare their dossiers, how to best present their accomplishments

- Preliminary meetings (before the review process has started) of the DPCs with experienced former DPC members to establish unified standards, ensure consistency, share experience and discuss best practices

- Meeting among all the TPRC members before the TPRCs start their review process to help new TPRC members get on board, discuss the common standards with previous TPRC to ensure consistency and continuity