

Faculty Senate Forum
Contract Renewal, Tenure, Promotion Dossier
Wednesday, April 15, 2015
2:30-4:00 pm
'Ohi'a 118

Present:

Candy Branson, Ana Bravo, Porscha DelaFuente, Eric Denton, Ibrahim Dik, Susan Dik, Leigh Dooley, Colette Higgins, Shiuling Huang, Grant Itomitsu, Susan Jaworowski, Yoneko Kanaoka, Thomas Keopuhiwa, Dawn Khaafidh, Jaclyn Lindo, Anne Craig Lum, Kristie Malterre, Maiana Minahal, Jeff Nathan, Frank Noji, Veronica Ogata, Sunny Pai, Naresh Pandya, Catherine Primavera, Leon Richards, Lori Sakaguchi, Kawehi Sellers, Tony Silva, Mary Ann Vasaturo, Joanne Whitaker, Dawn Zoni.

Meeting Facilitated by:

- Dawn Khaafidh, Chair, FS Evaluation Committee (2:30-3:00 pm)
- Lori Sakaguchi/Eric Denton, Concierges, C4ward Circle on Contract Renewal/Tenure/Promotion (3:00-4:00 pm)

Notes taken by:

- Kristie Malterre, FS Member-at-Large
-

Dawn K.

- Goal for today's forum – look at the contract renewal, tenure/promotion dossier and process, faculty concerns - what would you like to see in the future?
- Contract renewal guidelines are at the campus level – more flexibility; tenure/promotion process is on the system level.
- Heard about concerns via FS Action Requests submitted:
 - Streamlining of e-Café data - suggested that data go through OFIE.
 - Related to guidelines and revising.
- FS Evaluation Committee submitted proposal to revise contract renewal guidelines in 2009 – email Dawn K. or Leigh D. and will share (signup list for interested faculty to receive the proposed changes to guidelines via email was circulated).
- Request for revisions to contract renewal guidelines document is currently pending at Chancellors office.
- Evaluation Committee cannot guarantee changes, but would like to take note of suggestions for changes.

Anne C.

- Submitted a FS Action Request recommending that OFIE generate same basic data for everyone and individuals can expand on their own if they choose to.
- We're all discussing "highs and lows, how want to improve." These basics would be the same for everyone.
- Seems that process could be streamlined if presentation were the same.

- Thought it would take a little pressure off of faculty members – less “number crunching” - if could be done for us as part of a standardized process.
- Know that CELTT can do some to help us, but as a faculty member, would rather write about students rather than “number crunch.”

Leigh D.

- e-Café – already averages responses.
- Was there an interest/need to group items into a certain factor? E-Café already summarizes data for faculty.

Anne C.

- Would like composite data and assistance in compiling data.

Eric D.

- That might be an e-Café issue.

Dawn K.

- Mary Hattori is on the Evaluation Committee and said that she would be willing to look at current e-Café capabilities for individuals who may be interested in analyzing data this way.

Anne C.

- I think it would be easier for reviewing bodies to look at standardized responses for all faculty applying for contract renewal, tenure, promotion.

Ibrahim D.

- The current guidelines allow for flexibility for faculty members to present their data.
- No one else can aggregate someone else’s data for them – it is up to each faculty member.
- It is our job as faculty to present the way we want to – the way data is aggregated and presented.
- Faculty may want to differentiate by module, course, etc. and not in one standardized way.

Leigh D. & Dawn K.

- If e-Café can offer aggregating as an optional function, may be valuable to look at with CELTT.

Ibrahim D.

- I think we should separate – address contract renewal suggestions and then tenure/promotion differently/separately, since changes to tenure/promotion guidelines need to be done as part of a system.
- We can suggest things and then ask Chancellor to carry to system level.
- Maybe Leigh can share the main proposed changes to the contract renewal process in 2009.

Leigh D.

Summary of recommended changes from 2009:

- Make contract renewal guidelines more similar to tenure/promotion guidelines, so when trying to compile information and apply for tenure/promotion, can be easier, not as time-consuming.
- When on non-tenure track and submitting contract renewal document, then tenure/promotion document – document due dates are within four weeks of each other. Tried to streamline so can write single document in that year to serve as both contract renewal and tenure/promotion document. That might be what is holding recommendations up at Chancellor's level. Also trying to align with the strategic plan that was in effect at that time period.
- For contract renewal, changed suggested page limit to 10 pages per year.

Dawn K.

- If Colette could add some suggested changes to contract renewal process based on what was submitted in 2009, that would be great.

Leigh D.

- Faculty members were polled for feedback collected in 2009 and at least 50 members saw the results.
- We're working off guidelines that were put in place since 2003.

Colette H.

- As a department chair, have not yet seen a contract renewal document submitted that when written had a length of less than 20 pages per year covering.
- In the past, contract renewal was simpler - focus on the four main areas.
- Hard to integrate with current tenure/promotion dossier guidelines/areas. Needs to be more streamlined with tenure/promotion document areas.
- Contract renewals looking more and more like tenure/promotion dossiers, becoming more burdensome. Needs to be shortened and streamlined.

Ibrahim D.

- In the contract renewal document, need to address recommendations received from reviewing bodies – process allows for faculty to realize where they have been and where they are going.
- Size limit for contract renewal or tenure/promotion is definitely an issue – recently there was a three volume (narrative) – with a couple of hundred pages for each volume (not appendix).
- Difficult to describe what faculty do in small number of pages with all that needs to include – it all adds up. At least 10 pages per year is okay.

Colette H.

- Many contract renewals are long – easily 60 pages.

Leigh D.

- Whatever is suggested can only be guidelines, no limits.

Lori S.

- Wondering if faculty members feel they need to write more because there is a need for clearer criteria of what should be included in their document.
- Faculty may be anxious about the process – may be throwing more information in their document.
- Criteria and language for rank criteria could be clearer – we should address with the system, union.

Leigh D.

- Last time that was revised was 1992.
- I've had a 180 degree change in stance on rubrics in the guidelines. When started thinking about this more, had to think, who would write the rubric? Strength now is that several different perspectives are contained in the review process – it's important that have different values and perspectives in the review process.
- If wanted to write a rubric, most likely would want to have this written by the “head” reviewer - would this give the Chancellor too much power in the process?

Ibrahim D.

- Guidelines are vague and broad on purpose – designed to be that way.
- If want to get something changed, can get union and system to change – it's a union issue.
- Faculty members do not want to be restricted due to diversity of faculty.

Eric D.

- A big deal is the rank criteria and how they are written. We can simply create improvements of how rank criteria as currently written.

Lori S.

- It's important to keep loose, but have clear understanding of Rank Classifications – this is different than the tenure/promotion guidelines – we need to be careful to separate out these two different issues.

Tony S.

- On Quill, came across a simplified document (at the beginning of the forms/guidelines section); it's about a page and a half long.

Leigh D.

- Yes, KCC overlays their own guidelines on top of the system guidelines, which is more simplified. We can relook at this.

Ibrahim D.

- We use the same criteria in review/recommendation for contract renewal and tenure/promotion process in the Social Sciences department – only difference with contract renewal is that faculty must include/address recommendations from previous reviewing bodies. This helps faculty to be more prepared when they need to submit for tenure/promotion. As DPC chair, we do it this way as a department.

Lori S.

- The DPCs at Maui College are seen as a support system for faculty applying for contract renewal/tenure/promotion; they help to mentor faculty through the process, help them to identify what kind of activities they should be involved in for growth, recommend things for faculty member to think about, and provide a general support system for faculty members. In this model, the DPC is not a “gate-keeping” body – it’s a softer, gentler approach.

Ibrahim D.

- As DPC members, we should not review a document before it is submitted.

Frank N.

- When we review contract renewal documents, we read with C3 level in mind – make recommendations to the applicant based on this.
- When we write the letter/recommendation, we keep in mind that the applicant is headed for tenure. We look for weaknesses in the document. The chair meets with the applicant and gives them advice for what he/she should be preparing for C3 level.

Colette H.

- As department chair – talk with faculty on contract renewal process, what faculty will work on. At the end of the process, chair meets with faculty again before the dossier goes up to dean for review. There are two “touch points” when can “coach” the faculty member. Don’t help with editing, etc. Do consider contract renewal process a “coaching process” toward tenure/promotion. Any kind of advice, you give with that in mind.

Frank N.

- When contract renewal changed to every other year process, concern was that there will not be as much time for feedback to the applicant before applying for tenure/promotion, need to see/have time for growth.

Lori S.

- Tenure committee – responsibility is to assist faculty member to gain tenure.

Ibrahim D.

- Agree! Always believed that upon hire, each faculty member should be given a committee to help and support them in earning tenure.

Kawehi S.

- Wrote annual contract renewal because was in a non-tenure track position. Did not lose sleep because was preparing self for four years. I advocate yearly contract renewals – formalized process, felt supported throughout the whole four years. May be based on department and the culture. My department did a service – they helped me. I felt completely prepared for my promotion document.

Ibrahim D.

- In the old model, you did four contract renewal documents, then tenure document.
- Current structure does not allow faculty to get needed feedback before applying for tenure.

Colette H.

- When (the change from yearly to every-other-year contract renewal issue) went to union, mainly meant for those in non-tenure track positions, but in actuality, the union put tenure track faculty on the same standard – consequence is less feedback opportunity.

Yoneko K.

- Adding to anxiety – mixed message received by faculty.
- I've only done contract renewal documents, but remember the year started, received guidelines for contract renewal, but different faculty members would pull me aside and say, "this is the real story."
- Helpful advice, but someone else saying, "this is what you really need to do..."
- If you write anything less than 50 pages, the expectation in LLL is that the document should be longer.
- Others saying "nobody wants to read 50 pages...keep it short."
- Document guidelines no longer relevant.
- Luckily have a supportive program – I'm not trying to criticize, because everyone is trying to help, but it is a difficult process as a new faculty member.
- Clearer guidelines will help.

Lori S.

- Training for reviewing bodies is also needed in order to have everyone "on same page."

Frank N.

- On DPC, document was deemed exemplary one year, but not the next. difficult to write critique. On what criteria is something exemplary?

Ibrahim D.

- Look at the criteria – forget the size, except if go beyond what is reasonable to you - do your job well and you should get contract renewal.
- Advice to faculty – do your job, describe what you do while following the guidelines.

Eric D.

- Lori and I talking about the perception that it is perhaps more difficult to get tenure/promotion at KCC than on other campuses.
- Had idea to ask union to give us data.
- So far, we were given half of the data that we need – percent of all faculty who have been granted tenure/promotion over the past 5 years across the UHCC system.

- Incomplete data – we need the total number of faculty who actually applied for tenure/promotion so that we can know how many/what proportion resulted in a negative recommendation/denial.
- Across the UHCCs – average over 5 years = 29% of all faculty have been granted tenure/promotion.
- On individual campus level
 - LCC = 33% (highest)
 - Maui College and HonCC = 27% (two lowest campuses)
 - KacCC = 30% (second highest)
- We need to look at the total number of faculty who applied for tenure/promotion by campus and as a UHCC system and then determine the number/percent of positive and negative recommendations (not looking at the percent of all faculty as a whole).

Ibrahim D.

- Based on serving on TPRCs, KCC is not the hardest in reviewing applicants, other campuses are – they are usually harder on the candidate.

Lori S.

- Need training for DPCs and TPRCs on criteria.

Eric D.

- Positive numbers from union, negative needs to come from individual campuses.

Ibrahim D.

- A “mature” campus will bias the numbers/data as Lori/Eric currently have it (because once at level five, faculty no longer have opportunity/need to apply for tenure/promotion).

Lori S.

- Heard an interesting thought - There is no other business anywhere in the world that would allow faculty to spend hours and hours on self-evaluation.
- Should be a concern to the system that we’re spending so much time on a document – that could come as a detriment to our students.

Ibrahim D.

- I tell faculty in my department – don’t spend all your time on your document, do your job well, describe it using criteria.

Kawehi S.

- It’s important to tell faculty “you cannot do this in a few weeks” – you need to put in the time and spread it out so that students, family, etc. doesn’t suffer. Not sure if people join the C4ward group early enough.

Candy B.

- This will be my first promotion without having to type up every single student comment. This was very time-consuming. The busywork of typing up my data was challenging.

Susan D.

- Page-numbering took a week for me to figure out – time consuming.

Veronica O.

- I'm like Kawehi – I actually enjoy the process of being able to reflect on myself as a professional. As an instructor, how I can be better for my students?
- You have to take what works best for you as a person.
- If we go in a positive mode for self-reflection and to be better professionals for our students, that would be better.
- It's not about the number of pages – if you believe you're putting forth a document that reflects you, then submit. If you don't feel sure of this, then don't submit.
- Move forward with the thought that you want to do it for your students, for yourself, for the college.
- When I look at faculty, I see that we're awesome people – share your awesomeness with others.
- With TPRC- people need to know who you are. If you're not out of your office sharing your mana'o, people won't get to know you. You should get to know your campus and your discipline across the system so that we know who each other are. If someone in my discipline doesn't know me, it means I didn't do my job in building bridges and establishing relationships.
- We as colleagues should be supporting each other every step of the way. We can be our biggest enemies or biggest supporters.
- My hope is that everyone can appreciate and enjoy the process.
- Today, you are here sharing your voices and experiences - our job as FS Forum is to help make it better for you.

Kawehi S.

- Write a little bit at a time, reflect, let the process work for you.

Veronica O.

- What can we do as a Senate to help makes things better at the college level? What is under our control and not the union?
- Will put up notes from today onto the FS website.
- If you have any feedback, send it to the Faculty Senate Executive Team.
- We will try to move forward in the Senate via your FS reps.
- Today's discussions may be one of several in a series – will need to have continued discussions.
- If you have any other ideas, please let us know.

Yoneko K.

- Regarding timeline
 - For those going up for tenure/promotion in October, at this time, no changes to the guidelines - are they only pending for now?

Veronica O.

- We can move forward more quickly with the contract renewal guideline changes, but not the tenure/promotion guidelines, because that is part of a system discussion.

Ibrahim D.

- Maybe we can change system-wide the Rank Criteria for tenure/promotion. If we can collect information, summarize, give to administration to submit, maybe can move forward.

Chancellor Richards

- Need dialogue with university on that language. UH system hopes to refine as well.