Contract Renewal and Tenure/Promotion Guidelines

Last year the Faculty Senate tasked its Evaluations Committee to study the alignment between the Contract Renewal Guidelines and the Tenure/Promotion Guidelines. As you know, this Fall several faculty were surprised by the requirement of having to complete both processes within a very short period. The Senate appreciates your compassion in granting extensions to these individuals for their Contract Renewal Dossiers, a campus deadline. Since the Tenure/Promotion process is system-wide and not within the control of our campus, the Senate recommends that our campus align our Contract Renewal Process with the Tenure/Promotion process so that affected individuals do not have to document the same activities/skills in two different formats. We believe that the process can be streamlined into a less traumatic set of events. The Senate recommends that:

1. The Contract Renewal Document should require the applicant to describe their teaching philosophy as in the Tenure/Promotion Document. Tenure-track faculty should develop their teaching philosophy early in their careers, and they only make two contract renewals before applying for tenure and so receive feedback from their DPC and DC only twice. An inconsistency was also discovered in the “Guidelines for Contract Renewal Dossiers for Faculty with Renewable Appointments” in that Instructional Faculty are given a maximum of ½ page and Academic Support Faculty are given a 1 page maximum to discuss teaching philosophy.

2. The Contract Renewal Document page limit should be set by the department, not by the administration, to allow for the differences between departments. Although brevity is preferred, a six-page limit is difficult to keep under when only two contract renewals are done before the tenure application.

3. The Non-Teaching Evaluation should be eliminated. The “Guidelines for Contract Renewal Dossiers for Faculty with Renewable Appointments” can be modified to instruct the applicant to include non-teaching endeavors in the Contract Renewal Document. It doesn’t make sense to ask a faculty reviewer to ask the applicant for this information and put it into another document. Non-teaching endeavors should be discussed with the DC and/or faculty mentor during the development of the applicant’s career.
4. All guideline(s) for Contract Renewal, including “Guidelines for Contract Renewal Dossiers for Faculty with Renewable Appointments”, should be consolidated and updated. Guideline(s) should include the office of origin, date of last edit, author, and contact information for faculty with questions.

5-Year Review Guidelines (K9.203)

The Senate also tasked the Evaluations Committee to study the Five-Year Review process, “Suggested Guidelines for the Five-Year Review Document”. Based upon this study, the Senate recommends that K9.203 be revised for clarity and for greater consistency between departments. The scrutiny of a tenured faculty in a 5-Year Review should be kept to a cursory level, it is NOT a re-tenure process. A tenured faculty has already proven effectiveness by the process of tenure/promotion.

1. Individual departments are responsible for their own processes and for consistency with the current UHPA contract, and K9.203 provides “Suggested Guidelines”. However, after reviewing these processes, the Senate recommends that the following addition be offered to the departments if they want to adopt it:

“In the event of a negative review by a department chair, peer evaluation by the DPC may be used as another source of evaluation.”

This places the evaluation process into the hands of the faculty, instead the administration, in the event of a negative department chair evaluation. We feel that this is consistent with BoR Policy 9-15 “Evaluation of BoR Appointees” and gives a level of protection for the faculty from the scrutiny of an unreasonable DC.

2. The Senate also suggests the following changes to the current language:

a. In the first paragraph of K9.203, the following sentence should be eliminated: “Successful student learning is measured, in part, by ongoing assessment of faculty who provide direct instruction and student and academic support”. The Senate feels that this is a reference to Student Learning Outcomes, which are NOT used to evaluate faculty, and therefore the sentence is not appropriate.

b. Clarification of the “Outcomes” column in the Guidelines. It is not clear what is being asked here because outcomes can have so many different meanings. Examples using the specific format desired may be one method of clarification.

The Senate wishes to thank you for this opportunity to help improve the quality of instruction and the quality of academic life on our campus.

Aloha, Harry

Harry B. Davis
Professor of Chemistry, Chair Faculty Senate