

2 Nov. 2015

**Summary of Findings, Issues, and Preliminary Recommendations**  
**Non-Tenure Track Subcommittee**  
**Faculty Affairs Committee**

*NB: The sub-committee recommends the use of the term “specialized faculty” in place of “non-tenure track faculty” for reasons explained below. That term is therefore used throughout this document.*

“Specialized faculty” are members of the faculty whose duties do not include all three areas of research, teaching, and service:

- *Teaching:* lecturers, professors of practice, clinical faculty, some visitors and post-docs.
- *Research:* research scientists, most post-docs.
- *Service:* academic specialists.

A variety of other titles are used. In many or most cases specialized faculty have duties two areas—most commonly, service or lecturers—or even three.

In most ways, Indiana University Bloomington has an exemplary record on treatment of specialized faculty. We have avoided the extensive reliance on part-time adjuncts that is so common elsewhere. Nevertheless, there are problems that need to be addressed, some similar to the national situation and some arising from the policies that we now have in place.

The Non-Tenure-Track Subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs committee was established in spring 2014 when it became clear that an earlier effort to bring IUB policies on specialized faculty into accordance with University policies would create significant issues for many units across campus. It was also clear that there were other issues on such matters as governance rights and working conditions that needed to be addressed.

The committee spent the 2014–15 academic year collecting information, including unit policies, surveys, statistical data, existing best practices, and peer university task force reports, and doing focus-group and one-on-one interviews with faculty, chairs, and administrators. This information gathering and analysis is likely one of the most extensive that has been carried out by a college or university task force examining policies and issues regarding specialized faculty. A detailed report on our methodology and findings will be presented with our final recommendations.

We expect that the results of our efforts will receive national attention.

## *Facts and Findings*

### *A. Statistical Findings*

- As of fall 2015 there were 3,270 members of the IUB faculty:
  - 1,486 TT professors
  - 85 TT librarians
  - 1,311 full-time specialized faculty, of whom
    - 659 full-time lecturers and other teaching faculty
    - 652 research scientists, academic specialists, etc.
  - 388 part-time lecturers and other teaching faculty
- Specialized faculty form 52% of the IUB faculty by numbers and 49% by FTE.
- As of fall 2015 the teaching faculty (excluding librarians, research scientists, academic specialists, etc.) consisted of 2,516 faculty and 2317 FTE.
  - 1,486/59% (64% FTE) TT professors
  - 659/26% (28% FTE) full-time lecturers and other teaching faculty
  - 371/15% (7% FTE) part-time lecturers and other teaching faculty
- As of fall 2014, the latest date for which we have data on who did how much teaching, we have:
  - By credit hour:
    - 33% TT (fall 2007: 40%)
    - 52% specialized faculty (fall 2007: 39%)
    - 16% SAA (fall 2007: 20%)
  - By section:
    - 36% TT (fall 2007: 40%)
    - 40% specialized faculty (fall 2007: 30%)
    - 24% SAA (fall 2007: 30%)
- Since 2006 the number of TT faculty and librarians has increased by 4%.
- Since 2006 specialized faculty (excluding librarians and research faculty) have increased by 53% by FTE and 36% by numbers.
- In COAS (fall 2014) specialized faculty teach 43% (2007: 32%) of the credits, and TT faculty 37% (2007: 43%).
- The schools most heavily reliant on specialized faculty (fall 2014) are Business (77%, TT 16%) and SPEA (70%, TT 19%).
- The only school where TT faculty teach the majority of credits is Law. Music is the only school where the majority of sections are taught by TT faculty.
- IU has generally avoided reliance on part-time faculty.
  - BFC policies have blocked it.
  - AIs fill that gap—but does that place the burden of providing budget flexibility on graduate students?
- Female faculty and staff (fall 2014): Exec./Admin. with faculty status 38%; TT 35%; specialized 49%; prof. staff 51%; admin. staff 84%; infrastructure staff 23%

## *B. Qualitative findings*

Based on surveys, focus groups, and interviews with specialized faculty and interviews with administrators at the school and department level, we found that the situation was seen quite differently by specialized faculty and administrators in some areas, though in other areas there were similarities.

### *1. Specialized faculty:*

- Morale of a number of specialized faculty is not very good, though it varies greatly with individual situations.
- Specialized faculty often report feeling like “second-class citizens,” a perception that we found often justified by actual policies and practice.
- They particularly detest the term “non-tenure track,” which defines them negatively.
- They are often unaware of the nature and duties of their positions when they are hired.
- They are often unclear about the criteria for evaluation, reappointment, and promotion. In many cases such criteria do not exist.
- They want support for professional development, notably sabbaticals.
- They want clearly defined and meaningful governance rights, notably including the right to vote for unit leadership, hires, and issues such as curriculum that they are directly concerned with.

### *2. Administrators and Chairs:*

- The roles and rights of specialized faculty vary enormously among schools and departments.
- Actual practice is frequently not in accordance with University, campus, and sometimes even school policies. (See section C for specific examples.)
- Administrators in schools with well-defined roles for specialized faculty are anxious not to change arrangements that they think are working well.
- Administrators want to have clearer guidance on specialized faculty policy and have identified a number of areas where clearer guidance is needed, particularly in procedures for promotion and reappointment.

### *C. Policy and Practice*

- Specialized faculty titles are used inconsistently across schools, with the title “clinical professor” being particularly used in ways inconsistent with policy.
- Specialized faculty appointments are sometimes used by administrators as shortcuts to solve problems—for example, making hires without regular faculty-directed search and screen. Most of the major problem cases we encountered were the result of administrators using specialized faculty appointments inappropriately.
- There is no clear standard for reappointment of specialized faculty. Essentially, specialized faculty have no due process protection from the assertion of “lack of programmatic need” by a chair or dean.
- There are diversity issues, which we have not specifically addressed, particularly involving gender balance.

DRAFT

## *Recommendations*

These recommendations have been approved by the Subcommittee and have been presented to the Faculty Affairs Committee for discussion. In some cases, the Subcommittee is still working on their final form.

In most cases, the Bloomington Faculty Council has the authority to adopt these recommendations. In a few cases, notably the creation of the title “professor of teaching,” action by the University Faculty Council will be necessary.

### 1. Context

- A. Academic appointments are made with respect to a set of unordered categories, each of which has a set of specific responsibilities defined in the University appointment policy (Policy A1 in Bloomington Academic Guide).
- *Justification:* University policies make it clear that specialized faculty represent a *category of appointment*, not a rank. They play a critical role in the functioning of the University and its ability to meet its research, teaching, and service obligations. While the fact that IUB is a research university may justify giving final authority on some matters to TT faculty, it does not justify exclusion of specialized faculty from authority areas where they play a legitimate role.
- B. Tenure-track faculty have a significant role in defining scope of work of specialized faculty under university policy.
- C. Under existing policy, specialized faculty are guaranteed academic freedom. Thus tenure-track and specialized faculty have identical teaching prerogatives.

## 2. Titles and Career Paths

### A. Titles:

- The term “non-tenure track faculty” should be replaced by “specialized faculty.” “Non-tenure track” defines this class of faculty negatively and leads to the perception that specialized faculty are not full members of the faculty. (The term “departmental faculty” was also suggested.)

### B. Career Path for Lecturers

- A third level, equivalent to full professor, should be added for instructional faculty. We suggest the title “Professor of Teaching.”
  - This rank will require a terminal degree in an appropriate field.
  - The standards for promotion to this rank should involve possession of a terminal degree in a relevant field, progress in quality of teaching, curricular innovation, and leadership, with exact standards to be determined by schools and units.
  - This will require a change in Policy A1.
    - *Justification:* This will bring the lecturer/senior lecturer track into alignment with the three-stage tenure-track and clinical sequences. We believe that it will provide powerful motivation for senior lecturers to continue to improve and will encourage the development of leaders within lecturer cohorts in a way similar to the role of full professors in the tenured ranks.

### C. Clinical Faculty

- The title “clinical professor” should only be used in situations that involve clinical practice. “Clinical practice” should be defined in order to provide clear guidance.

### 3. Promotion and Reappointment Procedures for Specialized Faculty

#### *A. Clear expectations:*

At the time of hiring, specialized faculty should be provided with clear guidance on the job duties, expectations, and evaluation criteria specific to their specialized faculty rank. Schools and departments should provide specialized faculty members with information on the process, criteria, and standards for promotion for their rank.

#### *B. Campus-level review for all categories of specialized faculty*

As is the case with tenure-track faculty, promotion and reappointment decisions should be reviewed at the campus level for all categories of specialized faculty.

#### *C. Reappointment and promotion decisions* should be made by committees of more senior specialized faculty, drawing on specialized faculty from comparable units if necessary. If unit circumstances require the involvement of TT faculty, they should be either non-voting or a minority, with arrangements justified in governance documents.

#### *D. Clear standards* should be created for reappointment and promotion of specialized faculty, explained in writing to new hires.

- The standard of teaching required for promotion of lecturers should be determined by committees of lecturers within the unit and should not be based on the standard set for promotion of research faculty on the basis of teaching.
  - *Justification:* The standard of tenure on the basis of teaching is designed to discourage individuals from applying for tenure on that basis. It requires a national reputation in pedagogy in the field, which is scarcely a realistic standard for all lecturers. Deans repeatedly raised this issue with us. The Business School, for example, routinely promotes its lecturers on the basis of a balanced teaching-service case, but the dean was concerned about what would happen in the case of a lecturer who happened not to have service responsibilities.

#### *E. Presumption of Reappointment*

The meaning of “presumption of reappointment” for senior lecturers and comparable ranks should be clarified:

- The burden of proof in non-reappointment decisions for senior lecturers will be on the unit and school, not the candidate.
- Programmatic need is to be determined in the first instance by the unit.

#### 4. Governance

*A. Clarification of the 40% Rule Unit voting rights*

The 60% rule should only be invoked on matters where there is a principled justification.

*B. Participation in selection of unit head*

Specialized faculty should have the right to vote for departmental leadership and on all policy matters except when there is some clear reason not to, such as tenure.

*C. BFC representation:* Specialized faculty representation on the Bloomington Faculty Council should be increased to more nearly represent their proportion of the faculty and to adequately represent the various categories of specialized faculty

DRAFT



## 5. *Specialized Faculty Classification Review Committee*

A standing committee within the Faculty Affairs Committee should be created to deal with issues relating to the classification of positions that are not tenure track. It will have two duties:

- *Review of new lines:* When a specialized faculty line is proposed, this committee will be on the relevant e-doc with the responsibility of determining whether the proposed position is, according to policy, appropriate for the category under which it is proposed.
- *Review of misclassifications:* The committee will review appeals claiming misclassification—for example, lecturers who claim to have research duties and should therefore be tenure-track. The decisions of this committee should be final and not reviewable by administrators.

*Justification:* The administrators' record in properly using specialized faculty appointments is not good, so there needs to be something to balance their role.

DRAFT

## 6. Career support and quality of life

### A. Support for professional development:

- *Funding*: Specialized faculty should have funding for professional development
  - Travel funding to attend conferences or training.
  - Organizing visits of renowned experts in a field.
- *Sabbatical-like leaves*: Funding should be available to support leaves or course releases for professional development or in recognition of major achievements.

### B. Recognition:

Specialized faculty should be eligible for University recognition in ways comparable to tenure-track faculty:

- Specialized Faculty should be recognized in any IUB event that celebrates excellence in teaching. IUB should provide a means to recognize the winners, which shall, at a minimum, include a permanent plaque as it is indicated in policy ACA-80.
- Chairs or an assigned committee should be encouraged to nominate specialized faculty for the different teaching and service awards at the campus, university, and national levels.
- There should be recognition for specialized faculty based on evaluations of quality provided by students of each unit, not student evaluations, comparable to the College's Holland Award based on emails sent by students.

### C. Improving Culture to Positively Value and Integrate Specialized Faculty and Remove the "Second-Class Citizen" Stigma

A number of specialized faculty described feeling like "second class citizens."

- Specialized faculty should be publicly acknowledged by university, school, and department administration for the critical role that they play at IUB.
- Deans and chairs should ensure that specialized faculty are included in regular school and departmental communications and information-sharing and in formal and informal events of faculty life in the school and department.

## 7. *Issues needing further consideration*

### A. *Specialized faculty appointments in the sciences*

We found that we did not have the expertise to deal with the issues raised by specialized faculty appointments in the sciences: soft-money appointments, management of departmental research resources, grant eligibility, criteria for promotion and salaries, and so forth. We recommend that another subcommittee be appointed to review these issues.

### B. *Academic specialists and adjuncts*

We initially believed that these categories of appointment raised only minor issues, but we have concluded that they should be investigated.

C. *Professors of practice*: There are a small but growing number of professors of practice on campus filling a variety of roles. Some, like Senator Lugar and Congressman Hamilton, have essentially honorary positions. Others function much like research faculty except that their qualifications and teaching responsibilities are supposed to be based on real-world experience. The policies governing their duties and rights need to be clarified before their number grows, but we do not have a consensus at this point as to how this should be done. However, we do agree that such appointments should not be made inappropriately.

### D. *Grievances*

We found some evidence that the grievance process was not working well for specialized faculty. FAC now plans to deal with the whole question of grievances.