



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	12-13-56
Title:	Consideration of an Overall Title for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty
Presenter:	Devin Ellis, Chair, Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date of SEC Review:	August 28, 2014
Date of Senate Review:	October 9, 2014
Voting (highlight one):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	<p>In April 2013, the Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty Task Force presented a report to the University Senate noting several areas of concern related to NTT faculty, and recommended extensive changes to policies and procedures that affect NTT faculty at UMD (Senate Document #12-13-41). Among other issues, the report noted that the term “non-tenure track faculty” does not identify NTT faculty as a valuable asset to the institution, and suggested that the lack of a formal overall title impedes the creation of policies or procedures that explicitly apply to NTT faculty. The Senate approved the report, and in May 2013, the Senate Executive Committee voted to charge the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) with consideration of these issues and asked that the committee develop an overall title for NTT faculty that more accurately reflects their contribution to the institution.</p>
Relevant Policy # & URL:	<p>II-1.00(A) University of Maryland, College Park Policy on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii-100a.html</p>
Recommendation:	<p>The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the attached policy entitled “University of Maryland Policy on Professional Track Faculty” be adopted as official University of Maryland policy and be added to the Consolidated USM and UMD Policies and Procedures Manual.</p>
Committee Work:	<p>The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) considered its charge over the course of the 2013-2014 academic year, in tandem with its review of the framework for NTT faculty appointments. The committee worked very closely with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and the Director of Faculty Initiatives throughout its review, and consulted with the Office of Legal Affairs on its proposed policy.</p>

	<p>The FAC recognized at the beginning of its review that while the term “non-tenure track faculty” is correct, it does not accurately represent the substantial role these faculty play at the institution. The FAC focused on creating a title to identify these faculty in a positive manner. It reviewed the work of the NTT Task Force and considered titles used at peer institutions.</p> <p>After a thorough review of all options, the FAC discussed the term “professional track faculty,” which had been recommended by the NTT Task Force as a possible alternative to NTT faculty. The FAC noted that the term inherently indicates that all such faculty are valued at the institution for the professional experiences, endeavors, or other skills they contribute through their work with the University. The committee also noted that the inclusion of “track” indicates that these faculty have opportunities for career development despite the fact that they are not a part of the tenure system. The FAC agreed that this term is the most appropriate option for UMD’s NTT faculty, and voted unanimously to recommend adoption of the term.</p> <p>The FAC developed a proposed policy to institute the new overall title for NTT faculty, noting that the current lack of a policy definition for “non-tenure track faculty” has hindered the development of policies and procedures related to NTT faculty. In May 2014, the committee finalized its proposed policy and voted to forward its recommendation to the Senate for review.</p>
Alternatives:	The Senate could reject the proposed policy and the proposed overall title of “professional track faculty.” These faculty would continue to be referred to as “non-tenure track faculty,” and the University would lose the opportunity to appropriately recognize the roles and contributions of these faculty to the institution.
Risks:	There are no associated risks.
Financial Implications:	There are no financial implications.
Further Approvals Required:	Senate approval, Presidential approval.

Senate Faculty Affairs Committee

Senate Document #12-13-56

Consideration of an Overall Title for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

August 2014

BACKGROUND

During the 2012-2013 academic year, the joint Provost/Senate Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty Task Force analyzed policies and procedures related to NTT faculty at the University of Maryland (UMD) and at peer institutions, and compiled data on the substantial contributions of NTT faculty to the research and teaching mission of the University. In the course of its review, the Task Force noted that the term “non-tenure track faculty” does not identify NTT faculty as a valuable asset to the institution, and suggested that the lack of a formal overall title for these faculty impedes the creation of policies or procedures that explicitly apply to NTT faculty. The Task Force presented a final report (Senate Document # 12-13-41) to the Senate in April of 2013, which recommended extensive changes to policies and procedures that impact NTT faculty and recommended that the University adopt a new overall title for these faculty. The Senate approved the report and directed the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) to charge the appropriate Senate committees with considering the specific recommendations within the Task Force’s report for further review. In May of 2013, the SEC voted to charge the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) with consideration of these concerns, and asked that the committee review the roles of NTT faculty at UMD and develop an overall title for NTT faculty that more accurately reflects their contribution to the institution (Appendix 2).

CURRENT PRACTICE

In current practice, the University of Maryland uses the term “non-tenure track faculty” to refer to full-time and part-time instructional and research faculty who are not eligible for tenure. The term is a part of the common vocabulary at the University, but the term is not widely used in University policy. For instance, the University of Maryland Policy on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty (II-1.00(A)) uses the term in passing to indicate that the “University of Maryland Professor” title does not and will not involve a tenure commitment, but the policy does not explicitly define the term, either in this instance or elsewhere in the document.

When “non-tenure track faculty” is used, there is no consistent policy definition of the term, and as such, it can be difficult to identify which faculty are being referenced in any given situation. It can also be difficult for the University to create official policies and procedures that apply to these faculty in particular. During its work, the NTT Task Force found that policies that apply to faculty in general are often not clear as to whether they apply to NTT faculty or only tenured or tenure track (T/TT) faculty. The Task Force noted that in its work and in previous work undertaken by the Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document #10-11-04), guidance from the Office of Legal Affairs was necessary to determine the applicability of various campus policies related to faculty appointments. The Task Force suggested that such guidance may be less necessary if policies were able to refer to particular subsets of faculty, whether they be T/TT faculty or NTT faculty.

COMMITTEE WORK

The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) considered its charge on an overall title for NTT faculty during the 2013-2014 academic year, in tandem with its related charge on creating a unified framework for NTT faculty appointments (Senate Document #12-13-55). The two charges complement each other, as the development of a unified framework made it clear that a new generic title was needed. The FAC worked very closely with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and the Director of Faculty Initiatives from the Office of Faculty Affairs during its review, and consulted with the Office of Legal Affairs during the spring of 2014.

The unified framework for NTT faculty appointments was developed by the FAC as an attempt to foster the careers of NTT faculty. It was understood by the committee that the work of NTT faculty was valued. As it worked to develop this new framework, the FAC realized the extent to which the absence of a unified overall title would hinder attempts to improve policies and procedures related to the evaluation, promotion, and continued development of NTT faculty. The FAC also worked to more accurately identify the responsibilities of the faculty member by his or her title, and recognized that while the term “non-tenure track faculty” is correct, it does not accurately represent the substantial role these faculty play at the institution.

During its review, the FAC focused on creating a title to identify these faculty in a positive manner. It reviewed the work of the NTT Task Force and considered titles used at peer institutions. In looking at UMDs peers in the Big Ten, the FAC found that some institutions also use “non-tenure track faculty,” while others favor titles that define faculty by the terms of the contract, using “fixed-term faculty” or “contractual faculty” in policies and communications. These titles refer to the terms of appointment, not to the responsibilities of faculty members. Very few peer institutions currently use terminology that focuses on faculty responsibilities. As an example of one effort to rename NTT faculty in a more positive manner, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign has recently begun using the term “specialized faculty” instead. The FAC found additional examples when looking beyond UMD’s peer institutions in the Big Ten, and noted that the University of North Carolina at Greensboro uses the term “academic professional” as a generic title for NTT faculty, while Oregon State, Texas A&M, and Virginia Tech all use either “professional faculty” or “professional track faculty.”

In considering options, the FAC reviewed the three main dimensions of faculty activity in the APT system. The committee suggested that NTT faculty often specialize within the three dimensions of teaching, research, and service. For this reason, the FAC considered adopting the term “academic specialists” for NTT faculty. However, the committee was concerned that the term would conflict with the newly-developed Faculty Specialist title track, and decided that the term “specialist” would not be ideal for the overall title as well as for a specific title series.

After much discussion, the FAC considered the term “professional track faculty,” which had been recommended by the NTT Task Force as a possible positive title for NTT faculty. The FAC noted that the term inherently indicates that all such faculty are professionals, and are valued at the institution for the professional experiences, endeavors, or other skills they contribute through their work with the University. The committee also noted that the title inclusion of “track” indicates that these faculty have opportunities for career development despite the fact that they are not a part of the tenure system. The FAC agreed that this term is the most appropriate option for UMD’s NTT faculty, and voted unanimously to recommend adoption of the term.

Having agreed upon an overall title, the FAC focused on which faculty should be referred to as professional track faculty. The committee agreed that faculty with a title of College Park Professor,

University of Maryland Professor, or Professor of the Practice should not be referred to as professional track faculty. These faculty are appointed at the highest level through a process that includes approval by the University President. As such, these faculty do not fit within any NTT title series, and are not subject to the same policies and procedures as NTT faculty. Instead, the overall title should apply to all instructional, research, and clinical faculty with titles in the new unified framework for NTT faculty appointments.

The FAC also considered how the University might adopt the proposed new overall title, and ultimately developed a policy to institute the new overall title for NTT faculty. The committee noted the current lack of a policy definition for “non-tenure track faculty,” and discussed the references in the NTT Task Force’s report related to the difficulties the institution faces in creating policies or procedures for a specific subset of faculty, which has hindered the development of policies and procedures related to NTT faculty. Therefore a precise definition of the groups of instructional and research faculty to whom the title referred would enable development of those policies and procedures of faculty.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the attached policy (appearing below and in Appendix 1) entitled “University of Maryland Policy on Professional Track Faculty” be adopted as official University of Maryland policy and be added to the Consolidated USM and UMD Policies and Procedures Manual.

RECOMMENDED UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON PROFESSIONAL TRACK FACULTY

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON PROFESSIONAL TRACK FACULTY

I. Purpose and Scope

This policy establishes a generic title of Professional Track Faculty for faculty ranks that are not eligible for an award of tenure or permanent status. The new designation will facilitate the development and implementation of policies for Professional Track Faculty with respect to appointment, promotion, and representation in shared governance.

II. Applicability

A. The generic title of Professional Track Faculty applies to the specific faculty ranks in each faculty rank series as set forth below:

1. Instructional faculty series: Junior Lecturers, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Lecturers;
2. Artists-in-Residence series: Assistant Artists-in-Residence, Associate Artists-in-Residence, and Artists-in-Residence;
3. Clinical faculty series: Assistant Clinical Professors, Associate Clinical Professors, and Clinical Professors;
4. Research Professor series: Assistant Research Professors, Associate Research Professors, and Research Professors;
5. Research Scientist series: Assistant Research Scientists, Associate Research Scientists, and Research Scientists;
6. Research Scholar series: Assistant Research Scholars, Associate Research Scholars, and Research Scholars;
7. Research Engineer series: Assistant Research Engineers, Associate Research Engineers, and Research Engineers;

8. Faculty Specialist series: Faculty Specialists, Senior Faculty Specialists, and Principal Faculty Specialists;
9. Agent Associate series: Agent Associates, Senior Agent Associates, and Principal Agent Associates;
10. Faculty Assistants
11. Post-Doctoral Associates

B. Definitions of the faculty ranks listed above appear in II-1.00(A) University of Maryland Policy on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Proposed University of Maryland Policy on Professional Track Faculty

Appendix 2 – Charge from the Senate Executive Committee on Consideration of an Overall Title for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

**APPENDIX 1 - PROPOSED UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
POLICY ON PROFESSIONAL TRACK FACULTY**

**RECOMMENDED UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON PROFESSIONAL TRACK
FACULTY**

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON PROFESSIONAL TRACK FACULTY

I. Purpose and Scope

This policy establishes a generic title of Professional Track Faculty for faculty ranks that are not eligible for an award of tenure or permanent status. The new designation will facilitate the development and implementation of policies for Professional Track Faculty with respect to appointment, promotion, and representation in shared governance.

II. Applicability

A. The generic title of Professional Track Faculty applies to the specific faculty ranks in each faculty rank series as set forth below:

1. Instructional faculty series: Junior Lecturers, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Lecturers;
2. Artists-in-Residence series: Assistant Artists-in-Residence, Associate Artists-in-Residence, and Artists-in-Residence;
3. Clinical faculty series: Assistant Clinical Professors, Associate Clinical Professors, and Clinical Professors;
4. Research Professor series: Assistant Research Professors, Associate Research Professors, and Research Professors;
5. Research Scientist series: Assistant Research Scientists, Associate Research Scientists, and Research Scientists;
6. Research Scholar series: Assistant Research Scholars, Associate Research Scholars, and Research Scholars;
7. Research Engineer series: Assistant Research Engineers, Associate Research Engineers, and Research Engineers;
8. Faculty Specialist series: Faculty Specialists, Senior Faculty Specialists, and Principal Faculty Specialists;
9. Agent Associate series: Agent Associates, Senior Agent Associates, and Principal Agent Associates;
10. Faculty Assistants
11. Post-Doctoral Associates

B. Definitions of the faculty ranks listed above appear in II-1.00(A) University of Maryland Policy on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty.

**APPENDIX 2 - CHARGE FROM THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ON
CONSIDERATION OF AN OVERALL TITLE FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**



**University Senate
CHARGE**

Date:	May 6, 2013
To:	Ellin Scholnick Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee
From:	Martha Nell Smith Chair, University Senate 
Subject:	Consideration of an Overall Title for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty
Senate Document #:	12-13-56
Deadline:	December 15, 2013

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) requests that the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) review the roles of Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty at the University and make recommendations on whether changes to existing policy are appropriate.

Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Review the Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Policies & Procedures Report (Senate Doc. No. 12-13-41).
2. Review the University of Maryland Policy on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) of Faculty (II-1.00(A)) as it pertains to NTT faculty.
3. Develop an overall title for NTT faculty that more accurately reflects their contribution as a group to the institution.
4. Review the titles used for NTT faculty at our peer universities.
5. Consult with a representative from the University's Office of Faculty Affairs on each of these initiatives.
6. Consult with the University's Office of Legal Affairs on each of these initiatives.
7. If appropriate, recommend whether the current APT policy should be revised.

We ask that you submit a report to the Senate Office no later than December 15, 2013. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.

Attachment

MNS/rm