



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	10-11-04
PCC ID #:	NA
Title:	University Policies Related to Lecturers/Instructors & Research Faculty
Presenter:	Robert Schwab, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee
Date of SEC Review:	March 15, 2011
Date of Senate Review:	April 7, 2011
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:	To determine whether there are areas of concern with existing policies related to non-tenure-track faculty.
Relevant Policy # & URL:	II-1.00(F) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON FULL-TIME and PART-TIME NONTENURE TRACK INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY.
Recommendation:	<p>The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the Senate form a task force to carry out a thorough and systematic review of campus policy on the terms of employment for University non-tenure-track faculty.</p> <p>The following two recommendations should be considered during the proposed task force's broader review:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluation of maximum teaching load per semester. 2. Development of policies on appointing graduate students as lecturers. <p>Additionally, the Committee suggests that a careful survey of all University non-tenure-track faculty be conducted. This survey would offer a comprehensive picture of the terms of employment for this large and growing part of the University community.</p> <p>Following our review of policies at other universities and the results of the focus groups, the Faculty Affairs Committee also suggests the University give serious consideration to the</p>

	<p>following recommendations, which are explained in further detail in the attached report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify an administrative unit to oversee all issues related to lecturers and instructors. 2. Modify the UMD <i>Faculty Handbook</i> to provide a wider range of ranks and promotions within the category of lecturer. 3. Specify assignments and responsibilities in contracts. 4. Explore ways to recognize outstanding lecturers through campus-wide awards, promotions, funds for travel to conferences and other professional development opportunities. 5. Provide lecturers opportunities to participate in department governance. 6. Establish clear policies to evaluate instructors, lecturers, and research scientists.
<p>Committee Work:</p>	<p>The Senate Executive committee charged the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) with reviewing University Policies Related to Lecturers/Instructors & Research Faculty. At the September 13, 2010 meeting the FAC discussed the charge and created a Lecturer/Instructor & Research Faculty Policy Working Group to evaluate the current policies of the University of Maryland.</p> <p>The Working Group met over 3 months researching the current practices at the University; during this time they also researched peer institutions and their related policies. Additionally the Working Group met with Boden Sandstrom, the original proposer to have a better understanding of the viewpoint of the Lecturers at the University.</p> <p>In December 2010 the Working Group conducted focus groups with several non-tenure-track faculty of the University of Maryland to determine if the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty warrant further evaluation.</p> <p>In January 2011 the Working Group presented their initial findings in a draft report to the committee. The committee accepted the draft report from the Working Group as the basis for the committee report.</p> <p>At the February 4, 2011 meeting the committee agreed that additional demographic information should be added to the final report in order to better support suspected inequities for non-</p>

	tenure-track faculty across the campus. On March 7, 2011 the final report and recommendations were adopted and approved by the committee via an email vote.
Alternatives:	The University could continue with current policies and practices.
Risks:	The University's lack of policies protecting the functions and activities of non-tenure-track faculty could result in further inequities.
Financial Implications:	Additional resources would be required for the Office of Faculty Affairs to successfully take on the extra responsibility of the non-tenure-track faculty.
Further Approvals Required:	Senate and Presidential approval are required.

Faculty Affairs Committee
Instructor/Lecturer and Research Faculty Report
March 2011

On September 1, 2010 the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) asked the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) to review University Policies related to Lecturers/Instructors and Research Faculty. At the September 13, 2010 meeting FAC discussed the charge and created a Lecturer/Instructor and Research Faculty Policy Working Group (Working Group) to evaluate current campus policies regarding non-tenure-track faculty. For the purpose of this report the term “non-tenure-track faculty” includes: full and part-time instructor/lecturers and research faculty.

Over the next three months, the Working Group researched current practices at similar institutions and consulted the University Legal Office on all campus policies that are applicable to non-tenure-track faculty. The Working Group also met with Boden Sandstrom, the lecturer in the Department of Music who initially raised this issue with the Senate. In December 2010, the Working Group conducted individual interviews and focus groups with a number of campus non-tenure-track faculty. The qualitative study focused on instructors and lecturers and collected relatively limited information about the research faculty.¹

As Table 1 shows, there are currently 860 instructors and lecturers on campus. It is helpful to put this number in perspective. There are roughly 1,500 tenured and tenure-track faculty on campus. Although most lecturers and instructors work part time, their numbers—860—represent over one-third of the College Park instructional faculty (though perhaps somewhat less in terms of FTE).

Policy on non-tenure-track faculty is an essential issue at UMCP and virtually all other universities. Since 1990, the majority of new faculty members in U.S. academic institutions have been hired as contingent workers, either as lecturers or adjuncts, and not as tenured or tenure-track professors. In 1969, just 3.3% of new full-time faculty appointments were off the tenure-track. By the 1990s, over half were off the tenure-track (Schuster and Finkelstein, 2006). There has also been an increase in the proportion of faculty having part-time appointments; in 2001, 44.5% of the faculty were working part time (Bradley, 2004).

The increase in non-tenure-track faculty positions also has a gender dimension. Nationally, by 2003, women comprised 42.4% of those employed in universities (all full-time and part-time instructional faculty and staff in degree-granting institutions; NCES, Table 255, 2009). Women are over-represented, however, as contingent faculty—that is, as adjunct professors, lecturers, or instructors. In 2005, women held 57% of the full-time non-tenure-track faculty. Moreover, 30% of the full-time female faculty was in non-tenure-track faculty compared to 18% of the full-time

¹ We found considerable ambiguity about titles. At UMCP, new teaching faculty can be appointed as lecturers or senior lecturers; new appointments as instructor have not been allowed since 1995. Adjuncts typically teach just one or two courses per semester. SEC made clear that this report should not be concerned with the status of adjuncts. We note that different units use these titles and that other campuses often have different titles for their non-tenure-track faculty.

male faculty (Schuster and Finkelstein, 2006). The overall situation—large numbers of faculty under contract, job instability, and widespread feeling of lack of professional recognition by peers—renders the development of an institutional identification difficult for them and tends to remove a substantial number of faculty members from academic decision-making.

Table 1. UMCP Instructors/Lecturers by College Relative to Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty, 2010

Name of Unit	Full-Time Lecturers/Instructors	Part-Time Lecturers/Instructors	Total Lecturers/Instructors	Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty ¹
Engineering	5	56	61	181
Agriculture & Nat'l Resources	8	14	22	171
Arts & Humanities	76	203	279	310
Behavioral & Social Sciences	28	68	96	170
Chemical & Life Sciences	24	2	26	109
Computer, Math, Physical Sciences	31	34	65	210
Education	38	59	97	95
Information Studies	1	14	15	16
Journalism	6	40	46	11
Business	37	37	74	100
Architecture	1	27	28	22
Public Health	10	26	36	57
Public Policy	1	14	15	15
TOTAL	266	594	860	

¹ Full-time equivalent. Profiles shows a total of 1,494 tenured and tenure track faculty for the campus. The remaining 27 have a tenured home outside the 13 colleges listed in this table.

As Table 2 shows, we find a similar pattern at UMCP. Slightly less than one-half of all campus non-tenure-track faculty are women. In sharp contrast, women represent just 31 percent of the campus tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Table 2. UMCP Faculty by Gender, 2010

		Percent Female	Percent Male
Lecturers			
	Full Time	59.8%	40.2%
	Part Time	44.7%	55.3%
	Total	49.2%	50.8%
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty		30.6%	69.4%

A Comparison of UMCP and Four Similar Institutions

We compared UMCP policies on non-tenure-track faculty to similar policies at the following institutions: Virginia Tech, the University of Wisconsin at Madison, UCLA, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The review was challenging because policies on non-tenure-track faculty are scattered throughout the faculty handbooks at these institutions. Moreover, we do not know the extent to which policies are in fact implemented at the four campuses we considered. The review of the faculty handbooks focused on 10 issues: titles, ranks within classifications, length of contracts, promotion within the classification, performance evaluation, salary determination, letters of appointment, non-reappointment, sabbaticals, and governance. Some of the four institutions did not have clear policies on each of these ten questions. In other cases the coverage in the faculty handbooks is uneven, with some detailed and others very brief.²

Regarding the *classification* of the position, UMCP refers to contingent faculty as non-tenure-track instructional faculty. Non-tenure-track faculty at Maryland are appointed either as lecturers or senior lecturers; some non-tenure-track faculty are instructors, but the campus no longer appoints new non-tenure-track faculty to that rank. UCLA offers a very rich description of these positions, establishing seven ranks within the classification of lecturer. UCLA also makes a distinction between an appointment with potential security of employment (PSOE) and one with security of employment (SOE).

On *contracts*, UMCP units and departments are encouraged to offer two- or three-year contracts to full-time non-tenure-track faculty following satisfactory performance, and even longer contracts in case of departmental need; it appears, however, that most contracts at UMCP are for just one semester or one year. UCLA requires that PSOE lecturers and PSOE senior lecturers be appointed for two years or less, with a maximum of eight years in that rank, and that SOE lecturers and SOE senior lecturers be given security of employment. Virginia Tech discourages the use of one-year contracts.

On *promotion*, UMCP has no explicit procedures for promotion within the non-tenure-track faculty category. Two institutions are very explicit on promotion: Virginia Tech has a formal mechanism for promotion from instructor to advanced instructor and then to senior lecturer based on satisfactory performance. UCLA mandates that PSOE lecturers or senior lecturers be considered for promotion to associate professor.

² Please see Appendix A for a fuller comparison of UMCP and Similar Institutions faculty policies.

On *performance evaluation*, UMCP requires an annual performance evaluation for both full-time and part-time non-tenure-track faculty; these evaluations are to be placed in a personnel file and reviewed by the non-tenure-track faculty themselves. It appears that such evaluations are not conducted regularly.

On *salaries*, UCLA policy says that SOE lecturers are to receive no less than the salary rates for associate professors, and PSOE and SOE senior lecturers should not receive less than the rate of professors. The University of Wisconsin-Madison sets a minimum of \$35,840 per year for instructors.

Only one of the four institutions has an explicit policy on *professional development*. The University of Wisconsin-Madison recommends “a temporary reassignment of duties” to enable “sufficient time for instruction enhancement, courses and curricula development, or course redesign.”

On *governance*, UMCP is vague about formal representation of non-tenure-track faculty, although it recommends that each unit integrate them into the academic life of their departments. The UMCP Senate’s Plan of Organization provides for one representative for full-time lecturers/instructors and one representative for part-time lecturers/instructors. The University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Virginia Tech, and University of Wisconsin-Madison all give their instructors/lecturers much greater representation on their campus senate.

Terms of Employment Non-Tenure-Track faculty at UMCP

We invited faculty from four campus colleges that employ significant numbers of non-tenure-track faculty (see Table 1 above): BSOS, ARHU, Education, and CMNS. The data were collected through individual interviews and focus groups during December 2010 with 22 people who volunteered to participate. We recognize that our sample is small and clearly non-random and that we therefore need to qualify our findings carefully. This is a common problem in qualitative research, where the emphasis is not on stating broad generalizations but on giving details of the life experience of subjects in any given social setting. The participants included men and women who have been at UMCP between one semester and 10 years. The sample included few research scientists and so any conclusions about terms of employment for this group are tentative at best.

Appendix B includes a detailed discussion of the results of our interviews. The people we interviewed raised some very serious and very troubling issues. The University is an institution where equity is a key priority. In practice, however, our interviews found significant inequality in the treatment of some of its community members. While not all, a substantial portion of the non-tenure-track faculty interviews reporting working in an environment in which job uncertainty and heavy teaching burdens are common. From the perspective of the University, we recognize that it is difficult to know with precision how many students will be taking specific courses until classes actually begin. The need for the University to maintain some degree of flexibility in providing for unexpected enrollments tends to create employment uncertainties for faculty in the lower ranks. How to reconcile the University’s need for flexibility with some assurance of job stability is a challenge that needs to be resolved.

Variations in the determination of half-time status are a source of major concern among non-tenure-track faculty, particularly because of the implications for access to health benefits. Non-tenure-track faculty see themselves as underpaid for the tasks they perform and in a position from which little mobility is possible. Teaching demands absorb much of their time, leaving limited opportunity for the research endeavors and professional development that will prepare them for regular faculty positions in the future. This is particularly problematic for non-tenure-track faculty who hope to move to a tenure-track position in the future. Given the current job market for new PhD's, a lecturer position is similar in some ways to a post-doc and thus the first toward tenure.

Although non-tenure-track faculty make significant contributions to the academic functioning of the University, teaching many of the courses at the undergraduate level, they feel unrecognized as partners and deprived of adequate representation in departmental and campus governance.

In all, the views presented by non-tenure-track faculty indicate dissatisfaction with the way the University treats them. Moreover, some of the people we interviewed felt they were trapped in a situation that they have little means to correct.

Recommendations

As we noted above, our study - given its small and non-random sample - does not allow us to draw broad generalizations about the terms of employment for campus non-tenure-track faculty. We feel strongly, however, that the results we have summarized in this report make a compelling case for a thorough and systematic review of campus policy on these issues. We suggest that the SEC form a task force—or possibly a joint task force that includes the Provost's Office—to carry out this review. We believe that a careful survey of all UMCP non-tenure-track faculty is an important next step. This survey would offer a comprehensive picture of the terms of employment for this large and growing part of the UMCP community.

Our review of policies at other universities and the results of our focus groups suggest the following recommendations should be given serious consideration. The first six of these recommendations are efforts to include non-tenure-track faculty in the UMCP faculty and might be implemented fairly quickly. The other two recommendations might be part of the broader review proposed in this report.

1. The campus should identify an administrative unit to oversee all issues related to non-tenure-track faculty. This unit would be responsible for a range of important issues including oversight of contracts, benefits, professional development, and grievances. A sensible first step might be a request to all of the colleges for a report on their policies on non-tenure-track faculty.

The Office of Faculty Affairs would seem to be the logical choice. At present, it deals only with tenured and tenure-track faculty. Faculty Affairs, however, currently does not have the resources to oversee the non-tenure-track faculty as well. It would therefore be essential that the campus give Faculty Affairs significant additional resources if it is to be asked to take responsibility for the non-tenured-track faculty.

2. Modify the UMD *Faculty Handbook* to provide a wider range of ranks and promotions within the category of non-tenure-track faculty. The creation of multiple ranks will allow departments to recognize the contributions of their non-tenure-track faculty. Criteria should focus on teaching and service performance and time in service.

3. Contracts should carefully specify a non-tenure-track faculty's assignments and responsibilities so that this labor is properly acknowledged and remunerated. In particular, contracts should specify any expectations for administrative responsibilities, advising, and service. Contracts should also establish a better timeline to enable the non-tenure-track faculty to face more predictable working conditions.

4. The campus should explore ways to recognize outstanding non-tenure-track faculty through campus-wide awards, promotions, and funds for travel to conferences and other professional development opportunities. Departments should expose non-tenure-track faculty to the range of resources available on campus including the Center for Teaching Excellence.

5. Departments should provide non-tenure-track faculty opportunities to participate in department governance.

6. Departments should establish clear policies to evaluate non-tenure-track faculty. These periodic reviews are a necessary prerequisite for several of our other recommendations.

7. The campus should consider evaluating the maximum teaching course load per semester. Teaching three and four courses with large classes each semester, while advising students, can be overwhelming and is often inconsistent with a high quality undergraduate education.

8. Consideration should be given to the development of policies on appointing graduate students as lecturers. Becoming a lecturer often imposes a heavier teaching burden on graduate students (possibly increasing time to degree) and reduces their total compensation.

References

Bradley, Gwendolyn. 2004. Contingent Faculty and the New Academic Labor System. *Academe Online*, Jan-Feb. <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubres/academe>

NCES. 2009. *Digest of Education Statistics, 2008*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.

Schuster, J. and Finkelstein, M. 2006. *The American Faculty: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Appendices

Appendix-A Comparison of Policies of UMCP and Four Similar Institutions

Appendix-B Results of the Working Group's Interviews

Appendix-C Applicable Policy Review from the Legal Office

Appendix-D Charge

Appendix-E Proposal

Appendix A

A Comparison of Policies on Instructional faculty at UMCP and Four Similar Institutions

Below we state in full the policies regarding lecturers and instructors across five universities (UMD, UCLA, UN-Chapel Hill, Virginia Tech, and UW-Madison). The policies are presented below in terms of 10 categories: professional classification, ranks within the classification, length of service, promotion, performance evaluation, salaries, letters of appointment, non-reappointment, sabbaticals/professional development, and governance.

The text indicated in regular letters is taken verbatim from the policy documents. In a few instances, text is expressed in italics to refer to observations and clarifications made by members of the Faculty Affairs Senate Committee.

1. Professional Classification

UMD

General denomination: Non-tenured track instructional faculty (NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY).

UCLA

General denomination: Academic non-tenure track faculty.

The title Lecturer will be assigned to professionally qualified appointees not under consideration for appointment as professor ... whose services are contracted for special purposes[sic]

The title Sr. Lecturer may be assigned ... to a Lecturer whose salary is at full professor level and whose services are of exceptional value to the University. [sic]

UN-Chapel Hill

General denomination: Fixed-term faculty. Members of the faculty: instructor, lecturer, or any of the formally authorized lecturer-equivalent rank.

Virginia Tech

General denomination: Non-tenure-track instructional faculty.

UW-Madison

General denomination: Instructional academic staff. This comprises professional and administrative personnel other than faculty, classified staff, limited staff, student employees, or employees in training.

2. Ranks within the Classification

UMD

The university should confer appropriate, non-tenure instructional ranks commensurate with credentials and professional experience. For long-term PTNON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY and FTNON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY instructional faculty, academic units should consider the development of procedures for progression in rank.

UCLA

Lecturer

Senior Lecturer

Lecturer with potential for SOE (security of employment)

Senior Lecturer with potential for SOE

Lecturer with SOE

Senior Lecturer with SOE

Lecturer in Summer Session

UN-Chapel Hill

Instructor

Lecturer

Senior lecturer

Virginia Tech

Instructor

Advanced Instructor

Senior Instructor

UW-Madison

Assistant Instructional Academic Staff

Associate Instructional Academic Staff

No Prefix (*i.e., Instructional Academic Staff*)

Distinguished Instructional Academic Staff

Associate Lecturer

No Prefix (*i.e., Lecturer*)

Senior Lecturer/Visiting Lecturer

Distinguished Lecturer

3. Length of Contracts

UMD

Normally FTNON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY contracts should be for one academic year and initial contracts for PTNON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY instructional faculty for a period of one semester.

Departments are encouraged to offer two to three-year contracts to FTNON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY faculty members with long-term satisfactory service verified by written evaluation of performance and to offer longer-term contracts, not to exceed three years, to PTNON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY instructional faculty in cases of demonstrated departmental need.

UCLA

Lecturers or senior lecturers without SOE are not subject to eight-year limit of service. Faculty members with PSOE cannot be employed for a period more than eight years in that rank.

UNC-Chapel Hill

Instructor: One-year contract, renewable for three additional one-year terms. No reappointment beyond four years is allowed.

Lecturer: Fixed term of one to five years. Subsequent appointments may be made in succession or intervals.

Senior Lecturer: Generally, an appointment for five years should be considered.

Note: UNC has also the rank of instructor under tenure track: This rank is appropriate for persons for whom there is reasonable expectation that in the normal course of events he or she will progress to the rank of assistant professor. The appointment is for a probationary term of one year, renewable for three additional successive one-year terms, a total of four years. No reappointment beyond four years is allowed.

Virginia Tech

All initial non-tenure-track faculty appointments are normally for a period of one year, including appointments at the more senior ranks. The practice of issuing repeated one-year restricted contracts for an individual faculty member over many years is explicitly discouraged.

Reappointments are usually effective July 1 or August 10, reflecting either calendar year or an academic year appointment.

Instructor: Appointment at this rank consists of a series of one- or two-year renewable appointments with a minimum of five years of completed service before consideration for promotion.

Advanced Instructor: A minimum of five years of completed service is required before consideration for promotion to senior instructor. Promotion to the advanced instructor rank is generally accompanied by a renewable three-year contract.

Senior Instructor: Promotion to the rank of senior instructor is generally accompanied by a renewable five-year contract.

UW-Madison

None stated.

4. Promotion within the Classification

UMD

None stated.

UCLA

A lecturer PSOE or senior lecturer PSOE who has completed eight years of service in that title cannot continue after the eighth year unless promoted to a higher position.

UNC-Chapel Hill

Instructor: Not stated.

Lecturer: No promotion within this rank but may receive salary increases.

Senior Lecturer: Not stated.

Virginia Tech

Instructor: Promotion to advanced instructor is possible after five years of service.

Advanced Instructor: Promotion to senior lecturer is possible to five years of service.

UW-Madison

None stated.

5. Performance Evaluation

UMD

Evaluations shall be annual. The evaluations shall be kept in a personnel file. FTNON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY and PNON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY faculty members shall have the opportunity to review each evaluation and sign off on it.

UCLA

Every faculty member should be reviewed at least every five years.

UNC-Chapel Hill

General statement only: Each year, it is expected the unit will meet with every untenured member and set forth the expectations for that member, an evaluation of past performance, and the duties he/she is expected to fulfill over the next year. A written record that such a conversation has taken place should be placed in the individual's personnel file.

Virginia Tech

Continuous faculty members must submit an annual evaluation in accordance with departmental and college procedures and timelines. Annual evaluation of performance by department head/chair or supervisor will provide feedback to faculty member. Timely submission of the actual activity report is required for consideration for a merit adjustment.

Non-tenure-track faculty members are entitled to full consideration for merit adjustment as available and warranted by their performance.

UW-Madison

None stated.

6. Salary Determination

UMD

None stated.

UCLA

Lecturer PSOE or Sr. Lecturer PSOE. Recommended salary comparable to Assistant Professor IV.

Lecturer PSOE or Sr. Lecturer PSOE. Recommended salary comparable to Associate Professor I & Above-Scale.

UNC-Chapel Hill

None stated.

Virginia Tech

None stated.

UW-Madison

Salary minimum (effective until 5/22/11) for instructors: \$35,840 per year.

7. Letters of Appointment

UMD

All FTNON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY and PTNON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY shall be provided with clear written and approved contracts prior to the beginning of the assignment. The contract shall stipulate the term of the contract, the salary, assignments and expectation, expected notification about renewal or non-renewal, resources, and performance-evaluation policies and procedures.

UCLA

The appointment letter shall state: the title of the position, the salary rate, the name of the department in which the appointment is located, beginning and end of the appointment, percentage time, general responsibilities, the name of the individual to whom the academic appointee reports. The university shall not be required to provide written notice of the above to an appointee at less than 50% time or short-term appointment of no more than one quarter or semester. For these people either the University shall not be required to give written notice of non-reappointment.

For those who have worked at least 50% time for eight or more consecutive years in the same academic title or title series on campus, notice of written non-reappointment shall be issued.

UNC-Chapel Hill

None stated.

Virginia Tech

None stated.

UW-Madison

None stated.

8. Non-Reappointment

UMD

FTNON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY faculty members should receive adequate notice of non-renewal of contract. PTNON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY faculty members should receive at least 30 days of notice of non-renewal prior to the end of the current contract.

UCLA

None stated.

UNC-Chapel Hill

Notice of non-reappointment is needed for full-time faculty at the rank of instructor. No obligation exists on the part of the University to give any notice in advance of expiration of a current term (*that is less than FT*).

Virginia Tech

In the cases of faculty on temporary or restricted appoint for which there is no indicated opportunity for reappointment, the letter of appointment also serves as notice of the termination of employment. The appointment is discontinued unless notified otherwise.

UW-Madison

None stated.

9. Professional Development

UMD

None stated.

UCLA

None stated.

UNC-Chapel Hill

None stated.

Virginia Tech

None stated.

UW-Madison

Sabbaticals would be too expensive. It is recommended instead a temporary reassignment of duties for instructional academic staff to enable the sufficient time for instruction enhancement, courses and curriculum development, or course redesign.

10. Governance

UMD

Participation. Each department or unit should make every effort to integrate FTNON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY and PTNON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY faculty members into the scholarly, intellectual and academic life of the department or unit, and institution. Departments are encouraged to have policies aimed toward this integration.

Shared Governance. All FTNON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY and PTNON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY faculty members should be informed of the procedures and calendar for the election of their representatives to the University Senate.

UCLA

None stated.

UNC-Chapel Hill

Fixed-term faculty can vote if no less than 75% of an equivalent FT position, their duties include teaching, research, or both; and the actual or anticipated length in the position is at least three years.

Participation in the Faculty Council (*the equivalent of UMD Senate*). One representative for each 42 members of the voting faculty. In divisions either two or more representatives are chosen on the basis of proportional representation of (1) professors, associate and assistant professors with permanent tenure, and librarians and (2) all other ranks. Elected members of the Council serve for terms of three years and are not eligible for election more than twice in any period of seven years.

Virginia Tech

Faculty at the rank of instructors are eligible to serve as voting members of the Faculty Senate. They should have meaningful engagement in program planning at the department level. Cannot vote in cases of promotion and tenure. *Observation: no formula is given for instructors' representation; it would seem they represent themselves through one person-one vote.*

Instructors may serve on graduate advisory committees and interact with graduate students and interns where relevant to their assignment and with the approval of the departmental

graduate program, department head or chair, and graduate school. They may not chair a graduate committee.

Instructors may serve as a principal investigator for a sponsored project or contract with the approval of the department chair, the dean, and the Office of the Vice President for Research.

UW-Madison

Faculty includes instructors with at least a one-half time appointment.

Faculty is divided into electoral districts. Each department having ten or more faculty members constitutes a district. Each district is entitled to elect from among its members one senator for each ten voters.

Appendix B

Results of the Working Group's Interviews with Lecturers, Instructors, and Research Scientists

Our findings are presented in terms of categories we deem essential to our evaluation. We begin with a discussion of job classifications and then move to contracts, salaries, health benefits, workloads and responsibilities, physical working conditions, professional development, evaluation practices, and participation in governance.

Job Classification

There was considerable ambiguity in the name of the position; some units use the term instructor, while others use lecturer; in two cases the categories "visiting lecturer" and "adjunct lecturer" were utilized. In one instance, the person was initially hired as "visiting assistant professor" and then re-appointed as lecturer. For simplification purposes only, we will refer to both lecturers and instructors as lecturers. Overall, respondents had very little familiarity with the *UMD Faculty Handbook* as a source of information regarding their position and responsibilities.

Contracts

In some units most lecturers work with one-year renewable contracts, but in other units it is common to work with one-semester contracts. Often, contracts are not signed until the last minute (most often a month before their courses begin), a convenience for the unit but a practice that creates hardship among the lecturers. This is especially true of summer teaching, when it is important for them to retain health benefits (in those cases where they qualify for health benefits). There were several instances of lecturers working on three-year contracts, but there were also individuals who have worked for three, four, even eight years and always under annual contracts. It was unclear to most of the lecturers if they could negotiate the length of the contract. We found one instance in which the lecturer had been moved from one-year contracts to being hired on a semester basis.

Several reported last-minute changes in their contract. For instance, one lecturer said, "I was on a 12-month contract and was told that I would have to go back to a 9-month contract. I wasn't bothered by this because I had wanted to change anyway, but they changed my salary to a level lower than was I was hired at. This I think is again completely unfair but there is no one to intercede." In another instance, a contract that included teaching two courses and supervising eight students, with an increase of \$4,000, was modified by a superior saying that it had been a mistake as there were no students to supervise and that an additional course had to be taught. The final contract, signed at the end of July, was for teaching three courses and supervising two students, at the same salary the lecturer had with her old contract. A third lecturer reported being told she had to teach off-campus just as the spring semester was to start.

There was great variability in the definitions of part-time and full-time status. Full-time is determined on the basis of the number of courses, but the required number of courses varies across departments. In one department teaching three courses a semester is considered part-time; in another, one class with 150 students is considered part-time. In another department, teaching

half-time is defined as teaching two courses during two consecutive semesters; in this particular case, since the lecturers are hired for one semester at a time, many lecturers are prevented from having access to health benefits. In general, it appears that most lecturers must teach at least two courses per semester to receive health insurance.

In general, lecturers feel that appointment by semester is a poor practice that not only weakens needed job security but also blocks them from access to health insurance. Summarizing their status, one lecturer said: “I have no idea what will happen in the fall semester.”

Salaries

Many of the respondents argued that the criteria for salaries were unclear. In general, however, they felt very strongly that they were poorly paid given their backgrounds and the effort put into their classes. One lecturer put it this way: “Many of us are training students to be professionals in our field who will be starting at salaries with a bachelor’s degree that are very close to or more than our own salaries. I taught at a school with my master’s degree and earned \$20,000 more than I do now with an Ivy League doctorate ... and five years of experience teaching at the college level as well as 14 years in the public schools.”

Salary increases tend to be rare and small. One respondent reported an increase of \$3,000 over several years; another reported an increase of \$500 when she moved from teaching two courses to three. Another lecturer reported having received regular increases over the nine years in his position. In a number of cases, salaries had not changed in several years, ranging from three years to nine years. One individual, however, said that while there are no merit increases, there had been increases for the cost of living every year. Merit pay was reported in only one instance. One lecturer observed, “If you do a good job, you don’t get fired—that’s your merit pay.”

As a whole, lecturers feel they are paid much less than regular faculty and that they are underpaid for the work they do. Comparing themselves to assistant professors, lecturers observe that the latter earn \$25,000 more than lecturers. One lecturer stated: “I earn \$14,000 for four courses a year. I am not suggesting that I earn as much as [a] professor. I am suggesting a living wage. I am taking loans to cover my living expenditures.”

Regarding the divergence between performance of duties and remuneration, one lecturer who works in the social sciences was adamant: “[The situation of job dissatisfaction] *is not a product of miscommunication*. I know what I’m being offered. I understand that the job is for a year with no guarantees [of renewal]. Is this an argument (take it or leave it) also given to those in the sciences/engineering? But you are taking advantage of me because I have no options. This is a cynical view of the university as a working space.”

There were some instances in which the lecturers were also graduate students. They noted that losing their GA to become a part-time lecturer meant the loss of health benefits and tuition remission, requiring them to pay \$1,400 per semester to maintain their student status and amounting, de facto, to a salary reduction. GAs are FICA exempt, but all lecturers pay FICA; this creates a further decrease in their salaries.

Health Benefits

As noted earlier, standard health benefits are granted to all lecturers working on at least a half-time basis; the problem is the definition of half-time. The prevailing practice of hiring on a semester basis bars many half-time lecturers from receiving benefits.

Work Loads and Responsibilities

The number of courses lecturers teach varies a great deal. In one unit, they teach between five and six courses per year, with enrollments ranging from 40 to 400, and often with 250 students per class. In other units enrollment is about 60 students per course, or 180 students per week. In the social sciences, the latter load was considered high; one of the lecturers with such a load who teaches both lower- and upper-division courses, stated: “All exams are multiple choice. Ironic: you have people who want to teach and you create a situation that does not allow them to teach well.” Echoing this view, another lecturer said: “I give no written/essay assignments. Were I to give a five-page essay I would have to read 300 pages per class. I could not give detailed feedback. So I use Scantrons and memorization.” A third lecturer, with about 175 students per semester, felt this is a reasonable load, but added that students do not get individual attention. She mentioned that in previous occasions she had the assistance of TAs to help in the discussion sessions, but now—because of budget problems—there are fewer TAs. In one instance, the lecturer had taught 100 students with no TA.

There were complaints about workloads having changed after a contract was signed. In one instance, a lecturer felt forced to teach courses he/she was “not comfortable teaching.”

Most of the lecturers advise students. This is typically done informally and it is not an explicit contract component. In addition, they take on other responsibilities such as helping students with applications for graduate study, writing letters of recommendation, answering e-mails ranging from career choices to personal issues, assisting graduate students in developing their dissertation proposals, and writing and grading comprehensive exams. Some lecturers, in addition to their teaching responsibilities, plan department events, coordinate outreach programs, run technology labs, and serve as financial managers. In some cases, having office hours is formally part of the contract. In two units, it is one hour per class session.

A few lecturers have been asked to participate in either departmental committees or college committees. Most lecturers do not participate in such committees, some because they do not have time and others because they feel, or have been explicitly told, they are not welcome.

Physical Working Conditions

Most lecturers we interviewed have an office on campus. Their office space was described as ranging from small to very small. Most of the time, this is a space they share with other lecturers. In a few instances, lecturers use a temporary space, vacant until a new faculty member is assigned to it.

Many lecturers have very limited administrative support. They often do their own copying and other administrative tasks. Some feel they have access to all the equipment they need; others rely on their own computers. One lecturer mentioned that his computer account (through Novell) has very limited storage space, which makes file storage problematic.

While there are official policies to support tenured and tenure track faculty who are new parents (e.g., course buyouts that can be used for maternity leave and opportunities for reduced workload), there do not seem to be any similar policies to support non tenured/tenured track faculty.

Professional Development

Most lecturers do not participate in professional development. Funding for attending conferences is available for regular faculty and, on competitive bases for graduate students in all departments. In one unit there is funding for conferences in the spring for lecturers (\$500 per person); however, lecturers cannot always apply because they do not know if they will have a contract during the spring.

There is a widespread feeling that it is difficult for lecturers to stay current in the field because of lack of support to present their research at conferences, to apply for research grants, or even to conduct their own research. One lecturer mentioned that she received funding for attending a conference only once in her eight years of work. Several observed they had no time for professional development given their teaching assignments and the difficulty in leaving classes in the middle of the semester. As a result, they feel they will not be in a competitive position when they leave the University.

A few lecturers reported that there was an expectation (stated but not written) that they should publish and obtain grants. One stated: "I have been asked on many occasions when I will publish from my dissertation and that I need to apply for grants. I was told by a department chair that my position was in jeopardy because I do not bring in grant money, though neither is in my contract. Many of us do [research] at our own expense and at the expense of our own time while teaching overloads." The experience of another lecturer was different and yet the commitment to research similar: "The university says that lecturers don't have to do any research to maintain their jobs but because I consider myself a professional that one day will get an academic job, I have to continue to do research. There has to be a balance between teaching and research. That strengthens our teaching task. Otherwise it is no good for me, the students, or the university."

One issue of particular concern for many lecturers is their perception that they have no status in their departments. They feel that they do "an enormous amount of valuable teaching, program activities, supervising, and University-community partnership-building work" and yet many faculty members do not acknowledge this contribution sufficiently.

Evaluation Practices

Regarding evaluation of teaching practices, such procedures seem to be infrequent and ad hoc. The most common appraisal is that derived from student evaluations. In a few cases, faculty

members observe classes given by lecturers but feedback is rarely offered. Such evaluations are not grounds for conversations with department chairs, so “no oversight as long as there are no complaints.”

Participation in Governance

Many lecturers believe they are not welcome to participate in department or college meetings. Most do not have the right to vote on department or college issues. Some feel they do not have a voice: One lecturer, serving in that position for nine years, said: “I have never been aware that there is shared governance. How can I make a demand from my position? I have no political voice.” A similar comment was made by a lecturer who has been in that position for three years: “I am aware I can go to meetings. Governance moves too slowly. I don’t feel welcome in faculty meetings.... I don’t want to create an opposition environment with someone I work with.”

One lecturer linked her half-time status to a lack of academic freedom. She explained: “One of the primary purposes of tenure was to protect academic freedom. As a lecturer with no tenure, you have to be much more conscious of what you say in class. Academicians can complain if their freedoms are curtailed; as a lecturer, I have no recourse. Without job security you cannot do that.” A few lecturers, however, stated that in their departments lecturers are considered faculty and so they go to committee meetings and participate in decisions.

It was frequently remarked that, at present, there is just one campus Senate seat reserved for a full-time lecturer representative and another for part-time. There was a shared feeling among lecturers that their campus senate representation is small given the large number of lecturers on campus (as Table 1 shows, these two senators represent 860 lecturers). One of the lecturers in the study observed that while he could not participate in certain activities of his department because, “they told me I didn’t have a stake in the life of the department,” he had served in the campus senate as a lecturer representative.

Appendix C

Memo

To: Glen Fuhrmeister, Coordinator, UMD Senate Office

From: Diane Krejsa

Re: Faculty Affairs Committee: Lecturer/Instructor & Research Faculty Working Group

Date: November 15, 2010

You have asked whether the policies listed below are applicable to faculty *other than tenured and tenure-track faculty, specifically lecturers/instructors and research faculty*. My summary answers below are worded to answer this question. The policies listed include Board of Regents policies (denoted simply by a roman numeral and number) and related University of Maryland Policies or Procedures (denoted by a roman numeral and number, followed by a parenthetical letter). Some of the policies include specific eligibility statements. Others are applicable only to instructional faculty, which may include lecturers and instructors, but not researchers. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

II-1.00(E)

USM II-1.00 at II.C.7(i) provides that each institution shall establish its own guidelines and procedures for awarding the title of “Distinguished University Professor.” The UM Policy provides that the title is conferred only by the President and should be bestowed on a limited number of faculty. The criteria state that the faculty member must hold the rank of Full Professor. As such it is inapplicable to lecturers/instructors or research faculty.

II-1.00(F)

This policy is only applicable to instructional faculty. It applies to both full-time and part-time lecturers and instructors. It does not apply to research faculty (unless they also have instructional duties).

II-1.02(A)

This policy is required by USM II-1.02 which, by its terms, expressly applies only to tenure and tenure-track appointments. It does not apply to lecturers/instructors or research faculty.

II-1.03 (excluding section 3(e) and 3(f))

Faculty holding concurrent administrative appointments are generally tenured or tenure-track faculty. (Faculty holding concurrent administrative appointments, e.g., Chair, Dean, are part of the promotion and tenure review process and provide a recommendation independent of the faculty committee at that level.) While this BOR policy is silent on this issue, it is not likely that it applies to lecturers, instructors or research faculty as applied at College Park.

II-1.05

By its terms this BOR policy applies only to full-time instructional faculty who are neither tenured nor eligible for tenure. It applies to lecturers and instructors. It does not apply to research faculty (unless they also have instructional duties).

II-1.06

By its terms this BOR policy applies only to part-time instructional faculty who are neither tenured nor eligible for tenure. It applies to lecturers and instructors. (See the faculty ranks listed in section IV.) It does not apply to research faculty (unless they also have instructional duties.)

II-1.20

This BOR policy requires each institution to establish policies and procedures for a periodic evaluation of the performance of its faculty members consistent with its mission and goals. It is within the discretion of each institution to determine which faculty are evaluated and why.

II-1.20(A)

By its terms, this policy applies to tenured faculty and instructors and lecturers with job security. It does not apply to lecturers/ instructors or research faculty who do not have job security.

II-1.21

This BOR policy provides that the Chancellor shall develop guidelines and include salary ranges for each institutional faculty rank. The salary guidelines issued by the Chancellor's Office on an annual basis no longer provide minimums and maximums for faculty salaries by rank. The Division of Academic Affairs at UM has developed its own annual faculty salary guidelines, which include lecturer/instructor ranks and research faculty.

II-1.22

This BOR policy applies to all faculty appointments, including lecturers/instructors and research faculty.

II-1.22(A)

This policy applies to all faculty appointments, including lecturers/instructors and research faculty.

II-1.25

This BOR policy applies to the individuals listed in Section II, including full-time lecturers/instructors and research faculty.

II-2.20

This BOR policy applies to eligible faculty as defined in paragraph 1 (faculty employed on a continuing or term contract for at least two semesters or twelve months prior to the beginning of the proposed leave, with the expectation of continued employment upon the end of the leave without pay period). This would include eligible lecturers/instructors and research faculty.

II-2.20(A)

This policy applies to faculty who are eligible as defined in B(1) and (2), including lecturers/instructors and research faculty.

II-2.30

This BOR policy applies only to instructional faculty who are appointed for at least one semester, including lecturers/instructors. It does not apply to research faculty.

II-2.30(A)

This policy applies only to instructional faculty who are appointed for at least one semester, including lecturers/instructors. It does not apply to research faculty.

II-2.30(B)

This policy applies to non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty, including lecturers/instructors and research faculty who are employed at least 50% PT and who are eligible for sick leave benefits.

II-2.30(C)

This policy applies to non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty, including lecturers/instructors and research faculty.

II-2.30(D)

This policy applies to non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty, including lecturers/instructors and research faculty who are eligible for sick leave benefits.

II-2.31(A)

This policy applies to non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty, including lecturers/instructors and research faculty, provided they meet the eligibility criteria set forth in Section 1.

II-2.40

This BOR policy applies to non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty, including lecturers/instructors and research faculty, provided the faculty meet the eligibility criteria set forth in either Section I, II or III. Faculty serving on contracts of less than 10 months are not entitled to earn annual leave.

II-2.50

This BOR policy applies to non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty, including lecturers/instructors and research faculty.

III-3.00

This BOR policy is not clear in its applicability to non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty. My reading is that non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty, including lecturers/instructors and research faculty, have a role, but that tenured faculty and faculty with permanent status may have a greater advisory role.

II-3.10

This BOR policy expressly applies to all faculty, including non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty (e.g., lecturers/instructors and research faculty). See Section II.A. By explicit reference, see Section II.A., some sections of the policy apply only to full-time faculty members, including full-time non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty (e.g., full-time lecturers/instructors and research faculty). See Sections III and IV.B.

II-3.10(A)

This policy applies to non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty, including lecturers/instructors and research faculty.

II-3.10(B)

This policy applies to non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty, including lecturers/instructors and research faculty.

II-3.20

This BOR policy is redundant. BOR II-3.10 at Section IV. B. says the same thing. This policy applies to all full-time faculty, including lecturers/instructors and research faculty.

II-4.00

This BOR policy applies to any faculty member holding a recognized faculty rank, regardless of tenure status or percent time of employment, including lecturers/instructors and research faculty.

II-4.00(A)

This policy applies to “all persons with faculty status irrespective of their administrative duties or assignments at the time of the action or inaction prompting the grievance. The faculty members covered by the Grievance Procedures are all those whose titles are in the University of Maryland Policy on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Policy II-1.00(A) part I and in the University System Policy II-1.00, whether the person is full-time or part-time, as long as the faculty appointment is the person’s primary position at the University of Maryland.” As such, the policy applies to lecturers/instructors and research faculty “as long as the faculty appointment is the person’s primary position at the University of Maryland.”

Note: The last 3 policies listed are in a different category entirely. If there is a question as to the scope of the charge from the Executive Committee, I suggest that it would be appropriate to omit these 3 policies from the current review.

II-8.00

This policy applies to non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty, including lecturers/instructors and research faculty.

II-8.00(A)

This policy applies to non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty, including lecturers/instructors and research faculty. The applicability of certain provisions of the policy vary according to faculty status at the time notice of termination is given. See, e.g., paragraph 8(a) (non-tenure-track faculty including lecturers/instructors and research faculty shall be given written notice of up to one year but not less than 30 days prior to the date of termination of the appointment); paragraph 8(c) (lecturers/instructors with permanent status or job security shall be given written notice of termination of at least one year prior to the date of termination of the appointment).

II-8.00(B)

This policy applies to non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty, including lecturers/instructors and research faculty. See Section I, paragraph 6; Section IV, paragraph 3.



University Senate CHARGE

Date:	September 1, 2010
To:	Robert Schwab Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee
From:	Linda Mabbs Chair, University Senate
Subject:	University Policies Related to Lecturers/Instructors & Research Faculty
Senate Document #:	10-11-04
Deadline:	December 1, 2010

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) requests that the Faculty Affairs Committee review the attached proposal regarding policies for lecturers/instructors and research faculty at the University of Maryland.

The SEC feels that a preliminary evaluation will help determine whether there are areas of concern. Therefore, we ask that the Faculty Affairs Committee review the existing policies and comment on whether they are appropriate.

Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Review any existing University policies related to these constituencies including II-1.00(F) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON FULL-TIME and PART-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY.
2. Compare our existing policies to those at our peer institutions.
3. Comment on whether there are any areas of concern that should be reevaluated.

We ask that you submit your report and recommendations to the Senate Office no later than December 1, 2010. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.

**Recommendation to Senate-Faculty Affairs Committee:
Create a committee or task force to do research on how to improve employment
conditions for full time Lecturers at the University of Maryland**

By Boden Sandstrom, Lecturer, School of Music

I. Areas to Research

1. Salaries

- Base salary – how determined
- Policy on raises – how often and by how much
- System of merit raises – not included in current policy that was just passed

2. Description of Responsibilities

- Teaching load
- Other responsibilities

3. Research and Travel Grants (tenured and tenure-track faculty)

- Study Abroad Course Development Grant (Office of International Programs)
- International Travel Grant (Office of International Programs)
- Research and Scholarship Awards (RASA)
- Department travel funds to conferences (available to lecturers – dept. decision)

II. Reasons why research needed

1. Salaries

- Adequate compensation for contributions to University
- Advancement in profession
- Reward for service to University and Department community
 - Serving on or chairing University, Department or Student committees
 - Innovation in Departments
- To achieve above, many lecturers take on overloads

2. Description of responsibilities

- Base salary agrees with work load
- What is standard load for lecturers?

3. Research and Travel Grants

- Improve teaching and advising
 - By doing research and publishing
 - By staying current in field
- Be able to create Study Abroad Courses*

*This year I created 2 without benefit of travel grant: Balinese Performing Arts & Culture: Music, Dance and Puppetry and Manding Drumming & Culture in West Africa to Senegal