

Report of the ad hoc Committee of the Faculty Senate established to study the status of Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Faculty at Cornell

Submitted on behalf of the Committee

by

Donald F. Holcomb, Professor Emeritus, Physics (co-chair)

Norman R. Scott, Professor, BEE (co-chair)

20 August 2004

I. Introduction

Continuing academics not on tenure track serve the University, its colleges, and its departments in capacities essential to Cornell's ability to accomplish its many missions. The University recognizes its responsibility to review the privileges and academic protections it provides these valuable contributors.

Dean of Faculty J. Robert Cooke, as directed by the Faculty Senate (10/1/02), appointed an *ad hoc* committee to respond to this resolution:

The Faculty Senate directs the Dean of the Faculty to appoint a Task Force or Task Forces to investigate and make recommendations concerning the status and conditions of employment of non-tenure-track faculty, paying particular attention to such matters as titles, job security, rights to academic freedom, access to appropriate grievance and appeals procedures, eligibility for sabbatic/study leave, eligibility for emeritus/a status, and voting rights.

The Committee's membership is listed below. It began its deliberations in January 2003. An interim report was issued 12 May 2003. The present document is its final report.

Committee Membership

Lynne Abel, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, retired, Assoc. Prof. Classics

Nancy Burton-Wurster, Senior Research Associate, Veterinary College

Stuart Davis, Senior Lecturer, Arts & Sciences

Donald Holcomb, Prof. of Physics Emeritus, *Co-chair*

Kathleen Long, Assoc. Prof. of Romance Studies

Mary Opperman, Vice-President for Human Resources

Norman Scott, Prof. of Biological and Environmental Engineering, *Co-Chair*

Steven Shiffrin, Prof. of Law

Susan Steward, Director, Academic Personnel Policy Office

Maria Terrell, Senior Lecturer, Arts & Sciences

Pamela Tolbert, Prof. of Organizational Behavior, ILR

Linda Van Buskirk, Senior Lecturer, A&LS

Organization of the Report

I. Description of the Committee's Activities

- A. Composition of the NTT Faculty at Cornell
- B. Role of NTT Faculty: Perspectives and Principles
- C. Input to the Committee from Members of the University
- D. Commentary and Assessment
 - 1. Terms of Appointment, Performance Evaluation and Job Security
 - 2. Academic Freedom
 - 3. Professional Development
 - 4. Voting Rights
 - 5. Titles
 - 6. Retirement and Emeritus/a Arrangements
 - 7. Concluding Comments

II. Recommendations for Administrative Action

- A. Academic Freedom
- B. Consistency of Procedures for Appointment and Promotion
- C. Job Security: Funding
- D. Job Security: Access to Appeals
- E. Access to Grievance Procedures
- F. Consulting Policy
- G. Salary Study
- H. Phased Retirement for NTT faculty
- I. Representation of NTT faculty at the University Level
- J. Standing Committee on NTT faculty

III. Proposed Resolutions for the Faculty Senate

- A. Professional Development Study Leaves
- B. New Titles: Research Scientist and Principal Research Scientist
- C. Eligibility for Emeritus/a Status
- D. Voting Rights for Continuing NTT Faculty

Selected Resources

Appendix A: Non-Tenure-Track Academic Titles (1 February 2004)

Figures: Academic Non-Faculty 1993-2003

- 1. By college
- 2. By job function
- 3. Women by job function

A web site was developed to assist Committee members and others interested in the Committee's work to exchange and retrieve information. The address is (<http://instruct1.cit.cornell.edu/~sad4/NTTF/>). This web site is linked to the Dean of

Faculty web site at: <http://web.cornell.edu/UniversityFaculty/> under the section on Active Forums/Discussions.

A. Composition of Non-Tenure Track Faculty at Cornell

The 2002 Cornell *Faculty Handbook* (p. 27) gives a full list of academic titles; employee totals in NTT titles for 2003-04 are given in Appendix A. Our committee concluded that its attention should focus on the large group formed by the various levels of lecturer, research associate, extension associate, librarian and archivist. Most members of this group are, to various extents, naturally considered as members of college or department faculties, while they are not members of the University Faculty.

At the present time Cornell professorial faculty number approximately 1600. In 2003-04, those in NTT faculty ranks numbered 1624. February 2004 data show 278 lecturers and senior lecturers, 446 research associates and senior research associates, 287 extension associates and senior extension associates, and 130 librarians and archivists.

The committee focused primarily on the professional status and conditions of employment of NTT faculty appointed at the various levels of lecturer, research associate, and extension associate. However, it intends that any of its recommendations or legislation adopted by the Faculty Senate or implemented by administrators provide models and a positive context for addressing the professional status and conditions of employment of all NTT faculty at Cornell. In particular, librarians already have their own policies about many of the issues the committee addresses. The committee does not intend to require new ones. However, as librarians develop further policies and procedures, they will, the committee expects, build on outcomes of the committee's work. In another particular, some colleges or schools may propose appointing NTT faculty to the recently created titles of assistant, associate, and full clinical professor. Proposals for appointments in these and other new NTT faculty titles should conform to the principles espoused in this report. Finally, non-tenure-track professorial faculty, who are very few, share many of the same concerns and deserve similar protections as other NTT faculty.

B. Role of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: Perceptions and Principles

In considering the role of NTT faculty at Cornell, we must be aware of perceptions that attend their hiring in American academia.

1. In a workplace increasingly driven by the need to reduce costs, the cost saving achieved by hiring NTT faculty becomes a motive for their employment. The heavier courseloads carried by NTT teaching faculty is an example, although not the only one.
2. Where the labor pool is deep, cost-saving can be achieved without sacrificing quality of work.
3. Limited-term contracts allow for flexibility, allowing departments, programs, and units to respond to changes in enrollments and fluctuations in funding. This flexibility

also allows for precise definitions of duties and responsibilities that can fill the continuing as well as short-term needs and demands of departments, programs, and units.

4. An assumption that has prevailed at universities for some time is that NTT faculty salaries are a secondary part of a family's income. This assumption (in addition to prevailing market forces) has contributed to the limiting of NTT faculty salaries and to concomitant limiting of status and of resources available to NTT faculty, particularly in fields heavily populated by women.

These perceptions have to a great extent shaped present practices. We believe that anyone seeking to understand those practices should cultivate principled awareness of the risks they entail. In this report, we have been guided by the following principles.

1. Quality of instruction, research, or public service is enhanced by faculty members' knowledge and understanding of how a department or program functions and of its central goals. This knowledge is acquired over time and represents a form of "workforce capital." Supported by experience and academic qualification, this "capital" can contribute significantly to the effectiveness of NTT faculty. All these should be factors in hiring and retention decisions.

2. The depth of a given labor pool may vary considerably over time, and the only way to guarantee consistent quality of job performance is to hire from an excellent pool and then to assure some form of job security and opportunities for professional development. Constant rotation of NTT faculty brings with it the risk of hires from a less qualified and less motivated pool of candidates. Long retention of qualified NTT faculty and support of their professional development enhances their stake in and their contributions to the life of the institution.

3. Maintaining flexibility is a valid reason for hiring NTT faculty, but the value of this very flexibility must be reflected in adequate salaries, appropriate professional development opportunities, and a respectful workplace climate.

4. In this economic climate, no family salary is secondary, and financial well-being cannot be assumed. Adequate salary and resources contribute to a professional workplace climate and permit NTT faculty to perform their duties to the best of their abilities.

C. Input to the Committee from Members of the University

By e-mail in the spring 2003 semester, the Committee invited comments from tenured and tenure-track faculty as well as from non-tenure-track faculty concerning the following issues of governance and professional status:

1. The first concern is maintenance of academic freedom to teach students and to conduct research and extension activities in ways appropriate to a leading university. As broadly construed by the AAUP, academic freedom includes
 - Economic and job security,

- Grievance procedures,
 - Freedom in research and publication,
 - Freedom in the classroom, and
 - Due process in all professional matters.
2. While recognizing that the particular definition of responsibilities and privileges will necessarily vary among the departments and colleges, the Committee wished to explore issues such as
- Titles,
 - Career development,
 - Participation in university and academic life, and
 - Accountability, evaluation, and standards for renewal of contracts.

The Committee invited respondents to rank the importance to themselves and comment on concerns about the status of NTT faculty within their departments, to consider existing policies and practices, and to suggest reforms. In order to allow respondents to choose convenience or confidentiality, replies by email were directed to Sandie Sutfin (Dean of Faculty's Office) or through the University Faculty Senate website.

Summary of Responses

Sixty-three people, almost all NTT faculty, replied to the e-mail survey. They expressed appreciation for the opportunity, which many noted was the first provided to them, to convey their thoughts. In order of frequency of importance to them, their responses were directed to

- Job and economic security,
- Career advancement,
- Professional development,
- Ambiguity about status within the University, college and department,
- Salary schedule/incentives, and
- Titles, particularly relative to both being able to be a Principal Investigator for a research grant, and to the perception of agencies about the appropriateness of Principal Investigator status for people with certain of our present titles.

The NTTF Committee hosted an open hearing for NTTF faculty in November 2003. More than 60 attended. The major issues addressed were similar to those above with, however additional focus on

- Access to an appeals process,
- Rights to academic freedom,
- Consistency of promotion procedures and appointments across colleges,
- Opportunities for phased retirement,
- Clarification on voting rights,
- Representation in the University, and
- Autonomy in research funding.

Generally, NTT faculty perceived that they enjoy academic freedom in the conduct of their work, whether it be research, teaching, or outreach. However, some (primarily extension associates) reported feeling that pressure from persons or groups outside the University was used against them. Finally, many NTT faculty do not feel free to participate critically in academic governance.

Very few persons had sought to employ the existing grievance procedures. Almost all respondents expressed a lack of understanding about such procedures or uncertainty about whether such existed for NTT faculty.

One response portrayed the ideal situation for NTT faculty:

We want to “1) feel that our contributions are valued by the University just as faculty programs are, 2) work in an atmosphere where colleagues treat us as equals, 3) have the ability to gather resources (e.g. grants) necessary to support our program area, 4) have avenues for promotion built into the system and 5) be adequately compensated.

The Committee’s work should provide means to attaining some of these goals.

D. Commentary and Assessment

1. Terms of Appointment, Performance Evaluation and Job Security

University bylaws provide specifications for academic appointments. The authority comes from the Board of Trustees via “broad strokes” and from other Trustee legislation, hand-in-hand with University Faculty legislation. The appointment process does not seem problematic, although spousal appointments to support dual careers may need some increased flexibility. The Academic Personnel Policy Office is working with others to develop and refine policies governing early termination and non-renewal of NTT faculty appointments.

Normally performance reviews are not required at the University level. Good personnel policy entails reviews at the local level. All NTT faculty should receive periodic written reviews.

Job security was a principal concern of respondents to the Committee’s survey and in the open hearing. Related closely was perception that the salary structure for NTT faculty positions, perhaps particularly in the "Senior" categories, has lagged significantly behind salaries for comparable positions in other universities and non-profit enterprises. A serious study of this issue is beyond the mandate or capabilities of this Committee. But in Recommendation G, Salary Study, we urge the Provost to initiate comparative studies of salaries in the principal NTT faculty ranks.

With reference to research associates, a common suggestion was a pool of money to help a person for a short time between grants, particularly in the case of unavoidable breaks between research grants.

NTT faculty perceive a huge variation and inequity in the application of policies and procedures across colleges. This concern was expressed for appointments, reappointments, promotion, respect, responsibilities and expectations, service on graduate student committees, participation in departmental governance, and access to grievance policies.

☛ *See Recommendations B, Consistency of Procedures for Appointment and Promotion; C, Job Security: Funding; and D. Job Security: Access to Appeals*

2. Academic Freedom

The ninth edition (2001) of the AAUP *Policy Documents and Reports* restates that the AAUP has focused on the principles of academic freedom since its inception in 1915. Of special relevance is a section from the Conclusions of this document:

Individuals who are offered full-time service only on non-tenure track lines lack the financial, intellectual, and pedagogical security needed for the profession to be an attractive career choice for young scholars. Moreover, and of even greater importance, faculty members who hold such positions lack the security without which academic freedom and the right to pursue one's own contributions in research and teaching are but illusions.

The AAUP (in its 1986 report) raises concerns about the adverse effects of appointing NTT faculty in the place of TT faculty without guarantees and protections of academic freedom.

Consequently, all our recommendations converge on extending academic freedom in the broadest sense to NTT faculty in their teaching, research, and outreach activities. In particular, we propose that the University commit itself to protecting their academic freedom in concrete and meaningful ways.

☛ *See Recommendation A, Academic Freedom*

3. Professional Development

NTT faculty, while they may be faculty in their schools and colleges, are not members of the University Faculty. Like tenure-track faculty, NTT faculty routinely use their time on the job and off to maintain and further their professional competence. But most NTT faculty keep more prescriptive daily schedules than TTF; they may have more contact hours with students, more direct efforts in carrying out labs, practica, performances, and research or extension work. Vacation time alone is not sufficient for continuing professional development, and uninterrupted service in research, teaching, or outreach activities can lead to burnout.

Because the University has a positive interest in the professional and intellectual growth of all faculty, because resources for supporting this growth will need to come from the University as well as from the schools and colleges, and because equity across college and school boundaries requires similar treatment of faculty in similar titles, the Committee recommends to the Senate that it call upon the Provost and the school and

college deans and directors of administrative centers to establish mechanisms whereby professional development opportunities in the form of paid and unpaid leaves, and, where they do not already exist, resources for attending conferences and professional meetings, can be made regularly available to NTT faculty.

The Committee has developed a detailed plan for a professional development policy, which is presented as Resolution #1.

☛ *See Resolution A, Professional Development Study Leaves*

4. Voting Rights

The *status quo* for lecturers and senior lecturers in this area is described in print on pp. 4 and 5 of the 2002 Cornell *Faculty Handbook*, and more completely on p. 30, and for Senior Research Associates on p. 31. The entry on p. 30 is a slightly condensed version of an earlier statement approved by the Faculty Council of Representatives (predecessor of the Cornell Faculty Senate) on March 9, 1994.

That earlier resolution contained the following sentence:

Lecturers and senior lecturers are members in both college/school and department faculties and shall participate fully in decisions that are relevant to their roles within the college/school or department and in decisions that pertain to the hiring in their rank or below, and in any other matters the particular college/school or department may deem appropriate.

The FCR resolution was significantly modified before being presented to the Trustees and becoming part of University Bylaw XIII. The *Faculty Handbook's* current redaction of University Bylaw XIII states, in pertinent part, that lecturers and senior lecturers "participate fully in those decisions that are directly related to their roles within the college or school and within the department" (2002, p. 30). Because the current version gives an operational procedure for determining those issues that are "related,"* we recommend the deletion of "directly" in Bylaw and *Faculty Handbook* texts.

Because the pattern of decision-making at the departmental level varies greatly across academic departments, and the Committee hesitates to recommend any particular guidelines for all NTT faculty. However, it believes that effective relationships within a department are significantly enhanced when non-tenure faculty enjoy and receive the respect of the department and are included in decision-making of the department. Therefore the Committee has developed a resolution that includes both this larger principle and the deletion of "directly."

☛ *See Resolution D, Voting Rights for Continuing NTT Faculty*

* "The dean or director has the responsibility of identifying those issues that are related to their roles within the college or school, and the department chair has that responsibility within the department."

5. Titles

Our Committee's activities have focused on NTT faculty who occupy positions which carry the titles:

Senior Lecturer, Lecturer
Senior Research Associate, Research Associate
Senior Extension Associate, Extension Associate
Librarians and Archivists (eleven sub classifications)

The Committee has considered whether this list of titles is adequate to represent the academic world of 2004 at Cornell. We believe the titles, "Research Associate" and "Senior Research Associate", are inadequate to meet the wide-ranging needs of the University's research community in the research world of 2004. A proposal to add two titles, "Research Scientist" and "Principal Research Scientist", was voted on favorably by the faculty of the College of Engineering (April 30, 2003). Recognizing the inadequacy of existing non-tenure track titles for researchers at Cornell, the Committee has considered creation of new and the redefinition of existing research titles in the titles matrix. We do this because

- Senior Research Associates and some Research Associates are now often performing research that was traditionally a professorial responsibility. Their titles are no longer commensurate with their qualifications and responsibilities and are disadvantageous when applying for outside grants.
- Restricting Cornell Senior Research Associates and Research Associates to these two titles may compromise their professional standing, compensation and productivity, as well as limiting recognition and access to a rewarding career path.
- Of ten peer institutions, only two maintain the title, Senior Research Associate, and all have the titles, Research Scientist, Research Professor, or both. Cornell may well be at a disadvantage in competing with these institutions for researchers and funding.

☛ *See Resolution B, New Titles: Research Scientist and Principal Research Scientist*

6. Retirement and Emeritus/a arrangements for NTT faculty

As is the case for professorial faculty, many retirement arrangements for NTT faculty are covered by the Office of Human Resources plans described in the two booklets, "Retirement and Beyond (Endowed)" and "Retirement and Beyond (Contract College Faculty and Staff.)" These arrangements are also briefly described in a section of the 2002 *Faculty Handbook* entitled "Retirement Benefits", beginning on p. 62.

For professorial faculty, there currently also exist two available avenues which permit continuation of professional activities into the retirement years -- (1) phased retirement arrangements, and (2) opportunities for continuing university-based activity by Emeritus/a Professors, as described in the Provost's Policy Statement on the Transition of Faculty to Emeritus Status, which is reproduced on pp. 66-67 of the 2002 *Faculty Handbook*. The Committee believes that both the University and retiring NTT faculty would profit by extending availability of these two avenues to retiring NTT faculty. Recommendation J, directed to the Provost, describes our proposal in some detail.

☛ *See Recommendation J, Phased Retirement, and Resolution C, Eligibility for Emeritus/a Status*

7. Concluding Comments

The charge to this committee covered a large number of aspects of the professional life of non-tenure track faculty at Cornell. We believe that we have made some progress in sorting out where future investigation and possible actions are called for -- by the Faculty Senate, by the College administrations, the central administration and the University Trustees.

II. Recommendations for Administrative Action

A. ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The Committee recommends to the Provost that

1. Cornell University affirm the practice of academic freedom as a right and a responsibility of academic employment at Cornell, clarify the terms of employment and promotion for non-tenure track faculty, and inform the non-tenure track faculty that the grievance procedures available to tenure track faculty are available to them as well. For matters concerning academic freedom, grievance procedures be uniform across the university, for all titles;
2. Cornell University explicitly affirm its extension of the protections of academic freedom to its non-tenure track faculty on the occasion of their being hired, including all information commonly distributed to tenure-track faculty;
3. Cornell University hold its colleges and departments responsible for extending full rights and privileges of academic freedom to its non-tenure track faculty; and
4. Cornell University hold its colleges and departments responsible for defining the terms of employment of all non-tenure track faculty in such a way as to create a climate in which academic freedom is perceived to be equally available to tenured, tenure track, and non-tenure track faculty.

B. CONSISTENCY OF PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

The Committee recommends that the Provost review with the Deans, University Librarian and Vice Presidents and Vice Provosts with academic units compliance with Trustee legislation establishing guidelines on procedures for appointment, performance appraisals, reappointment, promotion and reconsideration of adverse decisions about academic reappointments and promotions for consistency across colleges. In addition, the Committee recommends that the Provost review these procedures with department chairs and heads of academic units to develop a consistency in these matters.

C. JOB SECURITY: FUNDING

The Committee recommends that the Vice Provost for Research and the Provost establish a mechanism whereby a modest portion of indirect costs recovered from grants and contracts be directed to an investment pool to be used for bridging funds, accessible by an internal-peer-reviewed research proposal, by those whose appointments are funded by grants and contracts and whose service at Cornell has exceeded six years. Bridging funds would enable the appointee to continue research during a funding gap between grants and contracts or when the pattern of funding renewal creates a gap that threatens to reduce salary to less than half or otherwise to benefits-ineligible status from a status that had conferred benefits eligibility.

D. JOB SECURITY: ACCESS TO APPEALS

The committee recommends that the Provost direct each college dean and director of a center to formulate policies and procedures to appeal the denial of reappointment to a NTT faculty member in a funded academic position. The dean or director may decide that departmental rather than college-wide policies and procedures are appropriate and direct departments that appoint NTT faculty to develop their own set. Departments will, however, submit their policies and procedures to deans for approval. The Provost will review all sets of policies and procedures for consistency and fairness.

Such procedures, the committee believes, may profitably be modeled on extant “Procedures for Appealing a Decision Not to Renew a Non-Tenure Appointment” (Appendix 3 of *Faculty Handbook*), which currently cover only faculty members in initial probationary tenure status appointments.

These procedures should be extended to NTT faculty. They should include the following features now present in Appendix 3:

- Timely notification to the faculty member of the right to appeal and of all relevant guidelines and procedures;
- The right to request a written statement of the reasons for the decision and the nature of the evidence;
- The right to appeal for reconsideration of the decision at the departmental or other unit level where the decision not to reappoint has taken place;

- The right to appeal the decision not to reappoint to an officer one (but in this case no more than one) level higher than the level where the decision has taken place. Thus NTT faculty members denied reappointment by their department must be able to appeal to their college dean. Those who hold their appointments at the school or college level must be able to appeal a decision not to reappoint to the Provost.

Reasons for denial of reappointment in a renewable and funded position may include the following:

- Programmatic, financial, or other factors related to the needs of the unit or institution to eliminate or change the position;
- Failure to fulfill the job requirements according to the standard of performance set for all employees in similar titles.

Grounds for appeal of any decision not to reappoint may include

- Faulty or improper conduct of the review resulting in the decision not to reappoint, including consideration of irrelevant factors;
- Discrimination;
- Arbitrary and capricious action by the officer or body making the decision not to reappoint.

When a NTT faculty member has held a position for 10 or more years and appeals a decision not to reappoint based on programmatic or institutional need or financial capability or the faculty member's performance, the institution should have to meet a high standard of evidence for the reasons supporting the decision.

E. ACCESS TO GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

Grievances are explicitly held to be separate from appeals concerning appointment status. University Policy Statement 6.1.2, available at <http://www.univco.cornell.edu/policy/CLAG.htm>, mandates the creation of grievance procedures at the school or college level. Matters that may be grieved include but are not limited to "reward; academic freedom; work assignment; working conditions; legally prohibited discrimination and existence of, adequacy of, and adherence to equitable grievance procedures." Expressly excluded are "complaints about appointment, reappointment, promotion or any tenure decision."

Since many NTT faculty professed ignorance of such grievance procedures as apply to them and their work, the Committee recommends that the Provost require any school or college that has not perfected such procedures to do so and to post such grievance procedures as it has developed in an accessible location; that the Office of Human Resources provide a central repository of these procedures; and that all letters of appointment and renewal issued to academic employees include concise and compendious reference to location of such postings.

F. CONSULTING POLICY

The *Faculty Handbook* limits consulting privileges to the professorial staff subject to conditions spelled out in detail there (pp. 78-9). But because senior NTT faculty appointees have well-defined roles and responsibilities comparable to those of TT faculty, a consulting option for NTT faculty needs to be developed which is appropriate for these positions. The Committee recommends to the Provost that senior scientists, senior research associates, senior lecturers and senior extension associates should be accorded the opportunity to consult for extra pay on the same basis and according to the same rules as apply to professorial faculty.

G. SALARY STUDY

The Committee is mindful that the perception as well as the reality of fair and competitive compensation is essential to the contributions of NTT faculty to the University and aware that many NTT faculty do not believe their compensation equal to their efforts and qualifications. It recommends that the Provost initiate comparative studies of mean and median salaries prevailing at Cornell and at peer institutions in the following titles or their closest functional equivalents: lecturer and senior lecturer, research associate and senior research associate, extension associate and senior extension associate, and the various librarian/archivist ranks. If possible, these studies should reflect and adjust for years in title of employees in these titles at Cornell and their counterparts at peer institutions. The Committee recommends that these studies be completed by June 2005 and that the results be distributed to all NTT faculty.

H. PHASED RETIREMENT FOR NTT FACULTY

The Committee recommends that the Emeritus/a title, with appropriate perquisites, should be made available to senior lecturers, senior research associates, and senior extension associates who have retired after ten years of service in these titles and who have rendered distinguished and meritorious service to the University. "Emeritus" is not synonymous with "retired." Just as the title Emeritus or Emerita is not conferred upon members of the University Faculty automatically upon retirement, so appointment to these NTT Faculty Emeritus titles should be contingent upon a history of distinguished and meritorious service and on departmental and school/college recommendation and the Provost's approval.

We further recommend that perquisites now available to holders of the Professor Emeritus/a title as described in the Provost's Policy Statement on the Transition to Emeritus Status be granted to senior lecturers, senior research associates, and senior extension associates upon their appointment to the "Emeritus/a" status.. Proposals for the allocation of these perquisites are incorporated into Resolution #3, directed to the Faculty Senate.

The Committee recommends that a formal program of phased retirement with benefits protections akin to that accorded to professorial faculty, be made available to those

appointed to titles of senior lecturer, senior extension associate, senior research associate, senior scientist, senior scholar, librarian/archivist and associate librarian/archivist, with analogous service requirements.

I. REPRESENTATION OF NTT FACULTY AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL

With the ranks of NTT faculty numbering approximately 1600, it has become apparent during our email survey and public hearing that NTT faculty do not have effective representation in any existing University body. The Committee recommends that concerned members of the NTT faculty consider the options for a separate assembly or work with the Faculty Senate to gain representation within the Faculty Senate.

J. STANDING COMMITTEE ON NTT FACULTY

Although NTT faculty are not members of the University faculty, the Committee believes that their numbers and their activities sufficiently important to the concerns of the University faculty to justify creation of a standing committee on NTT faculty. Therefore it recommends that the Dean of Faculty prepare legislation constituting such a committee under the rules and procedures governing standing committees of the Faculty Senate and providing for the appointment or election of members from the ranks of tenure-track and non-tenure faculty of the University.

III. PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

For the Faculty Senate

A. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDY LEAVES

Whereas non-tenure-track faculty (NTT faculty) are continuing long-term employees of the University who support the central missions of the institution in teaching, research, and outreach; and

Whereas the University has a positive interest in the professional and intellectual growth of all faculty; and

Whereas resources made available for supporting this growth must come from the University as well as from the schools and colleges and other administrative centers appointing NTT faculty; and

Whereas equity across college, school, and other administrative boundaries recommends similar treatment of faculty in similar titles,

Be it resolved that the Senate calls on the Provost and officers of schools, colleges, and administrative units employing NTT faculty to create professional development opportunities for these faculty where they do not exist, in the form of paid and unpaid leaves and individual research and travel accounts corresponding to the following descriptions.

1. Professional Development leaves. Senior lecturers, senior research associates, and senior extension associates shall become eligible to apply for paid Professional Development (PD) leaves at regular intervals under the following conditions:
 - i. Eligibility. Senior lecturers, senior research associates, and senior extension associates shall become eligible to apply for PD leaves after their first reappointment after six years of full-time service. Part-time service shall be prorated for progress toward eligibility. Interruptions in service, unless spent in a comparable PD or study leave or Prestigious Fellowship leave, shall not interrupt progress toward eligibility. After a first PD leave, senior lecturers, senior research associates, and senior extension associates shall become eligible for another after seven years of full-time service.
 - ii. Duration. Under this policy a PD leave will normally be for a full semester (or in the case of 12-month employees, six months) at full pay and benefits. In exceptional circumstances it may comprise two semesters or 12 months at half pay.
 - iii. Proposals. Applicants for PD leaves must present proposals for projects allowing for concentrated thinking on or investigation of substantive topics of interest related to their professional or intellectual commitments. Proposed PD projects need not be related directly to improvements in pedagogy or extension/augmentation of research skills, but they should promise (and deliver) a yield of contributions to the applicant's discipline or department that would not otherwise have been possible.
 - iv. Application. Applicants must submit proposals together with the endorsement of the chairs of their departments to their school or college deans or other officers of their employing units, or to their designees.

2. Leaves without pay.
 - i. Unpaid leaves of absence shall be available to senior lecturers, senior research associates, and senior extension associates after six years of service (and, by negotiation with the department chair or head of administrative unit, before that time).
 - ii. Leaves may be for one or two semesters with assurance of reemployment in the same position upon return.
 - iii. Under these conditions, unpaid leaves of absence shall be granted upon suitable application. University contributions to retirement, medical, and Cornell Children's Tuition Scholarship plans of those taking leave shall be continued at the level obtaining immediately prior to the leave.
 - iv. A senior lecturer, senior research associate, or senior extension associate shall not be unduly penalized with respect to salary increases by taking an unpaid leave for which she or he is eligible.
 - v. Those in these titles who win any of the prestigious awards which make tenure-track faculty eligible for unpaid leaves with continuing benefits from Cornell should be eligible for unpaid leaves with the same continuing benefits as tenure-track faculty receive.

3. Research and travel support. Continuing NTT faculty in some schools and colleges are already provided with annually replenished individual research accounts and with funding for attendance at and travel to professional conferences. Where these opportunities do not exist, we believe they should be established under the mechanism described in §4 below.
- 4 Funding and implementation of these proposals
 - i. The University will allocate moneys to the several colleges, schools, and employing administrative units sufficient to cover the cost of the PD opportunities described here.
 - ii. Schools, colleges, and other employing administrative units will cover the other half of such cost and will establish an application process for leaves administered by deans or other chief administrative officers or their designees, who may include the membership of a Professional Development Review Committee.
5. Adoption of any part of this PD proposal shall not diminish travel and research funding already made available to NTT faculty as members of a college school, or department. The granting of a PD leave to a NTT faculty member shall not impair his or her eligibility for such travel and research funding as is available to other NTT faculty members in his or her college, school, or department.

B. NEW TITLES: RESEARCH SCIENTIST AND PRINCIPAL RESEARCH SCIENTIST

[recommitted by the Faculty Senate 12 May 2004]

Whereas many Senior Research Associates and Research Associates are performing research that is on a level with that traditionally considered a professorial responsibility; and

Whereas the titles "Senior Research Associate" and "Research Associate," therefore, do not adequately reflect the qualifications and responsibilities of the holders of these titles; and

Whereas restricting Cornell Senior Research Associates and Research Associates to these two titles may compromise their professional standing and ability to acquire outside funding when competing with individuals from other institutions which have more appropriate titles; and

Whereas restricting Cornell Senior Research Associates and Research Associates to these two titles denies them appropriate recognition and access to a rewarding career path; and

Whereas restricting Cornell to these two titles may put the University at a disadvantage when competing with other institutions which have more appropriate titles for top quality researchers,

Be it resolved that

1. The Faculty recommend to the Provost creation of the titles “Research Scientist” and “Principal Research Scientist.” The net effect of creating these two new titles is increasing to four the number of titles available for researchers: research associate, senior research associate, research scientist, and principal research scientist.

2. If the recommendation is approved, the colleges be able to present to the Committee on Academic Policies and Procedures proposals for using the two new titles.

3. Proposals approved by CAPP be sent to the Faculty Senate for action.

C. ELIGIBILITY FOR EMERITUS/A STATUS

Whereas senior non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty, like their tenure-track counterparts, are continuing long-term employees of the University who support the central missions of the institution in teaching, research, and outreach; and

Whereas senior NTT faculty may continue to contribute to the missions of the University and the campus community after their retirement; and

Be it resolved that the Senate calls on the Provost and the Board of Trustees to create emeritus/a titles to which senior lecturers, senior research associates, and senior extension associates with sufficient service may be appointed and to extend to them perquisites comparable to those available to their tenure-track colleagues upon their transition to emeritus/a status on these conditions:

1. The Emeritus/a title should be made available to Senior Lecturers, Senior Research Associates, and Senior Extension Associates who have retired after ten years of service and who have rendered distinguished and meritorious service to the University in these titles. "Emeritus" is not synonymous with "retired." Just as the title Emeritus or Emerita is not conferred upon members of the University Faculty automatically upon retirement, so appointment to these NTT Faculty Emeritus titles should be contingent upon a history of distinguished and meritorious service and on departmental and school/college recommendation and the Provost's approval.

2. University policy (including, if necessary, Trustee legislation) be amended to effect such an change as this to the description of the Emeritus title found in the 2002 *Handbook*. pp. 31-32.

Professor, Senior Lecturer, Senior Research Associate, Senior Extension Associate Emeritus. Any member of school, college, or University faculties who retires after ten years in the tenured ranks of university professor, professor, or associate professor or in the nontenured ranks of senior lecturer, senior research associate, or senior extension associate and who has rendered distinguished and meritorious service to the university, may be appointed to an *emeritus* or *emerita* title corresponding to his or her title upon retirement by the provost after

recommendation by the members of the particular department and the dean of the college or school faculty to which that member belonged.

A faculty member who does not seek or is not qualified or approved for *emeritus* status is considered a retired academic.

3. University policy for emeritus faculty recorded in section 4.2 (pp. 64-68) of the 2002 *Faculty Handbook* should be modified to extend to NTT faculty emeritus/a perquisites comparable to those available to tenure-track faculty, and these in particular:

i. Emeritus/a perquisites pertaining to use of the approved title, to legal defense and indemnification, and to membership in the University community (directory listing, *Chronicle* delivery, identification cards) should be extended without reservation to NTT FACULTY emeriti/ae, as should those providing basic resources for study and communication (library and computer services, mail, and C.U. course enrollment).

ii. Schools and colleges should be requested to consider revising their policies to permit emeritus/a NTT faculty to retain all of the college/school rights and privileges of active NTT faculty members, including voting rights in the college/school faculty. Emeritus/a NTT faculty are to be welcome to attend departmental faculty meetings. Each department will set its own policies regarding voting rights and privileges, but these policies should be put in writing.

iii. Office space and basic office and clerical support should be provided NTT faculty emeriti/ae by departments, colleges, and schools depending on individuals' involvement in continuing teaching, research, and outreach activities. Laboratory or experimental space is not an entitlement for emeritus/a faculty. Provision of such space should be made by department chairs for emeritus/a NTT faculty who maintain active research programs meeting conditions for those of tenure-track faculty laid down in the Provost's Policy Statement, 4.a, 4.b, and 4.c (2002 *Faculty Handbook* pp. 66-67).

iv. It should be noted that in the Provost's Policy Statement of 1997 (see *Faculty Handbook*, pp. 66-67) there appears an important qualifier in the matter of providing office and other support facilities to Emeritus/a faculty, to wit: "The allocation [of space and support facilities] will treat faculty who have retired on an equitable basis with non-retired faculty, based upon post-retirement levels of teaching, research/scholarship and outreach/extension activities." Said somewhat differently: The provision to provide certain University support facilities to Emeritus/a folk is based on the assumption that there is a balancing responsibility on their part to continue, albeit at a lower intensity and, perhaps, along different channels, "distinguished and meritorious service to the University." Such an assumption should be equally applicable to non-professorial academics who might be appointed to Emeritus status.

v. Membership in CAPE and the Statler club should be free to NTT faculty emeriti/ae.

vi. Participation in Graduate School faculty responsibilities will be available only to those NTT faculty emeriti/ae who have been members of graduate Fields hitherto.

4. Emeritus/a status should be extended to already- retired NTT faculty on the above conditions.

D. VOTING RIGHTS for CONTINUING NTT FACULTY

Whereas at present continuing NTT faculty affiliated with colleges may vote in college faculty meetings on issues related to their jobs; and

Whereas at present continuing NTT faculty affiliated with departments and other units participate in departmental decision-making in widely varying ways; and

Whereas continuing NTT faculty have a professional interest in virtually all issues considered by college and department or unit faculties; and

Whereas continuing NTT faculty can best perform their duties when they participate fully in their college and department or unit decision-making concerning academic policies and procedures,

Be it resolved that each college take separate action to grant all its affiliated and continuing NTT faculty voting rights appropriate to their jobs and that each department include its affiliated and continuing NTT faculty in decision-making related to their responsibilities. Such action does not imply participating in appointments and promotions of tenure-line faculty.

Be it further resolved that the word “directly” in the following sentence in the paragraph beginning “Lecturers and senior lecturers are not members of the University Faculty or of the Graduate Faculty (page 30 of the 2002 *Faculty Handbook*) be deleted:

However, they participate fully in those decisions that are directly related to their roles within the college or school and within the department.

Selected Resources

a full list of documents consulted is at
<http://instruct1.cit.cornell.edu/~sad4/NTTF/>

Association of American Universities. *Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Report*. April 10, 2001.
< <http://www.aau.edu/reports/NonTenure4.01.pdf>>

Association of American University Professors. "Contingent Appointments and the Academic Profession." *Academe* 89:5 (September-October 2003): 59-71.

-----, *Policy Documents and Reports*. 9th ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2001.

-----, "The Status of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty." June 1993. < <http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Rbnonten.htm>>

Baldwin, Roger G. and Jay L. Chronister. *Teaching Without Tenure: Policies and Practices for a New Era*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty, University of North Carolina. *Report and Recommendations*. 6 March 2002. < <http://www.aau.edu/reports/NonTenure4.01.pdf>>

Finkelstein, Martin. "The Morphing of the American Academic Profession." *Liberal Education* 89 (Fall 2003). <<http://www.aacu.org/liberaleducation/le-fa03/le-sfa03feature.cfm>>

Leslie, David W., ed. *The Growing Use of Part-Time Faculty: Understanding Causes and Effects*. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 104. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.

Office of University Faculty, Cornell University. *Faculty Handbook*. 7th ed. Ithaca, NY: 2002.

Appendix A:
Non-Tenure-Track Academic Titles and Employees
as of 2/1/04

Title	Employees
Senior Scientist	3
Senior Scholar	1
Instructor	20
Senior Lecturer	164
Lecturer	134
Teaching Associate	22
Senior Research Associate (NAIC/Arecibo)	9
Senior Research Associate	176
Research Associate (NAIC/Arecibo)	8
Research Associate	253
Postdoctoral Associate	359
Postdoctoral Fellow	58
Senior Extension Associate	163
Extension Associate	124
Associate University Librarian (CA09)	6
University Librarian	1
Librarian I	33
Librarian II	14
Librarian III/Assistant Director	1
Associate Librarian I	32
Associate Librarian II	1
Senior Assistant Librarian	13
Assistant Librarian	24
Archivist I	3
Archivist II	1
Assistant Archivist	1
Total	1624

source: Academic Personnel Database