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Brief History of Proposal

- CVM strategic planning identified that issues regarding faculty titles posed significant problems with our ability to fulfill our veterinary and public health missions.
- Titles committee (both TT and RTE) reviewed & recommended:
  - adopting Prof of Practice titles
  - modifying system that had tight caps on specific RTE titles but no caps on other RTE titles (while retaining current proportion of TT faculty)
- Discussion (department and college faculty meetings and town halls)
- Adopted Prof of Practice titles (approved, Faculty Senate April 2020)
- Vote to modify CVM use of RTE titles (current proposal)
  - University Faculty: Yes = 87 (74%), No = 6 (5%), Abstain = 7 (6%), DNV = 18 (15%)
  - Voting RTE Faculty: Yes = 81 (87%), No = 2 (2%), Abstain = 2 (2%), DNV = 8 (9%)
Brief History of Proposal

• CAPP review and initial presentation to Senate in May, 2020

• Based on need for University to have criteria to evaluate such requests, and incorporating feedback from CAPP, a revised proposal was prepared

• Revised proposal was reviewed and passed unanimously by CAPP in October 2020
What Does the Proposal Do?

• Establishes a minimum percentage of TT faculty in the CVM at 55% (RTE ~ 0.8 TT). This is the current situation, stable for past 10 years.

• Sets a maximum % of all RTE faculty for the CVM (currently, only Clinical and Practice track are capped at 25%; there currently are NO caps on titles such as Lecturer)

• Allows us to utilize RTE titles that best match training, experience and duties

• Promotes scholarly activities of, and allows greater career growth for, our RTE faculty – Outcomes

• Enhances competitiveness of veterinary and public health programs in multiple ways, particularly recruitment and retention – Overall benefit
# Peer Institutions (AAVMC data, 2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School (Rank)</th>
<th>#TT</th>
<th>#RTE</th>
<th>Ratio RTE:TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Davis (1)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell (2)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State (T4)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State (T4)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M (T4)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania (T4)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Very few “cap” clinical professor titles
- Clinical professor titles are the most common
- Lecturer titles are rarely used
- Exact comparisons difficult
Proposal Is Compliant with Resolution on Requirements to Modify RTE Percentage

- Identifies subset of titles to be covered
- Specifies criteria for departments to exceed maximum ratio
- Provides rationale why current percent limitation constraints are not relevant or appropriate
- Provides data and policies from peer institutions
- Confirms that RTE positions do not replace TT positions
- Confirms that RTE positions do not detract from hiring additional TT faculty
- Specifies voting rights
- Describes importance of this change to the College’s strategic plan
- Describes history of college-level and department-level discussions and faculty votes