

Committee on Non Tenure Track Faculty Affairs
2011-2012 Annual Report to Academic Senate
Co-Chairs: Ginger Clark and Rebecca Lonergan

A. Issues Addressed and Resulting Actions and Recommendations

1. Analysis of 2011-2012 Survey Data:

In the 2011-2012 academic year, the CNTTFA conducted a campus-wide survey, gathering information about the Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) practices, guidelines, and criteria from sixteen schools with faculty representation on the committee. Documents were collected by committee members, from their dean's office, that described how each school addressed NTT workload profiles, merit review, promotion, sabbaticals, governance, and contracts. Committee members also interviewed NTT colleagues to gather information about how the policies were actually being implementing in each school. This year, the CNTTFA formed a subcommittee to compile and analyze this information to create an updated "White Paper" as discussed below.

2. Drafting of 2012 White Paper

Recognizing the impact of the 2009 White Paper on NTT Practices in motivating a number of positive changes across the university, the committee completed an updated White Paper to assess the current state of NTT faculty affairs at USC.

3. White Paper's Key Recommendations

When the 2012 White Paper was presented to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, a summary of the paper's most important recommendations was suggested. That summary included recommendations regarding faculty profiles, workloads, merit pay, promotion and governance. *We recognize that tenure track faculty experience many of the same issues, and therefore argue that most of these recommendations should apply to all faculty, regardless of tenure or non-tenure line.* The recommendations are as follows:

- **Profiles:** Work profiles that include varied responsibilities allow faculty to reach their full potential and maximize their contribution to the school and university. Therefore, it is recommended:
 - *Every faculty member should have a faculty profile.*
 - *Faculty should have profiles where duties are distributed across at least two areas of responsibility—e.g., Teaching, Service, and Scholarship/Research—to meet institutional goals and enhance faculty satisfaction and growth.*
 - *Various work profiles (e.g., 80/20/0, 70/20/10, etc.), that are deemed by the deans to meet the needs of the school, should be communicated to the faculty. This allows the opportunity to adopt a profile that addresses the school's needs, but also allows the faculty to pursue areas of interest and growth that enhances their career development.*

- **Workload:** The survey revealed that the actual workload of faculty is often out of alignment with their mutually agreed upon faculty profiles. As a result, it is recommended:
 - *Workload and faculty profiles should match, such that workload in one profile category is not so heavy that it prohibits completion of responsibilities in other profile categories.*
 - *Reasonable workload adjustments should be made when additional responsibilities are assigned; reductions should be made in one area to account for added responsibilities in*

another, thereby allowing faculty to fulfill their duties in a way that does not compromise the quality of their work.

- **Merit pay:** Transparency in the process of evaluating performance is a key element in both enhancing faculty performance and creating equitable opportunities for advancement for all faculty. Therefore, it is recommended:
 - *Written criteria for merit pay, developed in consultation with the school's NTT & TT faculty, should be provided to all faculty in the school. These criteria should generally describe what constitutes meritorious work for the school's various NTT & TT faculty. The criteria should be aligned with faculty profiles and promotion criteria. (See RSOE example).*
 - *Teaching should be evaluated using multiple assessment methods, not just student evaluations (e.g., peer evaluations, outcomes assessments, class engagement measures, etc.).*
 - *Merit review should be conducted by a committee that includes NTT faculty, when possible, since other NTT faculty have comparable responsibilities, and can better evaluate their colleagues.*
 - *Mentoring should be an integral part of the annual merit review process. Each faculty member should receive developmentally constructive feedback each year, from a merit review committee that includes at least some their peers (NTT for NTT, and TT for TT)), to help them reach their goals and meet the needs of the school and university.*

- **Promotion:** Promotion opportunities should be made known to all faculty and awarded in a fair and equitable manner, using relevant criteria. Therefore, it is recommended:
 - *Promotion opportunities should be communicated fairly and regularly to all faculty, with accompanying written criteria, procedural guidelines, timelines, and examples of successful dossiers within each school. Promotion criteria should be tied to faculty profiles and merit review criteria. Perhaps the UCAPT manual might be a resource to help schools begin to describe promotion criteria, with small changes made to reflect differences in NTT policy.*
 - *Additional compensation that may be awarded at the time of promotion should generally be predetermined and communicated to all faculty, and equally applied to those who qualify, with flexibility for deans to additionally compensate extraordinary work. (RSOE example: Higher rank and title, 10% raise, longer commitment, leadership opportunities).*
 - *Processes should be in place to avoid arbitrary selection of candidates for promotion. To further that goal, the promotion process should be tasked to a committee of one's peers, including NTT faculty, who have knowledge of the candidate's field and responsibilities, and can evaluate the quality of the candidate's work using objective measures of performance.*
 - *Mentoring committees should be provided for junior faculty to foster high quality work. Faculty should receive guidance as to the direction their work should take, and where they need to improve, in order to qualify for a promotion review.*

- **Governance:** Opportunities should exist within every school, and at every level, for NTT faculty to participate in governance and policy development. Therefore, it is recommended:
 - *NTT and TT faculty should be allowed to actively participate in governance and policy development at every level (e.g., voting members of faculty council and general faculty meetings, and serving on key committees, such as Salaries and Promotions Committees).*

- *Leadership opportunities (e.g., Faculty Council Chair, Representation to the Academic Senate, Chairs, Vice Deans, etc.) should also be available to qualified faculty (NTT and TT), with the exception of oversight of and voting on tenure-related issues.*

4. Sabbaticals for NTT Faculty

The committee formed a subcommittee to examine the sabbatical issue for NTT faculty. The committee is working on a report recommending that University funded Sabbaticals be opened to NTT. This would benefit the university in encouraging multidisciplinary, high impact projects, and in attracting “star” NTT faculty to USC. The requirements should be largely equal to those of TT faculty, as the current guidelines are broad enough to include NTT sabbatical proposals, and a workable system is already in place. In order to address the additional cost of including NTT in university-funded sabbaticals, it is recommended that sabbaticals become even more competitive so that only the most high impact projects are chosen each year, whether they are submitted by TT, NTT, or by a team of interdisciplinary faculty from both faculty lines.

5. Teaching Evaluations

The committee formed a subcommittee to examine the teaching evaluation process. This subcommittee will work with designees from the Executive Committee during the next academic year to examine the issue. Given the heavy teaching load of many NTT faculty, the CNTTFA is well positioned to advise on this process, and already has ideas for increasing the validity of the evaluation process (e.g., peer review, outcomes assessments, class engagement measures, etc.).

B. Resolutions Presented and Policies Resulting from CNTTFA’s Work

1. The committee presented the 2012 White Paper and the executive summary of its recommendations to the Senate Executive Committee in April, to the full Academic Senate in May 2012.
2. The faculty council in Engineering completed its resolutions to include NTT faculty in faculty governance and on faculty council. Ratification of those resolutions did not occur.
3. The faculty council in the Libraries crafted a comprehensive governance, profile, workload, contracts, and compensation document that is in the approval process.

C. Recommendations for the 2012-2013 CNTTFA

1. The committee voted to recommend to the Senate that Rebecca Lonergan and Nick Stoubis serve as co-chairs on next year’s committee. Since no one from the Health Science Campus was eligible to serve as co-chair next year, the committee will focus on targeting a HSC co-chair in 2013-2014.
2. The committee should bring the 2012 White Paper to the attention of the administration and faculty councils within each school to continue to encourage the schools to review their own NTT practices.
3. The committee should continue its work in developing a more reliable and valid method of teaching evaluation to more accurately assess the impact of USC faculty on students.
4. The committee should examine NTT participation in governance across the university and encourage NTT faculty to self-nominate for committees where NTT faculty are under-represented.
5. The committee should continue to support VSOE in its endeavors to include NTT faculty in governance
6. The issue of NTT sabbaticals should continue to be examined as a path to 1) increased notoriety, impact, and prestige for the university, 2) increased interdisciplinary collaboration, and 3) as a recruitment tool for high quality NTT faculty.
7. The committee should continue to hear concerns of NTT faculty across the campus and advocate on their behalf, when appropriate, to the Academic Senate.