

## **FS0708ref-3 Campus NTT Procedures**

To the Standing Committee for Personnel. The Personnel Committee is requested to advise Vice Provost Schwartz and the Faculty Senate on the proposed campus policies on the implementation of the UM System NTT policies. A response is expected by the Jan. 2008 FS meeting.

**RE: Ranked NTT Teaching Faculty – Campus Policy and Procedures and**

**Ranked NTT Research Faculty – Campus Policy and Procedures**

(both documents are considered together below)

From: Personnel Committee, Faculty Senate

The Personnel Committee has been given the referral to look at the two documents. This was done by using several criteria as measures. These were that the use of NTT would not compromise accreditation procedures such as ABET, that NTT would not later claim tenure based on their work, and that the mission of tenured/tenure track faculty was not compromised.

(i) To go through a national search and a promotion process that mimics the search and promotion of tenured/tenure track is both expensive and requires a lot of faculty time, which does not appear justified for 1-3 years contract jobs. In addition, such rigor in appointment and promotion would lead candidates to claim tenure. UM Legal should be consulted to verify this, but there were enough anecdotes to show that the cause exists. The Committee suggests that in section 3 first paragraph line 3 (in both documents) “shall” be replaced with a word that suggests as much flexibility as the rest of the sentence and in section 3 line 6, delete “and regional.” Reconsider line 2 section 3: Leaving the whole matter to department chairs or unit directors, as is done now, should at least be replaced with “department or unit.”

To repeat an important point, too many resources are being tied to hiring and promoting temporary faculty, one consequence of which will be to provide them cause to claim tenure.

(ii) Instances were pointed out that over time, NTT were given a variety of work load. As a result, after a number of years they claimed tenure and the courts agreed because they had de facto done the work of a tenure track faculty, and had done it acceptably. The fact that they were hired under NTT searches was not important. There are boundaries involved in giving NTT the detailed work load and years of work, that should not be crossed. UM Legal should be consulted to determine what these boundaries are.

(iii) Teaching NTTs are asked to teach four courses. At the time of promotion, do they have to show scholarly teaching work as well in form of books, manuals, papers, computer programs,

etc., on teaching. This requirement appears appropriate for someone to use the title of “professor” but leads us deeper into the above problem that tenure can be claimed later.

(iv) In the last accreditation process by ABET, the Chemical Engineering Department was handed a “concern” because a visiting professor was teaching a key course, even though he was, prior to his resignation from UMR, a tenured Associate Professor. In that, he would have been a Teaching Associate Professor by the new NTT norms. Consequently, we express a concern as well, that no upper limit to Teaching NTT numbers have been given in the documents, nor are there any guidelines on what kind of courses they cannot teach.

(v) The documents refer to “department by-laws” which do not exist. This is important, for the dynamics of voting in a department can alter many important things such as hiring of a tenure track faculty.

(vi) The role of a Teaching NTT in determining curriculum and curriculum changes needs to be clarified.

(vii) The hiring authority is described as department or a unit. A unit presently has no promotion committee, nor is it clear that it is authorized to have one.

(viii) Line 9 in 7.A.1 in both documents read:

*If both NTT and tenure/tenure-track faculty are members of the department or academic unit, both faculty groups shall be represented on the committee.*

It should be made clear that there will be two committees. The one that looks at applications from the NTT faculty shall have NTT faculty on the committee, and the one that looks at applications from tenured/tenure track faculty shall have none.

(ix) In view of (v), Faculty Senate and RP&A should carefully review what the dynamics of NTT should be in faculty governance. For instance, using department by-laws, NTT faculty could get excluded from making a decision on curriculum change, but as NTT are not excluded now from voting at the Faculty Senate, the same program from the department could get rejected. Further, there are inter-departmental issues such as department mergers and splits: how do NTT vote such that parity is preserved.

(viii) It is questionable if MFA can be held to be equivalent to a Ph.D.

Closed: 27 Sept 08