

TO: Executive Committee/Faculty Senate
FROM: Ad-Hoc committee on Lectureships and Part-time lectureships (Renee Everett & a committee from the Chairs' Association comprised of Dr. Jaleh Rezie, Dr. Bonnie Plummer, Dr. Pat Costello, Dr. Larry Collins, Dr. Steve Savage and Dr. Carole Garrison)
DATE: 2/1/03
RE: Proposal for non-tenure, renewable Lecturer position at EKU
Summary Chart Attached

Summary:

The committee was asked to consider the viability of creating a yearly renewable non-tenured lecturer position at Eastern Kentucky University as a (a) partial solution to the hiring of part-time or adjunct instructors and (b) to provide a way to hire "professionals" with a particular skill set necessary in some applied fields. The ad-hoc committee on Promotion and Tenure also recommended this type of position based on (b) above.

Almost **all** other schools in our benchmark listing **have** such a position, as do Northern Kentucky University and the University of Kentucky (see attached chart).

The position is **not** intended to replace or detract from tenure track positions. This position would be in **addition** to such lines. The number of such positions would also be clearly limited in terms of the overall percentage of such positions within the university.

The committee's discussions, along with input from the Provost's Council (consensus of agreement to support 2/26/03), Chairs' Association (consensus of agreement to support 2/19/03) and faculty, plus comments from AAUP and COSFL, led the committee to conclude there **is** an appropriate use of such a rank at EKU.

Statement of Principle:

Although the committee has agreed such a position is appropriate at EKU, it is understood that this type of rank is never a "first" choice at a comprehensive, regional university. It is our belief that the university should always attempt to create full-time, tenure-track lines first and to consider the creation of lectureships as only a second choice. The committee also believes it is the University's responsibility to indicate why a tenure track line could not be created and why a lectureship might be recommended instead.

Possible Modified Statement of Principle (recommended by Provost's Council):

Although the committee has agreed such a position is appropriate at EKU, it is understood that this type of rank would rarely be a "first" choice at a comprehensive, regional university. It is our belief that the university should attempt to create full-time, tenure-track lines and lectureships as appropriate based on departmental wants/needs. The committee also believes it is the

University's responsibility to indicate why a tenure track line could not be created and why a lectureship might be recommended instead.

Guidelines for Creation of a Lecturer Rank:

To make this system work, **guidelines** must be clearly set forth. The committee has looked at concerns from both AAUP and COSFL and feel those concerns can be addressed through a clear articulation of guidelines to govern the non-tenure lecturer rank..

1. This rank will **not** be considered tenurable regardless of years re-hired into rank and is **not** intended to replace or detract from tenure-track positions.
2. Non-tenured renewable faculty should constitute no more than 15% of the total full-time faculty within the institution and should be no more than 20% of the total full-time faculty within any given department (**or** departments could be permitted to vary that percentage individually based upon their needs)
3. The faculty member hired into the non-tenured, renewable rank would be hired into a fixed 9-month term with limitless renewals
4. Credential requirements **could** be less than those for tenure track faculty (MA/MS required, plus any additional credentials as required by individual departments)
5. All appointments in the non-tenured, renewable rank should have a description of the specific professional duties required in the position
6. The performance of faculty members on non-tenured, renewable tracks should be evaluated annually by the respective department with appropriate, established criteria
7. Faculty in the non-tenured, renewable rank should be eligible for merit pay based on the specified duties of the position
8. Compensation for non-tenured, renewable rank faculty should include such essential fringe benefits as health insurance, life insurance and retirement contributions
9. Faculty in non-tenured, renewable rank who have been employed consecutively for 3 or more academic years should receive at least a full term's notice of nonreappointment
10. Departments with faculty in non-tenured, renewable rank must provide the conditions necessary to perform the assigned duties in a professional manner, including such things as appropriate office space, necessary supplies, support services and equipment.
11. Faculty in non-tenured, renewable rank should be included in appropriate departmental and institutional structures of faculty governance
12. A faculty member in this position **may** apply for a full-time tenure track position and would be permitted to negotiate for early tenure based upon some portion of the teaching completed in the non-tenure, renewable position.

Justification:

Even AAUP acknowledges, “there are legitimate uses” of non-tenure track, full-time lecturers to “meet unexpected increases in enrollment or faculty vacancies, to provide service in a specialized field, or to develop a new academic program” (AAUP Non Tenure Track Guidelines, 2001). In fact, non-tenure track, full time faculty now hold more than 20 percent of all faculty positions across the U.S. (AAUP).

A system, which combines the use of both tenure track and non-tenure faculty, seems appropriate. Different kinds of faculty are appropriate to different kinds of settings and classroom experiences. However, to protect those faculty in non-tenure track positions, certain guidelines and policies must be established. When this is done and clearly communicated to all faculty, the “divide” that so often occurs between the two tracks can be diminished.

To make this system work successfully, those guidelines must be clearly set forth. The committee has looked at concerns from both AAUP and COSFL and feel those concerns can be allayed through clear articulation of guidelines to govern non-tenure track, full-time faculty. Most of those concerns revolve around the fact that part-time or non-tenure track faculty are short term and can't participate in the long-term plans and goals of a department and/or university. However, the renewable, non-tenure track position (the “lecturer” or “teaching associate”) would be continuing. The individual could be rehired year after year and provide the continuity missing in part-timers and adjuncts. Another concern is the “reduction in the sense of community of the university” (COSFL comment page). The statement is made that part-timers are not considered part of the university family (i.e., no benefits, short-term contracts). This would not be true of a renewable position that the committee will suggest here. Individuals holding the rank of “teaching associate” would have benefits, would undergo evaluation, and would be eligible for return the next year.

Anecdotal evidence from several institutions (University of Cincinnati Pharmacy School, West Virginia University, University of Illinois at Champagne-Urbana, Berry University, University of Georgia, Northern Kentucky University and Ball State University) supports the viability of such non-tenured lecturer positions. Faculty in those positions are long-term. The committee talked to several faculty members who had been in such positions for over 15 years. They felt completely welcome in their respective departments and believed they were full and active participants in the university. Most underwent annual evaluations, received merit raises, and were active in departmental committees. Jobs posted on the West Virginia University web site were written to allow the candidates to choose either a tenure-track (which included research, etc.) or a non-tenure track renewable lecturer track (with a heavier emphasis on teaching and less on research).

The committee's polling of deans and faculty on campus also generally supported the creation of such a “teaching associate” rank (see attached summary of comments). It is particularly interesting to note Dean Hart's comments. Dean Hart chaired a committee charged with this same issue back in 1993. That committee decided not to recommend such a position at that time.

However, Dean Hart now notes that he would be “somewhat softer on the possibility now than he was several years ago – though [he] still has serious misgivings.” Dean Hart recommends, “If it were to be instated, there should be appropriate and secure restrictions on its use.” This committee agrees, wholeheartedly.

The committee feels the “treatment of non-tenure track faculty is the barometer whereby the general status of the profession may be measured. While the colleague whose performance is undervalued or whose potential is blighted by underemployment bears the brunt of the situation, the status of all faculty is undermined by the degree of exploitation the profession allows of its members” (AAUP, non-tenure track guidelines, 2001).

There is justification for the creation of such a position, but it must be treated carefully to ensure faculty placed in such positions are not de-valued or treated as second-class citizens.

Additionally, by ensuring such faculty do not exceed 15% of the entire institution, we protect against the marginalization of faculty as whole and the de-valuing of tenure among the rest of the faculty.

Recommendations for Implementation of the Non-Tenure Lecturer Rank:

1. It is recommended that this rank be phased in over a period of 5 years.
2. It is recommended that during Phase One (first year), the University convert **some** existing Visiting Instructor (3-year positions) lines into Non-Tenure Lecturer positions
3. It is recommended that additional Non-Tenure Lecturer lines be created in the remaining 4 years following a review of Phase One and keeping within the % guidelines as set forth
4. It is recommended that Non-Tenure Lecturers undergo annual evaluation and that the whole rank be reviewed at the end of year one.

Summary of Deans' Comments (2002):

Dean Rogow (College of Business and Technology): (verbal discussion) Dean Rogow is in favor of such a position and attempted for 7 years to create such a position at Auburn University. He feels it is useful in cases of “skills” oriented classes such as accounting, broadcast skills, and others.

Dean Hart (College of Arts and Sciences): (email) Dean Hart was on a committee in 1993 that decided against such a “lecturer” position, but notes today that he “would be somewhat softer on the possibility [now] than he was several years ago – though [he] still has serious misgivings.” He is fearful that such positions are often used to “staff lower division course which the regular faculty often find unattractive and to do so at a reduced cost.” Dean Hart also recommends that “if it were to be instituted, there should be appropriate and secure restrictions on its use.”

Dean Corder (College of Justice and Safety): (email) Dean Corder is generally agreeable to the idea and notes that he checked with several folks in his area and that “we generally support the idea. Anything that would give us more flexibility in hiring would be a plus.” He also cautioned “figuring out how to avoid making such folks second class citizens is important.” Larry Collins, chair of Loss Prevention and Fire Safety, also added he feels this “has potential to solve the problem of finding people in some of the technical areas. In some fields, even the best don’t pursue terminal degrees.”

Dean Gale (College of Health Sciences): (by phone) Dean Gale is also very much in favor of this kind of position, as it would be extremely helpful in the areas of clinical work. He said he has also tried for several years to get ECU to pursue this kind of position to no avail.

Dean Wasicko (former Dean of College of Education): Declined to respond. (Now, as Acting Provost, Dr. Wasicko has commented he is interested in seeing such a plan regarding the creation of a non-tenure, lecturer position.)

Summary of Benchmarks
Lecturer Position

School	Has Lec. Pos.	Limit %	Eligible/Promo	Get Benefits	Merit
Northern Mich	Yes (Continuing Contract Status)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Northern Iowa	Yes (term Contracts - up to 8 yr)	No	No	Yes	Yes
SE Miss State	Yes (Regular, NonTenureTrack)	Yes 20%	No	Yes	Yes
Bowling Green	Yes NTT FT positions	?	?	?	?
U. NC/Greens	Yes (3 depts. Use them Nursing, Health, Human Environmental Used for clinical lecturers/ranks)	?	?	?	?
Youngstown State	Yes - very few out of 270 FT But 300-400 Part-timers !	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
E. Illinois	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
W. Illinois	Yes (Associate Faculty) teach 4 in the fall 3 in the spring	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
W. Carolina	Yes (given contracts as long as there is a need)	Yes (6% but a new rank)	Yes	Yes	Yes
Indiana State	Yes (w/ a 12-hr. load)	?	?	?	?
Calif State/Fresno	Yes, but only up to 6 yrs.	No	?	?	?
Ball State	Yes (Continuing Contract Status)	35%	?	?	?
Utah State	Yes (Non-Tenure lecturer)	?	?	?	?
Northern KY	Yes (Renewable & Temporary) Renewable (Indef) Temp (1-3 yrs)	10-15%	Yes - New Promo Ladder for them after 5 yr - Lec II = \$1,200 increase after 10 yr - Sr. Lec \$1,500 increase	Yes	Yes - but w/ diff. Require. No scholar/ creative
Utah State	Yes (Renewable year to year)	74/829 9%	Yes - Unique Promo Ladder for them Lecturer to Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer inc. salary increases	Yes	Yes- but with diff. Require. No scholar/ creative