

Report and Recommendations

Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty

**Presented to the
Personnel and Tenure Committee
UNC Board of Governors**

March 6, 2002

Committee Members

Denise N. Baker, Professor and Head
Department of English
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Betsy E. Brown, Associate Vice President
for Academic Affairs
University of North Carolina Office of the President

Paul B. Farel, Professor
Department of Cell and Molecular Physiology
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Walter Harris, Provost & Vice Chancellor
for Academic Affairs
North Carolina Central University

Ali Khan, Professor
Department of Physical Sciences
Elizabeth City State University

Leonza Loftin, Adjunct Assistant Professor
Department of Mathematics & Computer Science
Fayetteville State University

Robert C. Morrison, Professor
Department of Chemistry
East Carolina University

Pamela Sofras, Professor
Department of Dance and Theatre
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

John Turner, Professor
Department of Sociology & Social Work
Appalachian State University

Warren R. Wogen, Professor and Chair
Department of Mathematics
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Margaret Zahn, Former Dean
College of Humanities and Social Sciences
North Carolina State University

Executive Summary


The Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty, appointed in February 2001 by Dr. Gretchen M. Bataille, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, was charged with examining the employment of non-tenure track faculty at the University of North Carolina “from numerous perspectives, including the needs of the institutions as well as the conditions of employment for this group of faculty” and making “a series of recommendations that meet both the needs of faculty we employ and the institutions in need of their services.”

The committee reviewed recent literature and national survey information on non-tenure track faculty, policy statements from professional organizations, campus surveys, campus policies on non-tenure track faculty positions, and data on UNC faculty. They consulted with legal and human resources staff in the Office of the President and developed a survey for UNC chief academic officers. Committee members also held regional focus groups with non-tenure track faculty and developed a questionnaire for faculty who may have been unable to attend a focus group. The committee found that the issues and concerns identified in the national context are mirrored by many of the practices at UNC campuses and in the comments of UNC faculty in focus groups and questionnaires.

The committee determined that the percentage of non-tenure track faculty has increased nationally and at UNC institutions in the last decade; however, compared to national percentages, non-tenure track faculty make up a smaller percentage of total faculty at UNC institutions and have increased at a slower rate. Among all U. S. institutions, the percentage of part-time faculty increased from 33% in 1987 to 43% in 1998; in the same period, full-time non-tenure track faculty increased from 8% to 18%

nationally (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 4, 2001). The combined percentages of part-time and full-time non-tenure track faculty increased nationally from 41% in 1987 to 61% in 1998 (see Table 1).

Data from UNC institutions indicate that, from 1990-2000, the percentage of part-time non-tenure track faculty increased from 15% to 21%, while full-time non-tenure track faculty increased from 19% to 23%. Combined percentages of part-time and full-time non-tenure track faculty increased at UNC institutions from 34% in 1990 to 43% in 2000 (see Table 1).



Source: NSOPF: 99, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 4, 2001, and UNC-GA Prog Assess/ PDF.CH134/ 16JAN02

The internal and external forces leading to these increases nationally and at UNC institutions include “rising costs, perceived declines in faculty workload and productivity, projected increases in student enrollment, a diversifying student clientele, the shifting popularity of academic fields, an aging faculty, . . . a favorable academic labor market, . . . demands for greater accountability and responsiveness, new technologies and competitors, and strident criticism of the tenure system” (Baldwin and Chronister, 2001, p. 30).

For UNC institutions in particular, influences include declining state support relative to actual personnel and operating costs, enrollment growth at most campuses, the possibility of budget reversions, the delay between the enrollment of new students or the implementation of new programs and allocation of funds for enrollment increases, the emergence of more “applied” and clinically-based academic programs, and the growth in sponsored research (with the accompanying need to hire research faculty on “soft money” or temporary faculty to replace those faculty whose instructional time is “bought out” by grants). The aging of the faculty and their frequent move to formal or informal phased retirement arrangements also create a temporary need for part-time faculty to cover retiring faculty members’ responsibilities.

The increase in employment of non-tenure track faculty should create concern for the University for a number of reasons. These include the “bifurcation” of faculty into “high- and low-status ‘castes,’ ” a lack of integration and support of part-time faculty as “full partners” among campus faculty, and “false economies” resulting from the “burdens that accrue to full-time faculty [such as increased student advising loads, responsibility for curricular development, other service activities, and higher expectations for research productivity] as more part-timers take on teaching assignments” (Gappa and Leslie, 1993, p. 12). An additional false economy arises from failure to calculate the costs in administrative time of hiring, evaluating, and making reappointment decisions for an increasing proportion of faculty hired year-to-year or semester-to-semester.

In addition, non-tenure track faculty often “play a highly circumscribed, that is, specialized, role at institutions, usually centering on the teaching function” (at least at the undergraduate level) and may spend more time teaching, less time in service, and even less time in research than tenure-track and tenured faculty (Finkelstein and Schuster, 2001, p. 6). In some departments, this leaves a smaller group of tenure-track and tenured

faculty to assume greater responsibilities in advising, research and public service. In other departments, particularly in graduate and professional programs, non-tenure track faculty appointments may be specialized research or clinical rather than instructional positions. Whether non-tenure track appointments are concentrated in instruction, research, or clinical practice, they reflect a shift away from traditional assumptions about faculty responsibilities (represented by the tenure system) and raise issues about the distribution of faculty responsibilities across institutions. Whatever the focus of these appointments, institutions need to make staffing decisions on the basis of assumptions about academic quality and the ability of the institution to achieve its diverse missions, rather than on financial considerations alone.

The committee recognizes that issues for both non-tenure track faculty and institutions vary in relation to various types of appointments—clinical, research and teaching faculty, for example—and that faculty members accept non-tenure track positions for a variety of reasons. Just as there is no single profile for non-tenure track faculty members, there is no single set of concerns and no single set of remedies to address the needs of non-tenure track faculty as a group. However, based on its review of literature, data on non-tenure track faculty, surveys of chief academic officers, focus groups, and questionnaires from non-tenure track faculty, the committee has identified a number of issues related to the employment of non-tenure track faculty that UNC institutions should address.

The committee makes the following recommendations for addressing these issues, each of which is discussed at length in the committee’s report (page numbers refer to the location of the recommendations in the full report):

Recommendation 1: Each UNC institution should develop a staffing plan defining the desired mix of various types of faculty appointments and monitor its progress in

moving toward its staffing goals. These plans should be developed with input from a broad array of campus constituencies, including non-tenure track faculty. The staff of the Office of the President should also undertake periodic studies of the mix of faculty appointments across the University. (See pp. 24-25)

Recommendation 2: Each campus, whenever possible, should offer multi-year contracts (for three or more years, with eligibility for reappointment) to full-time non-tenure track faculty who have successfully completed a probationary period or otherwise demonstrated their effectiveness and contributions. (See p. 27)

Recommendation 3: The Office of the President should develop a policy and guidelines for non-tenure track appointments, requiring each institution to develop the following:

- A. a definition of “full time” faculty load applicable to non-tenure track positions and appropriate to the institution’s mission and program array;
- B. a definition of assignments and responsibilities that constitute 50%, 75% and 100% loads, with identification of the employee benefits available to non-tenure track faculty employed at 50% or 75% of a full-time load;
- C. a policy determining under what circumstances if any faculty on part-time appointments can be assigned full-time loads;
- D. a policy determining under what circumstances part-time faculty should be issued two-semester continuing contracts with accompanying eligibility for benefits;
- E. a policy for timely notice of appointment or reappointment of part-time faculty.

Recommendation 4: Each campus should develop a set of clearly defined position descriptions and titles for full- and part-time non-tenure track positions. The use of

“advanced” titles with appropriate salary increases and other recognition should be considered to appropriately distinguish faculty with longer service records and accomplishments (for example, Senior Lecturer or Research or Clinical Faculty with rank). (See p. 31)

Recommendation 5: At campuses which have not done so, full-time and part-time non-tenure track faculty should be provided a specific description of the evaluation process and criteria by which their performance will be judged and how the evaluations will be linked to reappointment and salary determination; training should be provided to department chairs on effective means of evaluating and supervising non-tenure track faculty. (See p. 32)

Recommendation 6: Each campus should

- A. provide non-tenure track faculty adequate orientation to their responsibilities and access to office space, telephones, computers, email, clerical support and other assistance necessary to fulfill their responsibilities;
- B. develop guidelines for the proper compensation, either through stipends or adjusted teaching loads, for advising and administrative activities assigned to non-tenure track faculty;
- C. include non-tenure track faculty as appropriate in decision-making processes at the department, college, and university level, particularly in decisions affecting their own responsibilities and employment conditions.

(See p. 34-35)

Recommendation 7: Each campus should provide opportunities to non-tenure track faculty for professional development activities and for recognition of their accomplishments through campus awards. (See p. 36)

Recommendation 8: As part of their staffing plans, institutions should

- A. analyze the compensation of full-time and part-time non-tenure track faculty and weigh this compensation against the duties and responsibilities of these positions;
- B. increase compensation where appropriate to ensure the continued employment of qualified, experienced, and professional faculty;
- C. develop policies for the eligibility of full-time non-tenure track faculty for regular salary increases and for increases in part-time faculty stipends, both across-the-board within disciplines and for individual faculty based on experience and performance. (See p. 38)

The committee recognizes that the same forces that produced an increase in the proportion of non-tenure track faculty at UNC institutions also make it difficult to change institutional hiring patterns. Increasing enrollment, declining and uncertain state funding, broader demands on institutions for other personnel and services, and increasingly complex instructional, research and service missions are trends that will likely be exacerbated rather than moderated in the future. However, because of the potential impact of an increasingly specialized cadre of non-tenure track faculty on the ability of institutions to achieve all aspects of their missions and the likely increase in competition to hire both tenure-track and non-tenured faculty in the next decade, the committee believes that the University and its constituent institutions must address the issues identified in this report and respond to the recommendations in order to ensure an appropriate mix of qualified, adequately compensated and supported faculty.

Introduction

The Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty, appointed in February 2001 by Dr. Gretchen M. Bataille, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, was charged with examining the employment of non-tenure track faculty at the University of North Carolina “from numerous perspectives, including the needs of the institutions as well as the conditions of employment for this group of faculty” and making “a series of recommendations that meet both the needs of faculty we employ and the institutions in need of their services.” The committee’s establishment followed a commitment by President Molly C. Broad and then-Senior Vice President Roy Carroll to address the issue of part-time and fixed-term faculty, raised by the UNC Faculty Assembly in late 1999. The committee, made up of representatives from 10 UNC campuses and chaired by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, met from March 2001 through January 2002. Members include two department chairs, a dean, a provost, and both tenured and adjunct faculty, several of whom are involved in the study of non-tenure track faculty issues on their campuses.

While committee members did not bring the same perspective to all of the issues considered in this study or always agree on the best ways to address them, the recommendations were reached by consensus after continuing analysis and discussion. The committee’s report and recommendations are intended to initiate discussion and consideration of changes in policy and practice by the Board of Governors, the Office of the President, chancellors, academic administrators, and faculty on UNC campuses to address important issues related to the faculty workforce and faculty working conditions across the University. Issues surrounding the appropriate and equitable employment of non-tenure track faculty are linked to institutional mission and vary to some degree for full-time and part-time faculty members. Many of these issues will not be easily or

immediately resolved. The Committee hopes that its report will initiate short-term revisions of policies and practices and long-term planning and evaluation of the roles, responsibilities and needs of all UNC faculty.

Methods

The committee began its work with a review of recent literature on non-tenure track faculty. Its work has been informed by the release of initial reports from the National Study of Post-Secondary Faculty 1999 (NSOPF: 99), the most recent of three faculty surveys by the National Center for Educational Statistics of the U. S. Department of Education. The first report from the survey, Background Characteristics, Work Activities, and Compensation of Faculty and Instructional Staff in Postsecondary Institutions: Fall 1998, released in April 2001, not only provided a national context for statistics on UNC faculty but also prompted a number of articles in the higher education press about the growing reliance of U. S. institutions on non-tenure track faculty.

Several studies of full-time and part-time faculty in the past decade describe the non-tenure track workforce, analyze issues, and suggest best practices for institutions employing non-tenure track faculty. These studies include Judith M. Gappa and David W. Leslie's The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-times in Higher Education (1993); a report by the Sloan Conference on Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty, Part-Time, Adjunct and Temporary Faculty: The New Majority? (1998); and Roger G. Baldwin and Jay L. Chronister's Teaching Without Tenure: Policies and Practices for a New Era (2001). In addition, the committee reviewed policy statements on non-tenure track faculty from professional organizations such as the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), and the Association of American Universities (AAU) as well as

criteria for use of part-time faculty from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' Commission on Colleges (SACS).

In the context of higher education literature and national data, the committee reviewed UNC faculty data, consulted with legal and human resources staff in the Office of the President, and reviewed campus surveys and selected campus policies on non-tenure track faculty positions. UNC chief academic officers completed a survey developed by the committee on contractual, salary and other employment issues for full-time and part-time non-tenure track faculty. Committee members held regional focus groups with non-tenure track faculty at seven campuses and developed questionnaires to be completed by faculty who may have been unable to attend a focus group. The committee found that the issues and concerns identified in the national context are mirrored by many of the practices at UNC campuses and in the comments of UNC faculty in focus groups and questionnaires.

In its study, the committee looked at non-tenure track faculty in two large groups, full-time and part-time, without detailed analysis of the variety of types of appointments within these two categories. The committee elected not to address the particular issues related to post-doctoral employees. Typically, postdoctoral appointees occupy their non-renewable positions for two or three years, as part of the transition from graduate study to tenure-track positions. "Postdocs" are generally involved in the research activities of a department, and competition among research universities in hiring them keeps salaries and benefits (sometimes offered through student health rather than employee benefits programs) at a competitive level. While a study of the working conditions for postdoctoral appointments may be timely, the committee decided to focus its study on more traditionally defined faculty positions.


The committee recognizes that issues for both non-tenure track faculty and institutions vary in relation to various types of appointments—clinical, research and teaching faculty, for example—and that faculty members accept non-tenure track positions for a variety of reasons. As the committee’s focus groups and questionnaires showed, some full-time faculty choose their non-tenure track jobs because they either do not have the credentials or do not want the multiple responsibilities associated with the tenure-track; others would prefer tenure-eligible appointments but are place-bound and thus are not able to seek them or find competition keen for such appointments in their fields. Some part-time faculty hold full-time non-academic jobs and teach a course or two for their own personal or professional development; others seek part-time employment because family or other personal responsibilities keep them from pursuing full-time positions. Still others would like a full-time appointment but, when these are not available, piece together “full-time part-time” jobs by teaching multiple sections or taking on other responsibilities, often at more than one institution.

Just as there is no single profile for non-tenure track faculty members, there is no single set of concerns and no single set of remedies to address the needs of non-tenure track faculty as a group. Having recommended a set of “best practices” below, the committee hopes that institutions will work to match appointments and terms of employment to their needs and the qualifications and circumstances of each faculty member.

National and UNC Trends in Faculty Hiring

National Hiring Trends: Reports from NSOPF: 99, based on data from a 1998 survey, document a trend, previously reflected in similar surveys in 1992 and 1987, of increasing use of non-tenure track faculty among U. S. college and universities. The percentage of

part-time faculty increased in the 1980's and 1990's, from 33% in 1987 to 42% in 1992 and 43% in 1998, an increase of ten percentage points (Chronicle, May 4, 2001). The percentage of full-time non-tenure track positions also increased by 10 percentage points in the same period, from 8% to 18% (see Table 2). Combined, full-time and part-time non-tenure track faculty at institutions with tenure systems increased from 41% to 61% from 1987 to 1998 (see Table 1, above). Nationally, an additional 10% of full-time faculty work at institutions that have no tenure system.




*An additional 10% were employed at institutions without tenure systems in 1998
 Source: NSOPF: 99 and Chronicle of Higher Education (May 4, 2001)

At four-year institutions nationally, part-time faculty represent a smaller percentage of faculty than at all U. S. institutions. The percentage of part-time faculty at 4-year institutions in 1998 was 34%, compared to 43% at all institutions. The percentage of full-time non-tenure track faculty at four-year institutions offering tenure was slightly higher than at all U. S. institutions with tenure systems: 21%, compared to 18% at all institutions offering tenure.

UNC Hiring Trends: Data on faculty appointments in the University of North Carolina show that non-tenure track faculty make up a smaller percentage and have increased at a slower rate than nationally. (See Table 1 above and Appendix A.) The percentage of part-time faculty at UNC institutions increased from 15% to 21% between 1990 and 2000 (including participants in the Phased Retirement Program), an increase of six percentage points compared to an increase of ten percentage points nationally between 1987 and 1998 (see Table 3). The 2000 UNC percentage, 21%, compares to 43% part-time faculty among all U. S. institutions and 34% among four-year institutions nationally, as noted above.

The percentage of full-time non-tenure track faculty at UNC institutions increased from 19% to 23% between 1990 and 2000, an increase of four percentage points compared to ten-point increase nationally from 1987 to 1998 (see Table 3). The UNC percentage in 2000, 23%, compares to 18% at all U. S. institutions with tenure systems and 21% at four-year institutions offering tenure. Combined, full-time and part-time non-tenure track faculty at UNC institutions increased from 34% in 1990 to 43% in 2000, an increase of 9 percentage points compared to a national increase of 20 percentage points in roughly the same period (see Table 1 above).

An additional 10% of faculty members nationally are employed at institutions that do not have tenure systems. At UNC, only the North Carolina School of the Arts does not offer a tenure system. However, the number of full-time non-tenure track faculty at NCSA is small, slightly over 1% of all UNC faculty in Fall 2000. Excluding them from UNC data does not change the UNC faculty percentages represented in the committee's report; thus, they are included in totals and percentages for completeness.




*Includes participants in Phased Retirement Program

**Includes faculty at NCSA, which does not have a tenure system

Source: UNC-GA Prog Assess/ PDF.CH134/ 16JAN02

During the period 1990-2000, UNC institutions saw a decline in tenured and tenure-track faculty paralleling the increase in non-tenure track faculty. Among all UNC faculty, the percentage of tenured faculty in 2000 was 42%, declining from 47% in 1990. The percentage of tenure-track faculty in 2000 was 15%, down from 19% in 1990 (see Table 4). When these two groups are combined, the percentage of these “tenure-stream” (tenure-track and tenured) faculty declined from 66% in 1990 to 57% in 2000.



Source: UNC-GA Prog Assess/ PDF.CH134/ 16JAN02

These data clearly demonstrate a trend on UNC campuses away from hiring tenure-track and tenured faculty toward hiring more non-tenure track faculty in the decade between 1990 and 2000. These figures parallel the direction of hiring trends nationally, but at a slower rate and lower overall percentages, as noted above.

Institutional Differences: From 1990-2000, all UNC institutions showed an increase in the percentage of all non-tenure track faculty and in the percentage of part-time faculty in particular. However, faculty data from individual UNC institutions show variation in the proportion of tenure-stream and non-tenure track faculty and of full-time and part-time faculty (see Appendix A). The percentage of all non-tenure track faculty (full- and part-time) varied in 2000 from 36% at Fayetteville State and 37% at UNC Chapel Hill to 51% at UNC Pembroke and 53% at UNC Asheville. The percentage of part-time faculty also

varied among UNC institutions in 2000, from 8% at the School of the Arts and 9% at UNC Chapel Hill to 42% at UNC Asheville.

Student satisfaction with instruction at UNC institutions does not appear to correlate with the percentage of non-tenure and part-time faculty. The 2000 Senior Survey conducted by the UNC Office of the President Division of Program Assessment asked students about their satisfaction with the overall quality of instruction at their institutions. The highest mean response to this question, 3.3 on a four-point scale, came from seniors at UNC Pembroke and UNC Asheville, which employed the highest percentages of non-tenure track faculty in the same year; UNC Asheville also employed the highest percentage of part-time faculty. The next highest mean satisfaction rating, 3.2, was reported by UNC Chapel Hill seniors; UNC-CH had the lowest percentage of non-tenure track faculty and the next lowest percentage of part-time faculty in the same year. These responses suggest that the proportion of non-tenure track faculty at an institution is not a major influence on student satisfaction with instruction.

Full-time Equivalence: The numbers and percentages of non-tenure track and tenure-stream faculty cited above represent the numbers of faculty (or headcount) employed in each category. Information on faculty full-time equivalence—FTE, or the number of full-time positions each group equals—is not available from the UNC Personnel Data File, from which the headcount numbers are drawn. However, the annual *Faculty Teaching Workload Report*, drawn from data provided by department chairs, includes data on the percentage of lower-division undergraduate student credit hours (SCHs) taught by three groups of instructors: tenure-stream faculty and department heads; teaching assistants; and off-track faculty/“other” (which includes non-tenure track faculty but may also include administrators and others who do not fit the “tenure-stream”

definition). According to the *1999-2000 Faculty Teaching Workload Report* (see Appendix B), 43% of lower-division undergraduate SCHs were taught by “Off Track/Other” faculty system-wide. This percentage varied considerably across UNC, from 50% or more at two institutions (NC A&T and UNC Charlotte) to 22% at UNC Chapel Hill, where an additional 37% of undergraduate SCHs were taught by teaching assistants.

Influences on Hiring Patterns

The reasons for the national trend toward hiring fewer tenure-track and tenured faculty have been analyzed by a number of authors, many of whom note that the higher education community has paid little attention to the trend and its possible consequences. Baldwin and Chronister, in their study of full-time non-tenure track faculty, provide a helpful summary of the internal and external factors that have led to shifts in faculty hiring, including “rising costs, perceived declines in faculty workload and productivity, projected increases in student enrollment, a diversifying student clientele, the shifting popularity of academic fields, an aging faculty, and a favorable academic labor market” (2001, p. 30). Additional influences include “demands for greater accountability and responsiveness, new technologies and competitors, and strident criticism of the tenure system” (p. 30). According to Baldwin and Chronister,

Developing alternatives to traditional tenure as a means of assuring some degree of staffing flexibility has become a more and more common faculty employment strategy. At many institutions this has meant limiting faculty appointments to fixed or renewable term contracts and in some cases narrowing these positions to specialized or single-function roles rather than the traditional multiple-function faculty position. In a transitional period, full-time non-tenure-track positions buy

institutions time and flexibility to respond to the diverse forces that are reshaping higher education (p. 30).

Constituent institutions of the University of North Carolina face the same challenges identified by these authors; in particular, declining state support relative to actual personnel and operating costs, enrollment growth at most campuses, the possibility of budget reversions, the delay between the enrollment of new students or the implementation of new programs and allocation of funds for enrollment increases, the emergence of more “applied” and clinically-based academic programs, and the growth in sponsored research (with the accompanying need to hire research faculty on “soft money” or temporary faculty to replace those faculty whose instructional time is “bought out” by grants) are forces which, while often consistent with University goals, result in the need for more fixed-term or part-time faculty to carry out the teaching, research, clinical and public service missions of UNC institutions.

The aging of the faculty and their frequent move to formal or informal phased retirement arrangements also create a temporary need for part-time faculty to cover retiring faculty member’s responsibilities. However, while the University’s formal Phased Retirement Program for Tenured Faculty was anticipated to contribute to an increase in part-time faculty, the relatively small number of faculty participating in the formal Phased Retirement Program in the first three years has not had a significant impact on the growth of part-time faculty across the University.

Changes in the mix of faculty at U. S. institutions has been called a “silent revolution” by authors Martin J. Finkelstein and Jack H. Schuster, who have done extensive analysis of faculty survey data since the 1988 NSOPF survey. Citing the “radically decentralized” organization of higher education and forces similar to those delineated by Baldwin and Chronister, they conclude:

No sinister conspiracy orchestrates this change. It truly is a revolution driven from ‘below,’ fueled by innumerable decisions on individual campuses—often at the academic unit level—as they develop strategies to engage an uncertain future. No single agency’s or institution’s decisions can influence more than a small portion of the larger picture—either by way of further fueling or retarding the changes.” (2001, p. 7)

However, Finkelstein and Schuster urge “that faculty members and administrators alike commit to focusing more attention on monitoring the extent and pace of change, and that they also contemplate, beyond acknowledging the expedient flexibility and cost savings that accrue with faculty redeployment, the likely consequences for the quality of education” (p. 7).

Consequences of Recent Hiring Patterns

What are the consequences on faculty work life and educational quality of recent hiring trends? Researchers and professional organizations cite several consequences. In their study of part-time faculty, Gappa and Leslie discovered several “themes” in their questionnaires and campus interviews with tenured faculty, part-time faculty, and administrators that would seem to apply to full-time non-tenure track faculty as well. These themes include “bifurcation” of faculty into “high- and low-status ‘castes’ ” which the authors describe as “damaging to the general ethic of community” among academics; a lack of integration and support of part-time faculty as “full partners” among campus faculty; and “false economies” that result from “failing to account for the burdens that accrue to full-time faculty [such as increased student advising loads, responsibility for curricular development, other service activities, and higher expectations for research productivity] as more part-timers take on teaching assignments” (1993, p. 12). Another

false economy may result from the failure to calculate the costs in administrative time (for department chairs and institutional staff) of hiring, evaluating, and making reappointment decisions for an increasing proportion of faculty employed year-to-year or semester-to-semester.

Finkelstein and Schuster point to a number of long-term policy implications from evidence they found that many full-time non-tenure track faculty spend more time teaching, less time in service, and even less time in research than tenure-track and tenured faculty (p. 6). Non-tenure track faculty often “play a highly circumscribed, that is, specialized, role at institutions, usually centering on the teaching function (p. 6).” In some departments, this leaves a smaller group of tenure-track and tenured faculty to assume greater responsibilities in advising, research and public service. In other departments, particularly in graduate and professional programs, non-tenure track faculty appointments may be specialized research or clinical rather than instructional positions.

Finkelstein and Schuster express concern about the “unraveling of the ‘holy trinity’ --teaching, research and service” as the traditional definition of the faculty role and about the implications of this “unraveling” for the quality of teaching, advising and research (p. 6). This concern is not so much for the impact of non-tenure-track faculty members on the quality of instruction. (In fact, neither Gappa and Leslie nor the Sloan Conference found evidence that the quality of teaching was lower overall among part-time or other non-tenure track faculty compared to tenured and tenure-track faculty.) Instead, increasing the number of faculty whose responsibility is primarily instruction may have greater consequences for the research and service missions of institutions, as fewer tenure-track and tenured faculty take on an increasing share of these responsibilities.

The most important consequence for the faculty and institutions, beyond changes in responsibilities as the faculty cohort changes, may be the impact on the tradition of tenure itself as the standard by which all faculty are measured. In addition to a loss of commitment to the institution and its students when more and more faculty are hired on short-term, contingent contracts and the difficulty of hiring many of the most promising new faculty in non-tenure track positions, “the excessive use of part-time and non-tenure track faculty,” according to the American Association of University Professors’ “Guidelines for Good Practice: Part-Time and Non-Tenure Track Faculty” (1995) undermines “academic freedom, academic quality and professional standards” and “erodes” the tenure system:

The treatment of non-tenure track faculty appointments is the barometer whereby the general status of the profession may be measured. . . . Failure to extend to all faculty reasonable professional commitments compromises quality and risks the stability of the professional and the integrity of our standing with the public (p. 79).

Whether non-tenure track appointments are concentrated in instruction, research, or clinical practice, they reflect a shift away from traditional assumptions about faculty responsibilities (the “holy trinity” represented by the tenure system) and raise issues about the distribution of faculty responsibilities across institutions.

Concerns about the ability of an increasingly specialized cadre of faculty to achieve all aspects of an institution’s mission and the impact of recent hiring patterns on assumptions about faculty responsibilities (represented by the tenure system) must be weighed against the needs for reduced personnel costs and hiring flexibility as institutions develop plans for future staffing. Staffing decisions should be based on assumptions

about academic quality and the ability of the institution to achieve its diverse missions rather than on financial considerations alone.

The University of North Carolina and its constituent institutions need to examine more reflectively the numbers and roles of faculty in various types of appointments—tenured and tenure-track, fixed-term and part-time—to determine the appropriate mix of faculty necessary to achieve each institution’s mission and maintain its quality. The need for this examination is particularly timely in light of projections by the Office of the President that UNC institutions may need to hire up to 10,000 FTE faculty in the next decade as a result of retirements and enrollment increases (*Faculty Compensation and Competitiveness*, January 16, 2001).

In addition to its specific recommendations below addressing aspects of the work life of non-tenure track faculty, the committee believes that UNC institutions must undertake regular, comprehensive analyses of their faculty, including how many faculty they employ in each kind of appointment—tenure-eligible and non-tenure track faculty, full-time and part-time; how these appointments are arrayed among programs, department, colleges and the institution as a whole; how the proportion of appointments is changing; and how faculty responsibilities in teaching, research and service are—or are not—being fulfilled at the levels and quality dictated by the institution’s mission. Although faculty needs may vary across departments and schools (particularly at large, complex institutions), campuses need to maintain institutional as well as unit perspectives on their faculties.

The committee makes the following recommendation:

Recommendation 1: Each UNC institution should develop a staffing plan defining the desired mix of various types of faculty appointments and monitor its progress in moving toward its staffing goals. These plans should be developed

with input from a broad array of campus constituencies, including non-tenure track faculty. The staff of the Office of the President should also undertake periodic studies of the mix of faculty appointments across the University.

Best Practices

All UNC institutions are accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, whose *Criteria for Accreditation* (1998) offers several standards by which UNC institutions can organize their analyses of the faculty cohort and evaluate their employment policies. The *Criteria* states: “the number of full-time faculty members must be adequate to provide effective teaching, advising and scholarly or creative activity, and be appropriate to participate in curriculum development, policy making, institutional planning and governance” (p. 46). In addition, the *Criteria* makes a number of statements concerning an institution’s employment of part-time faculty: for example, each institution must “establish and publish comprehensive policies concerning the employment of part-time faculty” (p. 46). The institutional policies the committee received from UNC chief academic officers varied in scope and detail, often addressing limits on contracts and appointments rather than the role and responsibilities of non-tenure track faculty in moving the institution toward achieving its mission.

Professional organizations such as the AAUP and the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) recommend limits on the percentage of non-tenure track appointments in institutions and departments that UNC institutions might consider in developing their staffing goals. AAUP’s *Guidelines* (1995) recommends that institutions limit the use of non-tenure track and part-time faculty to no more than 15% of the total instruction within the institution, and no more than 25 % of the total instruction

within any given department. CCCC suggests that departments reconsider their hiring practices when the percentage of sections taught by part-time faculty exceeds 10% (1989, p.3).

The committee finds the following “Best Practices Model for the Employment of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty,” from Baldwin and Chronister’s *Teaching Without Tenure*, an excellent guide for establishing the terms and conditions of employment for non-tenure track faculty. Baldwin and Chronister recommend that institutions offer the following to non-tenure track faculty members (2001, p. 171):

- A defined probationary period
- Multiyear appointments following probation
- Defined dates for contract renewal or termination
- Explicit evaluation criteria
- Equitable salary system
- Equitable fringe benefit system
- System of sequential ranks
- Support for professional development
- Involvement in governance and curriculum development
- Recognition and reward for contributions
- Protection of academic freedom
- Orientation
- Oversight and monitoring of use of non-track faculty

This list parallels the recommendations of a number of professional organizations, including the AAU (2001) and AAUP (1995). While hiring policies may be developed at

the departmental or school level, particularly at large and complex institutions, all policies should be developed in light of institutional “best practices.”

While this list for the most part applies equally to full-time and part-time faculty, best practices also suggest that part-time faculty be given timely notice of appointment and reappointment. CCCC, following AAUP guidelines, recommends that when possible notice of hiring be given to part-time faculty during the preceding semester and that part-time faculty who have taught for three consecutive semesters be given a full semester’s notice if they will not be rehired (1989, p.3).

The committee used many of these best practices in developing its survey for chief academic officers, focus group questions, and the questionnaire completed by non-tenure track faculty. They are also reflected in the committee’s recommendations for improving current employment practices at UNC campuses.

Recommendations for Employment Practices at UNC Campuses

As part of its study, the committee developed a survey for chief academic officers (CAOs) at UNC campuses to determine current practice among institutions on a variety of issues identified in the literature on employment of non-tenure track faculty. The survey and a summary of responses are included in Appendix C. The issues identified in the survey were also raised in focus groups with non-tenure track faculty and in their responses to the committee’s questionnaire. This questionnaire is included in Appendix D, as is a report summarizing the issues raised and recommendations made by the focus groups. The sections below address issues from all three sources.

Appointments and Contracts for Full-time Faculty: While full-time non-tenure track faculty at nine institutions can receive appointments longer than year-to-year (generally

three to five years), CAO surveys indicate that six campuses limit appointments to one year at a time. Single-year contracts do not provide continuity for either faculty members or institutions. In addition, faculty on year-to-year contracts may not be considered eligible for merit or cost-of-living salary increases. Since many full-time non-tenure track faculty are rehired for a number of years and have more permanent than contingent roles in departments or programs, the committee makes the following recommendation:

Recommendation 2: Each campus, whenever possible, should offer multi-year contracts (for three or more years with eligibility for reappointment) to full-time non-tenure track faculty who have successfully completed a probationary period or otherwise demonstrated their effectiveness and contributions.

With careful planning, departments should be able to determine their needs for continuing full-time faculty while reserving flexibility in some positions in anticipation of changes in enrollment, funding, and the availability of tenure-track and tenured faculty.

Appointments and Contracts for Part-time Faculty: Although details about appointments of part-time faculty were not elicited through the CAO survey, in focus groups and questionnaires these faculty indicated that, even more than their full-time counterparts, they see job security as a major concern. In addition, the timing of appointments creates challenges for course preparation for these faculty and, presumably, their students. Finally, the practice at many campuses of semester-by-semester part-time appointments to teach up to four or five sections denies many part-time faculty appropriate contractual status and the benefits to which they could be entitled; many of them identify availability of benefits as the most important change that could be made to improve their jobs.

While some part-time faculty are hired to fill *ad hoc* vacancies created by unexpected enrollment increases or the departure or reassignment of tenure-stream faculty, many others are employed semester after semester to supplement the full-time cohort, particularly in lower division courses. Although departments expect to continue employing experienced lecturers or adjuncts each semester, these faculty are often given no formal assurance of reemployment and may learn within days of the beginning of the semester about the courses and number of sections they will teach. The uncertainty and timing of these appointments can limit faculty member's preparation for their courses and make proper orientation to new courses impossible.

AAUP's *Guidelines* recommends that non-tenure track faculty be informed of their continued employment and assignments as early as possible but at least four weeks before the beginning of a semester; the committee believes this recommendation can be a useful guideline for UNC campuses in developing procedures for part-time faculty appointments. To achieve this goal, department chairs and program directors must receive timely information about available funds in order to plan appropriately and provide adequate notice to faculty about future employment.

While the timeliness of part-time appointments raises questions of professional and instructional effectiveness, the widespread use of temporary part-time appointments that deny faculty the contractual status and benefits they could receive creates serious equity and ethical questions. Part-time faculty who teach each semester frequently are not given the two-semester continuing contracts that would make them eligible for benefits such as retirement contributions and health insurance (depending on the number of courses they teach). And some part-time faculty teach the equivalent of a full-time load—four or five courses a semester—without being offered a full-time appointment with the accompanying job security and benefits.

Except in the case of appointments to cover last minute vacancies or added sections, part-time faculty teaching a full course load should be given full-time nine-month contracts. And faculty whom departments expect to employ part-time for both semesters, with the prospect of employment for more than one academic year, should be given 50%-75% nine-month continuing appointments that entitle them to participation in the state employees' health insurance programs and state-sponsored retirement programs. With a 50% continuing appointment, faculty members are eligible to participate in the state employees' health insurance program, although they must contribute both the employee and employer's share of program costs, with no contribution by the institution. Continuing appointments of 75% or more entitle faculty to participate in the health insurance plan and contribute to the Teachers and State Employees Retirement System or a optional retirement program, with the institution contributing the regular employer's share for both benefits.

It is difficult to determine from available data how many part-time faculty could become eligible for employee benefits if given the necessary continuing contracts. However, in focus groups and questionnaires, many part-time faculty who had taught multiple sections for a number of consecutive semesters reported receiving no employee benefits. Since funds to cover employee benefits are allocated to institutions with FTEs, institutions should have the funds available to cover their contributions to the benefits package for continuing part-time instructors who qualify and seek benefits.

Among all the issues raised by part-time faculty, the issues of job security and availability of employee benefits seem the most compelling and most easily addressed by a central policy affecting all 16 UNC campuses. The committee makes the following recommendation:

Recommendation 3: The Office of the President should develop a policy and guidelines for non-tenure track appointments, requiring each institution to develop the following:

- A. a definition of “full time” faculty load applicable to non-tenure track positions and appropriate to the institution’s mission and program array;
- B. a definition of assignments and responsibilities that constitute 50%, 75% and 100% loads, with identification of the employee benefits available to non-tenure track faculty employed at 50% or 75% of a full-time load;
- C. a policy determining under what circumstances if any faculty on part-time appointments can be assigned full-time loads;
- D. a policy determining under what circumstances part-time faculty should be issued two-semester continuing contracts with accompanying eligibility for benefits;
- E. a policy for timely notice of appointment or reappointment of part-time faculty.

Job Responsibilities, Titles and Ranks: Survey responses from CAOs confirmed that UNC campuses use a variety of titles for non-tenure track faculty with different types of responsibilities and appointments, a fact leading to confusion about the nature of these appointments that was confirmed in the campus focus groups. The most commonly used title for *both* full-time and part-time non-tenure track faculty is “lecturer”; other widely used titles for both full-time and part-time appointments are “Instructor” and “Adjunct.” A number of campuses employ “Clinical” and “Research” faculty both full-time and part-time, some of whom are awarded traditional professorial ranks. A new title, “Academic Professional” (with rank), has been developed by two schools at UNC Greensboro. More

than half of the campuses employ “Visiting Faculty” (usually on temporary assignment from other academic or non-academic positions) and “Artists in Residence” (whose responsibilities are likely to focus on the practice of their art as well as mentoring of arts students).

The uses across individual campuses of the same titles for both full-and part-time faculty and of different titles for faculty with essentially the same set of responsibilities add to the confusion among non-tenure track faculty (and perhaps their department chairs) about the responsibilities of their positions and the rights and benefits associated with them. This confusion over titles on some campuses reflects a lack of clearly defined position descriptions, including length of appointment, opportunities for reappointment, possibility of promotion or movement through sequential ranks, job responsibilities, procedures for evaluation and reappointment, and eligibility for salary increases and employee benefits. Some long-time faculty in the focus groups also noted their frustration that they could not aspire to a title, such as “Senior Lecturer (currently used at two UNC institutions) reflecting their service or longevity.

While it is not feasible to develop a single set of titles and corresponding position descriptions for all 16 campuses, the committee makes the following recommendation:

Recommendation 4: Each campus should develop a set of clearly defined position descriptions and titles for full- and part-time non-tenure track positions. The use of “advanced” titles with appropriate salary increases and other recognition should be considered to appropriately distinguish faculty with longer service records and accomplishments (for example, Senior Lecturer or Research or Clinical Faculty with rank).

The committee has included two sample position descriptions in Appendix E, one from a professional school and one from a humanities department, which incorporate many of the best practices cited above and may serve as models for other institutions.

Evaluation: Research into the employment of non-tenure track faculty indicates that a well-defined evaluation process with clearly defined performance criteria is important for both the performance and morale of full-time and part-time faculty. According to the CAO survey, full-time non-tenure track faculty at UNC institutions are usually evaluated by the department chair, sometimes by deans, program directors, and faculty peers. Evaluation of full-time and part-time non-tenure track faculty includes the use of student evaluations. Part-time faculty are evaluated either annually or each semester, usually by the department chair. However, some non-tenure track faculty indicated uncertainty about the components and results of these evaluations and how they are used in decisions about reappointment and salary increases. Department chairs are key figures in the evaluation and supervision of non-tenure track faculty and should be provided training for these responsibilities, which vary in many ways from responsibilities for evaluating and supervising tenure-track and tenured faculty.

The committee makes the following recommendation:

Recommendation 5: At campuses which have not done so, full-time and part-time non-tenure track faculty should be provided a specific description of the evaluation process and criteria by which their performance will be judged and how the evaluations will be linked to reappointment and salary determination; training should be provided to department chairs on effective means of evaluating and supervising non-tenure track faculty.

Institutional and Departmental Support, Recognition and Participation: A major concern of non-tenure track faculty is a lack of support and recognition by their colleagues, their departments, and their institutions. This lack of support sometimes includes lack of access to basic resources needed to perform their job responsibilities. For example, not all part-time faculty are provided use of an office, telephone, computer, or clerical support. Providing offices for part-time faculty can be difficult on campuses where space is extremely limited, even for full-time faculty. However, as campuses proceed with planning and construction of new facilities supported by University or campus bonds or other funds, they should include in their planning consideration of the needs of all faculty, full-time and part-time, and their students for office space for conferences, as well as access to telephones and email networks.

A few faculty reported that their names and contact numbers are not provided to students and colleagues through campus or department telephone lists. It seems obvious that students must have a way to contact these faculty; the committee assumes that they are left off regular department lists only because they are hired at the last minute, and encourages departments to remedy this omission where it exists. Some faculty also indicated that they are often consciously or unconsciously excluded from other department activities, both academic and social. While department cultures vary in the degree to which non-tenure track faculty are included in informal faculty activities, the committee encourages departments and campuses to include non-tenure track faculty in as many activities as possible, recognize their status as contributing colleagues, and make them more “visible” to their colleagues and the campus community.

Involvement in more formal departmental activities is also a concern for non-tenure track faculty. Many non-tenure track faculty indicated a willingness to become more involved in departmental and institutional activities such as curriculum

development, student advising, program supervision, and governance activities. Some part-time appointees, however, noted that they are asked to take on such responsibilities in addition to their teaching assignments but without additional compensation.

Responses from the survey of CAOs indicate that at nearly all campuses, full-time non-tenure track faculty participate in orientation programs, curricular development activities, student advising, and department governance. They are involved in program administration and university governance at slightly more than half the campuses. Part-time faculty, however, participate in campus orientation programs at nine institutions. (Since SACS criteria require that part-time faculty be provided an orientation to their responsibilities and their institutions, the committee assumes that this orientation takes place informally within departments at some institutions.) At a few campuses, part-time faculty are involved in curriculum development and student advising. Only one institution reported that part-time faculty are involved in program administration or department governance. No institutions reported that part-time faculty participate in college or university governance activities.

Appropriate participation in department and other governance activities is one of the “best practices” recommended in the literature on non-tenure track faculty. Either as part of regular governance structures or on peer committees, these faculty can contribute to the well being of their departments and to their own self-governance and development as employees if they are given a voice at their institutions and feel that their academic freedom is not threatened.

Concerning institutional and departmental support, recognition and participation, the committee makes several recommendations:

Recommendation 6: Each campus should

- A. provide non-tenure track faculty adequate orientation to their responsibilities and access to office space, telephones, computers, email, clerical support and other assistance necessary to fulfill their responsibilities;
- B. develop guidelines for the proper compensation, either through stipends or adjusted teaching loads, for advising and administrative activities assigned to non-tenure track faculty;
- C. include non-tenure track faculty as appropriate in decision-making processes at the department, college, and university level, particularly in decisions affecting their own responsibilities and employment conditions.

Support for Professional Development: Non-tenure track faculty need opportunities to improve their skills and develop as professionals in order to contribute effectively to the teaching and/or research and service missions of their institutions. According to the CAOs, funds are available to full-time non-tenure track faculty to support travel to professional conferences related to teaching at 12 campuses; 11 also provide some support for travel related to research. Less than half provide support for research activities; such support is most likely to come from the department, although at about two-thirds of the campuses, support is also provided by school/college or university funds or external grants. Part-time faculty receive support for professional development travel related to teaching or research at only a few campuses, usually provided by the program or department.

The perennial shortage of travel funds, even for tenure and tenure-track faculty, has been exacerbated by recent budget reductions and state limits on reimbursement. However, while campuses may not be able to provide support for professional development travel to all faculty, non-tenure track faculty can be included in on-campus programs offered by such offices as the teaching and learning centers. In addition, at many campuses non-tenure track faculty are ineligible to apply for grants as principal investigators or to receive teaching awards and other recognition of their contributions, a disincentive noted by several non-tenure track faculty in focus groups and questionnaires.

The committee makes the following recommendation:

Recommendation 7: Each campus should provide opportunities to non-tenure track faculty for professional development activities and for recognition of their accomplishments through campus awards.

Salaries and Stipends: In no other area of non-tenure track employment is variation among UNC institutions more pronounced than in the salaries and stipends paid to these faculty members. This variation derives in part from the variety of appointments they hold, ranging from clinical faculty positions in medical schools and field instructors or supervisors in professional schools to instructors hired by the course in lower-division humanities and social sciences disciplines. Variations are also related to the disciplinary and market factors that are reflected in the salaries of tenure-stream faculty. Some variation may also be due to location, since institutions in urban areas must often pay more to compete with other institutions for non-tenure track faculty, while more rural institutions may pay less to place-bound employees for whom there are few other opportunities for employment.

These variations are clear from the CAO survey, which included questions about compensation of both full-time and part-time non-tenure track faculty. (See Appendix C.) Starting salaries for full-time non-tenure track faculty ranged by type of institution and discipline, from under \$30,000 for faculty in the humanities at some baccalaureate and comprehensive institutions to over \$45,000 at other institutions in architecture, computer science, law, medicine, and other health professions at research institutions. Most CAOs indicated that these salaries were lower than starting salaries for tenure-track faculty members, and all indicated that full-time non-tenure track faculty were eligible for merit and other salary increases.

Per-course stipends for part-time faculty reported by CAOs varied widely across disciplines and institutions and even within disciplines. For example, the stipend for English instructors varied from \$1500 to over \$4500 for a three-credit course. Several institutions have a fixed stipend for all part-time faculty regardless of discipline; most use a scale based on discipline, credentials and experience. At one institution, the fixed stipend was \$1500 for a three-credit-hour course; other institutions pay part-time instructors over \$4500 for a three-credit course, with higher stipends more frequent in such disciplines as computer science, social work and criminal justice. Only six institutions reported that part-time faculty were eligible for regular salary or merit increases. In focus groups and questionnaires, some part-time faculty reported teaching more than five years with no increase in their stipends.

Since variations in salaries and stipends across UNC institutions appear to be linked to the same forces that determine the salaries of tenure-track and tenured faculty, the committee has chosen not to recommend a single scale for full-time salaries and part-time stipends. However, based on information drawn from the focus groups and questionnaires, the committee recognizes that at many institutions part-time faculty, in

particular, are hired at the lowest rate possible and that these rates often are not increased to reflect higher credentials, better performance, or years of experience. Full-time non-tenure track faculty are not paid in proportion to their tenure-track or tenured colleagues, even though their responsibilities are similar in many disciplines and institutions. In addition, non-tenure track faculty sometimes do not receive merit or even cost-of-living increases because of the terms of their contracts, especially if they are hired on a series of one-year contracts.

Given the demonstrated reliance on full-time and part-time faculty members at UNC institutions, where they teach up to 50% of lower-division sections, their levels of compensation (often with no employee benefits) should give pause to institutional administrators and tenured faculty colleagues. Institutions should consider not merely how cheaply they can employ these faculty but what compensation is appropriate and adequate to reduce turnover and ensure a continuing cadre of qualified, experience and professional faculty.

The committee makes the following recommendation:

Recommendation 8: As part of their staffing plans, institutions should

- A. analyze the compensation of full-time and part-time non-tenure track faculty and weigh this compensation against the duties and responsibilities of these positions;
- B. increase compensation where appropriate to ensure the continued employment of qualified, experienced, and professional faculty;
- C. develop policies for the eligibility of full-time non-tenure track faculty for regular salary increases and for increases in part-time faculty stipends, both across-the-board within disciplines and for individual faculty based on experience and performance.

Conclusion

The committee recognizes that the same forces that have produced an increase in the proportion of non-tenure track faculty at UNC institutions also make it difficult to change institutional hiring patterns. Increasing enrollment, declining and uncertain state funding, broader demands on institutions for other personnel and services, and increasingly complex instructional, research and service missions are trends that will likely be exacerbated rather than moderated in the future. However, because of the potential impact of an increasingly specialized cadre of non-tenure track faculty on the ability of institutions to achieve all aspects of their missions and the likely increase in competition to hire both tenure-track and non-tenure track categories of faculty in the next decade, the committee believes that the University and its constituent institutions must address the issues identified in this report and respond to its recommendations in order to ensure an appropriate mix of qualified, adequately compensated and supported faculty. This report, the committee hopes, represents the beginning of the University's attempt to understand and address the role of non-tenure track faculty in ensuring quality in achieving its institutions' missions.

References Cited and Consulted

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. 1999. *Facing Change: Building the Faculty of the Future*. Washington, DC: AASCU.

American Association of University Professors. 1995. *Policy Documents and Reports*. Washington, DC: AAUP

Association of American Universities. 2001. *Non-Tenure-Track Faculty*. Report of the Tenure Committee. Washington, DC: AAU.

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

Conference on College Composition and Communication. 1989. *Statement on Principles and Standards for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Finklestein, Martin J., and Schuster, Jack H. 2001. "Assessing the Silent Revolution: How Changing Demographics Are Reshaping the Profession." *AAHE Bulletin* 54:2 (October 2001), 3-7.

Finklestein, Martin J., Seal, Robert K., and Schuster, Jack H. 1998. *The New Academic Generation: A Profession in Transformation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

Gappa, Judith M., and Leslie, David W. (1993) *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

"MLA Study Reveals Wide Discrepancy in Part-Time Faculty Member's Earnings." (2001). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 5, 2001.

National Education Association. 2001. "Part-Time Faculty." *Research Center Update* 7, no. 4. Washington, DC: NEA Higher Education Research Center.

Part-Time, Adjunct and Temporary Faculty: The New Majority? 1998. Sloan Conference on Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty. New York: Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

"Proportion of Part-Time Faculty Members Levelled Off From 1992 to 1998, Data Shows." 2001. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 4, 2001.

"Report Details Colleges' Heavy Reliance on Part-Time Instructors." 2000. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 22, 2000.

Southern Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Colleges. 1998. *Criteria for Accreditation*. Atlanta: SACS.

"Study Shows Colleges' Dependence on Their Part-Time Instructors." 2000. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, December 1, 2000.

Trower, Cathy A. 2000. *Policies in Faculty Appointment: Standard Practices and Unusual Arrangements*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

U. S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. 2001. *Background Characteristics, Work Activities, and Compensation of Faculty and Instructional Staff in Postsecondary Institutions: Fall 1998*, NCES 2001-152, by Linda J. Zimbler. Washington, DC.

U. S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. 2001. *Institutional Policies and Practices: Findings from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, Institutional*, NCES 2001-201, by Andrea Berger, Rita Kirshstein, Elizabeth Rowe. Project Officer: Linda J. Zimbler. Washington, DC.

Appendices

Appendix A: UNC Faculty Data, 1990-2000

Appendix B: Percentage Distribution of Undergraduate Lower-Division SCHs

Appendix C: CAO Survey and Summary of Responses

Appendix D: NTT Focus Group Summary and Questionnaire

Appendix E: Sample NTT Position Descriptions

Department of English, UNC Chapel Hill

School of Human Environmental Sciences, UNC Greensboro

Appendix A

UNC Faculty Data, 1990-2000

Distribution of UNC Faculty by Full-Time/Part-Time and Tenure Status
Over a Ten Year Span

1990

	----- Tenure Status -----																									
	Tenured						On Track						Not On Track													
	Full-Time		Part-Time		Total		Full-Time		Part-Time		Total		Full-Time		Part-Time		Total		Full-Time		Part-Time		Total			
Total	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
ASU	747	589	79	158	21	351	47	.	.	351	47	125	17	.	.	125	17	113	15	158	21	271	36			
ECU	1187	1066	90	121	10	595	50	1	0	596	50	324	27	1	0	325	27	147	12	119	10	266	22			
ECSU	142	104	73	38	27	48	34	.	.	48	34	28	20	1	1	29	20	28	20	37	26	65	46			
FSU	204	162	79	42	21	95	47	1	0	96	47	42	21	.	.	42	21	25	12	41	20	66	32			
NCA&T	432	349	81	83	19	180	42	1	0	181	42	99	23	5	1	104	24	70	16	77	18	147	34			
NCCU	363	245	67	118	33	164	45	.	.	164	45	56	15	.	.	56	15	25	7	118	33	143	39			
NCSA	89	87	98	2	2	1	1	.	.	1	1	86	97	2	2	88	99			
NCSU	1903	1681	88	222	12	947	50	1	0	948	50	277	15	.	.	277	15	457	24	221	12	678	36			
UNC-A	238	146	61	92	39	63	26	3	1	66	28	53	22	.	.	53	22	30	13	89	37	119	50			
UNC-CH	2493	2252	90	241	10	1300	52	2	0	1302	52	355	14	2	0	357	14	597	24	237	10	834	33			
UNC-C	768	649	85	119	15	320	42	.	.	320	42	202	26	.	.	202	26	127	17	119	15	246	32			
UNC-G	735	607	83	128	17	337	46	5	1	342	47	123	17	.	.	123	17	147	20	123	17	270	37			
UNC-P	197	153	78	44	22	72	37	.	.	72	37	46	23	.	.	46	23	35	18	44	22	79	40			
UNC-W	436	370	85	66	15	222	51	.	.	222	51	87	20	.	.	87	20	61	14	66	15	127	29			
WCU	407	313	77	94	23	188	46	1	0	189	46	75	18	1	0	76	19	50	12	92	23	142	35			
WSSU	173	147	85	26	15	64	37	.	.	64	37	55	32	.	.	55	32	28	16	26	15	54	31			
UNC Summary	10514	8920	85	1594	15	4947	47	15	0	4962	47	1947	19	10	0	1957	19	2026	19	1569	15	3595	34			

Faculty includes those receiving any teaching or research funds.

Distribution of UNC Faculty by Full-Time/Part-Time and Tenure Status
Over a Ten Year Span

1995

	Tenure Status																																
	Tenured												On Track						Not On Track														
	Full- Time			Part- Time			Full- Time			Part- Time			Total			Full- Time			Part- Time			Total			Full- Time			Part- Time			Total		

	Total	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%						
ASU	803	618	77	185	23	365	45	.	.	365	45	153	19	.	.	153	19	100	12	185	23	285	35										
ECU	1256	1130	90	126	10	640	51	2	0	642	51	268	21	.	.	268	21	222	18	124	10	346	28										
ECSU	146	118	81	28	19	45	31	.	.	45	31	35	24	1	1	36	25	38	26	27	18	65	45										
FSU	235	207	88	28	12	97	41	.	.	97	41	66	28	.	.	66	28	44	19	28	12	72	31										
NCA&T	532	412	77	120	23	180	34	.	.	180	34	152	29	12	2	164	31	80	15	108	20	188	35										
NCCU	399	290	73	109	27	159	40	.	.	159	40	81	20	.	.	81	20	50	13	109	27	159	40										
NCSA	114	111	97	3	3	111	97	3	3	114	100										
NCSU	1993	1734	87	259	13	1020	51	5	0	1025	51	230	12	3	0	233	12	484	24	251	13	735	37										
UNC-A	283	174	61	109	39	91	32	1	0	92	33	43	15	.	.	43	15	40	14	108	38	148	52										
UNC-CH	2561	2272	89	289	11	1318	51	6	0	1324	52	348	14	2	0	350	14	606	24	281	11	887	35										
UNC-C	924	683	74	241	26	400	43	.	.	400	43	164	18	.	.	164	18	119	13	241	26	360	39										
UNC-G	784	616	79	168	21	340	43	.	.	340	43	125	16	.	.	125	16	151	19	168	21	319	41										
UNC-P	215	147	68	68	32	78	36	.	.	78	36	43	20	.	.	43	20	26	12	68	32	94	44										
UNC-W	555	424	76	131	24	259	47	2	0	261	47	102	18	1	0	103	19	63	11	128	23	191	34										
WCU	486	337	69	149	31	194	40	1	0	195	40	91	19	.	.	91	19	52	11	148	30	200	41										
WSSU	226	162	72	64	28	69	31	.	.	69	31	60	27	.	.	60	27	33	15	64	28	97	43										
UNC Summary	11512	9435	82	2077	18	5255	46	17	0	5272	46	1961	17	19	0	1980	17	2219	19	2041	18	4260	37										

Faculty includes those receiving any teaching or research funds.

Distribution of UNC Faculty by Full-Time/Part-Time and Tenure Status
Over a Ten Year Span

2000

	Tenure Status																																
	Tenured												On Track						Not On Track														
	Full-Time			Part-Time			Full-Time			Part-Time			Total			Full-Time			Part-Time			Total			Full-Time			Part-Time			Total		
	Total	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%				
ASU	978	681	70	297	30	376	38	.	.	376	38	162	17	1	0	163	17	143	15	296	30	439	45										
ECU	1374	1114	81	260	19	561	41	14	1	575	42	247	18	5	0	252	18	306	22	241	18	547	40										
ECSU	161	112	70	49	30	62	39	.	.	62	39	22	14	.	.	22	14	28	17	49	30	77	48										
FSU	239	205	86	34	14	109	46	4	2	113	47	39	16	.	.	39	16	57	24	30	13	87	36										
NCA&T	540	411	76	129	24	233	43	3	1	236	44	82	15	1	0	83	15	96	18	125	23	221	41										
NCCU	414	279	67	135	33	141	34	1	0	142	34	78	19	1	0	79	19	60	14	133	32	193	47										
NCSA	141	130	92	11	8	130	92	11	8	141	100										
NCSU	2293	1937	84	356	16	1040	45	10	0	1050	46	242	11	2	0	244	11	655	29	344	15	999	44										
UNC-A	317	185	58	132	42	92	29	4	1	96	30	50	16	3	1	53	17	43	14	125	39	168	53										
UNC-CH	2698	2445	91	253	9	1300	48	19	1	1319	49	384	14	2	0	386	14	761	28	232	9	993	37										
UNC-C	1006	718	71	288	29	417	41	.	.	417	41	153	15	.	.	153	15	148	15	288	29	436	43										
UNC-G	916	705	77	211	23	338	37	1	0	339	37	128	14	.	.	128	14	239	26	210	23	449	49										
UNC-P	230	155	67	75	33	77	33	.	.	77	33	35	15	.	.	35	15	43	19	75	33	118	51										
UNC-W	655	469	72	186	28	285	44	.	.	285	44	97	15	1	0	98	15	87	13	185	28	272	42										
WCU	544	333	61	211	39	192	35	1	0	193	35	86	16	1	0	87	16	55	10	209	38	264	49										
WSSU	261	162	62	99	38	66	25	.	.	66	25	67	26	.	.	67	26	29	11	99	38	128	49										
UNC Summary	12767	1E4	79	2726	21	5289	41	57	0	5346	42	1872	15	17	0	1889	15	2880	23	2652	21	5532	43										

Faculty includes those receiving any teaching or research funds.

Appendix B

Percentage Distribution of Undergraduate Lower-Division SCHs

**Table 2. Percentage Distribution of Undergraduate Student Credit Hours, 1996-97 Through 1999-2000
Lower Division Undergraduate Including Basic Skills Courses But Not Remedial Courses**

Institution	Tenure Stream/Dept. Head				Off Track/Other				Teaching Assistant			
	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00
Research I												
NCSU	51.1%	48.6%	46.3%	46.1%	38.8%	43.5%	44.0%	48.0%	10.1%	8.0%	9.6%	6.0%
UNC-CH	42.2%	45.3%	42.5%	41.0%	20.3%	17.4%	20.7%	22.0%	37.5%	37.3%	36.8%	37.0%
Research I Total	47.3%	47.1%	44.7%	43.9%	30.9%	32.0%	33.8%	36.8%	21.9%	20.9%	21.5%	19.3%
Doctoral I												
UNCG	40.4%	41.0%	41.0%	40.8%	48.4%	48.9%	45.2%	46.2%	11.3%	10.1%	13.7%	13.0%
Doctoral II												
ECU*	51.6%	47.1%	45.9%	47.0%	35.7%	40.8%	42.9%	43.5%	12.7%	12.1%	11.2%	9.5%
Master's I												
ASU	60.2%	54.5%	53.9%	50.5%	34.5%	41.1%	41.6%	44.8%	5.2%	4.4%	4.5%	4.8%
FSU	60.7%	58.7%	64.0%	64.4%	39.3%	41.3%	36.0%	35.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
NCA&T	54.5%	49.4%	48.5%	44.2%	43.1%	47.8%	49.0%	53.2%	2.5%	2.8%	2.5%	2.6%
NCCU	68.2%	69.0%	53.7%	55.3%	31.8%	31.0%	45.9%	44.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%
UNCC	50.7%	45.7%	45.3%	45.2%	44.5%	50.1%	50.3%	50.0%	4.8%	4.2%	4.4%	4.8%
UNCP	62.9%	66.3%	64.5%	59.0%	37.1%	33.7%	35.5%	41.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
UNCW	67.3%	66.8%	62.6%	58.1%	30.7%	30.0%	34.5%	35.2%	2.0%	3.2%	3.0%	6.8%
WCU	73.9%	61.3%	62.2%	50.6%	23.2%	36.0%	35.2%	46.8%	2.9%	2.7%	2.6%	2.7%
Master's I Total	58.3%	53.8%	52.5%	51.2%	36.6%	41.2%	42.8%	45.0%	5.1%	5.0%	4.8%	3.8%
Bacc. I												
UNCA	55.8%	57.3%	61.9%	54.3%	44.2%	42.7%	38.1%	45.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bacc. II												
ECSU	64.0%	56.7%	59.9%	52.7%	36.0%	43.3%	40.1%	47.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
WSSU	64.4%	72.4%	60.9%	67.8%	35.6%	27.6%	39.1%	32.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bacc. II Total	64.3%	65.4%	60.5%	60.9%	35.7%	34.6%	39.5%	39.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
School of Art												
NCSA	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.9%	100.0%	99.7%	99.8%	99.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
UNC All	53.7%	51.1%	49.4%	47.9%	36.2%	39.3%	40.6%	43.0%	10.1%	9.6%	10.0%	9.2%

UNC-GA ProgAssess/Per.UR001C/2-22-01

*ECU became Doctoral II in 1999-2000. Master's I Total included ECU in 1996-97 through 1998-99.

Appendix C

CAO Survey and Summary of Responses

SUMMARY
UNC Chief Academic Officers
Survey Concerning Non-Tenure Track Faculty
August, 2001

1. Which of the following titles are used at your institution for **full-time (FT)** and **part-time (PT) non-tenure track faculty**? (Check all that apply)

Title	(FT)	(PT)
Lecturer	12	12
Senior Lecturer	2 [NCSU/UNCC]	1 [NCSU]
Instructor	7	9
Adjunct Faculty	8	9
Clinical Faculty with rank	5	5
Clinical Faculty without rank	4	5
Research Faculty with rank	5	3
Research Faculty without rank	4	2
Artist-in-Residence	9	7
Visiting Faculty	11	8
Other: UNCG: Academic Professional w/rank	1	1
Comments: UNC-CH: All fixed-term appointments carry rank.		

2. Are **full-time non-tenure track faculty** at your institution eligible for a promotion or change in title?

*Yes 7 No 8 N/R 1 (NCSA- PT responses only)
 *(does not include promotion to t-t Assistant Professor)

If so, in what disciplines are these promotions/title changes available? (check all that apply)

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture | <input type="checkbox"/> Engineering | <input type="checkbox"/> Humanities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Architecture | <input type="checkbox"/> English | <input type="checkbox"/> Law |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Business | <input type="checkbox"/> Fine Arts | <input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Communications | <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Languages | <input type="checkbox"/> Medicine |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Computer & Info Science | <input type="checkbox"/> Health Professions | <input type="checkbox"/> Physical & Life Sciences |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education | <input type="checkbox"/> Home Economics | <input type="checkbox"/> Social Sciences |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please list) |

Comments:

- ASU: Change in title only (yes)
 UNCG: Clinical Faculty and Academic Professionals with rank (yes)
 UNCW: Only upon achieving qualifications for tenure-track position (no)
 WSSU: Faculty can apply for a tenure-track position (no)

3. Do **full-time non-tenure track faculty** at your institution receive contracts whose duration is longer than one year?

6 None 9 Some 0 All

If so, do they have to complete a probationary period before reviewing/receiving a multiple-year contract? Of what length? No response to “length” from any of the 16.

Yes 0 No 8 N/R 1

In what disciplines are multiple-year contracts available? (Check all that apply)

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture | <input type="checkbox"/> Engineering | <input type="checkbox"/> Humanities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Architecture | <input type="checkbox"/> English | <input type="checkbox"/> Law |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Business | <input type="checkbox"/> Fine Arts | <input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Communications | <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Languages | <input type="checkbox"/> Medicine |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Computer & Info Science | <input type="checkbox"/> Health Professions | <input type="checkbox"/> Physical & Life Sciences |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education | <input type="checkbox"/> Home Economics | <input type="checkbox"/> Social Sciences |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please list) |

Comments:

NCCU: Some are given initial multi-year contracts up to 5 years; 3 is the norm.

UNC-CH: Appointments may be made for 1 – 5years.

4. Please indicate how often **full-time and part-time non-tenure track faculty** at your institution are evaluated.

	each semester	Annually	every 3-5 years
full-time	4	14	1
part-time	7	8	0

Comments: UNCA: FT NTT faculty evaluated annually for first 3 yrs; then every 3-5 yrs.
 FSU: Student evaluations each semester for both. Comprehensive annual evaluations for FT.
 UNCC: Student evaluations each semester.
 WCU: PT are evaluated only in certain departments (by Department Head).
 Student evaluations for all PT faculty.

5. Who is typically involved in the evaluation of **full-time and part-time non-tenure track faculty** at your institution?

Title	(FT)	(PT)
Students	13	14
Program director	9	9
Department chair/head	15	15

Peers	7	5
Dean	8	7
CAO	3	1
Comments:		

6. In which of the following activities do **full-time** and **part-time non-tenure track faculty** at your institution typically participate? Check all that apply.

Title	(FT)	(PT)
Orientation program	13	9
Curriculum Development	14	5
Student Advising	13	6
Program Administration	8	1
* Department governance	14	1
College governance	10	0
**University governance	9	0
Comments: * ASU: Lecturers only. ** UNC-CH: Membership in Faculty Council requires FT appointment of at least 3 years. PT faculty involvement is limited.		

7. For which of the following professional development activities are **full-time and part-time non-tenure track faculty** at your institution typically eligible to receive funds? (Check all that apply.)

	(FT)	(PT)
Travel to professional conferences related to teaching	12	5
Travel to professional conferences related to research	11	1
Support for research activities	6	0
Other (please explain): NCSU: Varies by department and responsibility of individual.		

From what sources are these funds typically available? (Check all that apply.)

	(FT)	(PT)
Program	9	5
Department	14	5
School/College	11	3
University	10	2
External Grants:	12	4

Comments:

8. Please check your estimate of the starting salary (in thousands) of **new full-time non-tenure track faculty** in the disciplines at your institution:

	<\$30	\$30-35	\$35-40	\$40-45	>\$45
* Agriculture	0	0	0	1	1
Architecture	0	0	0	1	2
Business		1	2	5	7
Communications	3	4	3	3	0
Computer and information sciences	1	0	1	5	4
Education	1	0	8	3	2
Engineering	0	0	1	1	2
* English	5	7	3	1	0
Fine Arts	2	7	2	2	0
Foreign Languages	3	7	1	1	1
Health Professions	2	2	3	2	3
Home Economics	1	1	3	1	1
Humanities	3	7	3	2	0
Law	0	0	0	1	2
Mathematics	1	3	5	4	1
Medicine	0	0	0	0	2
Physical and Life Sciences	1	3	3	5	3
Social Sciences (includes Criminal Justice and Social Work)	2	4	6	4	1
Other – Info. & Library Science	0	0	0	0	2
Comments: *NCSU - English Technical Writers salaries are \$30,000; others are less than \$30,000. NCSU – Agriculture covers a wide range, from \$30 - \$50,000+.					

9. How do these salaries generally compare to those of new **tenure-track** faculty members in the same discipline?

12 Lower 2 About the same *1 Higher

*NCCU: Hiring salaries are higher overall; thus, many new faculty typically come in a salaries greater than long-time faculty.

10. Are **full-time non-tenure track faculty** at your institution eligible to receive regular salary or merit increases? 15 Yes 0 No

Comments:

ECSU: If at the institution for 2 or more years.

UNCP: At the request of the chairs, long-term NTT faculty might receive an increase.

11. Please estimate the range paid per course to **part-time non-tenure track faculty** at your institutions in the following disciplines: (*assumes 3 credit hour courses*)

	\$1500-2000	\$2000-2500	\$2500-3000	\$3000-3500	\$3500-4000	\$4000-4500	\$4500+
Agriculture	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
Architecture	--	--	--	1	--	1	1
Business	1	3	1	3	1	3	3
Communications	--	7	1	3	1	1	2
Computer and information sciences	1	3	2	1	2	--	4
Education	1	4	4	2	2	1	--
Engineering	--	1	--	--	1	1	1
English	1	8	1	3	1	--	2
Fine Arts	--	7	2	3	--	--	2
Foreign Languages	1	5	2	4	--	--	2
Health Professions	--	3	1	4	1	1	1
Home Economics	--	1	2	3	--	--	--
Humanities	1	7	2	3	1	--	2
Law	--	--	1	--	--	--	2
Mathematics	1	4	3	4	1	--	1
Medicine	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
Physical and Life Sciences	1	2	3	5	1	1	3
Social Sciences (includes Social Work & Criminal Justice)	1	5	2	3	--	1	2
Other – Info. & Library Sciences	--	--	--	--	--	1	1

Comments: ASU: Each discipline pays the same rate per credit hour taught, depending on faculty member's highest degree: Doctorate: \$1020 per credit hour. Master's: \$918. Bachelor's \$816. Counted as \$2000-\$2500.
 FSU: Master's \$2,000/doctoral \$2500.
 NCA&T: At discretion of dept/school/college.
 UNCA: Flat rate \$1500-2500; included in \$2000-2500 range.
 UNCC: Rates vary within discipline; counted in higher range.
 UNCP: Established scale based on terminal degree/teaching experience.
 UNC-CH: \$ 4000-\$4500 Info/Library Science. Counted as \$4500+

12. Are **part-time non-tenure track faculty** at your institution eligible to receive regular salary or merit increases? 6 Yes 9 No 1 Other

Comments:

ECSU: Recent across-the-board increase.

UNCG: Reviewed at time of re-appointment

NCA&T: At the discretion of the department/school/college

NCCU: Increases are usually given when new contract is negotiated.

13. Does your institution or do individual colleges or departments have a written policy concerning the contractual terms, reappointment, evaluation, salary, benefits, raises, and other issues related to non-tenure track faculty? If so, could you please return a copy with this survey or indicate who might provide the committee with a copy?

Appendix D

NTT Focus Group Summary and Questionnaire

SUMMARY REPORT ON CAMPUS FOCUS GROUPS

In order to determine UNC non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) members' concerns, members of the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee held campus and regional focus groups in October and November 2001. Regional focus groups were held in the Triad region (UNCG, WSSU, NCA&T), the western region (ASU, UNCA, WCU), and the eastern region (ECU, ECSU, FSU, UNCW, UNCP). Campus focus groups were held at UNCC, NCSU, UNC Chapel Hill and NCCU. NTT faculty members were informed by committee members, campus Faculty Senate chairs, and academic affairs administrators about the focus group meetings. Attendance varied because of notification and schedules from less than five to over 35.

Below is a summary report on the committee's focus groups representing the range of issues raised and recommendations suggested by focus group participants.

Salaries and Benefits:

Issues:

- Salaries for both part-time and full-time NTTF are unreasonably low, and the salary differential between TT and NTTF is large.
- Salaries for both part-time and full-time NTTF vary across disciplines within an institution, presumably driven by market forces or quality of performance but often seemingly capricious.
- Salaries do not take into consideration such factors as years of experience at an institution, professional qualifications, class size, responsibilities other than teaching, meritorious performance, classification of position, and cost of living.
- Part-time NTTF are not eligible for merit increases, some FT NTTF are not eligible, and others do not know whether they are eligible.
- Low salaries result in a revolving door for NTTF, which negatively affects the quality of instruction and mission of each institution.
- There is little opportunity for NTTF members of institutions located in rural areas to supplement their income through "outside work."
- The definition of "part-time" NTTF is not clear or at least not uniformly applied, as at some institutions any workload below a 4/4 arrangement is treated as part-time without benefits even under the terms of a one-year contract.
- It would be helpful if NTTF could become vested in the retirement program more quickly.
- NTTF often do not know the source of the funds supporting their salaries or the factors affecting decisions regarding salary increases.
- At some campuses, part-time faculty teaching three or four courses a semester are paid at or below the federal poverty level.

Recommendations:

- Institutions should be provided clear guidelines regarding the provision of benefits to NTTF based upon workload over an academic year, and monitoring of an institution's implementation of the guidelines should occur.

- Uniform NC system policies should be established for determining salaries of part-time and full-time NTT, and should include such factors as credentials, years of experience, responsibilities, and performance.
- Establish NC system classifications of part-time and full-time NTTF and set minimum salaries for each classification.
- Establish NC system policies regarding merit increases for NTTF.

Contracts and Workload:

Issues:

- Part-time faculty need more notice regarding their status from semester to semester.
- In some institutions, multi-year contracts are utilized in some departments and colleges but not others; NTTF, and apparently administrators, are not clear about policies regarding such contracts. Job security is a major concern for NTTF.
- Contracts of NTTF do not specify clearly their responsibilities; some are responsible for non-instructional activities such as student advising, others are not.
- Lack of job security affects NTTF's perception of their academic freedom.
- NTT faculty who teach four courses a semester are not given FT contracts with eligibility for benefits.
- NTT faculty often carry heavier teaching loads and larger classes.
- Those who want to do their own research have little time or support and cannot be Principal Investigators on grants.

Recommendations:

- Institutions should consider new job titles for long-serving NTTF.
- Establish across the NC system "best practice" guidelines for notification of part-time faculty from semester to semester.
- Institutions should establish policies for departments and colleges related to the use of multi-year contracts.
- Institutions should specify the responsibilities of NTTF in contracts.
- NTTF who teach full loads each semester should be given year-long, FT contracts with benefits.

- **Work Environment:**

- **Issues:**

- All learning does not occur in the classroom, therefore, it is important for part-time as well as full-time NTTF to have a place to meet with students and access to telephones, computers, e-mail.
- It would be helpful to extend to part-time NTTF some amenities such as electronic deposit of salary.
- There is too little recognition of the contributions that NTTF make to their departments and institutions.
- NTTF too frequently feel undervalued.
- NTTF are isolated from the decision-making processes in their departments and institutions.

- NTTF are either not provided travel funds and other professional development support or are unaware of the availability of such funds.
 - NTTF often are not eligible for teaching awards and other recognition.
- **Recommendations:**
 - Institutions should establish mechanisms to assure that NTTF are provided the amenities and recognition afforded their tenure track peers.
 - NTTF should be included in web sites, catalogs, and departmental listings.
 - When possible, all NTTF should be provided office space and access to telephones, computers and email, and receive necessary instructional supplies and clerical support.
 - NTTF should be made aware of departmental policies related to travel funds and how to obtain funding if it is available.
 - Tenured faculty should be made aware of working conditions of NTTF.
- **Faculty Governance:**
 - **Issues:**
 - Some NTTF are systematically excluded from departmental and institutional governing bodies, some have no idea whether they are or are not excluded.
 - In some departments and institutions, NTTF are not particularly encouraged to participate in faculty governance but are accepted if they decide to do so.
 - There may be some reluctance on the part of departments and institutions to encourage NTTF participation in faculty governance for fear of further exploitation.
 - Some NTTF are reluctant to participate in faculty governance for fear of reprisal without the safety net of tenure.
- **Recommendations:**
 - NC system guidelines should be established providing for the involvement of NTTF in faculty governance.
- **Performance Evaluation:**
 - **Issues:**
 - Within and among institutions, some NTTF are subject to annual performance evaluations and some are not.
 - Consequences of performance evaluations vary within and among institutions from nonexistent to determining whether NTTF will be retained. NTTF are not always given access to their evaluations.
 - Merit increases are either not affected by performance evaluations, or NTTF are unclear about the effect.
 - Departments vary regarding whether NTTF are subject to peer evaluations, and whether student evaluations are made available to NTTF.
- **Recommendations:**
 - NC system guidelines should be established regarding methods of performance evaluations for NTTF, and the utilization of results.

NTT FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

Because attendance at its focus groups was small in proportion to the number of NTT faculty, committee members made questionnaires available to those who were unable to attend a focus group. Nearly 300 questionnaires have been received. Responses had not been tabulated at the time of the committee's report, but responses will be available to Office of the President staff in working with campus officials to address NTT faculty issues.

Questionnaire for Part-time and Non-Tenure Track Faculty in the UNC System

Your department _____ Your campus _____

1. Please indicate whether you are a part-time or full-time non-tenure track faculty member.

_____ Part-time _____ Full-time

2. How many years have you taught at this UNC campus? _____

Are you concurrently teaching at another campus, either within the UNC system or private?

Do you hold other non-teaching jobs at the present time?

3. Check the category below that best describes your assignment, indicating the percentage of time for each if your duties are divided among several categories.

_____ Classroom teacher
_____ Clinical faculty
_____ Administrator of a program
_____ Research faculty
_____ Other (please describe briefly)

4. How many sections or clinical students, on average, do you teach each semester?

_____ sections _____ clinical students

5. How much are you paid each semester?

\$ _____ per course or \$ _____ full time annually

6. Why are you a non-tenure track faculty member?

_____ Personal preference
_____ Don't have the degree required for tenure-track position
_____ Can't find tenure-track position
_____ Other (please specify briefly)

7. How satisfied are you with

a. your teaching at this institution

____ Very satisfied ____ Somewhat satisfied ____ Somewhat dissatisfied ____ Very dissatisfied
Why?

b. With your department (status, support, relationship to other faculty)

____ Very satisfied ____ Somewhat satisfied ____ Somewhat dissatisfied ____ Very dissatisfied
Why?

c. With the relationship between your teaching here and other jobs/roles

____ Very satisfied ____ Somewhat satisfied ____ Somewhat dissatisfied ____ Very dissatisfied
Why?

8. Do you know of any opportunity for promotion, title change, or salary increase available in your current non-tenure track position?
If so, briefly describe.

9. Have you received a contract or do you have an agreement, oral or written, indicating that your position will continue for more than one year?
If so, briefly describe.

10. Do you feel you have any job security?

Is your academic freedom jeopardized?

11. Check which of these activities you are eligible to participate in:

<input type="checkbox"/> orientation for new faculty	<input type="checkbox"/> department governance
<input type="checkbox"/> funding for professional travel	<input type="checkbox"/> college or school governance
<input type="checkbox"/> curriculum development	<input type="checkbox"/> university governance
<input type="checkbox"/> student advising	<input type="checkbox"/> other (please identify)

12. Check which kind of support is available to you:

<input type="checkbox"/> an office (shared with how many? _____)	<input type="checkbox"/> a computer
<input type="checkbox"/> a telephone	<input type="checkbox"/> secretarial assistance if needed
<input type="checkbox"/> other (please identify)	

13. What could be done to improve your situation in your current position?

Appendix E: Sample NTT Position Descriptions

Department of English, UNC Chapel Hill

School of Human Environmental Sciences, UNC Greensboro

Guidelines for Employing Lecturers
Department of English
UNC Chapel Hill

Although the Department of English has hired fixed-term faculty in the past without much thought to their conditions of employment, we believe that recent demographic changes offer an opportunity to consider certain standards and expectations for such appointments. The following guidelines serve three purposes: 1) to ensure the ethical and fair treatment of fixed-term faculty, 2) to promote high quality teaching in General College courses, and 3) to enable the efficient, stable administration of the Composition and Undergraduate Studies Programs.

1. Lecturers are defined as non-tenure-track faculty members in the English Department, excepting graduate teaching fellowships but including spousal hires. They are fixed-term (EPA non-faculty) appointments that may be part-time or full-time, temporary or permanent. To confer full fringe benefits, including University-paid health benefits and retirement contributions, lecturers must hold at least a 75% "permanent" appointment and a one-year contract.
2. Lecturers must hold the Ph.D. degree or other appropriate academic, scholarly, and artistic credentials, and they must demonstrate excellence in teaching.
3. The Department of English defines a full-time teaching load for a lecturer as three courses per semester. A 75% "permanent" appointment is defined as teaching five courses per year; to receive a 67% "permanent" appointment, lecturers will teach two courses per semester. Assignments will be split between composition/creative writing and literature/film courses.
4. Because only "permanent" appointments of 75% or greater carry benefits, such employment is a goal in awarding lectureships; however, the Department will consider individual preferences in determining teaching loads.
5. Lecturers will serve the first year of their appointment on a probationary contract; thereafter, they may be renewed for an additional two years. Following a satisfactory review in the third year of employment, the contract may be renewed for another three-year term.
6. Salaries and raises will be determined by qualifications and experience. In 2001-02 first-year lecturers will receive \$6000 per course. The Department of English recommends that future stipends be indexed to salaries customarily offered to beginning assistant professors in English.
7. Lecturers will have office space (two lecturers per office) and a shared telephone line.
8. Each lecturer will be assigned a mailbox, a photocopy allocation, and a computer. Each lecturer should be eligible to apply for travel funds awarded by the Department.
9. Though lecturers will not vote on personnel matters affecting tenure-track faculty members, they may vote on other issues coming before the faculty. They may attend faculty meetings, serve on departmental committees, and otherwise involve themselves in the life of the Department.
10. Lecturers will elect representatives to a peer-review committee, responsible for advising the Department Chair on policies and procedures affecting lecturers. Members of this committee may also interview applicants for lectureships and evaluate lecturers being considered for renewed appointments.
11. Lecturers shall be appointed in the spring semester. A call for applications will appear on the Department's Website, in local publications, and in announcements sent to the English Department chairs of other North Carolina universities. Applicants will submit a letter of application, current vitae, a teaching portfolio, and at least one letter of recommendation from someone who has observed the

applicant's teaching. A small search committee, appointed by the Department Chair, will review all applications and will conduct personal interviews with a smaller group of candidates (probably on two Saturdays). A list of recommended appointees will be circulated to the English faculty, who will be invited to review the candidates' materials on file outside the Chair's office. A meeting of the faculty will be called to discuss the candidates and to vote on which names should be recommended to the Chair for appointment.

12. The English faculty annually will receive a report describing how many lecturers are employed by the Department, what courses they are teaching, and what roles they are taking in the life of the Department. The faculty also will have an opportunity to review materials bearing on the reappointment of any lecturer and to advise the Chair on these reappointments.

[UNC Greensboro]

SCHOOL OF HEALTH AND HUMAN PERFORMANCE

THE ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL TRACK

I. Purpose and Rationale:

Purpose

Commentary in higher education over the past decade has underscored the importance of the diverse academic and professional contributions of faculty to the successful operation of the university (Krahenbuhl, 1998; Schon, 1995; Boyer, 1990). A companion theme has been the need to structure promotion and reward mechanisms that are sufficiently flexible to recognize performance in this broad spectrum of professional and academic work (Boyer, 1996). His proposal describes a mechanism for addressing this issue in the School of Health and Human Performance at UNCG. Specifically, the proposal recommends the establishment of an Academic Professional Track (APT) that provides for a hierarchy of ranks and a system for appointment and promotion to those ranks for non-tenure track faculty, based on the quantity and quality of critical teaching, service and professional scholarship.

Rationale

Fulfilling the mission of The School of Health and Human Performance (HHP) depends not only on tenure track faculty whose teaching, research and service conform to traditional prescriptions, but also on non-tenure track faculty assigned to unique and indispensable roles. Most of these assignments are carried out in connection with the professional preparation of students in all of the disciplines represented in HHP where application of theory to practice is an integral ingredient of the curriculum. Currently, one-quarter of the faculty force in HHP is assigned to lecturer lines. These positions require not only an advanced graduate education, but also a wealth of experience in the practice of the respective disciplines. Faculty in these positions not only keep abreast of theory and current practice, but also collaborate with professionals and contribute to the advancement of their professions. Because the disciplines represented in the school are diverse, these academic assignments span a broad range of professional duties including, but not limited to, the following: collaborative work with health and social agencies, technical support and teaching in creative performance settings, coordination and supervision of student interns at on-campus and off-campus clinical settings, fitness evaluation and prescription, professional program supervision, and advanced skill instruction.

Academic professionals assigned to these roles have developed reputations as excellent teachers and providers of important services, both to the university and to professional organizations. In addition, some have mastered highly specialized knowledge and skills sufficiently so that their professional contributions have received regional, national, or international recognition. However, because their roles do not align with the expectations typically prescribed for tenure track faculty (e.g., conducting highly specialized research in formal disciplines, advanced graduate teaching and advising, etc.) or because they lack the terminal degree, faculty usually are appointed to non-tenure track positions as lecturers.

Lectureships tend to be viewed as quasi-temporary appointments in which the institution has only a marginal commitment. This is especially the case where the term of appointment is subject to the AAUP recommendation of a maximum of seven years for faculty in non-tenure track positions. Faculty in these positions, however, often invest heavily in the mission of the institution. At the same time, they struggle with career uncertainties and regrettably suffer from the stigma of second class departmental citizens. From the standpoint of the department, the temporary nature of such appointments creates program instability and lack of continuity among the teaching faculty, many of whom are central to the day to day functioning of the professional curriculum. Additionally, even in cases where lecturers have been afforded the special privilege of multi-year appointments, current mechanisms do not adequately recognize and reward professional achievement and growth. Consequently, experienced, highly skilled and knowledgeable, regionally and nationally recognized non-tenure track faculty share the same rank designation as the novice—"lecturer."

The proposed APT will reduce the uncertainty and instability surrounding selected lectureship positions in HHP by providing for fixed term, multi-year appointments. It also will create a system for appointing and promoting faculty currently grouped under the rank of lecturer to professorial ranks based on their individual professional accomplishments. Finally, the proposed APT will strengthen departmental efforts to recruit highly qualified clinical and professional faculty who desire job stability and the opportunity for professional advancement. **The APT is not intended to alter existing job descriptions, workloads or qualifications for lecturers currently employed in HHP.**

The proposed structure has precedence in many professional schools. For example, clinical, non-tenure track faculty positions have long been recognized at professional schools of law, medicine, nursing, social work and education. At UNCG, both the School of Nursing and the School of Human Environmental Sciences have instituted similar academic professional, non-tenure track streams and appear to be functioning effectively.

The following titles for the AP track in HHP are proposed: Academic Professional Instructor, Academic Professional Assistant Professor, Academic Professional

Associate Professor, Academic Professional Professor. This proposal includes two strong recommendations: 1) that the APT be open to all faculty who meet at least the qualifications for appointment to the rank of AP Instructor; and 2) that promotions to higher ranks be accompanied by salary increments comparable to those increments awarded for promotions within the existing tenure track.

**II. DEFINITIONS AND GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING
TEACHING, SERVICE AND SCHOLARSHIP**

**III. CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT/REAPPOINTMENT TO RANKS
WITHIN THE APT.**

**IV. REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT,
AND PROMOTION OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL FACULTY**

**V. INITIAL APPOINTMENT OF CURRENT HHP LECTURERS TO AP
TRACK**

**[For the complete proposal, contact UNCG School of Health and Human
Performance]**