

Promotions Committee Report - Part-Time Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty M&E

Alexander Halperin

October 2022

1 Faculty Senate Charge

Determine whether Part-Time Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty should be represented by the Faculty Senate or the Adjunct Caucus.

2 Promotions Committee Determination

By a vote of 9 to 1, the Promotions Committee has determined that Part-Time Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (PTF) should be represented by the Faculty Senate, and that their representation should be equal to that for all other Faculty Senate members. This representation would require a change to the Faculty Senate Bylaws to include PTF as members of the Faculty Senate. This decision applies *only* to PTF, and *not* to other Part-Time Faculty.

2.1 Explaining the Promotions Committee Determination

Since PTF have nearly identical job requirements and interests as Full-Time Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (FTF), they deserve equal representation in the Faculty Senate. We further believe that the only practical purpose of denying Faculty Senate representation to PTF would be to inconvenience PTF, especially during promotion. We explain our reasoning in further depth below.

PTF, like FTF, are permanent faculty with teaching, research, and service requirements. The only differences between the two positions are that PTF, compared to FTF,

1. have a 50–80% teaching load,
2. receive a 50–80% salary,
3. require additional years of employment before applying for tenure and promotion.

The Bylaws currently do not allow for PTF to serve on Senate Committees, even though they have service requirements for tenure and promotion. Serving on Senate Committees seems a natural way for PTF to fulfill their service requirements, assuming they serve their Committee(s) as fully as all other FTF members.

One important consequence of not including PTF in the Faculty Senate is that PTF would not be allowed to be represented by the Promotions Committee, as it is a Faculty Senate Committee. As a result, the PTF promotions process would be unclear.

Fundamentally, PTF face the same concerns as FTF, including salary, tenure, promotion. Their positions would best be served by the same options for protection and representation in the Faculty Senate.

PTF representation in the Adjunct Caucus would not benefit either PTF nor Adjunct Faculty (AF). PTF have different employment requirements from Adjunct Faculty (AF) for employment purposes, nor do PTF fit the definition of AF according to the SU Handbook¹. Further, as noted above, PTF interests are

¹ *SU Handbook*, BOR II-1.07

not the same as AF. PTF apply for the same promotions as FTF and are required to conduct research and university service, whereas Adjunct and Contractual Professors do not apply for Associate/Full promotions and have no research or service requirements. Most importantly, PTF are permanent and salaried, unlike AF, which means their job security and pay concerns differ from AF.

3 Arguments Against PTF Inclusion in the Faculty Senate

We recognize there are concerns about including PTF on the Faculty Senate, which we summarize below.

From a point of first principles, the major defining difference between the Adjunct Caucus and the Faculty Senate is Part-Time vs Full-Time employees. Tenure and service requirements of the faculty are not the difference. There are non-Tenure-Track Faculty, VAPs, and other non-permanent positions (with no service or tenure requirement), but they are all Full-Time. That is the primary consideration—those who are invested as Full-Time status to this University. As such, the Adjunct Caucus seems a natural way for PTF to be represented. It would make sense to have one body representing all Part-Time Faculty.²

To put PTF as members of the faculty as defined by the Faculty Senate Bylaws would require a change of the Bylaws. This is a fundamental change to the Bylaws that would apply to all faculty in a similar fashion. To say that it is unlikely that there will be any more PTF in the future, and therefore it is OK to change the Bylaws, is short-sighted. We have to be OK with whatever decision is made, not only for today, but far to the future. Additional PTF hires could lead to negative consequences for faculty and the University. For example, administrators and departments may want to hire multiple PTF to cut costs, which could result in lower-quality hires. For faculty, a PTF position may be a way of keeping benefits and equal representation in the Senate with fewer job requirements and less involvement in University matters. This is particularly possible in departments whose faculty could easily hold a part-time job outside the University, such as Nursing.

The ramification of this outcome is if departments/units choose to have many part-time faculty (vs. fewer equivalent FTF), they will now have more votes. They can increase their voting power by hiring more PTF. Regardless of the likelihood, this is the consequence of changing the definition. There can be a day where there would be multiple PTF who have more voting power even though they are not fully vested into the university as FTF.³

From a promotion's standpoint, there are two potential ways to resolve the issue.

1. PTF could have their own review process, just as the library and clinical faculty have their own review process.
2. Alternatively, this could be taken care of on the committee level. Representation for relevant committees can have an ex-officio position for PTF. They could be voting or non-voting members depending on what people thought would be appropriate.

4 Promotions Committee Members

Mark deSocio, Geography and Geosciences

William Folger, Music

Seth Friese, Chemistry

Alexander Halperin (Chair), Mathematical Sciences

Deborah Mathews, Social Work

Althea Pennerman, Early and Elementary Education

Corinne Pubill, Modern Languages

Asif Shakur, Physics

Timothy Werner, Exercise Science

Starlin Weaver, Secondary and Physical Education

²We address this argument in the last paragraph of Page 1.

³A compromise allowing PTF to have full Faculty Senate representation *but with 1/2 voting power* was considered as a way to address the above concern, but it did not pass.