MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Regents
    Faculty Council Chair John McDowell

FROM: Associate Vice President Kathleen Bollard

DATE: April 26, 2010

SUBJECT: Report on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF)

In the spring of 2001, the campuses provided the Board of Regents with a progress report on the implementation of the recommendations from the 1999 ad hoc committee on non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF). In fall of 2003, fall of 2005, and spring of 2008, the campuses provided updates on that progress, agreeing that they would continue to submit biannual reports. In 2009, the faculty council worked with the system and campus Offices of Academic Affairs to update the report template in order to respond to the changes that had occurred over the previous ten years and to continue to solicit relevant and useful information.

The attached campus reports summarize the data from the schools and colleges on each campus. The more detailed reports are available upon request from the system Office of Academic Affairs, as is the updated UCB report describing the actions taken by the campus’s Academic Affairs Office in response to recommendations from the Boulder Faculty Assembly’s Instructor Task Force.

Attachment

cc: President
    Chancellors
    Provosts
To: Kathleen Bollard, Associate Vice President and Academic Affairs Officer  
From: Jeff Cox, AVC for Faculty Affairs, UCB  
Subject: Annual Report on Non-Tenure Track Faculty  
Date: 8 March 2010

I am providing here the report of the University of Colorado at Boulder on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty. I will provide a campus-level overview; I am attaching the various reports of the schools and colleges at the University of Colorado at Boulder to the questions issued for the campuses’ annual Report on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty. Each dean’s office has answered the questions as they pertain to the particular unit.

The Office of Academic Affairs, through the Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA), oversees the use of non-tenure-track titles to insure that they are employed correctly according to the policies and rules of the University. The OFA website contains definitions of all faculty job titles used on campus with links to system policies. Of the various non-tenure-track job groups, full time instructors must have their letters of offer approved by OFA; more detailed information on matters related to instructors are included on the OFA website. Offer letters for other non-tenure-track titles only need the approval of the dean. In the case of the large body of research faculty, that approval occurs in the office of the Dean of the Graduate School, though research faculty who carry professorial titles are also reviewed by OFA.

The Office of Academic Affairs maintains cross-college standards for the appointment of instructors and for the differentiation between instructors and lecturers (see the attached document, “Academic Affairs Takes Action on BFA Instructor Task Force Recommendations”). The Provost’s office has worked to improve the working conditions and professional situation of instructors who are on multi-year letters of offer. The campus has also outlined some broad policies in a document endorsed by Boulder Faculty Assembly (“Boulder Campus Guidelines for the Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Lecturer and Instructor Rank Faculty”). The BFA currently has a taskforce working on the status of instructors which is in the process of reporting its findings.

Through these policies and the work of OFA, Academic Affairs seeks: 1) to regulate the use of titles and the nature of letters of offer provided for different titles; 2) to set a floor for compensation for instructors, with compensation for other job titles being at the discretion of the deans; 3) to insure that benefits are provided according to system policies; 4) to insure grievance rights of all faculty; and 5) to encourage the inclusion of non-tenure-track faculty on multiple-year letters of offer in faculty development and recognition programs.

What follows are answers to the specific questions in the report template.
Section A.  
**Titles, Contracts, and Workloads**

Please answer the following questions for each of the schools, colleges, and libraries within your campus.

1. **What titles are in use for NTTF?**

   Adjunct  
   Adjoint  
   Attendant Rank  
   Instructor  
   Senior Instructor  
   Lecturer  
   Scholar in Residence  
   Visiting  
   Clinical Faculty Titles  
   Research Faculty Titles

   Numbers by job class are supplied by the Boulder Campus Office of Institutional Analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Class</th>
<th>Without student employees</th>
<th>Student employees only</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/tenure track (TTT)</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional not TTT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors/sr instr</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (hon/lec/visit/adj...)</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA/GPTI/other students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research not TTT</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr/rsrch, or admin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified staff</td>
<td>2,513</td>
<td>2,513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student hourly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>6,827</td>
<td>6,838</td>
<td>13,665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Are policies and procedures in place for initiating and reviewing NTTF contracts? If so, please summarize them.**

   All full-time instructor and senior instructor positions and all clinical faculty positions are reviewed at the department level, the dean’s office, and the Office of Faculty Affairs and ultimately by the Chancellor; the offer letter process is the same as it is for tenure track faculty. All research faculty appointments are reviewed by the Dean of the Graduate School and reported to the Chancellor. Other job classes, including less than 100% instructor and senior instructor appointments, are reviewed and approved at the level of the Dean and reported via the delegation report. We are currently requesting delegation of such appointments to the deans.

3. **Are workloads specified for each job title? If so, what are those workloads?**
Work loads vary by School and College; the individual reports indicate what these are. In general, Instructor and Senior Instructor appointments are 80% teaching and 20% service, but the number of courses taught varies. Research Faculty are assigned some teaching percentage if they carry a professorial title. Lecturers are hired on a per course, honorarium basis. There are no standard workloads for titles such as Adjoint, Adjunct and so on.

Section B. Evaluation and Promotion

Please answer the following questions for each of the schools, colleges, and libraries within your campus.

1. What policies and procedures are in place to ensure systematic evaluation of NTTF? If so, please summarize them.

   All instructors, senior instructors, and clinical faculty are on the salary roster and thus undergo annual merit evaluations in the same way as tenure-track faculty. Research Faculty undergo annual merit through processes overseen by the Graduate School (see http://www.colorado.edu/VCResearch/researchfaculty/#salary). Most other titles—i.e., adjunct or adjoint—are reviewed at the end of an appointment period, usually every four years. Lecturers are part-time, temporary employees and are not necessarily formally reviewed, though their credentials are reviewed each time an offer letter is generated.

2. How frequently are these evaluations conducted?

   As indicated above, annually or at the end of a period of appointment.

3. Are there policies and procedures for promotion within and between appropriate title categories? If so, please summarize them.

   Instructors: Instructors will normally be considered for promotion to Senior Instructor after a period of seven years of continuous appointment at greater than 50% time. Up to three years credit towards promotion, based on previous academic service, may be awarded at the time of initial appointment. Promotion after seven years is not mandatory, nor is it a right. The criteria used to evaluate an instructor for promotion to senior instructor will the same criteria as used for annual merit evaluation. Instructors promoted to senior instructors will be expected to have achieved a level of accomplishment sufficient to be judged as demonstrating excellence in teaching, and meritorious or excellent levels of accomplishment in the other areas defined by the workload definition. Instructors promoted to Senior Instructor continue to be considered "at-will" employees as defined by Colorado Statute and University policy.

   Clinical Faculty: Promotions are governed by the rules of the units using these titles

   Research Faculty: Promotions are governed by the rules of the Graduate School (see http://www.colorado.edu/VCResearch/researchfaculty/).

   Lecturers: Lecturers who have taught at 50% or more for at least three consecutive years may be considered by their unit for promotion to instructor.
Section C. Compensation and Benefits

Please answer the following questions for each of the schools, colleges, and libraries within your campus.

1. At what percentage of FTE are the NTTF holding various titles eligible for benefits? (The 1999 NTTF Recommendations set the goal that “Each primary unit determines what a full-time workload is for its NTTF, and that 50% workload be understood to be half of that departmentally-determined full-time load.”)


2. How are the policies and procedures related to compensation and benefits made readily accessible to NTTF, their supervisors, and relevant staff?

Material is available online. It is discussed at new faculty orientation. Specifics are indicated in offer letters. Payroll and Benefits supply additional guidance.

Section D. Professional Development, Recognition, and Grievance

Please answer the following questions for each of the schools, colleges, and libraries within your campus.

1. What opportunities and types of support are available to NTTF for professional development?

The various schools and colleges have indicated the kinds of professional development opportunities they provide. The campus encourages that professional development opportunities be made available to all instructors and senior instructors. The Faculty Teaching Excellence Program, the Leadership in Education and Administration Program, and the Office of Contracts and Grants offer sessions appropriate to various job classes.

2. How are NTTF recognized for excellent performance? For instance, are there any awards or other public expressions of appreciation for contributions to the University’s mission?

The various schools and colleges have indicated the kinds of recognitions they provide. Various job classes are eligible for Boulder Faculty Assembly Awards at the campus level.

3. Are there policies and procedures for addressing grievances by NTTF? If so, please summarize them.

There are many different kinds of things that are labeled as grievances. Most issues (say, harassment and discrimination) are handled through general campus policies. Many others are handled through specific policies and practices within individual schools and colleges. There is a general campus policy on the non-renewal of instructors:

1. Instructors are at-will employees and may be dismissed for cause, as stated in all letters-of-offer; grievances over any such dismissals are handled in the normal manner.
2. Non-renewal is not dismissal. There may be many reasons why a particular unit chooses not to continue a particular instructor position. There may, however, be cases where an instructor feels that his/her privileges have been violated in a case of non-renewal. In order to make use of grievance procedures in such cases, instructors should, in most
cases, receive timely notification of non-renewal. In general, a notice will be issued one semester before the current letter of offer expires indicating that (a) the person will be renewed; (b) the person will not be renewed; or (c) the person’s renewal is still pending. Rostered instructors on multi-year letters-of-offer should receive notification of non-renewal at least six weeks before the end date in the letter of offer.

3. A fast-track grievance procedure will be available to hear grievances while the instructor is still a member of the university community; such a procedure exists within the College of Arts and Sciences and AA will provide on its website a model procedure for the other schools and colleges to adapt. Where an instructor feels that s/he has been subject to discrimination or harassment, s/he should pursue remedy through ODH. Where an instructor feels that s/he has not been renewed due to procedural violations or due to an unfair (i.e. arbitrary, capricious, retaliatory, based on personal malice, and/or inconsistent with treatment accorded to the instructor’s peers in similar circumstances) recommendation, s/he should use the grievance procedure mentioned above.
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Report
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
Fall 2009

Preface:

Over the past decade, UCCS has been persistently engaged in addressing the recommendations of the 1999 Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Task Force. As a result of those efforts, the following steps have occurred at the campus level through the years:

- Faculty Assembly created a Committee on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and a position on Faculty Representative Assembly.
- The title of “Lecturer” was uniformly adopted for part-time faculty.
- Existing instructors with more than five years service were reviewed for promotion to Senior Instructor.
- Colleges were advised and expected to adopt policies for the systematic evaluation of instructors and to move all lecturers teaching greater than a 50% teaching load to an instructor position with benefits.
- Instructors are included in the campus orientation for new full-time faculty. The Teaching and Learning Center has tried a variety of means to provide more specific support to non-tenure-track faculty, including providing a voluntary new faculty orientation for lecturers in some years.
- Campus teaching award for instructors established
- Associate Deans’ Council led a review of college promotion policies to insure clarity and consistency in opportunities for promotion from instructor to senior instructor. Two colleges were identified as having policies that allowed individuals to be hired as senior instructors, but not promoted unless their credentials changed. One college has created a path to promotion for instructors and the other is examining its policies.
- Between AY2001 and AY2005, $146,000 in campus funding was distributed to increase equity for instructors, over and above the regular pool amount. The campus’ efforts notwithstanding, it was clear that most units remained substantially short of the goals recommended by the task force. As a result, UCCS Faculty Representative Assembly passed a motion endorsing setting recommended salaries based on peer comparisons for instructors in a variety of disciplines. The campus successfully was allowed to make mid-year adjustments for non-tenure-track faculty that brought all instructors halfway from previous salaries to the recommended salaries in spring 2007.
- That same spring, Faculty Representative Assembly endorsed a report from an ad hoc campus committee addressing a number of issues that emerged from a survey of NTTF conducted by the committee, as well as from ongoing discussions with the standing non-tenure-track faculty committee. The Associate Deans Council, in response to that report and in coordination with the FRA NTTF Committee, began drawing up recommendations to the colleges that are intended to address some of the concerns raised. Early results of those efforts include campus-wide templates for letters of offer to instructors and a process to clarify their ongoing employment status as early in the academic cycle as possible. Additional potential outcomes are addressed at the end of this report.
• Last year, Faculty Representative Assembly passed, and the campus has adopted, a motion to fund uniform promotion increases for instructors at the campus level, similar to the practice for TTF.

Section A. **Titles, Contracts, and Workloads**

1. What titles are in use for NTTF?
2. How many FTE’s serve in each title?

**Beth-El**
- Lecturers: 54, 7.3 FTE; Instructors: 8, 6.41 FTE; Clinical Instructors: 7, 6.2 FTE; Senior Clinical Instructors: 1, .6 FTE; Research Instructors: 1, 1.0 FTE

**Business**
- Lecturers: 29, 3.5 FTE; Instructors: 7, 5.93 FTE; Senior Instructors: 5, 3.85 FTE

**Education**
- Lecturers: 43, 5.1 FTE; Instructors: 10, 6.2 FTE; Senior Instructors: 4, 3.5 FTE

**Engineering**
- Lecturers: 18, 2.0 FTE; Instructors: 5, 4.5 FTE; Senior Instructors: 1, .75 FTE; Prof. Research Ass’ts: 5, 2.1 FTE; Sr. Prof. Research Ass’ts: 1, .5 FTE

**LAS**
- Lecturer: 144, 17.7 FTE; Instructors: 67, 59.18 FTE; Senior Instructors: 27, 24.56 FTE; Prof. Research Ass’ts: 7, 4.8 FTE; Sr. Prof. Research Ass’ts: 8, 5.6 FTE; Clinical Ass’t Professors: 2, 2.0 FTE; Research Ass’t Professors: 2, 1.5 FTE

**SPA**
- Lecturers: 13, 1.5 FTE; Instructors: 2, 2.0 FTE; Senior Instructors: 1, 1.0 FTE

**Library**
- Senior Instructors: 2, 2.0 FTE

3. How are titles assigned?
4. What policies and procedures are in place for initiating and reviewing NTTF contracts?
5. How are the policies and procedures related to titles and contracts made readily accessible to NTTF, their supervisors, and relevant staff?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th>Instructors, Research and Clinical Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth-El</td>
<td>Chairs select and extend offers to lecturers using a campus template available on HR website: letters are reviewed and approved by the dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Chairs select and extend offers to lecturers using a campus template available on HR website: letters are reviewed and approved by the dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Chairs select and extend offers to lecturers using a campus template available on HR website: letters are reviewed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and approved by the dean

| Engineering  | Chairs select and extend offers to lecturers using a campus template available on HR website: letters are reviewed and approved by the dean | Chair requests search, authorization by dean, provost and chancellor; letters use campus template, posted on campus HR website, approved by dean, provost and chancellor |
| LAS          | Chairs select and extend offers to lecturers using a campus template available on HR website: letters are reviewed and approved by the dean | Dean and chair request search, authorization by provost and chancellor; letters use campus template, posted on campus HR website, approved by dean, provost and chancellor |
| SPA          | Associate dean selects and extends offers using a campus template available on HR website | Associate dean requests search, authorization by provost and chancellor; letters use campus template, posted on campus HR website, approved by provost and chancellor |
| Library      | N/A | Dean requests search, authorization by provost and chancellor; letters use campus template, posted on campus HR website, approved by provost and chancellor |

6. What policies and procedures are in place for determining the workloads for NTTF?
7. Are workloads specified for each job title? If so, what are those workloads?
8. What is the range of distribution of effort for each title in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship and/or professional development? Please respond in percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th>Instructors, Research and Clinical Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth-El</td>
<td>100% teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>100% teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>100% teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>100% teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
when varied in letter of offer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>100% teaching</td>
<td>College policies (available in dean’s office) specify 4/4 teaching load is full-time; Instructors and Senior instructors: varies by department: teaching: 80%-100%, service 0-20%; beginning fall 2009, specified in individual faculty member’s letter of offer; may be adjusted by addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>100% teaching</td>
<td>Published college policy on NTTF mandates development of individual workload agreements; Actual range: teaching 70-80%, service 20-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Published policies govern across TT and NTT categories; Will be using new Faculty Responsibility Statements to specify distribution of workload across librarianship and service in future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section B. **Evaluation and Promotion**

1. What policies and procedures are in place to ensure systematic evaluation of NTTF?
2. How frequently are these evaluations conducted?
3. Are these evaluations reviewed outside of the primary units? If so, where?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Policy Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth-El</td>
<td>Chair’s responsibility, not reviewed otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Published college Faculty Handbook governs process for annual merit evaluation for all full-time faculty; college committee assigns ratings based on self-evaluation and chair evaluation, dean reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Chair’s responsibility, not reviewed otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Published college policy governs process for annual merit evaluation for all full-time faculty; college committee assigns ratings based on self-evaluation and chair evaluation, dean reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Chair’s responsibility, not reviewed otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College policy governs process for annual merit evaluation for all full-time faculty; college committee assigns ratings based on self-evaluation and chair evaluation, dean reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Chair’s responsibility, not reviewed otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department by-laws available on website govern process for annual merit evaluation for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
all full-time faculty; chair assigns rating, dean reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chair’s responsibility, not reviewed otherwise</th>
<th>All full-time faculty subject to annual merit review; for NTTF, chair assigns rating based on self-evaluation, dean reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>Associate dean’s responsibility, not reviewed otherwise</td>
<td>Annual merit review based on professional development plan conducted by associate dean or program director, as detailed in published school NTTF policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Published policy governs process of evaluation by dean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Are there clearly defined policies and procedures for promotion within and between appropriate title categories?

5. How are the policies and procedures related to evaluation and promotion made readily accessible to NTTF, their supervisors, and relevant staff?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th>Instructors, Research and Clinical Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth-El</td>
<td>Policies written in published Faculty Handbook: chair recommends based on teaching and clinical experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Exploring possible path to promotion; Currently hire based on credentials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Practice documented in dean’s office: chair recommends based on exemplary service to college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Documented in department by-laws, posted on the web; Criteria vary by department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>Practice documented in dean’s office: 5 years as instructor, positive annual merit evaluations, significant teaching accomplishments and chair’s recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>School-wide NTTF policy document contains policy: 5 years as instructor, substantial success in teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C. **Compensation, Benefits, and Conditions**

1. **What is the salary range?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Lecturers per CH</th>
<th>Instr &amp; Sr Instr FTE salary</th>
<th>Research Faculty FTE salary</th>
<th>Clinical Faculty FTE salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth-El</td>
<td>$1,333</td>
<td>I: $32,000-54,878</td>
<td>I: $74,800</td>
<td>I: $40,000-83,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SI: $55,077</td>
<td></td>
<td>SI: $55,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>$792-1,222</td>
<td>I: $41,667-54,191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SI: $42,729-76,586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$687</td>
<td>I: $41,500-45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SI: $43,827-46,062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$1,000-1,667</td>
<td>I: $42,000-55,000</td>
<td>PRA: $21,600-48,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SI: $94,729</td>
<td>S: $72,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>$796-1,333</td>
<td>I: $21,148-51,000</td>
<td>PRA: 19,656-70,000</td>
<td>Asst Prof: $42,000-46,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S: 32,837-48,525</td>
<td>S: $34,778-47,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S: $34,778-47,000</td>
<td>Asst Prof: $64,275-77,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>$933-1,167</td>
<td>I: $32,000-36,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S: $50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>S: $86,357-89,235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **At what percentage of FTE are the NTTF holding various titles eligible for benefits?**

3. **How are the policies and procedures related to compensation and benefits made readily accessible to NTTF, their supervisors, and relevant staff?**

   **Lecturers, Instructors, Research and Clinical Faculty**

   All colleges:

   According to the letter of offer template instruction, “Lecturers are part-time faculty and cannot exceed 49% time. Lecturers can teach 12 credits per year (6/6, 3/9, 2/3, 1/2).” Benefits are outlined on the campus HR website, with references to the system benefits website.
etc.). If they teach over 12 credits, they must be classified as instructors of some % (.5, .75, etc.).” However, since hiring is decentralized, it is difficult to be certain if this advice is always followed precisely.

4. What is the process for identifying deficiencies in working conditions, such as access to office space, telephones, and copiers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th>Instructors, Research and Clinical Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth-El</td>
<td>Provided in dedicated part-time faculty room</td>
<td>Have individual offices; Chair would handle reported deficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Provided in dedicated part-time faculty room</td>
<td>Have individual offices; Chair would handle reported deficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Conditions vary; Chair’s responsibility working with dean</td>
<td>Have individual offices; Chair would handle reported deficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Conditions vary; Chair’s responsibility working with dean</td>
<td>Have individual offices; Chair would handle reported deficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>Conditions vary; Chair’s responsibility working with dean</td>
<td>Instructors are assigned office space, likely shared, and have access to telephones and copiers; Chair would handle reported deficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Associate dean’s responsibility</td>
<td>Have individual offices; Associate dean would handle reported deficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Instructors are treated exactly like the TT faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D. Professional Development, Recognition, and Grievance

1. What opportunities and types of support are available to NTTF for professional development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th>Instructors, Research and Clinical Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth-El</td>
<td>Opportunity to attend department, college and campus events</td>
<td>Available on a limited basis to TT and NTT faculty, with a priority given to pre-tenure faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Opportunity to attend department, college and campus</td>
<td>Provided through annual professional development plan process per published</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
events college policy; college committee reviews requests and awards available funds

Education  Opportunity to attend department, college and campus events  Each faculty member provided $1,000 per year regardless of TT status

Engineering  Opportunity to attend department, college and campus events  Opportunities available at both department and college level, but no dedicated funding set aside specifically for NTTF

LAS  Opportunity to attend department, college and campus events  NTTF eligible to apply for professional development grants at college level; Departments also provide funding as available; College has faculty development web site that includes NTTF where upcoming training activities, important documents (for NTTF), links to other campus entities offering services and special Shared Expertise, Enrichment and Development (SEED) events are featured

SPA  Opportunity to attend department, college and campus events

Library  N/A  Same as available for TTF

2. How are NTTF recognized for excellent performance??

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th>Instructors, Research and Clinical Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth-El</td>
<td>Annual college Outstanding Instructor award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Annual college Outstanding Instructor award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Annual college Outstanding Instructor award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Annual college Outstanding Instructor award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>Annual Part-time Instructor award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Are there clearly defined policies and procedures for addressing grievances by NTTF?

Beth-El  No specific college grievance policy
Business  No specific college grievance policy
Education  No specific college grievance policy
Engineering  No specific college grievance policy
LAS  No specific college grievance policy
SPA  Published school NTTF policies and procedures include NTTF in SPA general faculty grievance process
Library  Salary grievance policy only

4. How are policies and procedures related to professional development, recognition, and grievance made readily accessible to NTTF, their supervisors, and relevant staff?

Beth-El  Except for grievance process, outlined in published Faculty Handbook
Business  Except for grievance process, outlined in published college policy
Education  Dean’s office and department chairs
Engineering  Published department by-laws
LAS  Faculty development website: Call for nominations for awards made to college e-mail list
SPA  Published school NTTF policies and procedures
Library  NTTF fully integrated into comprehensive published faculty policies and procedures

Conclusion

The collaboration between the Associate Deans’ Council and the FRA NTTF Committee has produced a draft model grievance process for consideration by the colleges. However, it is likely to be subsumed under a larger document that would provide a campus-wide framework for non-tenure-track faculty roles, rights and responsibilities as a means of creating a comprehensive source of guidance for faculty, staff and colleges. A draft is in the final stages of completion by the NTTF Committee for comment from the associate deans.
Preface

For the past decade, the University of Colorado office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research, now the System Academic Affairs Office, has asked each of the campuses to respond biannually to a set of questions based on the 1999 Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF) Recommendations. Those original recommendations were endorsed by the Regents, each Faculty Assembly, the Faculty Council, and the President’s Office.

Since 1999, changes on all campuses in NTTF conditions and practices have rendered the original set of questions and goals outdated. The Faculty Council and the System Academic Affairs Office believe that the biannual process of reporting on NTTF conditions has contributed to System-wide improvements. They also believe now that a new set of questions will enhance the accuracy and usefulness of the information coming from the campuses to the System Academic Affairs Office and the Faculty Council. This next phase in the biannual reporting process, like the first, has two goals: improving conditions for NTTF at CU and advancing NTTF contributions to the University’s mission.

UC Denver Report

Introduction:

To prepare this report, each school, college, and library at UC Denver was asked to answer the questions on the report template except for three questions that were answered centrally: A1 [answered by the Office of Institutional Research and Policy Analysis (OIRPA)]; and A2 and C1 (answered by Human Resources). Brief summaries of the answers sent by Deans, Associate Deans, and Directors are given below, along with answers that apply across schools, colleges, and libraries. The complete reports submitted by OIRPA and by the schools/colleges/libraries are in the appendices, as follows:

- Appendix A: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty List for UC Denver (OIRPA)
- Appendix B: Architecture and Planning Report
- Appendix C: Arts and Media Report
- Appendix D: Auraria Library Report
- Appendix E: Business Report
- Appendix F: Dental Medicine Report
- Appendix G: Education and Human Development Report
- Appendix H: Engineering and Applied Science Report
- Appendix I: Health Sciences Library Report
- Appendix J: Liberal Arts and Sciences Report
- Appendix K: Medicine Report
- Appendix L: Nursing Report
Section A. Titles, Contracts, and Workloads

Please answer the following questions for each of the schools, colleges, and libraries within your campus.

1. What titles are in use for NTTF?

UC Denver’s Office of Institutional Research and Policy Analysis (OIRPA) generated a list of all NTTF titles in use, by school/college/library, along with the fall 2009 numbers of faculty members holding each title. The list is in Appendix A. In some of the school/college/library reports (Appendices B – O), additional information is given about the titles that are currently in use.

2. Are policies and procedures in place for initiating and reviewing NTTF contracts? If so, please summarize them.

UC Denver policies and procedures for hiring faculty members make only minimal distinctions between tenure-track faculty and NTTF. All faculty letters of offer are initially reviewed in the Dean’s office. Denver campus tenure-track positions are reviewed by the Provost. All appointments with tenure go through a rigorous review process (with final tenure approval given by the Regents). All faculty appointments are currently forwarded to Human Resources bi-weekly or more frequently, as needed, along with personnel matters reports for the Chancellor’s approval. Human Resources staff members review the content of the letters and ensure that the approved searches or search waivers, the letters, the reports and the entries to the human resources management system all match. With the February 2010 changes to Regent Policy 2-K, the further delegation of authority for approval of NTTF appointments below the rank of Assistant Professor may be contemplated.

For additional information about the processes used in some of the schools/colleges/libraries, see the reports in Appendices B – O.

3. Are workloads specified for each job title? If so, what are those workloads?

The answers to this question are in the school/college/library reports in Appendices B – O. In general, the schools and colleges on the Denver campus, and the libraries on both campuses, have specified workloads for Instructors, Senior Instructors, and Lecturers.

The Denver campus schools and colleges are currently working on criteria for Clinical Teaching Track faculty; the criteria will include guidelines for distributions of efforts in teaching, research/scholarship, and service. The
AMC schools/college with CTT faculty members have written documents describing the criteria for ranks.

Faculty members in other NTTF positions on the Denver campus, as well as at Anschutz Medical Campus (AMC), have workloads that tend to be negotiated individually, depending on the needs of the sponsoring grant, clinical area, or department.

Section B. Evaluation and Promotion

Please answer the following questions for each of the schools, colleges, and libraries within your campus.

1. What policies and procedures are in place to ensure systematic evaluation of NTTF? If so, please summarize them.

There are two relevant policies for faculty members on the Denver campus. The Instructor and Senior Instructor Annual Performance Review policy (http://www.administration.ucdenver.edu/admin/policies/DDC/faculty/Instructor%20and%20Senior%20Instructor%20Annual%20Review.doc) requires annual reviews for Instructors and Senior Instructors. The policy entitled Lecturer, Adjunct Faculty, Adjoint Faculty, and Attendant Rank Faculty Performance Review (http://www.administration.ucdenver.edu/admin/policies/DDC/faculty/NonTenure%20Track%20Teaching%20Faculty%20Review.doc) calls for periodic reviews, defined as every three years unless the primary unit determines that earlier reviews are appropriate or necessary. The Deans on the Denver campus are reminded about these policies every year.

See the reports in Appendices B – O for specific answers to this question submitted by each school, college, and library.

2. How frequently are these evaluations conducted?

Most of the individual school/college/library reports (Appendices B – O) indicate that NTTF are evaluated annually. Some Denver campus units (e.g., Business; Public Affairs) reported that Lecturers are evaluated every three years, which is consistent with the policy cited in B1, above.

3. Are there policies and procedures for promotion within and between appropriate title categories? If so, please summarize them.

Answers provided by the schools/colleges/libraries varied. Some units reported clear descriptions of procedures and criteria for ranks within title series (e.g., Medicine; Nursing; Public Health; both Libraries; and Public Affairs for the Clinical Teaching Track and Research titles series). Other units reported that they have policies and procedures but did not give many details. And a few units reported that they are working on developing
procedures and criteria (e.g., Architecture and Planning; Education and Human Development for the Clinical Teaching Track series). See the individual reports for details.

Section C. Compensation and Benefits
Please answer the following questions for each of the schools, colleges, and libraries within your campus.

1. At what percentage of FTE are the NTTF holding various titles eligible for benefits? (The 1999 NTTF Recommendations set the goal that “Each primary unit determines what a full-time workload is for its NTTF, and that 50% workload be understood to be half of that departmentally-determined full-time load.”)

   Human Resources provided a link to a system-wide document that gives information about eligibility for benefits: https://www.cusys.edu/pbs/pbs_documents/EligibilityMatrix.xls.

   Most of the school/college/library reports also noted that faculty members who have at least a .50 appointment are eligible for benefits.

2. How are the policies and procedures related to compensation and benefits made readily accessible to NTTF, their supervisors, and relevant staff?

   The schools/colleges/libraries reported a variety of ways by which policies and procedures are made accessible to NTTF – e.g., at new employee orientations; in discussions with chairs or other administrators; by information sent from the school/college/library administration; by information provided on websites, in letters of offer, and in faculty/staff handbooks. See the individual reports for details.

Section D. Professional Development, Recognition, and Grievance
Please answer the following questions for each of the schools, colleges, and libraries within your campus.

1. What opportunities and types of support are available to NTTF for professional development?

   On the Denver campus, the Center for Faculty Development (CFD) provides various opportunities and supports for NTTF. NTTF are included in all professional development notices and invitations sent to faculty—such as messages about workshops, seminars, classroom observations and annual Faculty Development Grants. The CFD also has developed ways to reach NTTF electronically, including a CFD website page dedicated specifically to NTTF. The website contains extensive links to information regarding all aspects of teaching and an online assessment tutorial specifically aimed at NTTF. In addition, all faculty members on the Denver campus are required to attend New Faculty Orientation. The CFD developed an online version of the
orientation so that NTTF can meet this requirement and receive the benefits of the information presented at orientation.

As can be seen in the reports in Appendices B – O, a variety of opportunities are made available within schools, colleges, and libraries. Examples of the available opportunities and supports include: seed funding; travel funds; professional development workshops, seminars and demonstrations; internal grants for curriculum development or other professional development purposes; and information and advice sent via newsletters or posted online.

2. How are NTTF recognized for excellent performance? For instance, are there any awards or other public expressions of appreciation for contributions to the University’s mission?

On the Denver campus, there is an annual “Excellence in Teaching Award” for NTTF; Lecturers, Instructors, Senior Instructors, and Clinical Teaching Track faculty members are eligible to be nominated for the award. NTTF with at least a .50 appointment and three years of service on the Denver campus are also eligible to receive the annual “Excellence in Service Award.” Schools and colleges nominate one faculty member for the teaching and service awards (except for Liberal Arts and Sciences, which nominates three faculty members for each award) and the library nominates a faculty member for the service award. Faculty committees, comprised of the nominees and winners of the respective award from the past two years, select the overall campus-level winners. An “Excellence in Librarianship Award” is available to one faculty member in the Auraria Library; the library’s faculty members have developed the criteria and procedures for selecting the recipient of this award. All nominees and campus-level winners receive certificates and stipends; the campus-level winners are recognized at the May and December Commencements and by individual plaques added to the Faculty Awards Gallery in the North Classroom Building. A “Celebration of Faculty Excellence” is held each September to recognize and honor all award recipients.

Beginning in spring 2010, a new Denver campus award, the “Provost’s Award for Excellence in Practices Related to NTTF,” will be given to a unit that has demonstrated a high level of meaningful involvement of NTTF as well as excellence in the level of impact or contribution the NTTF involvement has had on fulfilling the mission of the unit. The unit that receives this award will be given a monetary reward and will be recognized at the May and December Commencements and with a plaque in the Faculty Awards Gallery. The monetary reward is intended to support further advancement of best practices, such as promoting the improvement of NTTF teaching, enhancing NTTF professional development, or stimulating NTTF engagement with the university community.
At AMC, there are two campus-level teaching awards given annually to faculty members in each school and college; the award winners are selected by the students in the respective schools and colleges. The “President’s Excellence in Teaching Award” winners are chosen by the senior classes in the schools/colleges of Dental Medicine, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, and Public Health. This award recognizes the faculty member’s outstanding, innovative, and inspirational contributions to the students’ professional development. The “Chancellor’s Teaching Recognition Award” rewards outstanding teaching. Nominees are identified by school/college student governance groups and winners are selected by committees comprised of students, faculty members, and administrators. The award is given to one faculty member in each school of Dental Medicine, Medicine, Pharmacy, and Public Health; and one faculty member in the College of Nursing and one in the Graduate School. All faculty members are eligible for both the “President’s Excellence in Teaching Award” and the “Chancellor’s Teaching Recognition Award.” Recipients are given cash awards and plaques, and they are recognized at the May Commencement ceremony.

For more information about the campus-level awards at AMC and on the Denver campus—including specific criteria for each award—go to: http://www.ucdenver.edu/faculty_staff/faculty/faculty-affairs/awards/Pages/default.aspx.

The reports in Appendices B – O include information about some additional awards and expressions of appreciation for NTTF within the schools, colleges, and libraries.

3. Are there policies and procedures for addressing grievances by NTTF? If so, please summarize them.

The school/college/library reports (Appendices B – O) describe grievance procedures available to NTTF. Generally, NTTF tend to have access to the same grievance procedures as tenured and tenure-track faculty members.
Appendices

- Appendix A: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty List for UC Denver
- Appendix B: Architecture and Planning Report
- Appendix C: Arts and Media Report
- Appendix D: Auraria Library Report
- Appendix E: Business Report
- Appendix F: Dental Medicine Report
- Appendix G: Education and Human Development Report
- Appendix H: Engineering and Applied Science Report
- Appendix I: Health Sciences Library Report
- Appendix J: Liberal Arts and Sciences Report
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- Appendix M: Pharmacy Report
- Appendix N: Public Affairs Report
- Appendix O: Public Health Report