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What We Need

In this presentation we outline what it would take to develop a three-tiered teaching professor (TP) track.

Before putting together a concrete proposal, we need preliminary feedback from (a) the Senate, (b) the RTE Working Group, (c) CAPP, (d) AFPSF, (d) the colleges and departments, and (e) the Provost and Deans.

Our goal is to have a proposal by the October Senate.
Supporting Documents

Associated with this effort are three documents, all online:

1. “Towards the Establishment of a Teaching Professor Title: An Exploratory Discussion” identifies the key issues that must be taken into account during the course of developing a formal TP proposal for Senate consideration.

2. “Senate Deliberations on Teaching-Related Titles” summarizes fifty years of discussion that have a bearing on the TP issue.

3. “A Study of the Teaching Professor Track at Some Peer Universities of Cornell” offers perspectives from 20 schools that have dealt with the TP title question (or not).
The lecturer track was modelled after the research associate and extension associate tracks in the early 1970s.
Shortfalls

- Reflects a lesser view of teaching when compared to the Clinical Professor (CP) and Professor of Practice (PoP) Tracks.
- Hinders the recruitment of the best educators.
- Sends a negative message to students, parents, and alumni.
RTE Teaching Title Numbers for AY2021-22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Lecturers</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Associate</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Practice</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>721</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FYI: There are about 1600 tenure track faculty.
Trends Over 2014-2022

Undergraduate Students  14453 → 15735  ( +9%)
Professional Students  2257 → 2907  (+28%)
Graduate Students  5140 → 7256  (+41%)
RTE Teaching Faculty  504 → 721  (+43%)
Tenure Track (TT) Faculty  Basically flat at 1600

Points to the increasing reliance on RTE teaching as the Grad-to-TT and Professional-Student-to-TT ratios increase.
We Need Something Like This

A three-tiered Teaching Professor (TP) track.

This requires

- job descriptions
- detailed processes
- an analysis of side effects and whether such a development strengthens Cornell.
Need Parity With Existing RTE Professorial Tracks

Advances in Undergraduate Education
- Assistant TP
  - Associate TP
  - Full TP

Advances in Clinical Education
- Assistant CP
  - Associate CP
  - Full CP

Advances in Practical Education
- Assistant PoP
  - Associate PoP
  - Full PoP

Advances in Research-Related Education
- Assistant RP
  - Associate RP
  - Full RP
Authorization Question

If we use the CP, PoP, and RP tracks as models for the TP track, then colleges would be required to obtain Senate approval before authorizing its use.

“Enabling legislation” would be required to provide guidance to the colleges for the writing of the proposal in which they would (a) justify the need for making TP appointments, (b) describe the hiring, reappointment, and promotion processes, and (c) perhaps impose a percent limitation. Importantly, it would lay out the connection between the TP track and other faculty tracks.
Questions

Setting up the TP track will be trickier than setting up the CP and PoP tracks. Those tracks “started from scratch.” Creation of a TP track must take into consideration hundreds of colleagues who have lecturer track appointments. Some questions:

• Does the lecturer track continue and, if so, in what form?

• If the lecturer track continues, how would it relate to the TP track?
Three is Better than Two

To discuss possible connections between the TP and lecturer tracks, it is handy to identify three “levels” within the latter.
Three Options

The Teaching Professor track **coexists** with the Lecturer track.

The Teaching Professor track **replaces** the Lecturer track.

The Teaching Professor track **merges** with the Lecturer track.
The Coexistence Option

The TP track *coexists* with the Lecturer track.

Lecturer track “job descriptions”, renewal processes, and promotion processes would have to be rewritten and made distinct from the corresponding TP job descriptions and processes.
The Coexistence Option

Distinction between TP and Lecturer tracks?

- **TP**: full-time academic career with expectations of impact beyond just the courses taught (dept, univ, world)

- **Lecturer**: part-time, short-term, and/or narrowly focused on specific courses
The Replacement Option

The TP track *replaces* the Lecturer track.

TP track inherits the Lecturer track job descriptions and processes with perhaps some adjustments.
Comparison: Coexistence vs. Replacement

Coexistence:
• Opportunity to distinguish professorial-level teaching contributions
• Gives units flexibility
• (The dominant model in our peer study)

Replacement:
• Easier to implement
The Merger Option (Version 1)

The TP track *merges* with the Lecturer track.

(3 ranks)
The Merger Option (Version 2)

The TP track *merges* with the Lecturer track.

(3 ranks)
The Merger Option (Version 3)

The TP track *merges* with the Lecturer track.
Comparison: Merger vs. Others

Merger:
• Easiest to implement (in V1): SL-R -> TP

Coexistence/Replacement:
• Better address recruitment/retention
• Standard title sequences won’t confuse the external world (or us)
Conclusion: Questions to Consider

• Which of the options best addresses recruitment and retention concerns?
• For the coexist option, how would the two tracks be distinguished?
• If the enabling legislation approach is taken, what would the required proposal to the Senate look like for each of the options?
• How would the transition to each of the options be handled taking into consideration timeline, possible unintended side effects, and administrative overhead.
• For each option, what would the title description writeups look like in the Approved Academic Titles document?
Need Feedback

To put together the best possible proposal, we need feedback.

Comments can be posted on the DoF website.

You can also email us directly:

mrc26@cornell.edu

cfv3@cornell.edu