

Summary of CAPP review of “Proposal to Authorize the College of Arts and Sciences to Use the Teaching Professor Title” and “College of Human Ecology Proposal for the Academic Title of Teaching Professor”

Tom Pepinsky (chair)

Overview

CAPP was asked to review the proposal on the adoption of teaching professor titles from the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Human Ecology.

Summary of CAPP Review

CAPP members expressed broad support for these two proposals. There was no objection voiced to either College’s plan to introduce Teaching Professor titles. The main points of discussion were the following.

1. It was observed that Cornell’s different colleges have implemented different rules and processes for Teaching Professors. The question that emerges is whether CAPP should recommend harmonization of the implementing regulations for Teaching Professor titles across colleges. Further correspondence confirmed that each College’s regulations are compliant with university policy. No further discussion on this point followed.
2. There was a discussion about the specific language in the proposal that reads “For Teaching Professors in language education, often no directly relevant PhD is available, and in such cases the dean may accept other degrees.” One member expressed that this implied that language teaching could be separated from broader engagement with literature, art, history, and media, which could undermine some departments’ efforts to hire language instructors who do hold PhDs. Another emphasized that the unavailability of a PhD degree for language instructors primarily applies to those who teach Less Commonly Taught Languages. Three alternative formulations that emerged from this discussion were
 - “For Teaching Professors in language education, when no directly relevant PhD is available, the dean may accept other degrees”
 - “For Teaching Professors in language and culture education, often no directly relevant PhD is available, and in such cases the dean may accept other degrees.”

- “For Teaching Professors in language education, particularly those teaching less commonly taught languages, often no directly relevant PhD is available, and in such cases the dean may accept other degrees”

In the end, no specific recommendation was made for amending the CAS proposal.

3. Another discussion focused on the criteria for promotion in the CAS proposal, with one member noting that the CAS proposal does not specify anything to differentiate the criteria for promotion from those for mere reappointment at the current rank. This is different from the CHE proposal, which has more specific benchmarks for promotion. Noting that the CAS proposal includes language that “Procedures [for reappointment] shall be standard within the department, exist in written form, and be distributed to all Teaching Professors upon appointment and again at a reasonable interval prior to a reappointment review,” the question is whether written procedures would include detailed criteria (developed by individual departments) for promotion to higher tiers. CAPP members expressed support for CAS departments developing written protocols for hiring and promotion of Teaching Professors that are attuned to these departments’ own circumstances.

Based on this discussion, one CAPP member asked whether the CAS proposal had been developed with sufficient input from “the departments most involved” and sufficient faculty consultation within CAS. CAPP members were satisfied that all CAS procedures for endorsing the proposal were followed by the CAS dean’s office, and there was no further committee discussion on this point.