

# **Proposal for RTE Representation**

The University Faculty Committee

March 4, 2019

# Senate Involvement in the Derivation of the Proposal

A plan to create an ad hoc committee to look into the representation of the nontenure track faculty is announced at the [February 2018 Meeting of the Faculty Senate](#)

Recommendations from the Committee on Academic Titleholder Representation is presented at the [September Meeting of the Faculty Senate](#).

University Faculty Committee resolution endorsing the recommendations is presented at the [November Meeting of the Faculty Senate](#).

Various concerns are discussed at the [December Meeting of the Faculty Senate](#).

Ten sense-of-the-senate votes are taken at the [February Meeting of the Faculty Senate](#).

# The Challenge

To ensure a positive referendum on the final recommendation it should be approved by a healthy margin in the Faculty Senate.

How “strong” can the final recommendation be subject to that constraint?

# The Proposal

The proposed representation plan for RTE faculty has provision for both department RTE senators and college RTE senators, but with a level of moderation that addresses voiced concerns.

Regarding the issue of university voting rights, the “senior-only” option was selected as the best way to launch an expanded version of the senate. Less restrictive options can be adopted in the future as dictated by experience.

# Let's Not Forget Why We are Doing This

1. **Shared Governance.** Representation for the University Faculty, the non-tenure track faculty, post-docs, librarians, and other academic titleholders should reflect the deep levels of professional interaction that already exist between these constituencies.
2. **Recruitment and Retention.** We want to send the message that at Cornell there is respect for the work and contributions of all academic titleholders.
3. **Long Term Well-Being.** The challenges facing Cornell and higher education are great. Navigating the future will require a “TT-plus-RTE” frame of mind.

Who are we talking about?

# Academic Titleholders

Professor (all ranks)	1582
Emeriti	619
University Professor	0
Professor-at-Large (in residence)	17

Visiting Professor (all ranks)	168
Adjunct/Acting Professor (all ranks)	258
Instructor	11
Teaching Associate	9
Visiting Instructor/Lecturer	131
Visiting Critic	33
Visiting Scholar/Scientist	168
Visiting Fellow	164

Research Professor (all ranks)	11
Clinical Professor (all ranks)	32
Professor-of-the-Practice (all ranks)	23

Research Scientist (both ranks)	9
Senior Scientist/Scholar	3
Senior Research Associate	122
Senior Extension Associate	108
Senior Lecturer	190

Research Associate	202
Extension Associate	117
Lecturer	140

Librarian (all ranks)	96
Archivist (all ranks)	15

About  
4400

# The University Faculty (UF)

<b>Professor (all ranks)</b>	<b>1582</b>
<b>Emeriti</b>	<b>619</b>
<b>University Professor</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Professor-at-Large (in residence)</b>	<b>17</b>

<b>Visiting Professor (all ranks)</b>	<b>168</b>
<b>Adjunct/Acting Professor (all ranks)</b>	<b>258</b>
<b>Instructor</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Teaching Associate</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Visiting Instructor/Lecturer</b>	<b>131</b>
<b>Visiting Critic</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Visiting Scholar/Scientist</b>	<b>168</b>
<b>Visiting Fellow</b>	<b>164</b>

<b>Research Professor (all ranks)</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Clinical Professor (all ranks)</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Professor-of-the-Practice (all ranks)</b>	<b>23</b>

<b>Research Scientist (both ranks)</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Senior Scientist/Scholar</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Senior Research Associate</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>Senior Extension Associate</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>Senior Lecturer</b>	<b>190</b>

<b>Research Associate</b>	<b>202</b>
<b>Extension Associate</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Lecturer</b>	<b>140</b>

<b>Librarian (all ranks)</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Archivist (all ranks)</b>	<b>15</b>

**About  
2300**



# The Research-Teaching-Extension (RTE) Faculty

Professor (all ranks)	1582
Emeriti	619
University Professor	0
Professor-at-Large (in residence)	17

Visiting Professor (all ranks)	168
Adjunct/Acting Professor (all ranks)	258
Instructor	11
Teaching Associate	9
Visiting Instructor/Lecturer	131
Visiting Critic	33
Visiting Scholar/Scientist	168
Visiting Fellow	164

Research Professor (all ranks)	11
Clinical Professor (all ranks)	32
Professor-of-the-Practice (all ranks)	23

Research Scientist (both ranks)	9
Senior Scientist/Scholar	3
Senior Research Associate	122
Senior Extension Associate	108
Senior Lecturer	190

Research Associate	202
Extension Associate	117
Lecturer	140

Librarian (all ranks)	96
Archivist (all ranks)	15

About  
2100

# Sense-of-the-Senate Polling: Terminology and Preferred Assembly

	<b>Essence</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abs</b>
SOS-1	“RTE” (research-teaching-extension) describes what those off the tenure track do.	65	12	13
SOS-2	“RTE Faculty” is a good way to refer to colleagues who are off the tenure track.	65	15	10
SOS-3	The RTE Faculty should be represented through the Faculty Senate instead of through the Employee Assembly.	77	6	7

# Qualtrics Polling of the RTE Faculty: Terminology and Preferred Assembly

How should the RTE Faculty be represented?	%	Count
Through the Faculty Senate	88.1	185
Through the Employee Assembly (currently the case)	1.4	3
Through a new assembly just for the RTE Faculty	10.5	22

Rank from most to least preferred:	1	2	3	Count
“RTE Faculty”	46.0%	37.4%	16.7%	174
“Academic Members”	21.3%	21.8%	56.9%	174
“Non-tenure Track Faculty	10.5%	40.8%	26.4%	174

# Employee Assembly Endorsement

## Resolution 3 (2019) Transfer of Representation of CU Academic Titleholders

This resolution is a formal endorsement by the Employee Assembly to declare its support with the formal recommendations from the Committee on Academic Titleholder Representation (Appendix) in shared governance at the university.

## The Proposal

**Recommends use of the terminology “RTE Faculty”.**

**Supports the alignment of this constituency with the Faculty Senate.**

# A Comment on Terminology

In the early 2000s it was somewhat contentious to use the word “professor” as in Clinical Professor, Professor-of-the-Practice, and Research Professor. Nowadays it is hardly an issue--the creation of these titles did not diminish what it means to be a professor on the tenure track.

We understand that there are concerns with the “RTE Faculty” terminology. However, we suspect that what it means to be a faculty member on the tenure track will not be diminished by referring to our research, teaching, and extension colleagues as “RTE faculty”.

A representation plan for the RTE Faculty has to define what is meant by voting rights and it must identify the recipients.

# Definition of University Voting Rights (UVR)

1. You are eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate.
2. You can participate in University-wide elections that determine
  - (a) The Faculty Trustees
  - (b) The Dean of Faculty
  - (c) The Associate Dean of Faculty
  - (d) The University Faculty Committee
  - (e) The Nominations and Elections Committee
  - (f) The At-Large Senators
3. You can vote in elections for senator in your department.



# University Voting Rights

Visiting Professor (all ranks)	168
Adjunct/Acting Professor (all ranks)	258
Instructor	11
Teaching Associate	9
Visiting Instructor/Lecturer	131
Visiting Critic	33
Visiting Scholar/Scientist	168
Visiting Fellow	164

No  
(Broad Consensus)

Research Professor (all ranks)	11
Clinical Professor (all ranks)	32
Professor-of-the-Practice (all ranks)	23
Research Scientist (both ranks)	9
Senior Scientist/Scholar	3
Senior Research Associate	122
Senior Extension Associate	108
Senior Lecturer	190
Librarian (all ranks)	96
Archivist (all ranks)	15

Yes  
(Broad Consensus)

Research Associate	202
Extension Associate	117
Lecturer	140

Should this group  
have UVR?

**Original Option**

says "yes"

**Mixed Option**

says "yes if 3+Yrs"

**Senior-Only Option**

says "no"

# Three UVR Options: Approximate Numbers

Title	Option		
	Original	Mixed	Senior-Only
Senior Research Associate	122	122	122
Research Associate	202	97	0
Senior Lecturer	190	190	190
Lecturer	140	55	0
Senior Extension Associate	108	108	108
Extension Associate	117	63	0
	<b>879</b>	<b>635</b>	<b>420</b>

In the Mixed Option the individual must have been in that position for three or more years.

# Sense-of-the-Senate Polling: UVR Options

	<b>Essence</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abs</b>
SOS-4	Original Option: Research Associates, Lecturers, and Extension Associates should have University Voting Rights.	21	54	11
SOS-5	Mixed Option: Research Associates, Lecturers, and Extension Associates should have University Voting Rights provided they have been in their position for 3 or more years.	30	44	16
SOS-6	Senior-Only Option: Research Associates, Lecturers, and Extension Associates should not have University Voting Rights.	41	36	10

# Qualtrics Polling of the RTE Faculty: UVR Options

Do you agree with the position that UVR not be given to RTE Faculty whose title includes any of the terms “adjunct”, “visiting”, “acting”, or “courtesy” ?

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Count</b>
All	Yes	82.5	174
	No	17.5	37
Senior Research Associates Senior Lecturers Senior Extension Associates	Yes	90.2	83
	No	8.8	9
Research Associates Lecturers Extension Associates	Yes	74.5	41
	No	25.5	14

# Qualtrics Polling of the RTE Faculty: UVR Options

If Senior Research Associates, Senior Lecturers, and Senior Extension Associates are given UVR, then should Research Associates, Lecturers, and Extension Associates be given UVR?

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Count</b>
Senior Research Associates Senior Lecturers Senior Extension Associates	Yes	26.1	24
	Yes if 3+ Years in Position	53.3	49
	No	20.6	19
Research Associates Lecturers Extension Associates	Yes	75.4	27
	Yes if 3+ Years in Position	24.6	29
	No	0.0	0

## The Proposal

**With respect to UVR in the research, lecturer, and extension tracks, it recommends the “Senior Only” option.**

**Consistent with this, it recommends giving UVR to the top two ranks of the four-rank librarian and archivist tracks.**

# Notation: RTE\* and UF\*

“ RTE\* “ will hereafter denote the RTE faculty who have UVR:

Research Professor (all ranks)  
Clinical Professor (all ranks)  
Professor-of-the-Practice (all ranks)  
Research Scientist (both ranks)  
Senior Scientist/Scholar  
Senior Research Associate  
Senior Lecturer  
Senior Extension Associate  
Librarian, Associate Librarian  
Archivist, Associate Archivist

“ UF\* “ will hereafter denote the University Faculty who have UVR:

Professor  
Associate Professor  
Assistant Professor  
The Emeriti

(Consistent with current legislation.)

# Comments on Choosing the Senior-Only Option

- Being at the senior level in these tracks guarantees a level of vetting that squares with having University Voting Rights.
- It encourages the proper use of titles and promotion-within-track procedures.
- After a few years, if experience dictates, then “upgrading” to the Mixed or Original options would be possible. ‘Downgrading” to a more restrictive option would be next to impossible.
- RTE w/o UVR would still be able to help shape RTE-related policy ....



# Committee on the Status of RTE Faculty

If this proposal is ratified by the UF\*, then a strong follow-up recommendation to the Senate will be for it to create a standing committee called the “Committee on the Status of RTE Faculty.”

It would deal with RTE-related issues including recruitment, retention, promotion standards, switching tracks, adequacy of the current lineup of titles and ranks, variations across the colleges, emeritus status, and academic freedom.

It would be staffed by members of the University and RTE Faculties with designated seats for RTE Faculty without UVR.

# Next Up: Rules for Senate Membership

There are four cases to consider:

- a) Designated and ex officio Senate Seats
- b) University at-large Senate Seats
- c) College at-large Senate Seats
- d) Department Senate Seats

# Designated and Ex Officio Seats

## The Proposal

### **Recommends:**

- 1 RTE-designated Senate seat filled by Cornell University Library.**
- 1 Ex Officio seat each for the SA, GPSA, EA, ROTC, and the postdocs**
- 1 Emeritus-designated Senate seat filled by CAPE**

(The Library and Postdoc seats are new.)

# University At-Large Seats

# University At-Large Seats: SOS Polling

	<b>Essence</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abs</b>
SOS-10	Nine At-Large Senate seats determined by university-wide elections. Three seats are designated for tenured faculty, three for assistant professors, and three for RTE* Faculty.	66	11	11

# Qualtrics RTE Polling: University At-Large Seats

There are currently nine at-large senate seats that are filled by university-wide elections. Do you agree with the position that three of these seats be designated for RTE Faculty with UVR?

	%	Count
Yes	94.3	200
No	5.7	12

## The Proposal

**Recommends that there be nine at-large Senate seats to be filled through university-wide elections. The seats would be designated as follows:**

**3 for tenured members of the UF\***

**3 for untenured members of the UF\***

**3 for members of the RTE\* faculty**

**The electorate for these positions would be the UF\* and the RTE\*.**



# Comments on University At-Large Seats

They create an opportunity for different types faculty to serve in the Senate as individuals who are independent of their home unit and college.

They create a path to the Senate for the RTE\* who work in centers and who do not have a college or department affiliation.

# Department/ College Membership Options

# SOS Polling:

## Department/College Membership Options

	Essence	Yes	No	Abs
<b>SOS-7</b>	Departments can send either University or RTE Faculty to Senate. Approximately 17 RTE-only seats apportioned among the colleges.	32	46	9
<b>SOS-8</b>	Departments can only send University Faculty to the Senate. Approximately 17 RTE-only seats apportioned among the colleges.	44	34	11
<b>SOS-9</b>	Each Department gets one additional Senate seat. At least half of the filled seats must be University Faculty. No College RTE-only college seats.	18	45	23

# Qualtrics RTE Polling: Department/ College Membership Options

<b>Rank from most to least preferred</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Count</b>
Departments can send either University or RTE Faculty to Senate. Approximately 17 RTE-only seats apportioned among the colleges.	74.5%	25.5%	0.0%	141
Departments can only send University Faculty to the Senate. Approximately 17 RTE-only seats apportioned among the colleges.	7.0%	27.0%	66.0%	141
Each Dept gets one additional Senate seat. At least half of the filled seats must be University Faculty. No College RTE-only college seats.	14.4%	47.5%	34.1%	141

How Do We Proceed from these Mixed Messages?

# Attributes of a Good Senate Membership Plan

It must be possible to have RTE\* Senators from the departments. This is because it is in the departments where having a positive TT-RTE chemistry does the most good.

It is important to have College at-large Senate seats because it creates a guaranteed RTE\* presence with an independent voice. They will be necessary until there is sufficient representation through the departments.

# Department RTE Senators: Compromise

	Essence	Yes	No	Abs
<b>SOS-7</b>	Departments can send either University or RTE Faculty to Senate. Approximately 17 RTE-only seats apportioned among the colleges.	32	46	9
<b>SOS-8</b>	Departments can only send University Faculty to the Senate. Approximately 17 RTE-only seats apportioned among the colleges.	44	34	11
<b>SOS-9</b>	Each Department gets one additional Senate seat. At least half of the filled seats must be University Faculty. No College RTE-only college seats.	18	45	23

<b>SOS-X</b>	In a 2-seat department, one of the senators can be RTE*.  Use the SOS-9 inspired rule for having two seats: $TT + RTE^* > 25$ . The Senate may grow as a result, but not at SOS-9 levels.
--------------	--

# College at-large RTE Senators: Compromise

	Essence	Yes	No	Abs
<b>SOS-7</b>	Departments can send either University or RTE Faculty to Senate. Approximately 17 RTE-only seats apportioned among the colleges.	32	46	9
<b>SOS-8</b>	Departments can only send University Faculty to the Senate. Approximately 17 RTE-only seats apportioned among the colleges.	44	34	11
<b>SOS-9</b>	Each Department gets one additional Senate seat. At least half of the filled seats must be University Faculty. No College RTE-only college seats.	18	45	23

<b>SOS-X</b>	Use the SOS-7 and SOS-8 rule for 2 seats: RTE*>25. Drop the SOS-7 and SOS-8 rule for 3 seats: RTE*>100.
--------------	--



## The Proposal

### Department Senate Seat Rules

Each of the 72 departments gets one seat if  $TT + RTE^* \leq 25$  and two seats if  $TT + RTE^* > 25$ .

Each department must have at least one University Faculty Senator.

### College At-Large Senate Seat Rules

The 10 colleges each get one  $RTE^*$ -only seat if  $RTE^* \leq 25$  and two seats if  $RTE^* > 25$ .

# Comments on the Allocation Formulae

There are 72 departments. With existing UF\* and RTE\* populations we have these numbers:

## Current Allocation Scheme

- 18 The number of 2-senator departments ( $TT > 25$ )
- 0 The number of college at-large seats
- 100 The overall size of the Senate ( $72+18+9+1$ )

## Proposed Allocation Scheme

- 32 The number of 2-senator departments ( $TT + RTE^* > 25$ )
- 16 The number of College-at-large seats
- 131 The overall size of the Senate ( $72+32+16+9+1+1$ )

# Comments on the UF\*-to-RTE\* Ratio

If the proposal is enacted, then here is what we can say about the 2019-20 Faculty Senate:

131	Total size
20	The minimum number of RTE* Senators resulting from college at-large elections (16), university at-large elections (3), and the library(1).  Assumes all 2-seat units elect 2 UF* Senators.
52	The maximum number of RTE* Senators.  Assumes all 2-seat units elect an RTE* Senator

Thus, the ratio can be as large as 111:20 and as small as 79:52

# A “Worst Case Scenario”

If the proposal is enacted and

- 1) the number of 2-seat units grows from 32 to 55, and
- 2) every 2-seat unit elects an RTE\* senator, and
- 3) the number of 2-seat colleges grows from 6 to 10,

then here is what we can say about the composition of the Senate:

158	Total size
79	The minimum number of UF* Senators (72 department seats, 6 university at-large seats, 1 emeritus/a seat.)
79	The maximum number of RTE* Senators. (55 department seats, 3 university at-large seats, 20 college at-large seats, 1 library seat)

# Comments on this “Worst Case” Scenario

Assume this plays out with a freeze on TT hiring. Among other things, there would have to be approximately 140 new RTE\* appointments strategically placed in 24 selected small departments so that they all become 2-seat units. **The RTE\* population in these units would have to increase more than 60%.**

This is highly unlikely, but we should always pay attention...

## The Proposal

**Every three years there would be an adjustment in the distribution of senate seats based on current UF\* and RTE\* numbers.**

**Every three years the University Faculty Committee with broad consultation would assess the quality of Faculty representation. All concerns would be discussed in the Faculty Senate.**

**Proposed modifications would be brought before the University Faculty in accordance with the Bylaws of that body, i.e., *The Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty*.**

Historical  
Perspective

Growth in  
Faculty  
Numbers  
Unlikely

	University Faculty			Academic Professionals		
	Number	Women	URM	Number	Women	URM
2017	1563	31.7 %	8.6 %	1020	48.5 %	5.9 %
2016	1599	31.5 %	8.4 %	1024	48.7 %	6.2 %
2015	1594	30.8 %	8.2 %	1074	48.5 %	6.3 %
2014	1601	29.4 %	7.8 %	1033	47.4 %	6.0 %
2013	1579	28.8 %	7.3 %	1037	45.2 %	6.0 %
2012	1553	27.9 %	6.8 %	1076	44.9 %	6.1 %
2011	1563	27.5 %	6.3 %	1101	44.1 %	7.1 %
2010	1544	26.7 %	6.3 %	1118	44.1 %	5.2 %
2009	1580	26.2 %	6.1 %	1135	43.7 %	3.8 %
2008	1589	25.9 %	6.0 %	1212	43.9 %	3.7 %
2007	1606	25.2 %	6.0 %	1195	44.0 %	4.4 %
2006	1581	24.4 %	5.9 %	1182	43.8 %	4.4 %
2005	1544	24.3 %	5.8 %	1223	44.7 %	4.3 %
2004	1532	23.4 %	5.7 %	1208	44.0 %	4.6 %
2003	1520	23.3 %	5.6 %	1203	44.0 %	4.7 %
2002	1511	23.0 %	5.5 %	1192	45.6 %	4.8 %
2001	1503	22.8 %	5.2 %	1181	44.8 %	4.5 %

Data from Institutional Research and Planning. “Academic Professionals” = “RTE Faculty” (roughly)

# Two More Features of the Proposal That Will Broaden Participation



## The Proposal

**All RTE Faculty, regardless of UVR, would be allowed to attend Senate meetings and speak.**

**Departments can let RTE faculty without UVR participate in their secret-ballot senator elections if they so choose.**

# Yes or No

Thinking in terms of whether or not it will improve the climate for research, teaching, and extension at Cornell, do you support this proposal for broader representation and engagement?