

*Faculty Senate*  
**Non-Traditional Faculty Task Force**  
**Draft Final Report**  
Submitted by: *Barbara Scott and Hans-Peter Plag*  
**May 18, 2009**

**Committee Membership**  
Tim McFarling, Hans Peter Plag, Alla Safronova,  
Barbara Scott, Gary Zunino

**1. Introduction**

The Non-Traditional Faculty Task Force was established by the Faculty Senate in 2006. Realizing that there is an increasing fraction of non-traditional faculty at UNR, the Faculty Senate saw the need to survey the situation of this faculty and to identify issues that would require specific actions. The Task Force was charged with establishing a general baseline reflecting the situation of non-traditional academic and administrative faculty and LOAs. A goal was to identify issues of concern for these groups and to recommend steps towards improving the framework conditions for these groups, where necessary. In particular, the Task Force was charged to:

- define what faculty are non-traditional;
- determine how many non-traditional faculty there are, where these faculty are, and what they do;
- quantify the (relative) contributions of non-traditional faculty to the institutional mission;
- identify issues related to rights, safety net and other concerns.

The number and fraction of non-traditional, non-tenured faculty (denoted as NTT Faculty) have increased considerably over time (Table 1). Academic NTT grew from 30% in 2000 to 38% in 2008, while tenured faculty decreased from 51% in 2000 to 44% in 2008. Considering all academic and administrative faculty, administrative NTT grew from 33% in 2000 to 40% in 2008. This also implies that there was a significant increase in the fraction of administrative faculty from 36% in 2000 to 41% in 2008.

**Table 1:** Number of academic and administrative faculty as function of time for the groups of tenure track, tenured, and non-traditional faculty.

Type	Status	10/1/2000			10/1/2004			10/1/2008		
		N	in group	total	N	in group	total	N	in group	total
AC	3 Yr Contract	10								
AC	NTT	257	30.24%	19.44%	348	35.32%	21.78%	399	38.14%	22.39%
AC	Tenure Track	150	17.65%	11.35%	175	17.77%	10.95%	184	17.59%	10.32%
AC	Tenured	433	50.94%	32.75%	462	46.90%	28.91%	463	44.26%	25.98%
AD	3 Yr Contract	11								
AD	NTT	432	91.53%	32.68%	586	95.60%	36.67%	708	96.20%	39.73%
AD	Tenured	29	6.14%	2.19%	27	4.40%	1.69%	28	3.80%	1.57%
Total AC		850		64.30%	985		61.64%	1046		58.70%
Total AD		472		35.70%	613		38.36%	736		41.30%
Total		1322			1598			1782		

The Task Force agreed on a definition of non-traditional faculty to include any non-tenured or non-tenure track faculty, be it academic, administrative, or letter of appointment (LOA). Initial activities included a review of

available data regarding NTT faculty, such as numbers (FTEs), years of service, colleges and departments, and source of funding. The distribution of tenured, tenure-eligible and NTT faculty in these three groups are summarized in terms of number and FTE in Table 2 for December 2006. It is worthwhile to note that NTT constitute 73% of all faculty and 65% of all FTEs. Almost all tenured and all tenure-eligible faculty are academic faculty.

**Table 2:** Distribution of number and FTEs for academic, administrative, and LOA faculty for tenured, tenure-track and NTT faculty. Numbers are for December 2006.

Group	NTT						Tenure-Track					Tenured				
	N	N	%	FTE	%	% gr.	N	%	FTE	%	%gr	N	%	FTE	%	%gr
Academic	1035	387	15	354	19	37	174	7	173	9	17	474	19	461	25	46
Administrative	709	680	27	664	36	96	0					29	1	28	1.5	4
LOA	783	781	31	186	10	100										
Total	2527	1848	73	1204	65		174	7	173	9		503	20	489	26	

The distribution of years of service is summarized in Table 3. There are considerable difference in terms of average individual service years between the different groups, with the largest average for tenured academic faculty. Moreover, the fraction of faculty hired within a certain number of years is also rather different between groups, with the tenured faculty having least turnover and LOAs having the highest fraction hired within the last three years.

**Table 3:** Distribution of years of services for academic, administrative, and LOA faculty.

Group	NTT				Tenure-eligible				Tenured			
	Average	Range	Total	Hire	Average	Range	Total	Hire	Average	Range	Total	Hire
Academic	8.4±6.7	1-38	3257	50%/6 yr	3.7±3.1	1-28	642	57%/6 yr	18.7±9.4	1-46	8846	50%/17 yr
Administrative	8.1±6.5	1-35	5486	50%/6 yr					21.6±12.4	2-40	626	52%/22 yr
LOAs	5.6±7.2	1-57	4338	52%/3 yr								

With respect to location of academic NTT faculty, it is noted that 76% of these were in three colleges (Medicine 45.6%, Science 16.4% and Liberal Arts 13.9%). In terms of rank, 26% of the NTT were instructors, 43% assistant professors, 19% associate professors, and 12% full professors. With respect to funding sources, 40% of academic NTT faculty received state funds, 19% were self-supporting, 40% received salary through external funds, and 1% had other funding sources.

For administrative faculty, the fraction of NTT is much larger and more evenly distributed over the colleges and divisions. 37.5% of these faculty are in four colleges or divisions, with 10.7% in IT, 10.2% in Athletics, 20% in Medicine, and 7.4% in Human and Community Studies. Of administrative NTT, 57% were on salary range 2 or 3. Funding for administrative NTT faculty was composed of 50% state funding, 24% self-supported, 19% external grants, and 7% other sources.

68% of the LOAs were in four colleges/divisions, with 18.5% in Extended Studies, 17.5% in Medicine, 16.6% in Liberal Arts, and 15.2% in Education. Information concerning rank and funding is not applicable for LOAs.

In order to establish the baseline and to identify issues of concern, the Task Force used surveys as the main tool. Three surveys were carefully prepared and conducted: A survey of academic faculty in 2006, a survey of administrative faculty in 2007, and a survey of LOA in 2008. Each survey resulted in relatively high participation and revealed a number of relevant issues. In the following, we will summarize the survey results for each survey separately. The full results are currently documented at <http://geodesy.unr.edu/ntt/> with the intent to relocate these pages to a permanent UNR-web-server and thus keep the survey results easily accessible for future

references.

## 2. Survey of Academic Faculty

The survey of academic faculty was carried out in December 2006 and reflects therefore data as of that date. The main goals of the survey were to identify and describe contribution and services of NTT faculty that were typically expected from tenure and tenure-track faculty (such as service on committees); to reveal impressions and issues of concern, including the level to which informed decisions were made at time of hiring, voting rights, and evaluation criteria and process; to determine concerns specific to B contract faculty, and to cover questions related to job security, source of funding, and conditions related to effort reporting.

356 academic NTT faculty were invited to take the survey and 108 responded. Thus about 30% of the invitees took the survey. Most participants were from College of Science (29%), Medical School (25%), and Liberal Arts (20%), which reflects the fact that they have the largest number of academic NTT faculty. In the following, we summarize the main results and discuss the issues of concern identified by the committee in reviewing the numerical results and comments.

NTT academic faculty are very active in serving on the various committees. More than 70% stated that they have served on committees. 44% of those who responded were on B contract, and 63% of those earn additional compensation through overload. It is interesting to note that most overload (67%) is earned for teaching, not for research. 48% reported that they teach 13 or more credit hours in overload teaching. 47% would like to see retirements benefits on overload and only 4.5% did not want this, while 48% were not sure.

A key issue emphasized in many comment are the limited or variable voting rights, which leads NTT faculty to feel “second class”. The survey asked concerning voting rights on curriculum changes, actions concerning graduate students performance and program, By-law changes, hiring of new faculty, and selection of new chair. For all these rights about half stated that they have equal voting rights, while more about a quarter considered their voting rights not as equal and the rest were unsure.

With respect to evaluation, 84% stated that the process was the same for them as for tenured or tenure-track faculty. Less than 5% saw a difference. However, concerning evaluation criteria, only 55% considered those applied to NTT faculty the same as for tenure or tenure-track faculty, while 23% stated that there were differences. Comments indicated that many feel that the opportunity for promotion is not available to them. Although criteria are generally the same as for tenure track faculty, support is lacking for sufficient time to do independent research, publication, etc., and the criteria for excellence defined by funding sources are often different than traditional criteria for promotion.

Faculty also stated that they are not mentored, or they are informed of the process after the fact. For SOM faculty, clinical service is priority for some, based on department need, but is not considered as important by UNR “mainstream” promotion committee. Several comments indicated that faculty felt criteria to change constantly and thus being a “moving target.” Some faculty indicated that they are left with little or no direction, and some stated that they are not evaluated until several years after hiring.

Many stated that during their interviews, they did not get sufficient information concerning the nature of their contract (no: 23%), the rights as NTT faculty (no: 68%), the conditions of continuity of the job (no: 43%), the development and use of the role statement (no: 74%), and the process of evaluation and merit (no: 71%). The fact that the nature of NTT contracts may not be fully explained and understood at the time in interview and the subsequent hiring likely contributes to faculty being uninformed about differences and inequities in contracts with respect to time to renewal, reasons for notification of non-reappointment, etc.

Another issue of concern is job “security” and a safety net. 26% of academic NTT stated that they feel very insecure in the NTT position and 21% feel somewhat insecure. Some feel fear for job based on lack of any legal rights and being under threat of loss of job at any time. Some departments may not allow academic faculty to

hold appointments less than 0.5 FTE, yet there are no bridge funds for temporary reductions in funding. With year to year contracts, NTT faculty expressed worry and lack of “peace of mind” if the unexpected were to happen. Comments pointed out that in a case where faculty or family member were to become seriously ill and the contract was not renewed or they were given 30 days notice, they would lose health insurance and accrued sick days and be left with no source of income. Even NTT faculty members who have worked for many years, brought in many external funds, including F&A, advised many students, done service for university and community, have no increased security compared to newly hired NTT faculty. The fact that academic NTT faculty were asked to make a long-term commitment to UNR and the department mission and activities, but that this is not reciprocated by the university was considered as a very negative inequality in commitment. It was also pointed out that the Board of Regents handbook primarily addresses state-funded and tenured/tenure track faculty and in many cases, does not adopt to the changing nature of the faculty employment status.

An issue raised in comments was the fact that academic NTT faculty can not transition into a tenure-track or tenured faculty position, no matter how productive and successful their teaching and/or research is, how many funds they have brought to UNR, or how many students have graduated under their advisement. It was requested that there should be a plan to allow this transition in cases where the performance of the faculty member warrants this. This question should be raised in UNR's faculty senate and with the provost.

Concerning funding sources, 33% stated that they were primarily (more than 75%) funded through external funds. 56% reported that they are regularly involved in proposal writing for their own position; but only 9.5% stated that there was financial support available to cover the proposal writing effort or starting up of new academic programs. Only 15% responded that there was some form of safety net available for their position, while 65% did not have such a net. 32% stated that they had the right to apply for professional leave while 42% were not sure whether they had this right. In comments, the lack of opportunity for professional development leave was considered negative, and less access to funding for travel and conferences was also emphasized.

### 3. Survey of Administrative Faculty

An on-line survey was conducted of the administrative faculty in Spring, 2008. 734 emails were sent out, and 296 administrative faculty responded, which is a response rate of 40.3%. Of these respondents, 43% (n=127) work in a college or academic unit (such as Agriculture, English, Business, etc.) and 57% (n=169) work in a non-academic unit or division such as Development and Alumni Relations, Athletics, President’s office, Fire Science Academy, etc. The majority of these faculty (62%) have either a Masters or Doctoral degree. Average time worked at UNR was about 8 years, with some faculty having well over 20 years experience (Table 4).

**Table 4:** Years at UNR and years working in their professional field.

	> 5 years	>10 years	Years at UNR	Years in Profession
Academic	25.6%	39.2%	8.5 ± 6.6 (range: 0.75-32)	9.6 ± 8.0 (range:0.5-40)
Non-academic	25.0%	33.3%	8.1 ± 6.9 (range:0.5-30)	9.3 ± 8.4 (range:0.5-46)

Most of these faculty reported having two (31.5%) or three (30.4%) types of job duties, and only 22% reported working at a single function (Table 5). The predominant (>50% of effort) types of job duties reported were quite varied (Table 6). As expected, the most frequently reported duty for both groups was administrative, followed by provision of direct services to clients other than students.

Administrative faculty reported that funding for their positions comes primarily from the state, followed by funding from grants and contracts for faculty in academic units and self-generated revenues for faculty in non-academic units (Table 7). The majority of administrative faculty (81.7%) reported that their position is funded by a single source. About 8% of respondents did not know the source of the funding for their position.

**Table 5:** Number of different areas of job responsibilities. Number are in percent of respondents.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Academic Units	23.9	30.4	26.3	14.7	3.8	1.0
Non-academic Units	26.4	28.8	20.8	16.0	5.6	2.4

**Table 6:** Job responsibility with highest reported percent effort in percent of respondents). AAC: Academic Advising, Career Placement; TCD: Teaching, Curriculum Development & evaluation; SM: Support/ Maintain Lab, Gallery, Facility; R: Research; DSC: Direct Services to Clients (Not Students); AD: Admin. Duties (budget, supervision, personnel); OEE: Other or Equal Effort across different duties.

	AAC	TCD	SM	R	DSC	AD	OEE
Academic Units	7.2	5.6	6.4	4.0	25.6	42.4	8.8
Non-academic Units	n/a*	2.4	n/a*	1.8	25.0	50.0	20.8

\* Non-academic faculty were not given these two job responsibilities to select from, and they may be reflected in the 20.8 % who selected the "Other" category.

**Table 7:** Primary funding sources (providing  $\geq 80\%$  of total funding). Numbers are in percent of respondents.

	State funds	Grants & Contracts	Self-Supporting Budgets	Other Sources
Academic Units	36.2	23.6	12.6	4.7
Non-academic Units	52.1	9.5	18.9	4.7

Approximately half of the administrative faculty who responded to the survey reported serving on a wide range of committees and boards such as search and personnel committees, strategic planning, curriculum, bylaws, scholarship, safety, special projects for children and youth, performing arts and special events. Similarly, about half reported providing service on committees and boards outside of their department or unit.

Faculty in academic units reported greater voting rights on program direction and hiring of new peer faculty (~40%) than did faculty in non-academic units. In non-academic units, the majority reported having some input into these matters without a vote (Table 8). A little more than half of the faculty in both groups reported having the right to vote for their faculty senate representative. About half of the faculty in academic units reported being able to vote on bylaw or policy changes in their units, but only about 20% vote on curriculum changes. Written comments about voting rights were very diverse, reflecting different cultures and practices across units. Some faculty felt comfortable about not voting on curricular issues, some felt wrongly excluded from decision making processes, and some reported being very involved, included and engaged in their unit.

A majority (~60%) of the respondents reported that they were not given sufficient information about the nature of their rights and benefits at the time of their initial interview. Faculty from academic units reported higher level of understanding for the criteria for annual evaluation and promotion, and faculty in both groups reported lower level of understanding for criteria for promotion (Table 9). Many, many comments were provided in this area. The vast majority reflected great dissatisfaction and frustration. Some general themes of these comments were:

- lack of any opportunity for advancement (dead end);
- lack of objectivity in the evaluation process;
- lack of clear (or any) communication about what is expected;
- evaluations done by immediate supervisor changed by upper management without explanation;

- evaluation done by supervisor or academic faculty who is not familiar with job duties of administrative faculty;

**Table 8:** Voting Rights in different areas. Numbers are in percent of respondents. AU: Academic Units; NAU: Non-Academic Units.

	Program Direction		Hiring of new peer faculty		Faculty Senate Representation		Curriculum Changes*		Bylaws/policy changes within unit*	
	AU	NAU	AU	NAU	AU	NAU	AU	NAU	AU	NAU
Yes	38.3	23.0	42.3	24.8	53.7	56.8	21.2	na	50.0	na
No	30.0	18.8	24.4	21.8	14.0	11.7	48.3	na	23.0	na
No vote, but input	21.7	46.7	22.0	41.8	2.5	11.7	16.9	na	11.5	na
Not Sure	10.0	11.5	11.4	11.5	29.8	19.7	13.6	na	15.6	na

\* Only faculty in administrative units were given the option to respond to questions about curriculum and bylaw changes

**Table 5:** Level of understanding regarding criteria for Annual Evaluation and for Promotion. Numbers are in percent of respondents.

	Annual Evaluation		Promotion	
	Academic Unit	Non-Academic Unit	Academic Unit	Non-Academic Unit
Extremely Well	42.5	27.4	12.8	9.0
Well Enough	44.9	48.2	52.0	44.6
Not Well	12.6	24.4	35.2	46.4

- supervisors not trained in how to evaluate faculty;
- criteria do not match or fit actual job responsibilities;
- lack of objective or consistent criteria;
- inconsistent expectations from supervisors;
- disconnect between evaluation and merit.

Comments overwhelmingly expressed frustration with a general lack of career ladder and promotion opportunities even when job duties increase in amount, complexity or responsibility. In order to advance, administrative faculty must apply for a different position and leave their current position where they are experienced and doing excellent work. Faculty felt that this process is counterproductive.

The administrative faculty reported that they feel somewhat (48%) or very (16%) secure in their position. About 13% were not sure how secure they feel, and 23% either feel somewhat or very insecure.

69 faculty responded to the final question, "Do you have any other issues or concerns related to your status as an administrative faculty member at UNR?" These comments indicated that the respondents have serious concerns, and that there is much that could be done to improve their morale. Some of their suggestions are as follows:

- develop a better process for administrative faculty to advance;
- increase job security and safety net options for administrative faculty;
- do a much better job of clarifying evaluation and advancement process including training of supervisors;

- develop system of evaluation that is more objective;
- have administrative faculty evaluate their supervisors;
- attend workshops on contract rights and responsibilities;
- provide more recognition and highlight the value that the non-academic (and often self-supporting) units and faculty bring to UNR and to the community;
- provide better channels for addressing areas of conflict;
- provide more opportunities for dialogue and interaction of administrative and academic faculty;
- open up opportunities to apply for funds (e.g., for campus projects) to all faculty, not just academic faculty.

#### 4. Survey of LOAs

An on-line survey was conducted of the LOA faculty in December, 2008. 229 emails were sent out, and 151 LOA faculty responded, which corresponds to a response rate of 66%.

The majority of the respondents reported teaching as their primary function: about half (50.7%) teach 1 to 3 credit hours, about a third (30.4%) teach 4 to 6, and the remainder (18.9%) teach 7 or more credit hours. About a third were contracted to work between 1 and 10 hours per week, a third for 11-20 hours, and a third for more than 20 hours per week. Almost half of the respondents (48%) reported spending additional time on UNR job-related activities for which they are not paid. These unpaid duties included tutoring and advising students, giving extra lectures, serving on department and university committees, and participating in/providing additional learning activities for students (special recitals, language fairs, competitions, study hours on the weekend, advising club activities, etc.)

The survey posed the question “How would you describe your main reasons for working as an LOA faculty member at UNR?” to test a commonly voiced assumption that most LOA faculty just “do this on the side.” Most (69.6%) responded “I enjoy this type of work as it keeps me busy, engaged, and informed.” However, many also selected “This provides supplemental income that I need or desire” (58.9%) or “So I might be hired in to a permanent position at UNR” (32.5%), indicating a more than peripheral engagement in their LOA duties.

With respect to support for their performance, only about a fourth (26.5%) indicated that they had received their contract more than one month before they were to start teaching. One half were not provided with an office or a place to work. 64% stated that they do have a place to hold office hours and meet with students, therefore presumably using some place other than a department office.

The majority reported not having voting rights (~50% for curriculum changes and program direction; ~75% for by-law changes and hiring of new faculty), but some said they could have some input (~20% for curriculum and program and 8% for by-laws and hiring).

The majority of the responding LOA faculty bring a high level of education, experience, and professional skill to their teaching: The majority reported having either a Master's degree (59%) or Doctorate (25%). About a quarter (23%) had worked at UNR for over 7 years. All were teaching in their professional field, with half (51%) having over 10 years of experience in their profession before coming to UNR as an LOA faculty. The majority (~70%) had another job where they worked more hours and got paid a higher (26%) or much higher (52%) rate than they earned for their LOA position. Income from LOA work provided a substantial percentage of total income (>40%) for about a fourth of the respondents.

In separate questions relating to hypothetical improvements in their job security and benefits, the majority responded that if it were possible, they would prefer to be hired at UNR in an academic position instead of being on a LOA (58%), would like to get health benefits (60%), and would like to work more than they do now (73.5%). About half (51.7%) indicate feeling somewhat or very insecure about their LOA position.

While the great majority expressed a love of teaching, feelings of being treated as second class citizens, and feelings of unfairness (especially as it relates to very low pay), insecurity, and frustration were articulated by many respondents in their general comments. Many would like more security with longer contracts, instead of never knowing from semester to semester if they will be teaching or not. Many expressed sadness that they had

worked hard to develop their courses and teaching expertise, but that they would soon be let go. Others had concerns about lack of continuity for students and inequities in teaching load and support (lack of benefits, teaching assistants, training on using campus computing resources, feedback on performance, sufficient notice before semester starts, storage space for teaching materials, and lack of mentors or support system) for LOA faculty who may teach more students and more credit hours than full-time faculty members. There was a general sense that many LOA faculty bring real-time, current and practical experience to the classroom that makes them ideal teachers. Yet because of the uncertain nature of their LOA positions, many worked more at other more secure jobs, even though their true love is teaching.

## **5. Summary of Survey results**

The three separate surveys of academic, administrative and LOA faculty revealed some both common concerns of all three groups as well as significant differences in between the groups. Common to all three groups is that there is considerable diversity in the basic rights, and the perceived promotion and evaluation criteria between the different schools and departments. In particular, less voting rights and lack of any safety net lead to a feeling of being treated as “second class” in all three groups of non-traditional, non-tenured faculty.

More than half of the academic non-traditional and LOA faculty perceive their job situation as insecure or highly insecure, while administrative faculty perceive a higher level of job security. In all three groups, a majority of the respondents stated that they had not received comprehensive information about the nature of their contracts.

For academic non-traditional faculty a key issue was a safety net to bridge gaps in external funding that can arise despite continuous efforts to secure sufficient external funding.

For administrative faculty, the lack of a career path with opportunities for promotion is a key issue that causes a lot of frustration and dissatisfaction among this group of faculty. Unclear or inconsistent criteria for evaluation and a low level of recognition of the contribution of administrative faculty to the success of the university add further concerns.

Based on the responses, LOA faculty appears to be highly motivated despite a clear tendency to being underpaid, under-appreciated, and with little rights. Most of them indicated a strong interest in teaching and would be willing to work more for UNR or to take a position as academic faculty, if possible.

## **6. Recommendations to Faculty Senate**

### **6.1 Guiding Principles (originally approved by the Faculty Senate in Spring 2007)**

As pointed out in the introduction, the number of non-traditional, non-tenured faculty has increased considerably over the last decade and this trend is likely to continue. While there will always be differences between tenured and non-tenured faculty, particularly with respect to the job security that is afforded tenure faculty, minimizing the differences between faculty members will strengthen the university. It is therefore recommended that the following general principles guide the development of By-Laws, procedures and policies as far as possible in order to promote the goal of faculty equity:

**Principle 1:** *The University strives to maintain equality between all faculty.*

This principle encourages the administration and faculty to adopt shared governance principles that promote equality in job security, voting rights, and opportunity for service, regardless of tenure status or funding source.

**Principle 2:** *The University strives for comparable work conditions, faculty treatment and faculty rights for all faculty, regardless of faculty type.*

This principle challenges faculty to adopt consistent by-laws in departments and colleges that align voting rights,

treatment of different faculty types, committee membership, etc. The administration is encouraged to develop policies and systems that support this equality of faculty.

**Principle 3:** *The University endeavors to improve job security for all faculty.*

This principle seeks to improve the situation of non-tenured faculty by providing for innovative contracting and funding mechanisms. Such changes are likely to result in higher rates of faculty retention, and thus, will serve the best interests of both the University and the non-tenured faculty. The administration is encouraged to develop systems for bridge funding (using successful models from other institutions) and investigate contractual arrangements that reward excellent performance for non-tenured faculty.

## **6.2 Specific recommendations**

### **R1: Bridge funding**

*Recognizing that*

funding for soft-money faculty can run out for brief periods of times despite all efforts to win continuous funding, often due to slow proposal reviews or decisions on funding, or delays in allocation of already awarded funds, and that

this group of faculty in many cases brings in substantial external funding and F&A, and

*Considering that*

many other institutions have bridge funding and use models where the number of months of bridge funding available to soft-money faculty increases with increasing longevity at the institution; and that

some institution consider bridge funding as part of the benefits to be funded through and increased fringe benefit rate (for example, DRI),

*it is recommended*

that a system of bridge funding for NTT faculty be developed to cover brief periods without funding, due to shortfall/end of funding or emergency situations such as illness, and that

the length of time covered be dependent on years of service, productivity, track record and other criteria to be developed, and that

this bridge funding be considered as part of the benefit and thus funded through increased fringe benefits.

Furthermore, it is recommended that the Faculty Senate urge administration to take action, and that the Faculty Senate tasks the Faculty Committee on Salary and Benefits to assist in developing appropriate models.

### **R2: Retirement benefits on overload salary**

*Recognizing that*

Faculty on B-contracts do not accumulate retirement benefits for overload days, and that overload salary can exceed 30% of the annual salary, and

*Considering that*

a large fraction of the respondents to the academic and administrative surveys were in favor of receiving retirement benefits on overload salaries,

*it is recommended that*

faculty on B contract be offered the option of having retirement benefits paid on overload salary.

Furthermore, it is recommended that the Faculty Senate asks administration to develop the necessary procedures and that the Faculty Senate tasks the Faculty Senate Committee on Salary and Benefits to follow up on the implementation of this recommendation.

### **R3: Professional development leaves**

*Recognizing that*

Non-traditional faculty currently has no or very little opportunities for professional leaves, and that therefore, non-traditional faculty is hampered in keeping up with changes and new developments in their fields;

*It is recommended that*

Funding for professional development leave (including sabbatical) be established, and that professional leave be considered a part of the benefit and, where possible, be funded through increased fringe

benefit rates.

Furthermore, it is recommended that the Faculty Senate asks administration to take necessary action, and that the Faculty Senate tasks the Faculty Committee on Salary and Benefits to assist in developing appropriate models.

#### **R4: Voting rights**

*Recognizing that*

equality in voting rights is important to foster the spirit of democratic process essential to an institution of higher learning and impacts the level to which faculty feel “ownership” of their department and unit, and

*Considering that*

many NTT faculty survey respondents indicated fewer voting rights than tenured faculty and emphasized the negative aspects of this inequality,

*it is recommended that*

Faculty Senate advocate for broadest possible voting rights for all faculty, that

Faculty Senate require that all by-laws clearly describe voting rights for all faculty, including non-traditional faculty, that

by-laws be posted on the Faculty Senate website, and that

in cases where there are some areas that non-traditional faculty may not vote on, a rationale be included that explains this particular situation.

Furthermore, it is recommended that the Faculty Senate asks the Faculty Committee on By-Laws to adhere to this recommendation.

#### **R5: Notice of non-renewal**

*Recognizing that*

many non-traditional faculty appointments are on a yearly basis and require annual renewals, and that most of these appointments have a 30-day period of notice

*it is recommended that*

the minimum number of days of notice for a notice of non-renewal is increased to be at least 60 days, with number of days of notice increasing with increasing longevity.

Furthermore, it is recommended that the Faculty Senate asks the Faculty Committee on Salary and Benefits to seek ways to implement this recommendation, which will require approval of the Board of Regents.

#### **R6: Access to state funds**

*Recognizing that*

state funds frequently become available through vacated or new positions,

*it is recommended that*

non-traditional faculty have equal access to apply for these funds; that

in the case of non-traditional faculty who have already received notice of non-renewal, the university should take proactive steps to contact these employees to let them know of relevant new job opportunities; and that

proactive steps be taken to contact LOA faculty who have been teaching in a department and to offer them to teach more hours for tenured faculty on sabbatical.

#### **R7: Advancement of administrative faculty**

*Recognizing that*

there is currently no clear process for the promotion and advancement of administrative faculty and

*it is recommended that*

written protocols be developed that articulate methods (handbook, training sessions, web-based information, supervisor training, etc.) for developing personal and professional skill sets that will position administrative faculty for advancement opportunities. Human Resources should continue to develop methods of career advancement through mechanisms such as “lines of progression.”

#### **R8: LOA compensation for extra services**

*Recognizing that*

many LOA faculty provide service to the university (such as serving on search committees, department internal

reviews, etc.) outside of their contracted teaching duties without receiving proper or any compensation  
*it is recommended that*  
a mechanism be established to compensate LOA faculty for service to the university provided outside of their contracted teaching duties.

### **R9: LOA representation on faculty senate**

*Recognizing that*

LOA faculty is currently not represented on the Faculty Senate and

*considering that*

the Faculty Senate is the only institutionalized component for faculty at large to participate in shared governance,

*it is recommended that*

LOA faculty with a minimum tenure at UNR (e.g., four years) be given the right to vote for faculty senate representative from their college or unit, and that

a mechanism be established that provides for at least one LOA seat on the Faculty Senate and that encourages LOA faculty to run for Faculty Senate.

### **R10: Recognition of LOA**

*Recognizing that*

Annual awards are an important means to give recognition to individual faculty for outstanding service and achievements, and that

there is currently no award dedicated to LOA or, more generally, to non-traditional faculty,

*it is recommended that*

an annual “Outstanding LOA Teacher of the Year Award” be established, and that other ways to recognize the contributions of non-traditional faculty be explored.

### **R11: Welcome package for new faculty**

*Considering that*

many respondents to the surveys stated that they were not informed about major conditions attached to their positions (including annual renewal, role statement, evaluation procedures, etc.) and that

many respondents commented negatively on the fact that it took considerable time for new faculty to understand the job conditions and their implications for their work,

*it is recommended that*

a new hire “on-boarding” program be developed by the Faculty Senate and Human Resources for all faculty that addresses pertinent information for each employee type including the nature of these contracts and positions, rights, benefits, etc. and that

all department, colleges and university by-laws be made available on a web page for easy access.

## **6.3 Future of the TASK Force**

The survey results and the prospect of a continuously growing number and fraction of non-traditional faculty warrant a constant spot-light on issues relevant to this part of faculty. The Task Force has discussed two alternatives which both have advantages and disadvantages.

One alternative would be to maintain the Non-Traditional Faculty Task Force as a standing Committee. This would emphasize the importance of maintaining a focus on the evolving conditions for this increasing group of faculty and would institute a dedicated means to follow up recommendations aiming at improved conditions for this group. However, this would increase the number of committees and thus be contrary to the declared goal of the Faculty Senate to reduce the number of committees. The other alternative would be to include the focus on non-traditional faculty as a permanent part in the charge of an appropriate committee. This would not increase the number of committees. However, the situation of non-traditional faculty is complex and deserves attention in social, economic, and legal aspects, which in this breadth are hardly covered by any of the other committees. Thus, it would be necessary to split non-traditional faculty issues over several standing committees (e.g., Salary

and Benefits, By-laws, etc.) which carries the danger of dimming or losing the necessary spotlight on the broad conditions affecting this group of faculty.

---