

Resolution to Establish a Teaching Professor Title

The Teaching-Track Title Taskforce (T4)

April 4, 2024

These slides are for the busy reader who does not have time to peruse T4 Docs that have been uploaded to the DoF website.

T4 Members

Larry Blume

Michael Clarkson*

Susie Fubini

Sarah Giroux

Fran Kozen

Neema Kudva

Beth Lyon

Jeff Niederdeppe

Derk Pereboom

Suzanne Shu

Charlie Van Loan*

Alan Zehnder

Economics

CS

Clinical Sciences

Global Development

Fiber Science

City & Regional Planning

Clinical Programs

Communication

Philosophy

Marketing

CS (Emeritus)

Mech & Aero Eng

Bowers CIS #

Bowers CIS

CVM #

CALS #

CHE

AAP #

LAW #

Brooks Public Policy #

CAS #

S.C. Johnson #

Bowers CIS

ENG #

*Co-chairs

RTE Faculty

Associate Dean

Charge from the Dean of Faculty

The Teaching-Track Title Taskforce is to develop a proposal and Senate resolution that creates a framework for Teaching Professor (TP) titles at all ranks following the enabling legislation approach used for the Clinical Professor, Professor of Practice, and Research Professor titles.

The enabling legislation must be structured so that colleges and schools can customize their TP-track implementation to address their specific educational goals.

What Is the Enabling Legislation Approach?

Instead of making the TP track automatically available across the university, colleges must submit a proposal to the Faculty Senate in which they explain why and how they intend to implement the new track.

College response is reviewed for completeness by CAPP and voted on by Senate before title becomes available in college.

This approach is used for the other RTE professorial titles: Clinical Professor, Professor of Practice, and Research Professor.

Outline

Part I. Motivation

Why do we need TPs?

Part II. Title Description

What would a TP appointment look like?

Part III. The Enabling Legislation

How would the colleges be authorized use of a TP track?

Part I. Motivation

There are three interrelated reasons why Cornell would benefit from having a teaching professor track.

1. Equity

Approximately 35% of all credit hours taught on campus are delivered by the 500+ full time faculty on the Lecturer (L), Clinical Professor (CP), and Professor of Practice (PoP) tracks.

Of those faculty, approximately 370 (70%) are on the L track.

Through its current set of titles, Cornell is saying that not one of those L track faculty is deserving of a professorial-level appointment.

2. Recruiting and Retention

For some colleges, it is hard to compete with peer institutions who can offer professorial-level teaching titles.

3. Professional Advancement

Designed and implemented fifty years ago, the two-rank lecturer track does not incentivize and reward professional advancement as a three-rank professorial track would.

Benefits to the educational environment can include curriculum development, pedagogical innovation, degree program leadership, and external visibility.

Part II. Title Description (TD)

The University describes its Academic titles in this [list of approved titles](#). TD text for any title is typically quite general because it must accommodate a wide variety of teaching and research across campus.

An effective TD makes a statement about expectations without being over-prescriptive. The colleges require flexibility.

With this in mind, we highlight three features in the proposed TD for the teaching professor title...

1. Level

Quality should be comparable to what is expected along the tenure track. (Impossible to give university-wide definition of quality.)

Actual Text:

The teaching professor titles are available only for long term, non-tenure-track faculty members whose efforts are devoted primarily to the teaching mission of the university and whose skill and independence are at the level of the tenure-track faculty.

Assistant, associate, and full teaching professors are expected to achieve a similar level of professional expertise within their areas of responsibility as their counterparts on the tenure track.

2. Impact

There should be impact beyond the immediate classroom/
seminar/lab/studio.

Actual Text

Teaching professors at higher ranks can demonstrate impact inside and outside the university through activities such as pedagogical innovation, curriculum development, and leadership roles.

3. Service Component

There are teaching-related service expectations.

Actual Text

Consistent with their rank and local needs, teaching professors are also expected to contribute teaching-related service, especially in areas that concern advising, mentoring, curriculum, and the management of degree programs.

The Enabling Legislation (EL)

To authorize use of the TP title, a college submits a proposal for Senate approval. The proposing college must:

- A. Justify its need for the title.
- B. Describe what a TP position would look like.
- C. Outline processes for appointment, renewal, and promotion.
- D. Explain limitations regarding scope and numbers.
- E. List the voting (and other) rights that are to be extended to TP faculty.
- F. Discuss impact on “nearby” titles and how it will handle transitions.

We highlight four areas of interest in the EL

1. Transition Processes

Processes for handling L-to-TP and other faculty transitions need to be outlined.

- Will some transitions be automatic, and if so, when will they occur?
- If transitions will be considered by application, how and when will the application process occur?
- How will the destination TP rank be determined?

Although potential for divisiveness should be treated carefully, it already exists by virtue of the CP, PoP, and RP titles. The TP title improves equity.

2. Limitations in Numbers

To guard against erosion of the tenure system, the proposal must include a statement that limits the number of TP positions. Limiting the overall number of RTE professorial positions is also a consideration.

It is up to the college to decide how to impose this limitation in a way that best meets its educational needs. Regardless of the chosen method, the proposal must explain why the adopted limitation makes sense given that Cornell is an R1 university.

Accreditation needs must also be considered.

An example limitation

One possibility among many: relate the number **R** of RTE faculty who teach to the number **T** of TT faculty as follows:

$$\frac{\mathbf{R}}{\mathbf{R}+\mathbf{T}} \leq \frac{\mathbf{X}}{100}$$

The sponsoring college would define **R** (e.g., $R = \#L + \#CP + \#PoP + \#TP$) and **X** (e.g. $X = 25$ or 35 or 45) to ensure that the majority of faculty who teach are TT faculty.

Colleges currently meet this bound for values of **X** in the range 18 to 45.

3. Degree Requirements

Candidates should hold a graduate degree that is appropriate to the level and field of instruction the individual will provide.

In situations where such degrees do not exist, the proposal should identify alternative degree requirements.

The proposal should explain whether higher TP ranks would entail higher degree requirements.

4. Job Security & Scholarly Leave

Recognizing that the TP track is intended for long-term members of the faculty, and that job security is a concern among RTE faculty, the proposal should describe typical appointment lengths at each rank and how reappointment processes can be streamlined for established titleholders.

The proposal should indicate the extent to which the college supports regular professional development opportunities for TPs, such as scholarly leave. Scholarly leaves would be used for professional development purposes in ways that benefit the college and its educational mission.

Next Steps

Where does the Enabling Legislation process go next?

What follow-up tasks remain?

Route of Enabling Legislation

Faculty Senate votes on the Resolution to establish the enabling legislation for the TP track. Provost and Trustee approval then required.

Next, colleges individually submit their own customized response to Enabling Legislation, including a vote indicating approval by their own faculty (TT and RTE tallied separately) for the college's intended usage. The Senate reviews and votes on the college's response. Only then does title become available in that college.

To support the T4 resolution is to support the proposal content and the associated approval process. That is separate from supporting a particular instantiation of the title in a particular college.

Outside of Charge but Worth Follow-Up

The following important topics fell outside of the T4 charge, but they warrant further study under the auspices of the Faculty Senate and its committees:

- *An Extension Professor Title*
- *A University-Wide Appeal Process for RTE Faculty*
- *Enhanced Sharing of RTE-related Docs Between the Colleges*
- *More University-Level Guidance about Who Votes on What*