

AAU

NON-TENURE-TRACK
FACULTY REPORT

April 10, 2001

Association of American Universities

Tenure Committee Membership

President Harold T. Shapiro, Princeton University (*Chairman*)

President Henry S. Bienen, Northwestern University

President William M. Chace, Emory University

President Scott S. Cowen, Tulane University

President Francis L. Lawrence, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

President Richard L. McCormick, University of Washington

President Hunter R. Rawlings III, Cornell University

President Jehuda Reinharz, Brandeis University

President Steven B. Sample, University of Southern California

Chancellor Larry N. Vanderhoef, University of California, Davis

Committee Staff:

John C. Vaughn, Association of American Universities

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: A Study of a Sample of AAU Universities

Introduction

The mission of research universities is to expand human understanding through the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge, and to preserve the accumulated knowledge of past generations and apply that knowledge to current and future societal challenges. The principal means by which universities accomplish these important endeavors is through the teaching, scholarship, and creative work of faculties of exceptional talent and commitment.

A key factor in fulfilling the mission of universities is the delegation by university governing boards of considerable governing authority to the tenured and tenure-track (TT) faculty themselves.

Because faculties operate at the forefront of research and scholarship, discovering and disseminating new knowledge and challenging established precepts, their work is most effective in an environment that nurtures and sustains their capacity for independent inquiry. A critical mechanism for creating such an environment is the tenure system and its role in the preservation of academic freedom—the rigorously defended right and responsibility of faculty to pursue their work without distortion or suppression from external political or other inappropriate societal pressures that could vitiate the benefits of the most effective teaching, scholarship, and creative work.

Research universities are committed to continuing this system of faculty teaching, scholarship, and governance sustained in part by the academic tenure system. At the same time, these institutions must carry out their missions of teaching, research, and service in a changing environment that requires the flexibility and agility needed to adapt to an evolving social and cultural environment.

In recent years, one of the ways by which universities have sought to respond to changing circumstances while preserving the capacity of these institutions to fulfill their social missions is to employ full-time and part-time non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty members. Although the use of NTT faculty is not new, their numbers within university faculties have been increasing recently.

Non-tenure-track faculty are now engaged in all aspects of university activities, playing useful roles in teaching, research, and service. The AAU Tenure Committee decided to examine the growth over time in the number of NTT faculty at a sample of AAU universities, their role within those institutions, and the institutional policies governing their employment. The committee focused its inquiry on NTT instructional faculty. As part of its effort, the committee carried out a data collection project in collaboration with the AAU Data Exchange (AAUDE) to gain an understanding of the

extent of the increase in the proportion of NTT instructional faculty among our faculties, in what schools and departments that growth has occurred, and what factors might account for it.¹

Given the increased use and varied roles of NTT faculty indicated by these data, the committee believes that it would be useful for universities to examine their employment policies governing NTT faculty to determine whether those policies continue to meet the needs of universities in ways that are responsive to the interests of NTT faculty. The committee has identified a number of policy issues concerning NTT instructional faculty employment that may be helpful in such an effort.

Data Collection Results

1. Trends in Use of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

From January through March, 1999, the AAUDE collected data on trends in the proportion of NTT faculty on the faculties of a sample of 25 AAU universities (Attachment 1). For each institution, the study examined the change in proportion of NTT faculty by comparing the most recent year for which data were available (either 1998-1999 or 1997-1998) to a base year generally about 20 years earlier.

The study found that over this period, the percentage of total faculty which was NTT had increased on average from 24% in the base year to 31% in the most recent year as measured by headcounts. This increase was achieved primarily through the addition of new faculty positions rather than by replacement of existing positions. The average number of TT faculty across the sample institutions had remained virtually constant over the measurement period. However, the average number of NTT faculty increased by 41% (Table 1). Individual institutional case histories accompanying the submitted data indicated that the reasons for the increase in proportions of NTT faculty varied widely across institutions. For example, at one institution, growth in NTT instructional faculty reflected an increased use of teaching associates and visiting scholars; at another institution, NTT growth was due primarily to an increase in senior lecturers and professor emeriti following the implementation of an early retirement program; at several institutions, the increase was due primarily to increased use of NTT faculty with special skills but without traditional academic certification in programs outside the arts and sciences core disciplines; and at two institutions, a substantial part of the increase was

¹ The Tenure Committee would like to thank the AAUDE for its invaluable assistance in gathering the data presented in this report. We would particularly like to thank Martha Casey, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Budget, Planning & Analysis, University of Wisconsin-Madison, for her work on the first survey, and Lydia Snover, Assistant to the Provost for Institutional Research, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Robert Heffernan, Director Institutional Studies & Assessment, Rutgers University, for their work on the second survey.

due to a reclassification of advanced graduate students involved in undergraduate teaching as NTT faculty.²

2. Use of Non-Tenure-Track Instructional Faculty

The committee's second data collection effort, again conducted with the effective assistance of the AAUDE, focused on current uses of NTT instructional faculty. The study gathered data from a sample of 22 public and ten private AAU universities (Attachment 2). Information was collected on the current composition and role of NTT faculty categorized by title (e.g., lecturer, instructor, and visiting or adjunct professor). For each title category, institutions provided information about the composition of NTT faculty in terms of gender, ethnicity, citizenship, discipline, and full-time or part-time status; comparable information was collected on TT faculty for comparison. For NTT faculty, information was also collected by title on institutional policies such as terms of appointment and benefits, participation in governance, and privileges such as consulting.

Composition of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: Table 2 presents the basic data for TT and NTT faculty, separating each category into full-time and part-time. Table 3 presents the same array of faculty data but calculates percentages vertically down the rows of faculty characteristics of gender, race, and citizenship rather than horizontally across the columns of full-time/part-time effort status as in Table 2. Table 4 displays these faculty data across academic disciplines; Table 5 displays the data by faculty titles. Some of the key results concerning the composition of faculty based on tenure status are:

- The preponderance of faculty are TT faculty—35,694 or 70% of the survey sample total of 51,344 faculty are TT faculty (Table 2).
- Fewer than half of NTT faculty are full-time—44% of NTT faculty in the sample are full-time; in contrast, 95% of TT faculty in the sample are full-time (Table 2).
- There are significant differences in the composition of TT and NTT faculty groups by gender but not by race or citizenship:

² The data reported here differ from those reported recently by the Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW), a group of 25 academic societies in the humanities and social sciences ("Summary of Data from Surveys by the Coalition on the Academic Workforce," available from the American Historical Society website, <http://www.theaha.org/caw>). That group found that full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty constituted less than half of the instructional staff in seven of nine disciplines. Some of the differences may be due to the disciplines surveyed, which in the CAW study were limited to humanities and social sciences departments, while a broader set of arts and sciences and professional school departments was surveyed in the study reported here. However, results differed significantly even in common disciplines: the CAW study reported that in English departments, only 36.3% of the faculty were full-time tenured and tenure-track, whereas this study found that 67% of English department faculty were full-time tenured and tenure-track. Some of this difference may be due to the different sets of institutions surveyed: this study sampled a subset of AAU research universities, whereas the CAW surveyed a much broader range of departments from Ph.D.-granting to associate-degree-granting departments. Discussions among association staff involved in both studies will examine the differences in these studies in greater detail.

- only 24% of TT faculty are female, whereas almost half (45%) of NTT faculty are female (Table 3);
- 82% of TT faculty are white U.S. citizens, and 80% of NTT faculty are white U.S. citizens (Table 3).
- In contrast to the differences between the compositions of TT and NTT faculties, there do not appear within either of these groups to be significant differences by gender or by race in the proportions of faculty who are full-time or part-time:
 - about 95% of TT faculty by gender or race are full-time, with the principal exception being nonresident aliens, 88% of whom are full-time (Table 2);
 - among NTT faculty, 42% of males and 47% of females are full-time; the most significant departure by race and citizenship is nonresident aliens, 68% of whom are full-time NTT faculty (Table 2).
- Of the 15,128 NTT faculty included in the classification by academic discipline, 9,245 or 61% are found in the following eight of the 32 disciplinary categories: health professions and related sciences (1,758), visual and performing arts (1,484), foreign languages and literatures (1,195), engineering (1,135), social sciences and history (966), English (916), business management and administration (909), and education (882) (Table 4).
- The titles of assistant, associate, and full professor are reserved almost exclusively for TT faculty, while the titles of lecturer, instructor, and visiting and adjunct professor are used primarily for NTT instructional faculty. Out of the nine titles displayed in Table 5, 46% of NTT faculty in the sample hold the title of lecturer. Within specific title categories, a slight majority of full-time NTT faculty hold the title of instructor or visiting professor, while larger majorities of part-time NTT faculty hold the title of lecturer, adjunct professor, or other title.
- Institutional policies governing NTT faculty vary widely by institution and by instructional title. As noted above, almost half of NTT instructional staff in the sample fall under the general title of lecturer (lecturer or senior lecturer). Most lecturers are appointed for a fixed term, receive benefits if appointed for more than 50% effort, generally cannot be a principal investigator or supervise students, and may or may not have voting rights or participate in governance activities. More detailed information on institutional policies by instructional title is provided in Attachment 3.

Discussion of Results

Although the proportion of NTT faculty among the university faculties sampled has increased over the last two decades, the increase is due primarily to the addition of new faculty positions rather than replacement of existing positions, and the

preponderance of university faculty remain in the TT category. Thus, these data indicate that tenure continues to be a predominant employment characteristic of the faculties of research universities.

While almost all TT faculty (about 95%) are full-time, fewer than half of NTT faculty (44%) are full-time. There is a significant gender difference in the composition of TT and NTT faculty: the ratio of males to females among TT faculty is three to one, while the male/female ratio among NTT faculty is slightly more than one to one. Much of the difference between TT and NTT faculty categories in their proportions of full-time/part-time faculty no doubt reflects the full-time demands on TT faculty to meet their multiple responsibilities, contrasted with the role of part-time NTT faculty in meeting specific course needs. However, the reasons for the gender differences in the composition of TT and NTT faculty are not clear and should be considered further.

Sixty-one percent of NTT faculty are concentrated in the following eight of 32 academic disciplines: health professions and related sciences, visual and performing arts, foreign languages and literatures, engineering, social sciences and history, English, business management and administration, and education. The concentration in these disciplines suggests that NTT faculty often are professionals whose primary employment is outside the university and who are employed in teaching as an adjunct activity (e.g., health professions and related sciences, visual and performing arts, and business management and administration), and persons hired for specialized expertise (foreign languages and literatures).

Although many NTT faculty may serve in these positions by choice, some NTT faculty would no doubt prefer TT status, and some part-time faculty would prefer full-time status. The survey data indicate that institutional policies governing NTT instructional faculty vary considerably by institution, by effort status, and by discipline. The committee recommends that universities which haven't recently done so examine their policies governing both full-time and part-time non-tenure-track faculty to determine whether those policies meet the needs of the institution in ways that are responsive to the interests of NTT faculty. Particularly in the case of full-time NTT faculty, universities may find that employment policies that recognize and accommodate their engagement with the institution will redound to the benefit of the institution as well as the faculty.

University Employment Policies Governing Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Instructional Faculty

The role of NTT instructional faculty in research universities varies greatly, from someone hired to teach one course for one semester to fill an unexpected vacancy, to a full-time faculty member with a multiyear teaching appointment. Some NTT faculty members have their primary employment elsewhere and have limited engagement with the university; for other NTT faculty members, university teaching may be their sole, full-time employment. Moreover, the roles of NTT faculty within a given institution will vary across departments and schools.

Institutional employment policies governing NTT faculty need to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate the variability in their roles within the university. However, a careful examination of those policies may well suggest modifications that are mutually beneficial to universities and their NTT faculty. The following areas of employment policy may warrant particular consideration:

- Probationary Periods, Evaluation Criteria, and Performance Evaluations: A defined probationary period provides both the institution and the faculty member with a specified evaluation period that concludes with some certainty about the employee's immediate employment future. Explicit evaluation criteria assure that both the institution and the faculty member have a common understanding of the basis on which the probationary period and subsequent evaluations will be conducted. Systematic performance evaluations permit both the institution and the faculty member to match performance to evaluation criteria in positions that, because of their comparatively short appointment periods, are more likely to go unevaluated absent a regular evaluation schedule. Regular evaluations also facilitate early identification of performance problems, and provide an opportunity to recognize and reward exemplary performance in employees whose contributions might otherwise be missed.
- Appointment Periods: Providing defined multiyear appointments where possible will provide some certainty about the faculty member's employment future. For positions that are on-going, fixed-term (e.g., 3- to 5-year) rolling appointments with renewal or termination determined in the penultimate year of the term would provide the institution and the faculty member with advance notice of continuation or termination of employment.
- Salary and Benefits: Tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to contribute to the growth of knowledge through research and scholarship and through the dissemination of that knowledge through scholarly communication as well as through teaching. Because of these broader responsibilities, comparisons between the salary and benefits schedules of TT and NTT faculty will often be difficult to draw. However, to the extent that salary and benefits schedules for full-time NTT instructional faculty can build upon reasonable estimates of comparability for common categories of responsibility and performance, those compensation schedules will be more internally consistent and will more accurately reflect comparable pay for comparable work.
- Professional Development: Opportunities for professional development are an integral part of the employment policies of TT faculty because they enhance the performance of the faculty and benefit the institution and its mission accordingly. Providing some aspects of such professional development opportunities to NTT faculty may well meet cost/benefit considerations and promote the mutual benefits to the faculty and the institution that underpin TT policies.

- Institutional Governance: Institutions might consider whether to extend a role in institutional governance to full-time NTT faculty whose professional activities fully engage them in the mission of the institution. Such a role might include membership in the faculty senate, voting rights on governance issues other than those involving tenure, and involvement in curriculum development.
- Academic Freedom: Tenure, an important mechanism for promoting academic freedom for tenured university faculty, helps to protect the independence of their teaching, research, and creative work. Universities might consider whether employment policies that would provide comparable protection for the teaching activities of full-time NTT instructional faculty could and should be implemented.

Institutions are encouraged to examine their employment policies governing part-time instructional faculty as well, to seek ways in which such policies can provide a positive work environment with as much job security as possible.

Non-tenure-track faculty are a growing presence on university campuses and play important roles in the execution of the university's mission. Yet the tenured faculty continue to have almost exclusive responsibility for the shaping of the evolving intellectual and educational mission of the institution, including the selection and promotion of faculty, the design of the curriculum, and the development and implementation of the scholarly agenda. An examination of the institutional roles and responsibilities of TT and NTT faculty can clarify why some faculty are TT and others are not, and provide the basis for developing appropriate sets of policies reflecting the similarities and differences in their respective roles and responsibilities.



Table 1:	Growth of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in a Sample of 25 AAU Universities
Table 2:	Comparison of Full-time to Part-time Tenured/Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty by Gender, Ethnicity and Citizenship in a Sample of 32 AAU Universities
Table 3:	Composition of Full-time to Part-time Tenured/Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty by Gender, Ethnicity and Citizenship in a Sample of 32 AAU Universities
Table 4:	Distribution of Faculty Across Academic Departments in a Sample of 30 AAU Universities
Table 5:	Distribution of Faculty Across Instructional Titles in a Sample of 30 AAU Universities
Attachment 1:	Institutions Participating in the 1999 Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Survey
Attachment 2:	Institutions Participating in the 2000 Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Survey
Attachment 3:	Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty Instructional Titles

Table 1.
Growth of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in a Sample of 25 AAU Universities

Headcount	Full-time and Part-time Average		Full-time and Part-time Average (excluding Institutions reporting only full-time counts)	
	headcount	percent	headcount	percent
<i>Base Year</i>				
TT Faculty	1298	76%	1334	76%
NTT Faculty	405	24%	428	24%
Total	1703	100%	1762	100%
<i>Current year</i>				
TT Faculty	1285	69%	1333	68%
NTT Faculty	571	31%	636	32%
Total	1856	100%	1969	100%
<i>Percent change in</i>				
<i>TT Faculty</i>	-1%		<1%	
<i>NTT Faculty</i>	41%		49%	
FTE	FTE	percent	FTE	percent
<i>Base Year</i>				
TT Faculty	1270	84%	1283	84%
NTT Faculty	243	16%	252	16%
Total	1513	100%	1535	100%
<i>Current year</i>				
TT Faculty	1328	79%	1343	79%
NTT Faculty	350	21%	352	21%
Total	1678	100%	1695	100%
<i>Percent change in</i>				
<i>TT Faculty</i>	5%		5%	
<i>NTT Faculty</i>	44%		40%	

Source: Survey of AAU institutions, January 1999
M. Casey / J. Milner, Budget Planning and Analysis, UW-Madison.
updated 3/2/99

Table 2.
Comparison of Full-time to Part-time Tenured/Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty
by Gender, Ethnicity and Citizenship in a Sample of 32 AAU Universities

	Full-Time Faculty		Part-Time Faculty		Total Faculty
	headcount	percent	headcount	percent	headcount
Tenured/Tenure-Track	33,850	95	1,844	5	35,694
male	25,688	95	1,322	5	27,010
female	8,162	94	522	6	8,684
White	27,718	95	1,482	5	29,200
Asian	2,398	96	98	4	2,496
NR Alien	1,312	88	178	12	1,490
Hispanic	1,094	98	20	2	1,114
Black	1,074	95	57	5	1,131
Unknown	147	98	3	2	150
Am Indian	107	95	6	5	113
Non-Tenure-Track	6,906	44	8,744	56	15,650
male	3,596	42	4,957	58	8,553
female	3,310	47	3,787	53	7,097
White	5,406	43	7,072	57	12,478
Asian	406	48	444	52	850
NR Alien	588	68	272	32	860
Hispanic	228	40	342	60	570
Black	206	45	249	55	455
Unknown	55	14	338	86	393
Am Indian	17	33	35	67	52
Total Faculty in Sample					51,344

Note: Percents are based on row totals.

Table 3.
Composition of Full-time and Part-time Tenured/Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty
by Gender, Ethnicity and Citizenship in a Sample of 32 AAU Universities

		Full Time Faculty		Part Time Faculty		Total Faculty	
		headcount	percent	headcount	percent	headcount	percent
Tenured/Tenure-Track	male	25,688	76	1,322	72	27,010	76
	female	8,162	24	522	28	8,684	24
	White	27,718	82	1,482	80	29,200	82
	Asian	2,398	7	98	5	2,496	7
	NR Alien	1,312	4	178	10	1,490	4
	Hispanic	1,094	3	20	1	1,114	3
	Black	1,074	3	57	3	1,131	3
	Unknown	147	<1	3	<1	150	<1
	Am Indian	107	<1	6	<1	113	<1
	Total	33,850	100	1,844	100	35,694	100
Non-Tenure-Track	male	3,596	52	4,957	57	8,553	55
	female	3,310	48	3,787	43	7,097	45
	White	5,406	78	7,072	81	12,478	80
	Asian	406	6	444	5	850	5
	NR Alien	588	9	272	3	860	5
	Hispanic	228	3	342	4	570	4
	Black	206	3	249	3	455	3
	Unknown	55	1	338	4	393	3
	Am Indian	17	<1	35	<1	52	<1
	Total	6,906	100	8,744	100	15,650	100
Total Faculty in Sample						51,344	

Note: Percents are based on column totals within each block.

Table 4.
Distribution of Faculty Across Academic Departments in a Sample of 30 AAU Universities
(sorted by total NTT faculty)

	Total Faculty	TT	NTT			NTT as % of Total Faculty		
			Total	FT	PT	Total	FT	PT
Health Prof.& Rel. Sciences	3,910	2,152	1,758	896	862	45	23	22
Visual and Performing Arts	3,617	2,133	1,484	459	1,025	41	13	28
Foreign Lang. & Literatures	3,009	1,814	1,195	702	493	40	23	16
Engineering	5,642	4,507	1,135	381	754	20	7	13
Social Sciences and History	5,149	4,183	966	354	612	19	7	12
English	2,494	1,578	916	461	455	37	18	18
Business Mgmt & Adm. Serv.	2,901	1,992	909	464	445	31	16	15
Education	2,287	1,405	882	309	573	39	14	25
Physical Sciences	3,717	3,055	662	328	334	18	9	9
Mathematics	2,162	1,581	581	403	178	27	19	8
Law	1,325	750	575	210	365	43	16	28
Biological/Life Sciences	2,781	2,261	520	332	188	19	12	7
Unspecified	618	150	468	132	336	76	21	54
Public Admin. and Services	879	478	401	146	255	46	17	29
Communication	891	520	371	193	178	42	22	20
Architecture	891	548	343	97	246	38	11	28
Area Ethnic & Cult. Studies	721	415	306	141	165	42	20	23
Psychology	1,342	1,055	287	109	178	21	8	13
Computer and Info. Science	739	529	210	120	90	28	16	12
Liberal Arts and Sciences	279	101	178	72	106	64	26	38
Interdisciplinary	439	277	162	54	108	37	12	25
Parks, Rec., Leis.& Fitness	337	184	153	72	81	45	21	24
Philosophy and Religion	696	548	148	67	81	21	10	12
Agriculture	1,428	1,282	146	101	45	10	7	3
Home Economics	483	361	122	61	61	25	13	13
Conserv. & Renewable Res.	587	492	95	46	49	16	8	8
Library Science	281	195	86	36	50	31	13	18
Vocational Home Economics	291	247	44	10	34	15	3	12
Theolog. Studies & Rel. Voc	47	38	9	9	0	19	19	0
Protective Services	36	28	8	2	6	22	6	17
Military Tech.	18	12	6	0	6	33	0	33
Trans. & Mater. Mov. Wrks	29	27	2	2	0	7	7	0
Totals	50,026	34,898	15,128	6,769	8,359	30	14	17

Note: Total faculty counts differ from those in Tables 2 and 3 because two universities reporting data in Tables 2 and 3 did not report complete data by academic departments.

Table 5.
Distribution of Faculty Across Instructional Titles in a Sample of 30 AAU Universities

Titles	Faculty	TT	NTT			NTT as % of Total Faculty		
			Total	FT	PT	Total	FT	PT
Professor	21,174	20,194	980	320	660	5	2	3
Assoc Prof	7,973	7,385	588	348	240	7	4	3
Asst Prof	6,906	5,810	1,096	773	323	16	11	5
Lecturer	6,946	160	6,786	2,411	4,375	98	35	63
Instructor	1,635	107	1,528	896	632	93	55	39
Visiting	1,625	124	1,501	825	676	92	51	42
Adjunct	1,557	29	1,528	447	1,081	98	29	69
Other	843	35	808	276	532	96	33	63
Administrative	147	90	57	45	12	39	31	8
Total	48,806	33,934	14,872	6,341	8,531	30	13	17

Note: Total faculty counts differ from those in Tables 2, 3 and 4 because two universities reporting data in Tables 2 and 3 did not report complete data by instructional title, but the two universities were different from those not reporting departmental data used in Table 4.

Institutions Participating in the 1999 Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Survey

Cornell University
Emory University
Harvard University
Iowa State University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Michigan State University
Northwestern University
The Ohio State University
Princeton University
Purdue University
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Davis
University of Florida
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
University of Iowa
University of Kansas
University of Maryland, College Park
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
University of Missouri, Columbia
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
University of Pittsburgh
University of Virginia
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Washington University in St. Louis

Institutions Participating in the 2000 Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Survey

Columbia University
Cornell University
Duke University
Iowa State University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Michigan State University
Northwestern University
Princeton University
Purdue University
Rice University
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Stanford University
University at Buffalo-State University of New York
The University of Arizona
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Davis
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, San Diego
University of California, Santa Barbara
University of Colorado, Boulder
University of Florida
University of Maryland, College Park
University of Michigan
University of Missouri, Columbia
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
University of Rochester
The University of Texas at Austin
University of Virginia
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Washington University in St. Louis

Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty Instructional Titles

Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) instructional titles include professor, associate and assistant professor, adjunct, visiting, lecturer and instructor.

A. Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor
These titles account for 18% of NTT staff.

B. Adjunct Professor (including Associate, and Assistant and Clinical Titles)
Adjunct faculty positions represent 3.2% of the total instructional staff of the institutions that provided data for this project. They represent 0.1% of the TT faculty and 10% of the NTT faculty. A related title used at one institution is professor of the practice.

1. Description

Adjunct titles at AAU institutions tend to encompass individuals who either possess special qualifications and/or individuals who are employed outside the institution. One institution specified that the role of adjunct professor “shall not be essential to the development of the unit’s Program.” Responding institutions indicate that adjunct appointments are used in all disciplines. One institution indicated that adjunct faculty members are generally non-salaried.

2. Policies Regarding Length of Appointment

Adjunct Professors are generally given fixed-length appointments. Some institutions provide for annual reappointment, and some indicate initial appointments from one to five years. Only one institution indicated that it would consider an indefinite appointment. Each institution was asked to provide the average number of years current appointees have held this title. Although many of the institutions were unable to provide this information, the range among those that did was from 1.5 years to 10 years. Most appointments are for the academic year only.

3. Policies Regarding Effort

Policies regarding maximum and minimum effort or the percent time are generally that there is no maximum effort. One institution indicated that adjunct faculty are generally part-time with a maximum of 50% effort.

4. Policies Regarding Benefits

Responding institutions’ benefit policies range from none to the same as TT faculty. Several institutions indicated that the appointment has to be a minimum of 50% effort and three months duration to be benefits-eligible.

5. Policies Regarding Privileges

Adjunct faculty generally do not have TT faculty consulting privileges, although the fact that positions are generally part-time negates this issue to some extent. Adjunct faculty members generally are not granted principal investigator status without special permission.

6. Policies Regarding Participation in Institutional Governance

Several institutions indicated that adjunct faculty fully participate in the governance of the institution, while some indicated that adjunct faculty have no voting rights in the faculty governance body, i.e., faculty senate. Public Universities are more likely than private universities to include this rank in governance activities.

7. Comments

The number of adjunct faculty positions is limited at some institutions to a percentage of the TT faculty.

C. Lecturer and Senior Lecturer

Lecturer positions represent 14% of the total instructional staff of the institutions that provided data for this project. These positions represent 0.5% of the TT instructional staff and 46% of the NTT instructional staff.

1. Description

In most of the institutions, the lecturer appointment is used for individuals whose primary responsibility is to teach and advise students. The rank does not usually carry tenure. Individuals with this title can either teach independently or under the general supervision of a tenure track faculty member. In at least one institution, lecturers may be un-enrolled graduate students. Some lecturers are hired to teach a single course. Some have special qualifications. Most institutions indicated that lecturers teach in all disciplines and at all levels.

2. Policies Regarding Length of Appointment

Lecturers are generally appointed for fixed terms. Initial appointments range from one year only up to five years. The average length of appointment of individuals currently holding a lecturer appointment ranged from less than 1 year to 11 years, with 3.5 years being the average.

3. Policies Regarding Effort

Lecturer appointments are not restricted: they can be full- or part-time at the majority of institutions. One institution reported that the appointment of limited-term lecturer has to be less than full-time. Lecturer appointments tend to be for the regular academic year only.

4. Policies Regarding Benefits

Most institutions indicated that individuals holding the title of lecturer were eligible for benefits if they appointed for 50% effort or more. In one case, only full-time

lecturers are eligible for health care and in another case, a lecturer must teach at least three courses to be eligible.

5. Policies Regarding Privileges

The ability of an individual appointed as a full-time lecturer to consult varies by institution. Most of the institutions restrict a lecturer's ability to be a principal investigator on a grant or to supervise graduate students.

6. Policies Regarding Participation in Institutional Governance

The responding institutions vary on their policies regarding participation of lecturers. At some institutions, lecturers are voting members of the faculty senate. Some restrict in institutional governance their participation at the departmental level. In other institutions, lecturers cannot vote or participate in governance activities. Public universities are more likely than private universities to include this rank in governance activities.

D. Instructor

Instructor positions represent 3.3% of the total instructional staff of the institutions that provided data for this project. They represented 0.3% of the TT instructional staff and 10% of the NTT instructional staff. Related titles include technical instructor, instrumentation innovator, assistant and associate faculty associate and acting professor.

1. Description

Instructor appointments are generally described as untenured members of the faculty whose primary roles are instructional with no or limited obligations for research or service. Instructors are usually required to hold the highest earned degree in their field, although in one institution, instructors are regarded as assistant professors in waiting and the appointment carries an automatic promotion to assistant professor upon completion of the PhD in most, but not all departments. In another institution, instructor is a probationary rank with the expectation that the individual will progress to the professorial ranks.

2. Policies Regarding Length of Appointment

Most instructor appointments are for one year with annual renewals. Some institutions limit these appointments to 3 or 4 years. The average number of years current appointees had held these appointments ranged from less than 1 year to 21 years.

3. Policies Regarding Effort

Instructor appointments can be full- or part-time, although a number of institutions indicated that they were normally full-time.

4. Policies Regarding Benefits

Instructors are generally eligible for benefits if they are appointed to 50% effort or more or teach a minimum number of courses.

5. Policies Regarding Privileges

Policies regarding consulting privileges vary among institutions. In general, instructors are not able to consult or can consult only with explicit permission.

6. Policies Regarding Participation in Institutional Governance

Institutions are split on the issue of participation in governance activities. Some consider instructors to be members of the faculty, and they have full voting privileges; at other institutions, instructors have no voting privileges. Public universities are more likely than private universities to include this rank in governance activities.

E. Visiting

Visiting positions represent 3.3% of the total instructional staff of the institutions that provided data for this project. They represent 0.4% of the TT instructional staff and 10 % of the NTT instructional staff.

1. Description

The term "visiting" appended to an academic title usually implies that the individual is a visitor from another institution who retains his or her status at that institution. Visiting instructional titles include professor, associate professor, assistant professor, lecturer and instructor.

2. Policies Regarding Length of Appointment

Visiting appointments are short-term, and most institutions limit their visitors to one to two years. When maximum appointment lengths are specified, they tend to be less than five years. Most of the current appointees have been at their institution a year or less, although one public institution reported an average of 5.2 years.

3. Policies Regarding Effort

These appointments can be full- or part-time. They are often not compensated by the host institution.

4. Policies Regarding Benefits

Although most institutions provide benefits to individuals holding this title who are compensated at a level of 50% effort or greater, a few have an additional time requirement (i.e., at least 3 months). At least one institution does not allow visitors to participate in its pension plan.

5. Policies Regarding Privileges

Most institutions are silent on consulting privileges, although in some cases visitors are required to report their outside activities.

6. Policies Regarding Participation in Institutional Governance

In most cases visiting faculty do not have voting rights, although there are exceptions.

F. Other

Besides these major categories, there is a variety of other instructional staff titles used. Many institutions append “distinguished”, “eminent”, or “university” to regular titles to indicate a particular level of expertise.