

Instructor Concerns (Ad Hoc Committee) Summary Report

May, 2013

Background: An ad hoc committee was established in September 2011 by the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in conjunction with the USC-Upstate deans from the George Dean Johnson College of Business and Economics, the Mary Black School of Nursing, the School of Education, and the Library. The purpose of the committee was to examine the possibility of developing a unified proposal recommending a clinical track option with appropriate titles for nontenured full-time faculty. In the past, various schools within the University drafted proposals with clinical track options; however, this was the first collaborative attempt across all of the previously interested colleges within USC-Upstate.

It became apparent to committee members that there was a broader range of concerns for full-time nontenured faculty, and a representative from the College of Arts and Sciences was added in Spring 2012. A three-tiered clinical track proposal for full-time nontenured faculty was developed, presented, and discussed with members of the Faculty Welfare Committee in Spring 2012, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on October 1, 2012, and the deans from all the schools on November 14, 2012. In response to the deans' and FWC members' feedback, a two-tiered proposal was presented to the Faculty Senate on February 22, 2013. Additionally, an open forum was held on February 28, 2012 to garner input from a larger population of USC-Upstate faculty. Ultimately, the Faculty Senate approved on April 26, 2013, the use of two clinical titles: Clinical Instructor and Clinical Senior Instructor, as equivalents to Instructor and Senior Instructor already utilized. In addition to developing a proposal for a clinical nontenure-track option, the committee developed procedural policies for promotion to Senior Instructor rank. The following table is a progress summary of the committees' identification of key instructor concerns and the corresponding status and resolutions that have occurred.

Table 1: Identified Key Concerns of USC-Upstate Instructors and Current Resolutions

	<i>Concerns/Issues Identified</i>	<i>Resolutions</i>
1	Ambiguous Senior Instructor Promotion process.	The rank of Senior Instructor was not well defined, nor was there a clear and widely-known process to be promoted to that rank, in spite of the process outlined in ACAF 1.18. The Committee drafted a definition of Senior Instructor rank that was largely adopted by the Faculty Manual Committee in its revisions to the Faculty Manual. In addition, the Committee created criteria and procedures for promotion review to the rank of Senior Instructor that were approved by Faculty Senate on April 26, 2013. The promotion review process is to be added to the Faculty Manual with additional procedures forming part of the Faculty Handbook.
2	No identified tangible benefits for the promotion in rank to Senior Instructor	The Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in conjunction with the deans of each college decided that the promotion would come with a \$3000.00 pay increase and (as indicated in the current draft of the Faculty Manual) 5-year length contracts .
3	Identification of viable and appropriate Clinical Titles for full-time nontenure track faculty within the Professional Schools to better reflect their professional experiences and clinical roles.	The Faculty Senate approved the use of the titles Clinical Instructor and Clinical Senior Instructor as equivalents to Instructor and Senior Instructor on April 26, 2013.
4	Salary inversion and compression at Instructor rank.	Committee did not explore this topic since another Salary review committee was exploring this issue.

Committee Recommendations:

1. Faculty Senate should monitor the new Senior Instructor promotion process to ensure that the procedures work as intended, and to make changes in procedures as needed. This should include the writing and publication of unit criteria in a timely manner, as well as, an evaluation of the effectiveness of the promotion process.

2. In the interest of continuing improvement of full-time nontenure-track faculty positions, the committee members believe there is still a need for further exploration of a full three-tiered clinical track for the Schools of Nursing and Education. In particular, Faculty Senate should monitor if clinical faculty have needs not being met by the reforms passed this year.
3. Disparity in workload is an issue for all full-time faculty, which is often pushed aside as other, more manageable issues come up. The committee recommends the establishment of a special ad-hoc committee to look solely at faculty workload issues.
4. Instructor issues and/or concerns should continue to be addressed by faculty welfare or as directed by senate leaders.
5. The committee also recommends that a conversation about the proportion of tenure-track, nontenure-track, and part-time faculty be pursued with the administration. Much of the opposition to a full three-tiered clinical track in the past has centered on the fear of eroding tenure, a fear that in times of uncertain budgets and social and political pressures on higher education is not entirely unfounded. The committee believes that a strong and improved nontenure-track strengthens the tenure-track, but the rationale for hiring positions on one track or the other is not always clear.