

First, CAPP would like to thank all those who contributed to the discussion of “The Proposal to Modify the Percentage of the RTE Faculty in the College of Veterinary Medicine.”

The Proposal raised several questions and the Committee appreciates the time everyone has taken to prepare responses.

In our minds the case rests on Resolution 30 (Sept 2002) that creates the enabling legislation for the Clinical Professor title. Colleges interested in using this title produce a plan to be approved by the Faculty Senate before it can be implemented. The ground rules include the stipulation that:

“The percentage of positions bearing the titles may not exceed 25% of the existing tenure-track faculty positions in the college or 25% of the tenure-track positions in those departments or programs where those positions are located.”

The resolution also includes an amendment that allows for a measure of flexibility in the percent:

“ A higher percentage may be afforded if, but only if, the relevant college, department, or program makes an overpowering showing that: (1) there is a need for the higher percentage; (2) the Clinical Professor positions in question would not replicate the functions of positions ordinarily held by tenured or tenure-track faculty; and (3) any additional Clinical Professor positions in a department or program would not detract in any way from the potential for adding tenured or tenure-track positions in that department or program.”

Until this proposal from CVM, no college has sought permission to exceed the 25% limitation. Other colleges, including JCSM, SHA, CALS, AAP, Human Ecology, Law, and Engineering all have undergone review and agreed not to exceed the 25% rule.

The case, then, turns on the compelling nature of the exception, which is significant. CAPP is split on this issue, with the majority against the proposal. Some members wrote that they were sympathetic to the large service role of the CVM, indicating the need was a serious one. Some discussion suggested that the proposal was desirable because it would avoid uncomfortable “work around” solutions. Yet, the additional information provided by CVM seemed to indicate that the suggested 45% was simply a reflection of the current situation. There was no information about what peer institutions are doing, or why. This led the majority to believe that such an exception would come at the expense of tenure track faculty across the University.

For the Committee,
Michael Tomlan, Chair