

**Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee  
Final Report  
3/31/21**

**Members:** Laura Adrien, Jonathan Benda, Michelle Carr, Kathleen Durant, Vaso Lykourinou, Jessica Maxwell, Mark Gooley, Dave Hagen, Carol Mallory

**Charge 1: Summary Report**

***In collaboration with FAC, the FTNTTFC shall (a) inquire and examine the data that have been obtained from the Colonial Group, (b) explore sources of more granular match-mate data for FTNTT faculty than is currently available, and (c) and make recommendations to improve FTNTT faculty compensation.***

**A: Examine the Colonial Group Data**

In December 2020 the Provost’s office provided our committee with aggregated data collected by 5 Colonial Group institutions - Boston College, Lehigh University, Tufts University, Tulane University, and Wake Forest University. As reported by University Decision Support (UDS), discipline-specific data cell sizes were too small to report from those institutions and cannot be provided. What was provided is median salary data for faculty holding Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, and Full Teaching Professor titles. *See chart below.*

Non-Tenure Track Teaching Faculty Salary Data				
<b>G14 (Colonial Group) Assistant Professor</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>NU Assistant Teaching Professor</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>Median Salary Difference</b>
Median Salary	N	Median Salary	N	
\$ 94,922.00	292	\$ 94,098.00	111	\$ (824.00)
<b>G14 (Colonial Group) Associate Professor</b>		<b>NU Associate Teaching Professor</b>		
Median Salary	N	Median Salary	N	
\$ 97,849.00	248	\$ 105,182.00	113	\$ 7,333.00
<b>G14 (Colonial Group) Full Professor</b>		<b>NU Full Teaching Professor</b>		
Median Salary	N	Median Salary	N	
\$ 124,939.00	216	\$ 129,420.00	54	\$ 4,481.00

While helpful, these data are problematic for several reasons:

- The data above does not include CPS, Business, Law, and Health disciplines, focusing more the core disciplines; this was due to the pilot nature of the program and that many of the colonial groups' schools do not have these disciplines. Therefore, reference salaries are not available for a significant number of NU faculty.
- Only data about faculty with *Assistant, Associate, and Full Teaching Professor* titles were given to the committee. Although data were collected across the University, across disciplines on various titles, the data are too sparse to share without potential identification. This was done as part of the agreement with the Colonial Group universities when they agreed to provide their salary data. This does, however, leave out reference groups for

faculty who hold many other titles (e.g., Lecturers, Clinical Professors, Professor of Practice, etc.). *See Appendix A for a full list of comparative titles.*

- At this level of aggregation, we do not have comparable salaries within colleges and among disciplines.
- Also, some of the five reference schools—Lehigh University, Tulane University, and Wake Forest University—are in slightly lower cost-of-living areas than Northeastern University.

In addition to the data above, we also received a report Northeastern produced, highlighting the challenges of collecting and reviewing the data from G14 (Colonial Group), their next steps, and methodology. In short, the challenges were that the data were sparse, the titles were greatly varied across the board, there were not enough universities polled (G14 was unable to collect a wide range of match mate data because not all universities decided to participate), and outliers in the data may have been present. An additional challenge is the number of FTNTT faculty lines we have in total at Northeastern vs other institutions, which may be more engineering or business heavy, thus inflating their averages. The University is asking G14 for more data; however, they are at the mercy of other universities providing information. It's important to mention Northeastern is not withholding information, it's waiting on other universities to participate.

**B: Find sources of more granular match-mate data for FTNTT faculty than is currently available.**


We attempted to gather more granular information from the Provost’s office and HRM, but due to privacy issues salary data cannot be shared.

We looked at public data from the National Center for Education Statistics - IPEDS Data Center <<https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/institutionprofile.aspx?unitId=167358&goToReportId=6>>, which documents pay by rank (TT and FTNTT faculty) and found significant gaps in pay by gender.

**National Center for Educational Statistics - IPEDS Data Center  
Northeastern University**

**Average Salaries of Full-time Instructional nonmedical staff equated to 9-months worked, by academic rank and gender: 2018-2019**

<b>Academic Rank</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>Difference in Pay Women Salaries (-) Male Salaries</b>
No Academic Rank	\$ 65,726	\$ 61,559	\$ 4,167
Lecturer	\$ 71,587	\$ 80,938	\$ (9,351)
Instructor	\$ 82,368	\$ 91,762	\$ (9,394)
Assistant Professor	\$ 108,023	\$ 117,514	\$ (9,491)
Associate Professor	\$ 122,866	\$ 125,139	\$ (2,273)
Professor	\$ 174,712	\$ 186,976	\$ (12,264)
All Instructional Staff Total	\$ 106,032	\$ 131,758	\$ (25,726)



**It is important to note:**

These data include the salaries of all teaching faculty by rank at Northeastern and it is not broken down by college or discipline. It is unclear whether this salary differential represents a gender pay issue (women are paid less for the same positions) or a gender mix-issue (i.e., women teach predominantly in lower paying colleges). We recommend that the University gather and analyze the data by college to determine this.

As per the IPEDS report instructional faculty includes faculty who are either (1) primarily instructional or (2) instructional and research based. It does not include NTT research faculty. CPS faculty are also excluded.

Each year the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs meets with the dean of each college to review male and female faculty salaries to ensure equity.

**C: Recommendations to improve FTNTT faculty compensation.**

The committee believes there is a need for FTNTT faculty to gain access to comparable salary data by discipline to avoid the potential for inequities within disciplines and across demographics (race, gender, geographical location, etc.). Currently, T/TT faculty have access to their match mate data by discipline, whereas FTNTT faculty do not. With that said, we recognize that there are legal and privacy issues in sharing the more granular data reported for FTNTT faculty titles, and in some cases the data is not available. However, lack of data prevents FTNTT faculty from making fair equity cases as spelled out in the Faculty Handbook equity module.

*Every third year (staggered across colleges), a request for equity adjustment may be made by a college dean, a unit head, or an individual faculty member based on factors above (B.1.a-e). In that same year, University Decision Support will provide the deans of the colleges eligible for equity adjustments with scatter plots of faculty salaries versus years in rank, pooled by rank, along with salary data for college match-mates that were approved by the college faculty and dean. **Deans shall provide an abbreviated version of this report to faculty that is redacted or edited to preserve privacy, confidentiality and anonymity but contains sufficient information for faculty to evaluate their own salary in light of the equitable factors listed above.***

*-Northeastern Faculty Handbook, Equity Module*

We recommend that efforts continue at the Provost level to gather the data from G14 to provide data to the FTNTT faculty and to include data for CPS, Business, Law, and Health disciplines when available. With the study being the first of its kind, we further recommend the University continue to be at the forefront of soliciting FTNTT faculty salary information from peer institutions, including but not limited to G14.

We recommend that the Provost's office and/or colleges continue to investigate if there are discrepancies in pay between male/female faculty, and BIPOC faculty, further breaking down the data (from IPEDS) by discipline to help determine if there are underlying issues present by rank and gender within each department. Also look at recruitment efforts to address possible issues, as in, if higher paying fields are predominantly male, why is this the case.

**In conclusion:**

The FTNTTFC cannot make a salary analysis based on the data provided. More granular data by discipline will need to be provided to do a quantitative and qualitative assessment.

In order to implement the One Faculty model, the University said they are committed to collecting and sharing benchmark data for FTNTT faculty when the information becomes available or is shared by other universities. Our hope is that this will eventually include all colleges not currently collected (CPS, Business, Law, and Health), functional positions and titles not collected (such as lecturers), at a granular enough level so that all faculty can compare their salary at the department/discipline level.

Furthermore, due to the current low number of research faculty at the university, getting meaningful privacy-preserving statistics for compensations of FTNTT faculty in this group is even more challenging. The fact that research faculty are expected to cover all or most of their salary from external funding sources, and the practical challenges this requirement brings, further complicates the situation for this group of faculty.

**Charge 2: Summary Report**

*The FTNTTFC shall (a) collect data from HR and colleges regarding various titles of FTNTT faculty across colleges, their workload and compensation (in ranges by unit or college to preserve anonymity), (b) analyze to determine if there are significant differences in workload and compensation for similar titles and across demographics, (c) examine faculty contracts for FTNTT faculty in regards to title and position (d) if needed, recommend changes to titles and responsibilities, and or contracts towards achieving increased uniformity.*

**A: Collect data from HR and colleges regarding various titles of FTNTT faculty across colleges, their workload and compensation (in ranges by unit or college to preserve anonymity):**

With regard to part (a) of the charge, we were unable to collect compensation data from the colleges, as noted in Charge 1.

**B: Analyze to determine if there are significant differences in workload and compensation for similar titles and across demographics.**

FTNTT faculty titles are fairly consistent across the University. The top 4 titles<sup>1</sup> account for over 88% of the FTNTT faculty<sup>2</sup>, while the top 8 cover 97%.

Title	Total	%	Cum %
Assoc. Teaching or Clinical Professor	180	32.7%	32.7%
Asst. Teaching or Clinical Professor	171	31.1%	63.8%
Teaching or Clinical Professor	86	15.6%	79.5%
Lecturer	51	9.3%	88.7%
Professor of the Practice	20	3.6%	92.4%
Assoc. Academic Specialist	12	2.2%	94.5%
Assoc. Research Scientist	7	1.3%	95.8%
Senior Lecturer	7	1.3%	97.1%
Principal Lecturer	4	0.7%	97.8%
Senior Academic Specialist	4	0.7%	98.5%
Clinical Instructor	3	0.5%	99.1%
Academic Specialist	2	0.4%	99.5%
Asst. Academic Specialist	1	0.2%	99.6%
Asst. Clinical Instructor	1	0.2%	99.8%
Professor of Design	1	0.2%	100.0%
	550	100.0%	

<sup>1</sup> Associate Teaching Professor, Assistant Teaching Professor, and Teaching Professor, combined with Associate Clinical Professor, Assistant Teaching Professor, and Clinical Professor, respectively. Clinical titles are used in BCHS, SOL, and to some extent KCCS.

<sup>2</sup> On the following charts these combined titles are often referred to as “full professor rank” or “associate or assistant professor rank” for brevity.

Note: Our data collection efforts did not include assistant/associate/full research professor ranks in some colleges as their funding comes from external sources.

**C: Examine faculty contracts for FTNTT faculty in regards to title and position.**

Research Faculty are not primarily addressed in this report as they have a different contract system and expectations than teaching faculty.

**Contract lengths are also consistent across colleges.**


- 1-year contracts for Lecturers<sup>3</sup>
- 1-year for the Assistant rank<sup>4</sup>
- 3-years for the Associate rank and Senior Lecturers
- 5-years for any level above the Associate rank, including Principal Lecturers

**At a high-level, average workload distributions are relatively consistent across ranks but there is quite a bit of differentiation by departments within some colleges. Below are the AVERAGES by rank.**

- Full Professor rank averages: 75% teaching, 11% service, 9% professional development, 6% research.
- Associate and Assistant rank averages: 74% teaching, 12% service, 10% professional development, 5% research
- Lecturer rank averages: 85% teaching, 7% service, 7% professional development, 1% research

**However, workload distributions do vary across colleges.<sup>5</sup>**

**Full Professor rank averages<sup>6</sup>**




<sup>3</sup> Only CAMD, COE, CPS, and DMSB offer the higher-level Lecturer positions.

<sup>4</sup> KCCS has some individuals at the Assistant level grandfathered into 3-year contracts.


<sup>5</sup> Some colleges merge service and professional development into one measurement component.

<sup>6</sup> These represent averages by colleges. CAMD, COS, and COE vary components and percentages by department. KCCS does not break down workload by percentages.

**Associate and Assistant rank averages<sup>7</sup>**



**Lecturer rank averages<sup>8</sup>**



<sup>7</sup> In some colleges, "leadership" is introduced at the Associate rank, but no percentage is assigned.

<sup>8</sup> SOL, BCHS, and CSSH do not generally utilize the Lecturer title.





**Women represent 44% of the FTNTT faculty.<sup>9 10</sup>**

Women’s representation is greatest in BCHS, CSSH and SOL. But absolute numbers in SOL are relatively low.

	BCHS	CAMD	COE	COS	CSSH	DMSB	KCCS	SOL	% women by rank	Total Women	Total Positions
Associate Teaching Professor	83%	36%	23%	50%	58%	15%	27%	100%	50%	70	140
Assistant Teaching Professor	61%	24%	22%	46%	58%	33%	25%	67%	40%	56	139
Teaching Professor	89%	33%	25%	100%	70%	0%	17%	86%	56%	39	70
Lecturer		40%		29%		33%	22%		33%	17	51
Professor of the Practice		29%	0%		67%	0%	40%		30%	6	20
Associate Academic Specialist		0%	0%		67%	29%			33%	4	12
Associate Research Scientist							29%		29%	2	7
Senior Lecturer		100%		0%		20%			29%	2	7
Principal Lecturer		50%				50%			50%	2	4
Senior Academic Specialist					100%	0%			50%	2	4
Clinical Instructor							0%		0%		3
Assistant Academic Specialist					100%				100%	1	1
Assistant Clinical Instructor							100%		100%	1	1
Professor of Design		0%							0%	0	1
Percent Women by College	77%	34%	22%	47%	64%	23%	26%	81%	44%	202	460
Total Women	48	25	12	29	46	14	15	13	202		
Total Positions	62	74	54	62	72	62	58	16	460		

**BIPOC represent about 1/9<sup>th</sup> of the FTNTT faculty.<sup>11 12</sup>**

BIPOC representation is greatest in DMSB and SOL. But absolute numbers in SOL are relatively low.

	BCHS	CAMD	COE	COS	DMSB	KCCS	SOL	% BIPOC by rank	Total BIPOC	Total Positions
Assoc. Teaching or Clinical Professor	6%	6%	11%	8%	19%	6%	0%	9%	11	120
Asst. Teaching or Clinical Professor	3%	0%	14%	6%	54%	0%	67%	12%	14	116
Lecturer		20%		14%	0%	11%		16%	8	51
Teaching or Clinical Professor	11%	0%	0%	20%	0%	17%	29%	10%	5	50
Professor of the Practice		29%	0%		0%	0%		12%	2	17
Assoc. Academic Specialist		0%	0%		14%			11%	1	9
Assoc. Research Scientist						14%		14%	1	7
Senior Lecturer		0%		0%	20%			14%	1	7
Principal Lecturer		0%			0%			0%	0	4
Clinical Instructor							33%	33%	1	3
Senior Academic Specialist					0%			0%	0	2
Asst. Clinical Instructor							0%	0%		1
Professor of Design		0%						0%	0	1
Percent BIPOC by College	5%	11%	9%	10%	21%	9%	25%	11%	44	388
Total BIPOC	3	8	5	6	13	5	4	44		
Total Positions	62	74	54	62	62	58	16	388		

<sup>9</sup> Associate Teaching Professor, Assistant Teaching Professor, and Teaching Professor, combined with Associate Clinical Professor, Assistant Teaching Professor, and Clinical Professor, respectively. Clinical titles are used in BCHS, SOL, and to some extent KCCS.

<sup>10</sup> Counts by gender by position are not available for CPS.

<sup>11</sup> BIPOC counts broken down by rank are unavailable for CPS and CSSH (BIPOC numbers broken down by rank are not available for this college).

<sup>12</sup> For COE, BIPOC is defined as underrepresented minorities (URM), which does not include Asians/Asian Americans.

**69% of co-op faculty are women, but only 7% are BIPOC.<sup>13 14 15</sup>**

Women Co-op Coordinators	COS	CAMD	BCHS	CSSH	DMSB	KCCS	COE	% women by rank	Total women	Total positions
Assistant Co-op Coordinator	75%	100%	100%	0%	50%	44%	76%	67%	30	45
Associate Co-op Coordinator	100%	100%	75%	67%	0%	33%	67%	68%	17	25
Senior Co-op Coordinator	100%	100%	67%	67%	50%	100%	100%	80%	12	15
Percent Women by College	88%	100%	75%	60%	50%	46%	76%	69%	59	85
Total Women	7	3	6	6	3	6	28			
Total Positions	8	3	8	10	6	13	37			

BIPOC Co-op Coordinators	COS	CAMD	BCHS	CSSH	DMSB	KCCS	COE	% BIPOC by rank	Total BIPOC	Total positions
Assistant Co-op Coordinator	25%	0%	0%	x	0%	33%	0%	9%	4	45
Associate Co-op Coordinator	50%	0%	0%	x	0%	33%	0%	8%	2	25
Senior Co-op Coordinator	0%	0%	0%	x	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	15
Percent BIPOC by College	25%	0%	0%	x	0%	31%	0%	7%	6	85
Total BIPOC	2	0	0	x	0	4	0			
Total Positions	8	3	8	10	6	13	37			

**D. Recommendations:**

The following recommendations are primarily for teaching faculty, except where appropriate for research faculty as well such as diversity.

We recommend that the University work to obtain salary benchmark data for all colleges, and perhaps even at the department level where needed, to allow FTNTT faculty members to benchmark their compensation similar to what is available for tenure track faculty. We were unable to obtain either this benchmark data or NU anonymized salary data by department by rank. (See Charge 1 recommendations for greater detail.)

Acknowledging that the University has had much success standardizing titles and contract lengths across colleges, we recommend that this process continue. This would include phasing out less-used titles like “academic specialists,” further standardizing contract lengths (e.g., assistant teaching professors in KCCS), and specifying teaching loads over a consistent number of months. (See #4 below)

Within positions, workload expectations vary across colleges. This committee did not discern the rationale for this. To the extent that this is due to accreditation differences, it seems reasonable to continue. However, to the extent it just reflects history or taste, the University should move to increasingly standardize workload expectations.

Similarly, the University should move to more consistent teaching expectations. These currently are specified in some colleges for 9-month periods and some for 12-months. Additionally, some colleges describe the workload by credit and some by number of courses. It seems easiest to change the specification to a

<sup>13</sup> Co-op coordinators in CPS and SOL are not considered faculty. Counts are unavailable for CPS.

<sup>14</sup> For COE, BIPOC is defined as underrepresented minorities (URM), which does not include Asians/Asian Americans.

<sup>15</sup> BIPOC numbers unavailable for CSSH and CPS.

credit range for 9-month contracts, with additional summer teaching expectations specified separately/additionally.<sup>16</sup>

We were encouraged by women's representation in the FTNTT faculty (44% and equal or over-performing in the higher ranks). There may be room to increase representation in some colleges.

At first glance, the BIPOC representation (1/9<sup>th</sup>) may appear low, but this is complicated by two factors: differing definitions across colleges and lack of a benchmark for comparison. Currently the University does not consistently define BIPOC according to OIDI. Therefore, we recommend that the University adopt a consistent data collection benchmark that breaks down faculty into the racial and ethnic categories including but not limited to: Black, Indigenous, Latinx/Hispanic, Pacific Islander, Middle Eastern, Asian, and multiracial. Furthermore, that it collect benchmark data to better understand BIPOC representation relative to peer institutions.

### **Charge 3: Summary Report**

***Following on Resolution #14 of the AY2018-2019 Faculty Senate, the FTNTTFC shall review the availability and assignment of leadership positions for NTT faculty within each college, including chairing MS Thesis and PhD Dissertation Committees, and shall make recommendations for wider implementation of this resolution through policy and bylaw changes within each college.***

#### **A. Data Collection**

Members of the FTNTT faculty Committee each reached out to leadership at their respective colleges to collect the data pertinent to this charge. An email template was developed by one of the FTNTTFC members to standardize data collection efforts. Once collected, each FTNTT faculty Committee member deposited the data into a spreadsheet located within Teams. Within the data collected, both the format and level of detail of the data collected varied by college and by the FTNTT faculty collecting that data. Some data collected included references to college by-laws; some data included the names and regular positions of leadership position holders; other data was provided as a single statement without a granular level of detail.

#### **B. Data Analysis**

From the data that has been provided by the colleges & departments contacted, it appears that there is no University-level policy regarding the availability and assignment of leadership positions for FTNTT faculty, as availability and appointments vary by college and department.

When collecting this data, leadership positions were identified, but not limited to:

- Department Heads
- Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs

---

<sup>16</sup> Our committee did not measure to what extent teaching loads incorporated class sizes (e.g., courses with 150 students vs. those with 10 students) or other aspects of workload (e.g., writing-intensive classes).

- Members of hiring, promotion or other committees
- Academic Affairs Committee
- Department Merit and Promotion Committees
- MS Thesis
- PhD Thesis

Based on the data available:

- CAMD\*, SOL, Bouvé all allow FTNTT faculty to occupy all leadership positions.
  - \*The PhD program in CAMD is set to pilot the 2021-2022 academic year, by-laws about leadership are to be determined.
- DMSB does not allow FTNTT faculty to hold Chair positions; there are no stated, formal limits on FTNTT faculty's ability to serve on the Dean's Cabinet as Associate Deans, as Concentration Coordinators, & Program Directors; and allows FTNTT faculty to serve on certain School Standing Committees while also barring them from others. DMSB also does not allow FTNTT faculty to serve as chair of the Faculty Policy Committee. This is significant because the FPC reviews all matters of importance to the DMSB Faculty. This is contrary to the One Faculty Model. Even the Faculty Senate permits its chair to be a FTNTT faculty member.
- COE allows FTNTT faculty to occupy most leadership positions, including Chair, Dean, and Program Director positions; however, similar to DMSB, FTNTT faculty are barred from serving on certain School Standing Committees (example, Tenure & Promotion Committee & Sabbatical Leave Committee)
- Khoury and CSSH appear to allow FTNTT faculty to hold a variety of leadership positions as current data indicates FTNTT faculty holding positions including Associate Dean, Director, and Chair; both colleges bar FTNTT faculty from specific leadership positions as with COE.

### **C. Recommendation**

Although there are gaps in the data collected, from the available data it is clear that the availability and assignment of leadership positions for FTNTT faculty is handled differently for each college. These observed discrepancies across colleges are in conflict with the University's One Faculty model and have the potential to create University-wide inequities for FTNTT faculty depending on their home college, as some may be eligible for leadership positions while others may be barred based on their status as FTNTT faculty.

Therefore, it is the recommendation of this committee that the availability and assignment of leadership positions for FTNTT faculty be standardized across all 9 colleges and campuses of the University. Further, it is a recommendation of this committee that all FTNTT faculty be made eligible for all leadership positions, with the exception of tenure-specific committees such as the Tenure & Promotion Committee & Sabbatical Leave Committee, and a possible exception of chairing a

PhD committee unless the FTNTT faculty holds an equivalent degree level. This recommendation is based upon the observation that colleges that do allow FTNTT faculty to serve in these leadership positions seem to be successful in the model and provide an equitable implementation of the University's One Faculty model.

(See Appendix B for a list of FTNTT faculty current Leadership Roles)

#### **Charge 4: Summary Report**

***The FTNTTFC shall also recommend best practices for FTNTT promotion processes at the departmental and college levels.***

This charge was conducted last year (Appendix C report attached). If the Senate resolved to require units to make changes to their processes as a result of the report, and the SAC would be pleased to charge us to assess whether this took place, we are happy to conduct this process next year.

We renew our recommendations:

1. Each unit and/or college should have a stand-alone FTNTT faculty promotion committee comprised of at least 3 FTNTT faculty members where the majority of the members are FTNTT faculty members who are at the same rank or higher than the candidates.
2. All units and/or colleges should provide a mentoring process specific to the FTNTT faculty promotion process, including but not limited to peer mentoring opportunities, and workshops conducted by panels of faculty who have successfully gone through the promotion process.
3. While units/colleges follow the Provost's prescribed process as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook and the Preparation and Format of Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Promotion Dossiers* manual, any unit/college specific promotion guidelines should be provided and easily accessible.

#### **Charge 5: Summary Report**

***The FTNTTFC shall follow up on professional development support, including one-term paid leaves. The FTNTTFC shall work with the Provost Office to develop an assessment plan for the ongoing semester-long professional development leaves for NTT faculty taking place during AY2020-2021, and shall make recommendations regarding wider implementation of this program.***

The committee spoke with the Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs who reported that most of the FTNTT Fellowships are happening during the Spring 2021 semester. We recommend SAC postpone this charge until one full cycle of the program has run. The Fellowship program will run again in the 2021-2022 academic year.

Note: The one-term paid leave does not include Research Faculty as they are paid by external grants for their salary.

**Final recommendation:**

It is recommended that SAC include a research faculty member on this committee.

**RESOLUTIONS:**

FTNTT Resolution 1

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the Provost's Office gathers more data from G14 or other sources to provide discipline specific match-mate data for all FTNTT faculty, in order for equity to be evaluated openly by both the administration and the FTNTT faculty, in accordance with the faculty handbook equity module.

FTNTT Resolution 2

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the Provost's Office, in collaboration with appropriate standing Faculty Senate committees, works to standardize FTNTT teaching faculty titles across disciplines and phase out less-used titles to increase uniformity.

FTNTT Resolution 3

**WHEREAS** the University does not consistently define and track Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) in faculty ranks,

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the University adopts a consistent data collection benchmark that breaks down faculty into the racial and ethnic categories including but not limited to: Black, Indigenous, Latinx/Hispanic, Pacific Islander, Middle Eastern, Asian, and multiracial; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the University collect benchmark data to better understand BIPOC representation relative to peer institutions.

FTNTT Resolution 4

**WHEREAS** the availability and assignment of leadership positions for FTNTT faculty is handled differently for each college, resulting in observed discrepancies which are in conflict with the University's One Faculty model and have the potential to create University-wide inequities for FTNTT faculty; and

**WHEREAS** FTNTT faculty serving in leadership positions have been successful,

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the Provost's Office, in collaboration with the Dean's Offices, prepares guidelines and assessment criteria for colleges to standardize availability and assignment of leadership positions for FTNTT faculty across all colleges.