UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Daniel L. Simmons Telephone: (510) 987-0711 Fax: (510) 763-0309

Email: Daniel.Simmons@ucop.edu

Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents University of California 1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor Oakland, California 94607-5200

April 19, 2011

PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT LAWRENCE PITTS

Re: UCEP and UCAP Letters on Ladder Rank Faculty

Dear Larry:

The Academic Council discussed the enclosed letters from UCEP and UCAP regarding the balance between ladder-rank faculty and non-ladder rank faculty at its March 30 meeting. Council requested that I forward both letters to you for distribution to members of the Joint Task Force on Salary Scales for their consideration.

Both committees emphasize as imperatives the need to protect the quality of teaching at UC and to ensure that students benefit from being taught by research faculty. UCEP offers a list of preferences and best practices that follow from this axiom. For instance, both committees favor making long-term, and if possible, full-time, appointments over short-term appointments of lecturers and non-ladder rank faculty. In addition, the committees oppose establishing new titles focused on teaching, preferring to use a mix of existing titles as deemed appropriate by departments. The letters offer alternatives to establishing new titles, such as offering incentives to ladder-rank faculty for temporarily increasing teaching loads, allowing senior ladder-rank faculty to focus more on teaching than on research for a specified period, and using emeriti in teaching roles.

I hope that the reflections of the Senate's committees on undergraduate education and academic personnel are helpful to the Joint Task Force.

Sincerely,

Daniel L. Simmons, Chair

Academic Council

Copy: Academic Council

Vice Provost Susan Carlson

Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director

Encl. (2)

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY (UCEP) David G. Kay, Chair kay@UCI.EDU

1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor Oakland, CA 94607-5200 Phone: (510) 987-9466 Fax: (510) 763-0309

Assembly of the Academic Senate

April 19, 2011

March 14, 2011

Dan Simmons, CHAIR ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Re: USE OF NON-LADDER-RANK FACULTY

Dear Dan,

If the current financial situation should make it necessary to increase the proportion of non-ladder-rank faculty at UC, UCEP recommends a set of best practices to maintain, to the degree possible, the quality of a UC education.

Instructors may be drawn from these payroll titles:

- (Senior) Lecturer with (Potential) Security of Employment (LSOE)
- (Senior) Lecturer (Unit 18 Lecturer)
- Adjunct (Assistant/Associate) Professor
- Postdoctoral Scholar
- Teaching Assistant/Associate (Graduate Student Instructor, GSI)

We expect all instructors at whatever rank to have expertise in their fields and to be engaged with their subject matter, effective in promoting learning, responsive to students' needs, and aware of their unit's curricular and research programs. These titles vary in qualifications, permanence, and balance between teaching and research. The optimal mix of titles will vary by discipline, campus, and department; we do not express a preference for one title over another in every situation, but we encourage adherence to the guidelines and best practices listed below.

We are skeptical of the need to create additional titles, especially titles with "light research" expectations, because it will be difficult to attract excellent candidates to such unconventional positions and to evaluate their performance in those positions.

UCEP recommends these practices for the appointment and employment of non-ladder-rank instructors:

- Maintain as high a proportion of ladder-rank faculty as possible, to maintain the research-inspired character of a UC education
- Determine, on a department by department basis, the courses in which the research orientation of the faculty can best be brought to bear in instruction and assign ladder-rank faculty to those courses

- Favor long-term over short-term appointments, to promote continuity and engagement with the students, the faculty, and the curriculum
- Favor full-time appointments over part-time, to promote engagement and maximize instructors' availability on campus
- Favor appointments with Senate membership, to promote engagement through sharing service responsibilities
- Where a short-term or part-time appointment is necessary, favor postdocs or GSIs over part-time Unit 18 lecturers, because the postdocs and GSIs will have a closer connection with the department
- Plan for recruiting of non-ladder-rank instructors far enough in advance to attract candidates in the usual "recruiting season" and to allow thorough interviews, ideally including a classroom teaching demonstration
- Assign to each new instructor a Senate mentor or resource person who will remain in regular contact with the instructor, enhancing quality by providing institutional context and advice
- Establish and require pedagogy seminars for GSIs and encourage attendance by other instructors
- Conduct classroom observations of new instructors and instructors teaching new courses, preferably with more than one visit per class by more than one observer
- Base reappointment, merit, and promotion reviews on student evaluations, classroom observations, and examination of course materials; where appropriate, consider also professional, creative activity and service
- Recognize Senate faculty who participate in recruitment, mentoring, observations, and reviews of non-ladder-rank instructors, at least as part of their service responsibilities
- Assign teaching loads that are sustainable and comparable to similar positions at similar institutions, taking into account the number of courses, the number of different courses ("preps"), the class size, the management of labs and TAs, and the instructor's service and other activities
- Encourage instructors' participation in all appropriate departmental events and meetings
- Provide adequate resources to instructors, including staff support, office space, computer equipment, telephone and network access, photocopying, and supplies
- Address the mix of instructional titles in regular academic program reviews

UCEP also raises the following related issues:

- As an alternative to hiring new people into teaching positions, consider paying ladder-rank faculty over 100% for extra teaching, given continuing research productivity (this requires a change in the APM)
- Allow senior ladder-rank faculty to shift their focus more to teaching, perhaps for a specified period

As the financial situation develops, UCEP reaffirms that consideration of ways to increase throughput and efficiency must not outweigh our focus on preserving the quality of a UC education.

Sincerely,

DOK

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (UCAP) Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair anpalazoglu@ucdavis.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate 1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor Oakland, CA 94607-5200 Phone: (510) 987-9466 Fax: (510) 763-0309

April 19, 2011

DAN SIMMONS, CHAIR ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: TEACHING FACULTY

Dear Dan.

During its meeting on March 8, 2011 UCAP discussed the question of how teaching faculty can be used differently in the future following a discussion session with Provost Pitts on this and related issues.

UCAP agrees that there are currently no systematic incentives for faculty to teach more and in fact faculty may be punished for increasing their teaching load at the expense of research activities. CAPs could consider, as a standard practice, rewarding faculty with an acceleration in time (or a half-step depending on local CAP practices) when they have excelled in teaching while maintaining at least an expected level of performance in research and service activities.

Members also proposed that UC could hire more Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOE). However, as these are FTE appointments, they would come at the expense of hiring ladder rank faculty. Thus, there has to be a critical balance in the use such LSOE positions as such a move could alter the research emphasis of UC and compromise training of the future professoriate.

UCAP also considered the idea of establishing a new title on the general campus analogous to Clinical X series in the health sciences. Members were not in favor of this option as such a series would not be well translated into the general campus practice.

UCAP recognizes the fact that at different times in their careers, faculty may conduct less research and focus more on teaching (or vice versa) due to a number of professional and personal reasons. Members proposed an incentive for such a *temporary* increase in teaching responsibilities in the form of off-scale salary components. This would be analogous to, and mirror, off-scale salary components that reward increased research productivity.

As another alternative to hiring new people, UCAP also proposed considering voluntary recall of emeriti faculty who have demonstrated outstanding teaching skills, and who are enthusiastic about helping UC continue to fulfill its mission of excellent teaching. This can be done on a class-by-class basis and provide at least a short-term solution to increased teaching loads.

UCAP recognizes the pressure to hire more temporary lecturers on theunit18 track to strengthen the teaching force. While this may be a cost-effective strategy, it would be disadvantageous for the lecturers themselves if such hires were made for short duration and at low percentage of appointment, thus depriving

them of the opportunity to become part of the excellent lecturer corps at UC and indeed raising the specter of a two-class faculty.

Finally, UCAP is very concerned about any decisions that result in reducing the amount and quality of research at UC and recognizes that the university may need to be smaller to achieve this. If the state support continues to drop precipitously, beyond adding teaching faculty and other cost-saving solutions, ultimately the number of in-state students will have to drop commensurate with the decrease in the budget and ladder rank FTE.

Sincerely,

Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair

UCAP