

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY



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

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

CIVIL ENGINEERING

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

June 26, 1991

PRESIDENT DAVID P. GARDNER
Office of the President
300 Lakeside Drive, 22nd Floor
Oakland, CA 94612

Dear David:

I am transmitting to you the Report of the Universitywide Task Force on Faculty Rewards. As you know, this Task Force was established in September, 1990, by Senior Vice President Frazer to review academic personnel policy on criteria for advancement and to review current practice in the implementation of this policy to determine if the reward structure in the professorial series is consistent with the mission of the University.

The Task Force met five times during the year and has, in addition, communicated extensively in preparation and editing of this report.

From the beginning of our deliberations, I have been struck by the seriousness of purpose of the Task Force. The significance of the issues in our charge was reflected time and again in our discussions and was frequently reinforced by the tremendous interest in our work evidenced in conversations that I had with colleagues across the country. Our overriding concern was to ensure that the "proper work of faculty members" was fully supportive of the broad mission of the University and that meritorious achievement by faculty in pursuit of the mission was both encouraged and appropriately rewarded. If I were to paraphrase our recommendations, it would be this: we must restore a more appropriate balance among the traditional categories of scholarly activity of the faculty, and we must exercise more judiciously the flexibility in evaluation of faculty performance that is currently available in our Academic Personnel Manual, yet infrequently utilized.

We invite faculty colleagues and other reviewers to thoughtful consideration of our recommendations. The outcome of this process can have a very significant positive effect on the University, from both internal and external perspectives.

May I conclude by adding my personal thanks to you for meeting with the Task Force to give us a context for our work. I look forward to the opportunity to continue the dialogue after you have had a chance to study the report.

Sincerely,

Karl S. Pister
Professor of Engineering Science
Task Force Chairman

KSP:gp
Attachment

cc: Senior Vice President Frazer
Associate Vice President Moore
Acting Assistant Vice President Switkes

TASK FORCE MEMBERS
September 1990 through June 1991

Karl Pister (Chair)
Professor, Civil Engineering, Berkeley

Carol Cartwright
Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, Davis (Fall 1990 - Spring 1991)

Marjorie Caserio
Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, San Diego (Spring 1991)

Carlos Cortés
Professor, History, Riverside

Jennifer LaVail
Professor, Anatomy, San Francisco

Charles Li
Dean, Graduate Division, Santa Barbara

Alexei Maradudin
Professor, Physics, Irvine

Clifton Poodry
Professor, Biology, Santa Cruz

Susan Prager
Dean, School of Law, Los Angeles

Melvin Ramey
Professor, Civil Engineering, Davis

Harold Simon
Professor, Family Medicine, San Diego

Richard Sisson
Vice Chancellor, Faculty Relations, Los Angeles

Melvin Webber
Professor, City and Regional Planning, Berkeley

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Charge	1
Prologue	1
Introduction and Summary	1
An Historical Perspective	2
Current Academic Personnel Policy on the Criteria for Advancement	4
Current Practices: Some Observations	7
The Contemporary Culture of Research Universities	10
Findings and Recommendations	12
Conclusion	14
Appendix 1 — Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual Section 210-1-d	15
Appendix 2 — Proposed Revisions to Academic Salary Scales Notes	19

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE

THE CHARGE

To review current academic personnel policy on the criteria for advancement and to review current practice in the implementation of this policy to determine if the reward structure in the professorial series is consistent with the mission of the University.

PROLOGUE

The distinctive mission of the University is to serve society as a center of higher learning, providing long-term societal benefits through transmitting advanced knowledge, discovering new knowledge, and functioning as an active, working repository of organized knowledge. That obligation, more specifically, includes undergraduate education, graduate and professional education, research, and other kinds of public service, which are shaped and bounded by the central and pervasive mission of discovering and advancing knowledge.¹

The University of California's tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service is reflected in the quality and scope of its faculty's work and in the alumni's contributions to society. In turn, the University's success in accomplishing its mission depends on the selection and advancement of its faculty. The criteria for appointment and promotion of faculty are critically important to ensure the continuing vitality of the University.

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

Our report begins with a brief review of the roles of American universities and of the University of California. An understanding of these roles is essential for the definition of the "proper work of faculty members" (Academic Personnel Manual (APM), Section 210-1-d) and for measuring faculty performance.

Present concerns need to be placed in their historical context. This University enjoys substantial constitutional autonomy; yet economic, social, and political forces have influenced the interpretation of both the University's mission and the faculty's role in its accomplishment. These external forces and their impact on the work of faculty must be recognized. We urge that the faculty renew its commitment to the institution. We call for reaffirmation of the institution's commitment to matters of important public moment, and for acknowledgement and reward for exceptional faculty involvement in such endeavor in greater and more explicit measure than in the recent past.

This report examines current criteria by which performance is measured and reviews how they are interpreted and implemented in individual faculty personnel actions. However, our findings and recommendations are concerned less with the criteria than with flexibility in their interpretation and application. We conclude that it is both necessary and desirable to be more flexible in interpreting and applying the criteria, both in a single review period and over an entire career path.

¹University of California Academic Plan 1974-78

Findings and recommendations are presented in full at the end of the report and may be summarized as follows:

1. Changes in emphases and interests which occur during an academic career are both inevitable and desirable. It is appropriate at all levels of review to exercise flexibility now authorized by University policy in evaluating faculty performance.
2. Review of faculty teaching and evidence collected to document teaching performance should be broadened. Peer evaluation of teaching should be given the same emphasis now given to peer evaluation of research.
3. The importance of applied research in the mission of the University should be recognized by encouraging and rewarding for meritorious achievement all faculty who are so engaged, not just those in professional schools.
4. Research thrusts should be encouraged into new and emerging disciplines and fields of inquiry, particularly those appearing at the interface of established disciplines.
5. Implementation of diversity- and equity- oriented goals of the University is a shared responsibility among all faculty, and faculty should be encouraged to pursue these activities and be rewarded for meritorious achievement wherever engaged in the "proper work of faculty members."
6. A review occurring at about the twelfth year of service at the full professor rank should replace the current special Step VI review for Professors. Special criteria now in place for advancement to Step VI should be removed.
7. Tenured faculty should be permitted, from time to time and with prior campus approval, to emphasize particular areas of professional endeavor consistent with the broad mission of the University and be rewarded for meritorious achievement in these endeavors.
8. Self-assessment of faculty members' performance in all four areas of activity should be included in each review file.

AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

In his recent report, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*², Ernest L. Boyer makes the observation:

Today, on campuses across the nation, there is a recognition that the faculty reward system does not match the full range of academic functions and that professors are often caught between competing obligations . . .

It is this issue — what it means to be a scholar — that is the central theme of our report . . .

²Boyer, Ernest L., *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, (Lawrenceville, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1991). This is a searching and provocative study which we commend to the attention of our colleagues.

How can the work of the nation's colleges and universities become more intellectually coherent?
Is it possible for scholarship to be defined in ways that give more recognition to interpretive and integrative work?

These quotations paraphrase the charge to our Task Force. We endeavor to respond for the University of California.

The evolution of American colleges and universities has reflected important societal needs at critical times. Early colonial colleges focused on the intellectual and moral development of a (male) student body, which would in turn contribute to the public good. In 1869, the mission statement and concomitant work of the faculty were reflected in the words of Charles W. Elliot, the newly appointed President of Harvard College, when he declared that "the prime business of American professors . . . must be regular and assiduous class teaching."

The Morrill Act of 1862 and the Hatch Act of 1887 provided unprecedented opportunities for states to develop a new kind of public institution that would support education in the liberal arts as well as in the mechanical arts and agriculture. Productive service was added to the obligations of public and private universities and their faculties.

The University of California was chartered in this environment. The original academic organization of the University attests to the significance of service to society: The founding colleges were Letters, Chemistry, Agriculture, Civil Engineering, Mechanic Arts, and Mining. In addition to teaching and research, applied research and service were embodied in the mission and the faculty's work.

The historic vision of the University of California, as advanced by President Daniel Coit Gilman in his inaugural address of 1872, is especially significant:

. . . this is "The University of California" . . . the University of this State. It must be adapted to this people . . . to their peculiar geographical position. It is not the foundation . . . of private individuals. It is "of the people and for the people" . . . in the highest and noblest relations to their intellectual and moral well-being . . . It opens the door of superior education TO ALL . . .

President Gilman framed the unchanging principle that shapes our commitment to academic excellence.

A dramatic change in the mission of American universities occurred during WWII as a result of the federal government's turn to academia as partner in pursuit of the war effort. Following that war, the National Science Foundation was established, and federal agencies expanded support for research and graduate study. These two developments set the stage for the strengthening of discipline-based departments and for a concomitant shift of allegiance toward discipline and department and away from school and institution. Emphasis was placed increasingly upon pure research unencumbered by social determination or utility. At the same time, the question of access to higher education was being redefined, and institutions were being moved from an "elitist" to a "universal access" system of higher education. The California Master Plan for Higher Education emerged in a milieu in which these parallel forces operated. The civil rights movement and consequent legislation added affirmative action and commitment to diversity to the mission of universities and the work of faculty.

As the twenty-first century approaches, the University of California has an opportunity and the obligation to take the lead in examining its mission, in ensuring that faculty are encouraged to support the full-breadth of the mission and are properly rewarded for doing so.

CURRENT ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY ON THE CRITERIA FOR ADVANCEMENT

The Academic Personnel Manual of the University sets forth in Section 210, *Appointment and Promotion, Review and Appraisal Committees*, instructions to review committees which advise on actions concerning appointees in the Professor and corresponding series. The crucial sentence in Section 210-1-d states:

The review committee shall judge the candidate with respect to the proposed rank and duties, considering the record of the candidate's performance in (1) teaching, (2) research and other creative work, (3) professional activity, and (4) University and public service.

The University's four determinants may be compared with the terminology suggested by Boyer, who poses and answers the following question:

Is it possible to define the work of faculty in ways that reflect more realistically the full range of academic and civic mandates?

His response is that the work of the professoriate might be conceived as having four separate, yet overlapping functions. These are *the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching.*

In daily discourse, the term "scholarship of discovery" is typically equated to "research." The search for new knowledge will unquestionably continue to be at the core of the University's mission. Yet, Boyer contends:

There is need for scholars to work at making connections across the disciplines, placing specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way, often educating nonspecialists, too.

This, he calls "scholarship of integration."

"Scholarship of application" is embodied in the work of faculty members that flows directly from their professional knowledge. It may be, but is not limited to, the innovative practice of a profession; it may be the application of knowledge to a consequential social problem. In every instance, the same measures of rigor and accountability, as applied to the scholarship of discovery, are required.

The "scholarship of teaching" moves well beyond the commonly accepted notion of the teacher as a classroom performer, or as a tutor of a single individual, for the mere transmission of knowledge. Teaching incorporates these activities but is concerned more broadly with the synthesis and extension of knowledge, i.e., the transformation of knowledge. It is self-evident that much of what constitutes the scholarship of teaching goes on outside the classroom or student-faculty conference.

The University's four criteria³ closely parallel these four categories. However, this agreement in substance masks an underlying concern among faculty that is evident from the 1989 Faculty Survey,⁴ in which 69 percent of faculty respondents at research universities agreed with the statement, "At my institution we need better ways, besides publications, to evaluate the scholarly performance of the faculty." Furthermore, the survey calls attention to disturbing age-related concerns: 53 percent of those under 40 years of age reported that, ". . . my job is the source of considerable personal strain . . .," 53 percent agreed that they hardly ever have time to give a piece of work the attention it deserves, and finally, 43 percent of those under 40 agreed that, "The pressure to publish reduces the quality of teaching at my university."

Although we do not have exactly comparable data for the University of California, anecdotal commentary indicates similar concerns among our faculty, as are reflected at research universities in general. In addition, data gathered by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA for 900 faculty at five UC campuses show that although 38 percent feel that research interferes with teaching, 92 percent feel that research is a very high priority. Further, 97 percent rate being a teacher as very important, but only 7 percent stated that UC faculty are rewarded for good teaching.

Further information describing the evolution of the understanding and interpretation of the criteria can be found in the following comparison appearing in the *Instructions to Review Committees* as published in the *Faculty Handbook* between 1958 and 1970. The 1958 statement actually dates from a July 1, 1953, revision; the 1970 version is still current. Accordingly, nearly four decades of evolution of the criteria can be examined.

1958 — In evaluating the candidate's qualifications within these areas⁵, the review committee will exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing, where the case requires, excellence in one area against less distinguished achievement in another.

Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced in teaching and by scholarship, creative ability, or comparable achievement, is, however, an indispensable qualification.

1968 — In evaluating the candidate's qualifications within these areas, the review committee shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing, where the case requires, heavier workload in one area against lighter workload in another. However, superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions since the professorship embodies the teaching-research function of the University.

³As described in APM 210-1-d(1-4)

⁴Boyer, Ernest L., *The Condition of the Professoriate: Attitudes and Trends, 1989* (Lawrenceville, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989).

⁵In the later editions of the *Faculty Handbook*, "within these areas" refers to teaching, research and creative work, professional activity and University and public service. These categories have not changed during the period under review.

1970 — In evaluating the candidate's qualifications within these areas, the review committee shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. The committee must judge whether the candidate is engaging in a program of work that is both sound and productive. As the University enters new fields of endeavor and refocuses its ongoing activities, cases will arise in which the proper work of faculty members departs markedly from established academic patterns. In such cases, the review committees must take exceptional care to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. However, flexibility does not entail a relaxation of high standards. Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions. Insistence upon this standard for holders of the professorship is necessary for maintenance of the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

This review of the wording of the performance criteria suggests several important conclusions. First, the four fundamental criteria have remained unchanged since 1953. These are teaching, research and creative work, professional activity, and University and public service. Likewise, insistence upon superior intellectual attainment has remained the definitive meaning of meritorious service and achievement. What has changed over time is the prescription as to how such attainment is to be evidenced. Note the following:

1958 — “as evidenced in teaching, and by scholarship, creative ability, or comparable achievement”

1968 — “as evidenced both in teaching and in research or creative achievement”

1970 — same as 1968

Note especially that the term “research” does not appear in the 1958 statement on how attainment is to be evidenced, although it is explicit as a category of performance in the paragraphs that follow that statement.

A second significant change has to do with flexibility in interpreting the criteria in individual cases. Note the shift in emphasis implicit in its change in wording from 1958 to 1970:

1958 — “the review committee will exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing where the case requires, excellence in one area against less distinguished achievement in another”

1968 — “heavier workload in one area against lighter workload in another”

1970 — “heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another”

Finally, the 1970 statement (which is the current APM statement) for the first time adds the instruction:

As the University enters new fields of endeavor and refocuses its ongoing activities, cases will arise in which the proper work of faculty members departs markedly from established academic

patterns. In such cases the review committees must take exceptional care to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. However, flexibility does not entail a relaxation of high standards.

CURRENT PRACTICES: SOME OBSERVATIONS

The operative sentence in APM Section 210-1-d reads:

Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions.

There is no issue concerning the indispensability of superior intellectual attainment in the work of faculty, nor does flexibility, as mandated in the 1970 statement above, entail a relaxation of high standards. At the heart of faculty (and Task Force) concern is the question of in which four areas of faculty performance such attainment is to be evidenced and how the appropriate balance among them is to be assessed. These are precisely the two issues in the *Instructions to Review Committees* in which changes have occurred. Current policy states explicitly that there must be evidence of superior attainment “both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement,” i.e., the measure of performance is to embrace the complete spectrum of faculty work — teaching as well as the discovery, integration and application of knowledge. Indeed, University policy places special emphasis on teaching by insisting that intellectual attainment be evidenced in teaching performance, along with attainment in “research or other creative achievement.”

Two observations must be made here. First, although the APM emphasizes the need for a range of evidence to establish superior intellectual attainment in teaching, the fact is that assessment of data and documentation of such attainment places a major burden on departmental colleagues, a burden that is all too often not assumed. As a consequence, student evaluations, which are required, have become the primary and often only indicator of teaching performance. Nevertheless, self-assessment, student evaluation, and careful peer evaluation of teaching, as now mandated in APM 210-1-d(1), are essential to give appropriate weight to teaching performance. We must, we believe, give equivalent emphasis to peer evaluation of teaching as we give to peer evaluation of research.

The University’s ability to encourage and reward effective teaching requires the development of efforts both to assess the strength of each faculty member’s teaching and to encourage programs at the departmental level and elsewhere that focus faculty on teaching and underscore its importance in the University. These efforts must be conducted in a supportive, collegial atmosphere where the purposes are (1) to help faculty achieve a high level of accomplishment in their teaching and (2) to ensure that faculty who have demonstrated effective teaching are rewarded.

Over the period under review, we believe that there has also been a narrowing of the interpretation of “superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced . . . in research or other creative achievement.” The work of the faculty will, and indeed must, continue to emphasize the scholarship of discovery. However, the mission of the University requires that the faculty also embrace the scholarship of integration and application of knowledge. Current policy does in fact encompass the broad definition of scholarship. Thus, the APM currently devotes Section 210-1-d(2) to *Research and Creative Work*, stressing appropriate understanding of “intellectual attainment” in professional fields and in the arts, the expression of which is quite different from traditional concepts of the scholarship of discovery. Concern for recognition of the distinctive qualities of various fields in the evaluation process is set forth in APM 210-1-d(3), which reads:

In certain positions in the professional schools and colleges, such as architecture, business administration, dentistry, engineering, law, medicine, etc., a demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to the field and its characteristic activities should be recognized as a criterion for appointment or promotion. The candidate's professional activities should be scrutinized for evidence of achievement and leadership in the field and of demonstrated progressiveness in the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems. It is the responsibility of the department chairperson to provide evidence that the position in question is of the type described above and that the candidate is qualified to fill it.

This principle must be extended to practice. We strongly support the principle and urge its application to other academic disciplines where "applied research" and "other creative achievement" frequently have not enjoyed the standing they deserve. In short, we urge that the phrase "or other creative achievement" be taken with the utmost seriousness and be given the emphasis that the broad mission of the University requires.

To give the point added emphasis, it should be better understood that the practice professions are explicitly purposive and are responsible for prescribing actions aimed at desired future outcomes. In these respects, they differ from the sciences and from the classical fields of scholarship, both of which stress the inherent value of ideas and knowledge, learning and understanding. The practice professions, in contrast, are by nature interventionist; knowledge for them holds instrumental value. Most significant, the professions are devoted to altering, in addition to understanding, the world, whether in the design of our built environment or in the design and effectuation of policies devoted to enhancing public benefit. If reviewers assess work in the practice professions against criteria more appropriate to work in the classical arts and science disciplines, then candidates for appointment or promotion may be unfairly judged for their seeming failure to demonstrate superior intellectual attainment.

Thus far, our concern has been the need for flexibility in applying performance criteria over the four areas of faculty endeavor. There is a second kind of flexibility which needs attention. We have in mind accommodating the fact that the career paths of individual faculty can change with time and differ one from another. The emphasis given to the various areas of faculty responsibility probably should change with time if the talents and energy of faculty are to be realized to the fullest and if the comprehensive mission of the University is to be achieved. Diversity, not uniformity, is the key to realization of faculty potential. Once again we find that University policy enables, yet practice does not encourage, the kind of flexibility in career paths that is called for to achieve this objective.

The needs of society and the University make it both necessary and desirable to encourage established scholars (those who have already demonstrated the capacity for superior intellectual attainment in teaching and in research or other creative achievement) to undertake scholarly activities that more broadly support the University's mission than does the exclusive focus on scholarship of discovery (research). Examples include (but are not limited to):

- designing and leading major curricular innovation projects, both in the University and in the K-14 school systems;
- taking a leadership role in activities that develop human resources, such as mentorship programs for graduate students, junior faculty, and underrepresented minorities;

- making significant contributions to the achievement of the University's affirmative action, equity, and diversity goals;
- applying scholarship to work with governmental agencies, educational institutions, and public service organizations involved in addressing critical societal issues; and,
- serving as an officer in a public agency that enhances the quality of the social product.

Such activities are not permanent substitutes for scholarship of discovery, nor are they suited to all faculty. But, if one accepts the importance of engagement by established scholars in activities vital to the University's mission and to society, beyond what is normally associated with teaching and research, then the reward system must be sufficiently flexible to award proper recognition for these activities. This flexibility is recognized in the APM in the statement:

As the University enters new fields of endeavor and refocuses its ongoing activities, cases will arise in which the proper work of faculty members departs markedly from established academic patterns. In such cases the review committees must take exceptional care to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility.

We cannot overemphasize the importance of maintaining this point of view throughout the entire review process — beginning at the department and college or school level, moving through the *ad hoc* review committee to the Committee on Academic Personnel, and ending with the administration.

Explicit recognition of the kind of temporary substitution of activities called for above appears in the APM in connection with service as department chair (Section 245-11, *Criteria for Evaluating Leadership and Service in the Academic Personnel Process*):

Academic leadership is, in itself, a significant academic activity. Therefore, distinguished leadership and effective discharge of administrative duties by a department chairperson shall be considered appropriate criteria in evaluating the performance of a department chairperson for a merit increase, accelerated increase, or promotion. It is expected that a department chairperson will remain active in both teaching and research in order to maintain his or her capabilities in the appropriate field of scholarship. However, a chairperson who discharges his or her duties as a chairperson effectively may have reduced time for teaching and research. Reduced activity in these areas that results from active service as a department chairperson should be recognized as a shift in the type of academic activity pursued by the department chairperson rather than a shift away from academic pursuits altogether. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate to award a merit increase, or, if performance warrants it, an accelerated increase, primarily for demonstrated excellence in service in the chair appointment when accompanied by evidence of continued productive involvement in scholarly activities.

This statement is an example of how the review process is designed to recognize a vitally important role that faculty play in the University in the fulfillment of its mission in society. We, therefore, strongly urge more explicit recognition in the APM of other variations in the career paths of established scholars important to the University.

In this connection, we urge a change in current policy governing advancement to Step VI of the professorship. The two detailed reviews conducted at the times of advancement to the associate professorship and to the full professorship provide firm evidence of the candidate's qualifications for

membership on the University's faculty. Additional detailed review at Step VI seems unnecessary — and unwarranted — when the associated special criteria inhibit recognition of alternative career paths. Step-wise advancement within the professor rank should follow only upon demonstration of continued meritorious service, and it should be sufficient to conduct a mid-rank career verification as the alternative to a full-scale review at Step VI. Accordingly, we propose that, at about the twelfth year in the professor rank, the normal review for a merit increase devote special attention to the professor's progress, supplemented by appraisals from external reviewers.

Advancement beyond Step VIII must be reserved only for those whose scholarship and teaching is of "the highest distinction and whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed." Consideration for above-scale rank calls for the most rigorous and detailed appraisal, and therefore, requires continuation of the present review procedures.

THE CONTEMPORARY CULTURE OF RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES

Our report would be incomplete without comment on factors responsible for influencing the way in which faculty members allocate their time among the various areas of scholarly activity.

Foremost in the minds of faculty (beyond that which is self-imposed) is the pressure to be a productive scholar in the sense of discoverer and reporter of new knowledge — that pressure which is captured in the popular expression "publish or perish." Sources of this pressure are funding agencies, publishers of journals, universities themselves, and faculty qua faculty. A vicious circle arises. Funding agencies, operating with limited resources, offer the carrot of funding on a competitive basis. Faculty respondents build their cases for funds before their peers, who make value judgments largely based upon evidence of intellectual capacity reflected in published papers. Publishers, motivated by economics and prestige, have proliferated the number of journals, which in turn require new manuscripts. Research universities and — in increasing numbers — institutions wishing to become research universities frequently expect or require their faculty members to offset their academic year salary in part from extramural sources. Buying off teaching obligations with research dollars is an increasingly pervasive practice in many institutions.

Faculty caught up in this system have generally gone along with it. They have contributed to the exaggerated credit assigned to the scholarship of discovery at the expense of the scholarship of integration, application, and teaching — little of which carries the financial consequence or peer recognition of sponsored research

Nor does this narrowing of focus of faculty activity affect only the conduct of research. As already noted, a direct concomitant has been the shift in faculty allegiance toward geographically dispersed, discipline-defined peers and away from college or school and home institution. This phenomenon was quantified in the 1989 Faculty Survey in which 75 percent of the faculty at research institutions rated the sense of community at their institutions as fair or poor. Disciplinary power has diminished commitment to the University, as researchers look horizontally for recognition, impact, and stimulation. In turn, universities have contributed to the process by emphasizing peer evaluation and departmental rankings at a time when increasing specialization prevails.

Achievement has been rewarded for those whose research performance before national and international audiences has been judged exemplary. Institutional reward has increased in the recent past as a consequence of extra-institutional contribution, engagement, and recognition. At the same time,

contributions to more immediate institutional concerns — whether to teaching in its various forms, attending to institutional development, or applying knowledge with salutary social effect — have received less acknowledgement and reward. It is our judgement that the University must reaffirm its claim to faculty obligation in teaching, institutional engagement, and commitment to other matters of important institutional need. Further, we contend that the University should reward meritorious achievement in these endeavors essential to the attainment of its mission.

The consequences of narrowing the focus of scholarly activity on the scholarship of discovery at the expense of teaching, integration, and application of knowledge are twofold: The broad mission of the University is unevenly supported by its faculty while, at the same time, the evolution of the career paths of individual faculty is likely to be impaired. The evidence for this is strong, particularly among junior faculty who find insufficient time and little encouragement to engage fully in the scholarship of teaching and in University and public service. Habits gained at the beginning of a faculty career are not easily changed — witness the relatively low level of the senior faculty's participation in shared governance at the level of the college, school, or campus. Finally, if the scholarship of teaching is to be restored to its proper place, it follows directly that peer evaluation of teaching must be pursued with the same level of enthusiasm and dedication now afforded peer evaluation of research.

Ironically, it seems clear that many members of the faculty have been attracted to an academic career by an interest in teaching.

Furthermore, there persists a widespread belief that, unlike published research, superior intellectual attainment evidenced in teaching is difficult to document. It is the view of the Task Force that present emphasis on scholarship of discovery (research) and failure to give sufficient weight to “other creative achievement” makes this belief a self-fulfilling prophecy. Proper recognition of teaching at all levels and under all forms, including mentoring of students and junior colleagues, requires a conscious change in the culture, reinforced by the faculty reward system. Current practices in the University vary widely among departments and campuses. Documentation of superior intellectual attainment in teaching is time-consuming, requiring self-assessment, peer-assessment, and assessment by students. We recognize the need to improve assessment of performance in the realm of teaching and call for the faculty to engage itself with this issue. We are aware of proposals for strengthening the reward structure for superior performance in teaching and scholarly service that are currently under discussion on several campuses of the University. Every encouragement should be given to such initiatives designed to foster the requisite flexibility.

Powerful arguments support the status quo in both the content and the implementation of the current criteria by which appointment and promotion decisions for faculty are being made. Superior intellectual attainment in teaching and research has constituted the basis for measuring faculty performance for at least the last four decades. Insistence on clear evidence of superior intellectual attainment has indeed served the University well in many, but not all, respects.

Yet, we are obliged to conclude that there is an urgent need to engage the faculty and the administration in a reaffirmation of the validity of the criteria and, more critically, to join in making a fresh commitment to a balanced weighting of their relative importance in the overall assessment of faculty performance. The consequences of such action are far from trivial. The faculty of the University will have to demonstrate a renewed commitment of time and effort to the principles of shared governance and a corresponding exercise of academic citizenship that is not now evident in the daily life of the campuses of our University. While the price may be considered too high by some, the consequence of not acting at this time is to jeopardize the University's ability to sustain its mission.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We have found the statement of the criteria for evaluating faculty performance to be consistent with the mission of the University. However, current implementation practices on the campuses provide neither sufficient encouragement nor reward for faculty to support fully the broad range of activities called for to fulfill the University's mission.

We have, therefore, proposed changes in the Academic Personnel Manual and in the Salary Scale Notes to encourage flexibility in the application of the criteria. These recommendations are found in the Appendices. We cannot overemphasize and we insist on the importance of implementing the flexibility which is written into University policy. This flexibility needs to be manifested throughout the entire review process — beginning at the department and college or school level, moving through the *ad hoc* review committee to the Committee on Academic Personnel, and ending with the administration. In this connection, we urge that explicit recognition be given to the applicability of the *Instructions to Review Committees, Professor Series* to all participants in the review process at every level of review.

1. During the past four decades, a shift has occurred away from assessment of intellectual attainment broadly across the four categories of performance, focusing instead on and emphasizing attainment in research defined narrowly as the scholarship of discovery. This finding is supported both by the occurrence of subtle changes in language in the instructions to review committees and by a substantial body of anecdotal evidence of current practice.

Changes to APM 210-1 (as proposed in Appendix 1) are recommended so as to emphasize that, "Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions."

In particular, we recommend that this APM section add emphasis to the instructions that, "Consideration must be given, however, to changes in emphasis and interest that will naturally occur in an academic career." To underscore this concern, we further recommend deletion of the modifier "reasonable" in describing the flexibility which review committees should use in "balancing heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another."

Finally, we recommend that self-assessment of performance in all four areas of activity be included by faculty in each review file.

2. While teaching has remained prominent in the formal statement of the criteria, the proper evaluation of and reward for superior intellectual attainment in the realm of teaching, as broadly described in the APM, have been slighted. Documentation and evaluation of meritorious achievement in teaching requires a level of faculty effort well beyond current practice. We urge that peer evaluation of teaching be given the same emphasis now given to peer evaluation of research.

We recommend, therefore, that APM 210-1-d(1) on teaching be amended to require that evidence of teaching effectiveness, in addition to assessment provided by students, be included in all review files. In addition, we recommend that commentary by other faculty

on teaching effectiveness be accepted as one example of appropriate evidence of teaching effectiveness which may be presented for any review, not only for reviews involving promotions.

3. Applied research is a vital aspect of the mission of the University. Faculty whose scholarship focuses on applications of knowledge should be encouraged and rewarded for meritorious achievement. We recommend the current APM language in APM 210-1-d(2) read: "Textbooks, reports, circulars, and similar publications are normally considered evidence of teaching ability or public service. However, contributions by faculty to the professional literature, the advancement of professional practice or of professional education, should be judged creative work when they present new ideas or incorporate scholarly research." The current interpretation of this language tends to discount the scholarship of publications that are expository or applied.
4. Current practice does not encourage, properly accommodate, nor reward established scholars in the University whose careers manifest shifts in emphasis among research, teaching, professional activities, and service. Nor does it encourage exploration into new and emerging disciplines and fields of inquiry. We recommend, therefore, appropriate additions to the criteria on research, APM 210-1-d(2), which address these concerns.
5. The development of human resources through personal mentoring and active involvement in affirmative action and other equity-and diversity-oriented pursuits is integral to the life and purpose of the University. As President Gilman stated in 1872, ". . . this is the University of California . . . the University of this state It opens the door of superior education TO ALL" At no time has this been more important than at present. As the population of the state becomes more diverse, the populations of students and faculty must also become more diverse. Implementation of these and other diversity goals is a shared responsibility among all faculty, and faculty should be encouraged to pursue these activities and be rewarded for meritorious achievement in the areas of equity and diversity wherever engaged in carrying out the "proper work of faculty members."

We recommend, therefore, an addition to the introduction of APM 210-1-d as follows: "Teaching and mentoring of students or new faculty, particularly those of underrepresented groups entering the University community, are to be encouraged and given recognition in academic personnel actions. Such teaching and mentoring are applicable in each area of faculty performance. This is a shared responsibility of all faculty."

6. We find that the existing special criteria for the Step VI review in the Professor rank, which appear in the Academic Salary Scale Notes (see Appendix 2), function as hurdles that unnecessarily inhibit the recognition of alternative career paths and changing responsibilities. Therefore, we recommend that the special criteria associated with Step VI be eliminated and replaced by the criteria described in APM 210-1-d which would then apply to all appointments and promotions up to the above-scale salary level.

However, we recommend that the concept of a review at the midpoint of the professor rank be retained. Such a review, which would include external evaluation, should occur at or near the twelfth year following promotion to full professor and would coincide with a merit review. The appointment of an *ad hoc* committee may be requested by either the

Committee on Academic Personnel or the Chancellor. The twelve-year review may be omitted for professors who have already been advanced to Step VI or beyond. Faculty currently at Step V who are at or past their twelfth year as a full professor should also be subject to this review before advancement to Step VI. The purpose of the review would be to provide a career appraisal as opposed to the conditions for continued advancement that presently apply.

7. Given the shifts of emphases and interests in the careers of faculty and given the broad range of institutional needs, we strongly recommend that each campus institute the following option in the academic review process.

Upon formal prior agreement with the department chair, the appropriate departmental peer review agency, and the dean, and for up to two merit review cycles, tenured faculty may emphasize particular areas of professional endeavor and will be judged for advancement based on those activities according to applicable standards of meritorious achievement. Such agreements should reflect faculty interest but must also reflect institutional need. This concentration of commitment could, among other things, include a greater than normal commitment to teaching. However, some activities would be expected to continue in each of the customary areas of evaluation — teaching, research and other creative work, professional activity, and university and public service.

8. The Task Force fervently urges those responsible for the academic personnel process at each of our campuses to contemplate additional ways that the principles set forth in our report may be enhanced in the varied circumstances that prevail.

CONCLUSION

In the final analysis, success in achieving the mission of the University rests squarely upon the faculty. It is we whose evaluations and judgments of the work of our colleagues set the milieu for the academic life of our University. We have deep responsibility for setting both the terms for what is understood and accepted as the “proper work of faculty members,” and for defining the measures of “superior intellectual attainment.” Administrative decision rests heavily on the quality, encompassment, and balance of our evaluations. To achieve the ends to which these means are directed demands from each and every member of the faculty the commitment of time and attention commensurate with the rights, privileges, and responsibilities afforded through membership in the Academic Senate of the University.

What was stated in the Prologue bears repeating here. The preeminent strategic factors in determining the success of the University in accomplishing its mission are the selection and advancement of the faculty. The shared governance structure of the University provides us both the opportunity and obligation to be engaged in this vital activity. Accordingly, we entreat our colleagues to join in the necessary individual and collegial actions that will ensure its success.

Finally, we request that the President, together with the Chair of the Assembly of the Academic Senate, accept this report and take the required steps to ensure widespread review, comment, and implementation.

APPENDIX 1

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO ACADEMIC PERSONNEL MANUAL SECTION 210-1-D

210-1 *Instructions to Review Committees, Professor Series*

d. *Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Appraisal*

The review committee shall judge the candidate with respect to the proposed rank and duties, considering the record of the candidate's performance in (1) teaching, (2) research and other creative work, (3) professional activity, and (4) University and public service. In evaluating the candidate's qualifications within these areas, the review committee shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. Teaching and mentoring of students or new faculty, particularly those of underrepresented groups entering the University community, are to be encouraged and given recognition in academic personnel actions. Such teaching and mentoring are applicable in each of the areas of a candidate's performance. This is a shared responsibility of all faculty. The review committee must judge whether the candidate is engaging in a program of work that is both sound and productive. As the University enters new fields of endeavor and refocuses its ongoing activities, cases will arise in which the proper work of faculty members departs markedly from established academic patterns. In such cases, the review committees must take exceptional care to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. However, flexibility does not entail a relaxation of high standards. *Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions.* Insistence upon this standard for holders of the professorship is necessary for maintenance of the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge. Consideration must be given, however, to changes in emphasis and interest that will naturally occur in an academic career.

The criteria set forth below are intended to serve as guides for minimum standards in judging the candidate, not to set boundaries to exclude other elements of performance that may be considered.

- (1) *Teaching* — Clearly demonstrated evidence of high quality in-teaching is an essential criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion. Under no circumstances will a tenure commitment be made unless there is clear documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role. In judging the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching, the committee should consider such points as the following: the candidate's command of the subject; continuous growth in the subject field; ability to organize material and to present it with force and logic; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; fostering of student independence and capability to reason; spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize the candidate's learning and teaching; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students, to encourage high standards, and to stimulate advanced students to creative work; personal attributes as they affect teaching and students; extent and skill of the candidate's participation in the general guidance, mentoring, and advising of students; effectiveness in creating an academic environment that is open and encouraging to all students. The committee should pay due attention to

the variety of demands placed on instructors by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels, and should judge the total performance of the candidate with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities. The committee should clearly indicate the sources of evidence on which its appraisal of teaching competence has been based. In those exceptional cases where no such evidence is available, the candidate's potentialities as a teacher may be indicated in closely analogous activities. In preparing its recommendation, the review committee should keep in mind that a summary of its report may be an important means of informing the candidate of the evaluation of his or her teaching and of the basis for that evaluation.

It is the responsibility of the department chairperson to submit meaningful statements, accompanied by evidence, of the candidate's teaching effectiveness at lower-division, upper-division, and graduate levels of instruction. Evidence of more than one kind must accompany each review file. Among significant types of evidence of teaching effectiveness are the following: (a) opinions of other faculty members knowledgeable in the candidate's field, particularly if based on class visitations, on attendance at public lectures or lectures before professional societies given by the candidate, or on the performance of students in courses taught by the candidate that are prerequisite to those of the informant; (b) opinions of students; (c) opinions of graduates who have achieved notable professional success since leaving the University; (d) number and caliber of students guided in research by the candidate and of those attracted to the campus by the candidate's repute as a teacher; and (e) development of new and effective techniques of instruction.

All cases for advancement and promotion normally will include: (a) evaluations and comments solicited from students for most, if not all, courses taught since the candidate's last review; (b) a quarter-by-quarter or semester-by-semester enumeration of the number and types of courses and tutorials taught since the candidate's last review; (c) their level; (d) their enrollments; (e) the percentage of students represented by student course evaluations for each course; (f) brief explanations for abnormal course loads; (g) identification of any new courses taught or of old courses when there was substantial reorganization of approach or content; (h) notice of any awards or formal mentions for distinguished teaching; (i) when the faculty member under review wishes, a self-evaluation of his or her teaching; and (j) ~~in the cases of promotions to Associate Professor and to Professor (but not in the case of normal merit increases);~~ commentary by other faculty on teaching effectiveness. When any of the information specified in this paragraph is not provided, the department chairperson will include an explanation for that omission in the candidate's dossier. If such information is not included with the letter of recommendation and its absence is not adequately accounted for, it is the review committee chairperson's responsibility to request it through the Chancellor.

- (2) *Research and Creative Work* — Evidence of a productive and creative mind should be sought in the candidate's published research or recognized artistic production in original architectural or engineering designs, or the like.

Publications in research and other creative accomplishment should be evaluated, not merely enumerated. There should be evidence that the candidate is continuously and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance. Work in progress should be assessed whenever possible. When published work in joint authorship (or other product of joint effort) is presented as evidence, it is the responsibility of the department

chairperson to establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in the joint effort. It should be recognized that special cases of collaboration occur in the performing arts and that the contribution of a particular collaborator may not be readily discernible by those viewing the finished work. When the candidate is such a collaborator, it is the responsibility of the department chairperson to make a separate evaluation of the candidate's contribution and to provide outside opinions based on observation of the work while in progress. Account should be taken of the type and quality of creative activity normally expected in the candidate's field. Appraisals of publications or other works in the scholarly and critical literature provide important testimony, and due consideration must be given to variations among fields and specialties in appropriate outlets for publication and presentation of scholarly and other creative contributions. Furthermore, new genres and fields of inquiry and creative endeavor also develop autonomously, and it is important that faculty enjoy freedom and support to pursue and explore new scholarly dimensions and frontiers. Contributions and achievement in such endeavors should be evaluated according to criteria appropriate to the genre and should encompass qualitatively new areas of inquiry and scholarship of application, as well as scholarship of discovery, that rest at the intersections of existing disciplines and areas of creative activity.

Textbooks, reports, circulars, and similar publications are normally considered evidence of teaching ability or public service, or. However, contributions by candidates in the professional school faculties—faculty to the professional literature, the advancement of professional practice or of professional education, should be judged creative work when they present new ideas or incorporate scholarly research.

In certain fields such as art, architecture, dance, music, literature, and drama, distinguished creation should receive consideration equivalent to that accorded to distinction attained in research. In evaluating artistic creativity, an attempt should be made to define the candidate's merit in the light of such criteria as originality, scope, richness, and depth of creative expression. It should be recognized that in music, drama, and dance, distinguished performance, including conducting and directing, is evidence of a candidate's creativity.

- (3) *Professional Competence and Activity* — In certain positions in the professional schools and colleges, such as architecture, business administration, dentistry, engineering, law, medicine, etc., a demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to the field and its characteristic activities should be recognized as a criterion for appointment or promotion. The candidate's professional activities should be scrutinized for evidence of achievement and leadership in the field and of demonstrated progressiveness in the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems. It is the responsibility of the department chairperson to provide evidence that the position in question is of the type described above and that the candidate is qualified to fill it.
- (4) *University and Public Service* — The faculty plays an important role in the administration of the University and in the formulation of its policies. Recognition should therefore be given to scholars who prove themselves to be able administrators and who participate effectively and imaginatively in faculty government and the formulation of departmental, college, and University policies. Services by members of the faculty to the community, state, and nation, both in their special capacities as scholars and in areas beyond those

special capacities when the work done is at a sufficiently high level and of sufficiently high quality, should likewise be recognized as evidence for promotion. Faculty service activities related to the improvement of elementary and secondary education represent one example of this kind of service. Similarly, contributions to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees and as advisers to student organizations should be recognized as evidence.

The Standing Orders of The Regents provide: "No political test shall ever be considered in the appointment and promotion of any faculty member or employee." This provision is pertinent to every stage in the process of considering appointments and promotions of the faculty.

APPENDIX 2

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO ACADEMIC SALARY SCALES NOTES

- D. ~~Professor: The normal period of service at step is three years in each of the first four steps. Service at Step V may be of indefinite duration. Advancement to Step VI usually will not occur after less than three years of service at Step V, and will be granted on evidence of great scholarly distinction and national or international recognition, highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellent University teaching. Service at Professor, Step VI, may be of indefinite duration. Advancement from Professor, Step VI to Step VII and from Step VII to Step VIII, usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the lower step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing great distinction, national or international recognition, highly meritorious service and excellent teaching performance.~~

Professor: The normal period of service at step is three years, however, service at any step may be of indefinite duration. Advancement from Professor, Step I through Professor, Step VIII usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the lower step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing demonstration of meritorious achievement and scholarly distinction.

A special review involving the Committee on Academic Personnel and the Chancellor shall be conducted at or near the twelfth year following promotion or appointment to the professor rank, to coincide with a merit review. The appointment of an ad hoc committee may be requested by either the Committee on Academic Personnel or the Chancellor. The special twelve-year review may be omitted for professors who have already advanced to Step VI or beyond.

Those Professors who are paid on the special Law School scale which has eight steps for the range are subject to the same criteria as Professors outlined above.

Advancement to an above-scale salary is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed and whose teaching performance is excellent. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at Step VIII. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step VIII is not a justification for further salary advancement.

There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step VIII was based. A further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an above-scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Continued good service is not an adequate justification. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinite, and only in the most superior cases where there is strong and compelling evidence will increase at intervals shorter than four years be approved.