May 31, 2017

Susan Cochran
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Systemwide Senate Review: Proposed Revisions to APM 285, 210-3, 133 and 740

Dear Professor Cochran,

Thank you for providing the Council on Research (COR) with an opportunity to comment on the Proposed Revisions to APM 285, 210-3, 133 and 740, concerning the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series. The Council discussed the proposed revisions at its meeting on May 31, 2017, and a summary of the discussion is provided below.

In the UC system teaching is a requirement for the appointment and promotion of professors; teaching is a prerequisite for professors in all academic series. By the creation of the term ‘Teaching Professor’ it may erroneously be implied that not all professors teach. Although there is the potential that the new series may be perceived as a valuable transition to current members of the LSOE series, it is possible that this is not the case for all its members. Specifically, COR members expressed concern that some members of the current series may not be able to meet the requirements of the new series. The introduction of the proposed series may also raise some questions about the overall commitment of UC to research performed by professors.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposed revisions to the series. If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me at havton@mednet.ucla.edu or via the Council’s analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeller@senate.ucla.edu or x62470.

Sincerely,

Leif Havton, Chair
Council on Research

cc: Leobardo Estrada, Past Chair, Academic Senate
    Elizabeth Feller, Analyst, Council on Research
    Sandra Graham, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
    Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Members of the Council on Research
May 24, 2017

Professor Susan Cochran
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity’s Response to Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised APM Section 285, Section 210-3, Section 133, and Section 740

The Systemwide Review of Proposed APM Section 285, Section 210-3, Section 133 and Section 740 was circulated and then reviewed at our May 1st meeting. CODEO members expressed the following opinions. Members agreed with the key revisions in APM and were pleased to see a clarification of the academic expectation section.

Members agree with the revisions in APM 210-3, however suggested adding the word “inclusion” after the word “diversity” to the last sentence of the last paragraph on page 16. Members recommend the sentence reads “Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunities, diversity, and inclusion should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements.” Members were also confused of the meaning of section f, on page 20 “Documentation of success as a positive role model or effective mentor for students at all levels, including those serving as teaching assistants; The sentence is ambiguous and should be deleted. Finally, members noted that the last sentence on page 25 should include the word “inclusion” as well. The sentence should read “…and contributions furthering diversity, equal opportunity and inclusion within the university…” CODEO thanks you for the opportunity to opine on these proposed revisions.

Sincerely,

Catia Sternini,
Chair, Committee on Diversity and Equality Opportunity

cc: Members of the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity
    Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate
    Annie Speights, Committee Analyst, Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity
May 08, 2017

Susan D. Cochran, Ph.D.
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
BOX 951408, Murphy Hall, 3125
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1408

RE: (Systemwide Senate Review) Proposed Revisions to APM - 285, 210-3, 133 and 740

Dear Professor Cochran,

In response to the request for system-wide review, The David Geffen School of Medicine Faculty Executive Committee (DGSOM FEC) voting members reviewed the proposed revisions to Lecturer with Security of Employment Series (APM - 285,) Instructions to Review Committees That Advise on Actions Concerning the Lecturer with Security of Employment Series (APM 210-3), Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles (APM 133) and the Leaves of Absence/Sabbatical Leaves (APM 740)

The Committee members expressed support for of all of these proposed revisions. The only comment we wish to make is that we notice this LSOE series is very similar to the Health Sciences Clinical series here in the School of Medicine. Based on our experience, there are issues to be concerned with including that this series would have no good grievance committee in place for them and that they would be subject to dismissal by department chairs.

I appreciate, on behalf of the Faculty Executive Committee of the David Geffen School of Medicine, to have the opportunity to review and discuss actions placed before the Academic Senate.

Respectfully,

Gary J. Schiller, M.D.
Chair of the Faculty, DGSOM Faculty Executive Committee (FEC)
Professor of Medicine
David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA

cc: Alon Avidan, MD, MPH, Vice Chair of the Faculty (DGSOM Faculty Executive Committee)
Jonathan S. Jahr, MD, Past Chair of the Faculty (DGSOM Faculty Executive Committee)
To: Susan Cochran, Chair, Academic Senate
Fr: Joseph Bristow, Chair, College Faculty Executive Committee
Date: May 25, 2017
Re: College FEC Response to Revisions to APM 285, 210-3, 133-0-B, and 740

The College FEC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Systemwide Review of the Academic Personnel Manual 285 (Lecturer with Security of Employment), 210-3 (Instructions to Review Committees), 133-0-B (Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles), and 740 (Leaves of Absence/Sabbatical Leaves). We reviewed the draft at our meeting on May 5, 2017. We were joined by Assistant Dean Lauren Na, who highlighted the key points of the document.

As you know, the College FEC has engaged in ongoing discussions on the merits of adding a working title “Professor of Teaching X” to the current Lecturer with Security of Employment (SOE) and Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment (PSOE) in the College. We have grappled with the issues of acknowledging the important work of our colleagues in these titles. While we appreciate the comprehensive review completed by the systemwide committee, there are a few areas that we hope can be clarified during this consultation process.

First, it was unclear what role research would play in the new Teaching Professor title. Previously, APM 285-20 (Conditions of Employment) noted: “Since appointment to a title in this series does not imply the responsibility of engaging in research, an appointee will be assigned a heavier instruction load...” We would like clarification on the role research would play for new hires in this title, since the expectation of research is not mentioned in APM 285. Perhaps it is worth including language in APM 210 that outlines that Professional and Scholarly Achievements and Activities members are expected to demonstrate.

Secondly, we were somewhat concerned about the language included in APM 285 (Criteria) where it now states: “Upon the recommendation of the department and consistent with campus academic review processes, the Chancellor may appoint an Associate Professor or Professor to the Associate Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor title. This change of series requires the written consent of the faculty.” We feel strongly that this should be changed to “the Chancellor may consider a transition in series of an appointee to the Associate Teaching Professor...” We have concerns that this will provide latitude for colleagues who are not active in research to be transferred into this new series. Furthermore, in addition to the consent of the faculty, this transition needs to undergo a formal approval process.

Additionally, in APM 285-80, if this series will follow the general pattern of the review process for members of the ladder-rank professorial series, there should be a mention of the mid-career evaluation for faculty in this new series. Also, it was unclear based on the cover memo how many years of service will be factored in transferring current Lecturer SOE/PSOE to the new title. For example, if there were any deferrals in a faculty member’s career, and years of service counts in the placement on the new salary scale, how will that time translate?
As always, our membership appreciates the consultative process and welcomes the opportunity to opine on important matters like this. You are welcome to contact me at jbristow@humnet.ucla.edu with questions. Mitsue Yokota, Academic Administrator, is also available to assist you and she can be reached at (310) 794-5665 or myokota@college.ucla.edu.

cc: Lucy Blackmar, Assistant Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education Initiatives  
    Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
    Lauren Na, Assistant Dean, Academic and Staff Personnel, UCLA College
May 26, 2017

TO: Susan Cochran, Chair, Academic Senate

FROM: Benjamin Williams,
Chair, HSSEAS Faculty Executive Committee

RE: Systemwide review of proposal to modify LSOE series to Teaching Professor series

The Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) of the Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science (HSSEAS) has discussed the package of proposals to modify the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series, including renaming to a “Teaching Professor” series. Discussion took place in FEC meetings on April 14 and May 12 2017. In the past, the HSSEAS FEC has written memos opposing similar proposals (memos dated February 18 2015, and February 20 2015) originating within UCLA. In the recent discussion, opinion within our FEC has evolved somewhat, and while some concerns remain, and opinion is mixed, we can offer cautious support for the proposal, provided that the concerns are addressed.

Points of support include:

• The LSOE series already exists with a variety of rights (academic senate membership, voting rights, etc.), and this proposal appears primarily to be a renaming.

• This proposal will elevate and distinguish LSOE with the title of “Teaching Professor”, which will be more widely understood outside the university, will give additional prestige to the involved faculty, and may allow recruitment of a higher level of candidate. It will help to distinguish between ad hoc Lecturers and the much qualitatively different series of LSOE/Teaching Professor. Indeed, our own discussion was initially muddied by extreme confusion between the difference between the Lecturer title and the LSOE series, and this proposal would help to distinguish this.

Specific concerns discussed include:

• One of the unique advantages of a research university is that the professors who teach the curriculum are also experts in their respective research fields. This benefits both the students by connecting them to the state-of-the-art, as well as the professors themselves. Establishing a new series of “Teaching Professors” wrongly gives the impression that our regular ladder faculty are not “teachers”. This is the wrong message to send – both internally to our own faculty who must balance research and teaching responsibilities – as well as to the outside world where we must fight the perceptions of public university faculty who do not perform enough teaching.

• The risk exists that “Teaching Professors” might be used as a lower cost alternative to hiring traditional Professor series, and thus displacing FTEs
from faculty engaged in research. We therefore support the use of a cap on
the number/fraction of Teaching Professor titles to prevent this from
occurring.
• Our own discussion was muddied by the extreme confusion between the
difference between the conventional  Lecturer” and LSOE. This included
concerns that ordinary Lecturers perhaps hired on an ad hoc basis would
“automatically” transition into “Teaching Professors” after some minimum
number of quarters. While the eventual reading of the proposal document by
the FEC appears to rule out this possibility, we wish to re-emphasize that
should there be no “back-door” path to a Teaching Professor title
automatically from the Lecturer series.
May 19, 2017

Susan D. Cochran, Ph.D.
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
Box 951408, 3125 Murphy Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1408

RE: Proposed revisions to APM concerning Lecturer with Security of Employment Series

Dear Professor Cochran,

On May 11, the Faculty Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Education & Information Studies discussed the proposed revisions to the APM related to the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series and the proposed Teaching Professor series. We appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on this proposal. There was a range of viewpoints expressed by FEC members, with support expressed for some aspects of the revisions, and questions and concerns expressed regarding others.

In support of the proposed revisions, some FEC members highlighted the importance of recognizing and valuing the multiple ways in which members of the academic community are contributing to the university’s mission. In particular, there was a sentiment that the proposed “Teaching Professor” is a more appropriate—and clearer—title than LSOE, and would be an important mechanism for recognizing faculty who are particularly strong in teaching and who may study teaching and pedagogy. The proposed revisions were also thought to both acknowledge and encourage the kind of teaching that is needed in undergraduate education, particularly at a time of growing enrollments.

However, some important concerns were raised by FEC members. One is a question about how faculty in these titles will be evaluated. There was a question about whether the criteria for Professional and Scholarly Achievement and Activity might be too restrictive, and whether the criteria even characterize the faculty who currently hold the LSOE title. There was also a concern that schools and departments might use this as a way of compensating for budget shortfalls in order to manage teaching demands, and thus raised questions about what the quotas might be. Given that UCLA currently has very few faculty in the LSOE series—and none in GSEIS—even a low quota (i.e., 5 or 10%) could result in an increase in the number of FTE allocated to this series. FEC members felt that the university should carefully consider the consequences to departments—and to individual faculty—of potentially greater usage of the renamed and revised LSOE series.
The GSEIS FEC appreciates the opportunity to weigh in on this matter.

Sincerely,

Linda J. Sax
Chair, GSEIS Faculty Executive Committee