November 10, 2015

To: Leo Estrada, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Council on Academic Personnel

RE: Proposed Teaching Professor working title

CAP received the request for comment on the Response to the Senate initial comment. Following committee review CAP has no further comment.

We thank you for the opportunity to opine.
Re: Committee on Teaching’s Response to College FEC Proposal to Establish a Teaching Professor Series

Dear Professor Estrada,

In response to your request for input, the Committee on Teaching discussed the College FEC Proposal to establish a teaching professor series at our meeting on November 4. The committee has the following thoughts on this subject:

Since the university budget is essentially a zero sum game, it seemed very unlikely to the committee that the appointment of “Professors of Teaching X" would not come at the expense of ladder faculty appointments. So the question is the following: Is the likely reduction in the number of ladder faculty FTE that this program would entail compensated for by the benefits of the teaching professor program? On the positive side, there might be value in having a cohort of faculty who were dedicated to the mission of enhancing pedagogy. Through collaboration with ladder faculty, this cohort could improve the quality of instruction at UCLA by speeding the adoption of state-of-the-art teaching practices in our classrooms. However, this would require a clear plan and support to facilitate the exchange of teaching practices among teaching and ladder faculty. On the negative side, establishing a group of professors who are focused only on teaching could detract from the advantages that students gain by obtaining their education at a research university such as UCLA. At such institutions, teaching and scholarship should be two sides of the same coin, with each enhancing the other. By divorcing these two activities, we risk reducing this synergy. In addition, by conferring the title of “Professor” on those who have not been selected on the basis of the highest scholarship, we risk degrading the value of that title.

The extent to which the above concerns are real could depend on how the program is implemented. Will the teaching professors be held to the highest standards of scholarship in education research? Will they be hired and promoted based on an outstanding track record in this kind of research in addition to their record of teaching and service? If so, then we have to think about mechanisms for evaluating the teaching professors, which are not well-articulated in the proposal, as very few college faculty have the expertise to
judge this kind of research. If not, then we might be better advised to devote available resources to growing our ladder faculty.

Sincerely Yours,

Albert J. Courey,
Chair, Committee on Teaching

cc: Members of the Committee on Teaching
   Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate
   Serge Chenkerian, MSO/Executive Assistant, Academic Senate
   Annie Speights, Committee Analyst, Committee on Teaching
The Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) of the Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science (HSSEAS) has discussed the proposal and response of the series “Professor of Teaching X”. In a memo dated February 18 2015, the HSSEAS FEC previously stated its objections for establishing such a new “Teaching Professor” series. Unfortunately, upon consideration of the response we still have significant concerns about this proposal, and do not support it.

Specific concerns remain:

- 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 doesn’t perform enough teaching.

- We previously raised the concern that the addition of ladder faculty who are not contributing to research may decrease our per-faculty research productivity which factors into various rankings. The response to this point was “As noted in the proposal, while Professors of Teaching X are not expected to engage in original research, they would not be discouraged from participating in creative endeavors that increase understanding, make qualitative improvements in the delivery of undergraduate education, or participate in research in their field of expertise, when applicable.” However, this response does not really address our core concerns of productivity, since the teaching loads of the Teaching Professors may be prohibitive, and running a successful and productive research program likely requires more than “not being discouraged”, but rather sufficient time, physical resources, student participation, etc..

- It was generally felt that the “Lecturer with Security of Employment” is the appropriate title for instructors solely focused upon teaching.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding this memo.
November 23, 2015

Leobardo Estrada
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Teaching Professor Series Proposal, Second Review

Dear Professor Estrada,

The Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) reviewed the proposal to establish a “Teaching Professor” for members of the Pre-Security Employment and Security Employment lecturer series at its meeting on November 2nd, 2015 and once again on November 16th, 2015. We were pleased to read the College FEC response to Senate Concerns dated October 23rd, 2015, which addressed some of the concerns expressed in our February 13th, 2015 letter. Nonetheless, during the discussion, several issues remained unanswered.

CPB opines that it would be helpful to learn more about how a similar program works at other universities such as UCSD.

Professorial Status Considerations

- CPB welcomes the idea of expanding the faculty roster in light of the increasing undergraduate student load, but CPB expresses concerns with respect to the extent to which “Teaching Professor” series will contribute to a two-tier, if not three-tier, faculty system that will disadvantage “regular faculty”, whose responsibilities include research and service as well as teaching. CPB members opined that our campus already has a two-tier system (“regular professor” & “clinical professor”), and that the creation of an additional hybrid professorial position might in fact deepen the divide among faculty (e.g., between lecturers and “regular professors”). CPB is concerned that the creation of a “Teaching Professor” series will inherently imply that Professor must be qualified as teachers or not teachers, and that this will signal, in a politically unhelpful way, that certain professors are primarily researchers, whereas others are teachers. From the perspective of budget and planning, CPB expressed concerns that this dichotomy could lead to undue pressure to increase the latter at the expense of the former.

- On the other hand, CPB does recognize the desirability of security of employment for lecturers, but also finds it disconcerting that this would come at the expense of having individuals with the professorial title, who had engaged in academic career preparation, would be steered away from research, which is one of the academic priorities of this university. CPB expressed concerns that the establishment of this new “Teaching Professor” series might appear to be a
way to accommodate faculty spouses, rather than being aimed principally at benefitting our students and our campus.

- CPB understands that the “teaching Professor” series might ultimately be particularly useful for language departments, where there is a chronic shortage of faculty especially in the less-commonly-taught languages. Nonetheless the convenience of this proposed series for a few departments is felt by CPB as another threat toward the establishment of an unwelcomed two-tier professorial system across the university.

Budget and Planning Considerations

- CPB opined that adopting the new series of “Teaching Professor” could reduce the already low intake of ladder faculty, thus placing further stress for departmental administration and university service on a decreasing pool of existing ladder faculty. As the FEC response notes, the College of Letters and Sciences is currently at 900. CPB is concerned that, if we assume that the number will remain at 900, we, as a campus, might increase the number of FTEs in the “Teaching Professor” series beyond 5% (45 faculty). It is not clear how this might affect the ability of this campus to grow beyond the 900 limit. The October 23rd, 2015 response fails to address this points satisfactorily, and simply states that “…[T]his proposed series is not meant in any way to replace the need for ladder faculty renewal.” While this may be the case, CPB reiterates its concern that the establishment of the proposed “Teaching Professor” series might (or will) hamper the campus ability to grow beyond the 900 threshold. CPB deplors that fact that the administration’s commitment to ensuring the necessary FTE needed to support our curricular needs and to improve our programs on the graduate as well as undergraduate levels remains unclear. CPB anticipates that it is possible, and even probable, that the proposed “Teaching Professor” series will blunt the the growth of our “Regular Professors”, whose research bring indispensable indirect funds to our campus. In brief, CPB is concerned that, while possibly beneficial in some respects, the proposed “Teaching Professor” in point of fact undermines the mission our faculty is expected to engage in, which includes the creation of new knowledge, in addition to teaching and university service.

- A related concern expressed by CPB centers on the issue that new “Teaching Professor” hires are likely to compete for individual departmental resources, in addition to reducing the number of per capita research grants coming to the department and the campus.

- With respect to planning, CPB also raised concern about the modes of evaluation for “Teaching Professors”, compared to “Regular Professors”. For the purpose of Merit and Promotion, faculty are evaluated on the basis of teaching, research, and service. The teaching component is quantified based on student evaluations and peer evaluations. It is not clear to CPB how the equivalent professorial series of Teaching Professors should be skewed, and evaluated solely, or mostly, on the basis of teaching. The argument that teaching excellence should be assessed among Teaching Professors on criteria that includes additional rubrics of evaluation for pedagogical effectiveness appears fallacious since these new rubrics of teaching would likely benefit current ladder faculty as well.
CPB members questioned what will happen to lecturers and lecturers with SOE, and whether there is in actuality a significant difference between the two positions. CPB felt that the arguments presented in the original proposal and in the October 23rd, 2015 were sufficiently detailed. In particular, CPB noted that individuals in the lecturer series, presumably unlike the “Teaching Professors”, presently are unionized. This, in and of itself, adds another layer of complexity, such as the extent to which the establishment of the proposed “Teaching Professor” might threaten to disenfranchise the union on campus.

- Directly related to the protection the union proffer lecturer, CPB expressed concern that, since the main focus of the new series is teaching, and the perceived benefit is focused on getting more teaching time out of this newly proposed faculty series, the potential is there loud and clear for abuse and overwork. The requirement to produce publications on pedagogical applied research, and putatively in curricular development and evaluation, both of course materials, and teaching quality of peers, while demanding a full teaching load from teaching professors adds to this problematic dimension.

Students Concerns

- The CPB student representative raised concern about how students would respond to the creation of a “Teaching Professor” series. The student perspective is that, on one hand it is exciting to create a series that is committed to teaching, but on the other hand, the question remains as to whether or not students might lose out on the opportunity to work with ladder faculty that have research and skills that students attend UCLA want to experience. In brief, student representatives expressed concern that the faculty recruited in the proposed “Teaching Professor” series might not provide them with the mentorship they expect and deserve from UCLA faculty.

In brief, CPB recognizes the merits of the proposed “Teaching Professor” series, but it is concerned that the zeal for teaching amongst the legislature might well transform our faculty into a non-support of research faculty. Therefore, CPB views the original proposal, and the October 23rd, 2015 as weak in a number of ways. It opines that the proposed “Teaching Professor” series, while beneficial to a few, will set into motion some actions and reactions about the structure of our faculty that could have negative long-term repercussions across the university. The proposed “Teaching Professor” series is not an appropriate response to the call of the legislature for increased quantity and quality of teaching by our faculty.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this proposal. If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me at fchiappelli@dentistry.ucla.edu or via the Council’s analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeller@senate.ucla.edu or x62470.

Sincerely,
Francesco Chiappelli, Chair
Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Susan Cochran, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
    Joel Aberbach, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate Office
    Elizabeth Feller, Committee Analyst, Council on Planning and Budget
    Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
November 19, 2015

Professor Leo Estrada  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

**re: Faculty Welfare Committee’s Response to College FEC Response to Academic Senate Concerns Regarding Proposal to Establish Working Title of “Teaching Professor”**

Dear Professor Estrada,

The Faculty Welfare Committee discussed the Response to Senate Concerns of the College FEC Proposal to establish a working title of “Teaching Professor” for members of the Pre-Security of Employment (PSOE) and Security of Employment (SOE) lecturer series at our November 17th meeting. Although many potential strengths of the proposed program were identified, the committee would like to highlight a few major concerns.

The Committee supports the “pilot program” outlined in the original College FEC proposal as long as the program’s success is reevaluated within a reasonable amount of time, preferably three years after the initial start of the program. As the program grows, we hope there will be particular attention paid to its impact on the allocation of regular faculty FTE, the integration of this new position in participating departments, the impact on other non-ladder faculty, and on the quality of undergraduate instruction in participating departments.

The original proposal envisioned that no more than 16 positions would be advertised in the first three years of the program. However, in the College’s Response, the total number of teaching faculty has increased to as many as 45 positions. We suggest that the number of new hires remain modest during the program’s initial phase, with the original 16 proposed positions. We ask that any planned expansion of the program be submitted to the Senate for review and only be undertaken after the initial pilot program has been thoroughly evaluated.

On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Welfare, I thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Response to Senate Concerns. Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of further assistance. I can be reached at 310-206-7290, or by email to msweeney@soc.ucla.edu. Our Committee Analyst, Annie Speights, is also available to assist. She can be reached at 310-825-3853 or by email to aspeights@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,
Megan Sweeney  
Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  

cc: Members of the Committee on Faculty Welfare
    Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate
    Serge Chenkerian, MSO/Executive Assistant, Academic Senate
    Annie Speights, Committee Analyst, Committee on Faculty Welfare
MEMO

November 23, 2015

TO: Leo Estrada, Chair, Academic Senate

FROM: Lily Chen-Hafteck, Chair, Faculty Executive Committee, School of the Arts and Architecture

RE: Response to the “Response to Senate Concerns” regarding College FEC Proposal to establish Teaching Professor X

The Faculty Executive Committee of the School of the Arts and Architecture (SOAA FEC) met on November 20, 2015 to discuss about the “Response to Senate Concerns” dated October 23, 2015. Members of the FEC have expressed a number of reservations.

Rodney McMillian, former Chair of SOAA FEC, sent a memo on February 16, 2015 to Joel Aberbach, former Chair of Academic Senate. In that document the key concerns were:

1. If the “Teaching Professor” is a new category, how will this impact budgetary issues in retention?
2. What would be the criteria of advancement for Teaching Professors?
3. The “Teacher Professors” are suggested in the proposal to be pedagogy experts, it seems more appropriate to use their expertise in guiding TA’s. What is the pedagogy mandate of “Teaching Professors”?
4. If a department’s FTE would be used for a “Teaching Professor”, what is the value if a ladder faculty line is given up? Unit 18 lecturers would provide more value.
5. With the established PSOE and SOE employment, how does “Teaching Professor” differ? Is it a new title?
6. If more teaching is needed at UCLA, is this the most appropriate method?

The discussion at the SOAA FEC meeting on November 20, 2015 raised several concerns. The primary concern is that the response does not address the points raised in the Rodney
McMillian memo. Further discussion of the issues raised in the proposal and the October 23, 2015 response are articulated below:

1. There are concerns about status issues, the lack of research, taking up FTE that could be used for a tenure-track position and what would be the benefit of having these Teaching Professors. If the school or the university gave the department extra FTE to hire a Professor of Teaching and would pay that in perpetuity, that might be worth consideration, but this is not the case in this situation.
2. Hiring these Teaching Professors to teach instead of Junior Faculty would compromise curricula since Junior Faculty are members of the research agenda of the home department.
3. The pedagogy of “Teaching Professors” is vague. Wouldn’t they be better suited in the School of Education. If pedagogy is their focus would they be up on current research in the field?
4. The “Teaching Professor” may be well-suited for larger departments with high enrollments. For the School of Arts and Architecture the small size classes with ladder faculty teaching is optimal. These Teaching Professor model does not seem to fit.
5. Faculty lines suited for teaching are better with term limits. Having recent graduates serve in a teaching capacity for 2-3 years is optimal.
6. Would the “Teaching Professors” be able to sit on doctoral committees? The status of these professors blurs lines of faculty and adjuncts.
7. The response does not address the need for “Teaching Professor”. Is it due to pay disparity for adjuncts?
8. Will there be a new committee formed to oversee “Teaching Professors”?
9. The three-year proposal of 16 new Teaching Professors is unclear. What would happen to them after the third year if this program did not work out?

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the proposal. Please do not hesitate to contact me at lhafteck@ucla.edu if you have any questions on this memo.
November 24, 2015

Leo Estrada, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: College Proposal to Establish Teaching Professor Title

Dear Leo,

At its meeting on November 13, 2015, the Graduate Council discussed the proposal from the College of Letters and Science to establish the academic personnel title of “Professor of Teaching X” at UCLA. The Graduate Council responded to the original proposal on February 17, 2015, noting its concerns about the proposal’s potential impact on faculty research and, by extension, on doctoral education programs. Many members suggested we limit the number of individuals appointed to the teaching professorship series that provides for security of employment. The November 13th discussion showed many of these concerns remained and the current Council’s overall response is split, albeit that a preponderance of unsupportive sentiments were expressed.

Most importantly, the council was concerned that: 1) the suggested proposal will not alleviate the creation of different tiers and second class citizenship; and 2) the number of Professor of Teaching positions requested has increased from 16 to 45 positions (with the potential to increase to higher numbers) since the proposal’s last vetting. This nearly three-fold increase in the proposed positions is significantly higher, especially in the face of earlier Senate committees’ responses expressing concern about the addition of the title to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) proposed in summer 2015.

Many members suggested the University has not demonstrated need adequately, since working titles for lecturer and adjunct faculty members appear sufficient. Health Science faculty members from the School of Medicine commented that teaching and clinical service series “Professor of Clinical X” (APM-275-8) and regularly appointed adjunct faculty play a critical role in departmental teaching missions. Other science and professional-studies (department) faculty members suggested we are challenged by programmatic accreditation requirements that a sufficient number of faculty members have both security of employment and meet externally set practice-based qualifications to teach in the curriculum. Some colleagues expressed that some departments undervalue the focus and talent of those focused on teaching and some are reluctant to convert full-time equivalent positions to non-research positions that commit resources due to a perceived loss of funding from extramurally funded research. Additionally, members wonder whether the new title may prevent the University from exploring improvements to existing titles as a means for resolving the College’s concerns over adequate numbers of high-quality teaching faculty. For example, members expressed concern over the overall impact a change in focus from research to teaching might have on the Academy, and that the new title will create a second-class citizenship for teaching-intensive faculty. A graduate student representative worried that this policy might further diminish the availability of research professorships for young scholars. Last, members expressed concern about the creeping language included in the College FEC response, including “… we are now looking to expand this series through a closely monitored process.” The addition of 29 proposed positions added to the original 16 proposed last summer underscores these concerns that relate to trust. Dramatic and rapid changes in recruitment may significantly alter the balance and research mission of UCLA.
Related to these changes, the University and the FEC have not identified monitoring activities for implementing this new APM Professor series. At best, the language is ambiguous and does not reflect the realities of monitoring the success of this change, especially with a three-fold increase in hiring over estimates proposed this past year. If pursued, the joint Senate-Administration committee should work to establish review guidelines and benchmarks for assessing the success of the working title before the policy is codified. While some members expressed that teaching security-of-employment faculty members would be welcomed and would balance departmental needs, skeptics expressed concern that this change will fundamentally change UCLA. State-wide pressures to increase our enrollment are evident, but acquiescence to these pressures may shift our foundations to more unstable grounds. In summary, the preponderance of opinion is that there is too little information or research available to assure that the Academy’s focus on the tripartite mission will remain intact: research, teaching and service. Consequently, members could not endorse this proposal.

Thank you for the opportunity to opine on this important topic. The Graduate Council is very interested to hear about any advancements with this initiative.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me via the council’s analyst, Kyle Cunningham, at kcunningham@senate.ucla.edu.

Best Regards,

Ioanna Kakoulli
Chair, Graduate Council

cc: Serge Chenkerian, MSO, Academic Senate
    Kyle Cunningham, Committee Analyst, Graduate Council
    Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate
November 25, 2015

Leo Estrada, Chair
Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division

Re: College FEC Proposal to Establish Working Title of “Professor of Teaching X”

Dear Leo,

The Undergraduate Council (UgC), at its meeting on November 20, 2015, reviewed the College Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) responses to the concerns raised by Senate committees in Winter 2015. Discussion on the proposal was lively, and I summarize below the key concerns and questions that were raised:

We appreciate the responses to the points we raised in our February 20, 2015 memo. Specifically, the clarification that this group will not exceed five percent of faculty FTE in the College was helpful. Much work remains, though, in defining the specifics of this new working title. Mainly, council members were concerned with the repeated reference to “innovative” teaching methods that will be researched and employed by Professors of Teaching X. The equation of teaching innovation with teaching improvement is not well supported in the proposal. Further, criteria for evaluating these innovations are not clear. Council members expressed a desire for publications to be key to the review and advancement of faculty in these positions, as peer-review (nationally, not just locally) may be the best way to evaluate the value of their innovative methods. Overall, the criteria for hiring, review, and promotion remain quite unclear.

In our February 20, 2015 memo, we expressed our fears that expansion of this series would be at the expense of FTE support for research faculty. We heard from Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Pat Turner (an ex officio member of the council) that that the expansion of this title would be targeted to areas of the college where pressure from undergraduate enrollments is profound. We have already expressed our support for the dignity this title will confer to the individuals in these positions, but the proposal still reads as a general expansion rather than a specific, directed response to a real problem. If these generalities were replaced with the Deans’ specific target areas for expansion of this title, much of the confusion would be dispelled. Council members are hopeful that the “pilot” nature of the expansion, to be reviewed after three years, will be helpful in evaluating the effectiveness of expansion and in checking the fears of “creep.”

The council hopes to be a part of the continued evaluation of this proposal, especially as more specifics are developed. It is our understanding that a Senate-Administration committee is convening to address these concerns and others. We support the three charges given to this committee, as outlined in the College FEC’s response document. We look forward to reading the committee’s conclusions and recommendations.
Thank you for the opportunity to review the College FEC’s responses to our concerns. If you have any questions, please contact me (x69449; jwg@chem.ucla.edu) or Undergraduate Council Analyst Matt Robinson (x51194; mrobinson@senate.ucla.edu).

Sincerely,

Jim Gober, Chair
Undergraduate Council

cc: Serge Chenkerian, MSO/Executive Assistant, Academic Senate
    Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate
    Matt Robinson, Committee Analyst, Academic Senate