February 20, 2015

Joel Aberbach, Chair
Academic Senate Los Angeles Division

Re: Proposal to Establish a “Teaching Professor” Series

Dear Joel,

The Undergraduate Council, at its meeting on February 6, 2015, discussed the proposal from the Senior College Dean, Joseph Rudnick, to establish a working title of “Teaching Professor” for members of the Pre-Security of Employment (PSOE) and Security of Employment (SOE) lecturer series as well as to modestly expand the classification in the College of Letters and Science. The council’s lively conversation continued electronically throughout the week of February 17 – February 20.

While supportive of this proposal’s goal of continuing to deliver a high-quality undergraduate experience in the face of skyrocketing enrollments, some council members expressed various concerns about this approach. Of primary concern is the lack of emphasis on research in the content area for Teaching Professors. The type of research outlined in the proposal differs from that of tenure-track faculty. It is not that new faculty in the LSOE/PSOE series would be incapable of research as a matter of fact, but rather that their heavy teaching load and pedagogical expectations would not allow time to pursue research in their content area. Some council members were hesitant about decoupling research and instruction, although others noted that this has already occurred for adjunct faculty however.

Another concern was the teaching load of LSOE/PSOE faculty. Tenure-track faculty at UCLA are expected to show excellence in research, teaching, and service. This proposal could allow a subset of faculty in some departments to bear an unfair load of teaching, potentially excusing other ladder faculty from teaching. The teaching duties of all ladder faculty must be emphasized, and new LSOE/PSOE positions should not be seen as a way to shift teaching duties away from other departmental faculty.

Council members pointed out the dignity in the title of “Professor” and supported the proposal for the recognition it would give to the valuable teaching efforts of the PSOE and LSOE faculty members. The expectations for promotion, as outlined in the proposal, would properly distinguish a Teaching Professor from a “regular” lecturer. Especially since PSOE and LSOE are titles that grant membership in the Academic Senate, the title of “Professor” would help to eliminate the arbitrary divide between lecturers and professors.

The council was pleased with the modest numbers called for in the proposal, with no more than four in each division in the College and no more than five percent of the total FTE in the College. Hiring a “Teaching Professor” would not be desirable in some departments, and the
council is wary of a Dean offering only a Teaching Professor when a full faculty member is needed. Departments should be able to choose whether or not to pursue one of these positions. Another concern is that the proposal is unclear on the treatment of existing PSOE and LSOE faculty at UCLA. The council could not discern whether these faculty would receive the title “Teaching Professor” and be held to the expectations outlined in the proposal. Also, it was unclear if the proposed expansion of the series would provide an entry for some of the excellent continuing lecturers on campus.

If the concerns above are addressed, namely the limited expansion of the series, the departmental ability to seek or not seek such a position, and the re-emphasis of the teaching duties for all ladder faculty, then the council supports this proposal. Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the report. If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me (x69449; jwg@chem.ucla.edu) or Undergraduate Council Committee Analyst, Matt Robinson (x51194; mrobinson@senate.ucla.edu).

Sincerely,

Jim Gober, Chair
Undergraduate Council

cc: Sergei Chenkerian, MSO/Executive Assistant, Academic Senate
    Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate
    Matt Robinson, Committee Analyst, Academic Senate
February 13, 2015

Joel Aberbach
Chair, Academic Senate

Re:  Proposal to establish a “Teaching Professor” series

Dear Professor Aberbach,

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 February 9, 2015. After a brief discussion, numerous issues were raised.

The majority of the CPB members understand the proposal is motivated by the need to deal with the increasing undergraduate student load and the concomitant ladder faculty decrease. Nevertheless, some questioned the decision to introduce a new series instead of expanding existing ones. Given this is a new faculty series, it could potentially hamper efforts to maintain an adequate number of regular ladder faculty, since the FTEs will be drawn from the same resources. The teaching professor series also would reduce the number of research grants coming to the campus, at least at the margins. Such faculty will also compete for departmental resources. Members recognized that those in the lecturer series, presumably unlike the teaching professors, are unionized, which adds another layer of complexity to this matter.

Moreover, members suspect that since the main focus of the new series is teaching, and the perceived benefit is focused on getting more teaching time out of such professors, there is potential for abuse and overwork.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this proposal. If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me at sears@issr.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

David O. Sears, Chair
Council on Planning and Budget

cc:  Leo Estrada, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
      Jan Reiff, 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
February 20, 2015

To: Joel Aberbach, Chair  
   Academic Senate

From: Council on Academic Personnel

RE: Proposed Teaching Professor Series

Members of the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) read the proposal for a Teaching Professor series and we discussed it at our meeting of February 10, 2015. CAP applauds the spirit of the proposal; we agree that new strategies are needed to insure that UCLA is able to maintain its mission to provide excellent undergraduate teaching in this era of substantial enrollment growth. However, CAP members raised the following concerns about the proposal as currently formulated:

First, it was unclear how Teaching Professors would be evaluated and what role CAP would play in that evaluation. New criteria for promotion would need to be developed to evaluate not only teaching excellence but also contributions to research on teaching. Clear guidelines would need to be developed on the relative weighting of teaching compared to research in evaluating Teaching Professors for promotion and merit advances.

Second, CAP was concerned about whether a 2-tier system would be fostered with regular ladder faculty enjoying a privileged status compared to Teaching Professors. This raised questions for us about the fluidity of membership in the two series. For example, under what conditions would ladder faculty be eligible (encouraged?) to transfer to the Teaching Professor series? Would it ever be possible for a teaching professor to become a regular ladder faculty? More clarity is needed on the boundaries between the two series.

Third, there needs to be a systematic plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the new Teaching Professor series. For example, what benchmarks will be established to determine whether the series is successful? If there is increased revenue due to undergraduate enrollment growth, would that be converted to new ladder faculty FTE?

Fourth, it was unclear whether there would be permanent limits on the growth of the Teaching Professor series. The proposal states that during its first three years of implementation, no more than 16 positions would be advertised and Teaching Professors would not exceed 5 percent of total faculty FTE in the College. Decisions to change (increase) these allocations to the Teaching Professor series could have significant implications for preserving the overall integrity of the regular ladder faculty series. CAP felt that those decisions should be the purview of the Academic Senate rather than the College FEC.

cc Jan Reiff  
   Leo Estrada  
   Linda Mohr
February 20, 2015

Professor Joel Aberbach
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Committee on Faculty Welfare’s Response to the Proposal to establish the working Title of “Teaching Professor”

Dear Professor Aberbach,

The Faculty Welfare Committee discussed the proposed “Teaching Professor” title and its implications at its meeting February 10, 2015. At the conclusion of the discussion, summarized below, the Committee reached the consensus position that it did support the “pilot program” outlined in Dean Rudnick’s proposal, as long as a rigorous evaluation after three years is carried out after three years. We emphasize that our support extends only to the pilot program and evaluation, and ask that any expansion of the program be submitted to the Senate along with an evaluation of its impact on regular faculty FTE, the integration of this new status of instructor in participating departments, the impact on other non-ladder faculty, and of course on the quality of undergraduate instruction in participating departments.

Chair Lopez explained that this proposal from Dean Rudnick, and endorsed by the L&S Faculty Executive Committee, can be traced back to joint administrative/senate meetings several years ago regarding the organization and support for teaching and research at UCLA, in light of changes such as the reduction of state support, the rise in out-of-state undergraduate enrollment and the search for new ways to maintain and improve undergraduate instruction. One committee member reported that the pilot program was already in the process of being implemented in her department, and that a meeting of all faculty had been convened to learn about it, and apparently to give their seal of approval. She reported that the sudden change evoked a mixed reaction among her colleagues, and this led to an animated discussion among FWC members. There was broad agreement that many departments could benefit from this sort of dedicated instructor, who have stronger credentials and status than most lecturers but not the research and service demands of ladder faculty. There was also consensus that, given the difficult job market in many fields over the past eight years, there are many talented and experienced potential candidates for these positions. But there was broad concern about whether such an in-between status could be created in such a way that the social and professional relations within departmental faculty could really accommodate them. And members were equally concerned about how this new title and status would fit into the administrative and Senate rules that govern academic titles and careers. For example, the proposal blithely asserts that the newcomers would be full members of the Academic Senate; we were not sure who has the authority to make this determination. Many members were concerned about the
implications for the renewal of ladder faculty positions, especially among those departments that have seen losses in recent years. Surely this will take some resources away, harming graduate education and ladder faculty morale, statements to the contrary notwithstanding.

Despite these concerns, the Faculty Welfare Committee position is that if this new title and status can indeed be created successfully, it would be a positive step for the quality of undergraduate instruction at UCLA. The Committee urges the Senate leadership to set up a careful monitoring process involving one or more Senate standing committees, and also to set clear requirements regarding a formal evaluation after three years or so, before the program is expanded beyond its current "pilot" level.

On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Welfare, we thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposal to establish the working title of “Teaching Professor”. You are welcome to contact me at dlopez@soc.ucla.edu with questions. Annie Speights, Committee Analyst, is also available to assist you and she can be reached at (310) 825-3853 or aspeights@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

David Lopez
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
February 18th, 2015

TO: Joel Aberbach, Chair, Academic Senate

FROM: Scott J. Brandenberg, Chair, HSSEAS Faculty Executive Committee

RE: Proposal for establishing a working title of "Teaching Professor"

The 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 was reviewed by the HSSEAS FEC during its meeting on February 6, 2015. After careful consideration of the proposal, we voted unanimously to oppose establishing a working title of "Teaching Professor" at UCLA. Although we recognize the challenges facing the University as its student body continues to expand, and we acknowledge the efforts of the many lecturers who teach our students, we feel that establishing a "Teaching Professor" title would be a detriment to our mission as a top tier research University.

Specific concerns raised by HSSEAS FEC members are as follows:

- The addition of ladder faculty who are not contributing to our research mission (aside from any educational research they may undertake) would decrease our per-faculty research productivity, which is important for University, School, and Department rankings.
- The title "Teaching Professor" could, and likely would, be misinterpreted in a manner that understates the importance of teaching within the regular Professor series.
- The title would create a second, lower tier of faculty members that could result in future debates over salary equity, evaluation criteria for personnel actions, etc.

In addition to these fundamental objections to establishing the Teaching Professor title, an objection was raised that six courses per year is too low for full-time faculty devoted solely to teaching and service, particularly in contrast with our California State University colleagues who often teach four courses per quarter or semester (i.e., twelve quarter courses per year).

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding this memo.
February 17, 2015

To: Joel Aberbach, Chair  
Academic Senate

From: Alex Bui, Chair  
Graduate Council

Re: Proposal to establish a “Teaching Professor” series

At its meeting on January 30, 2015, the Graduate Council reviewed and discussed the proposal from Senior College Dean Joseph Rudnick to establish a working title of “Teaching Professor” for members of the Pre-Security of Employment (PSOE) and Security of Employment (SOE) lecturer series, and the strategy to modestly expand the classification in the College.

Members were generally supportive of the notion but resisted endorsing the proposal due to some needed clarifications. Members were most interested in how these appointments would count towards departmental FTE and whether they could potentially detract from faculty research by placing more emphasis on the increasing instructional needs of undergraduate students. While maintaining the university’s reputation for delivering a top-rate undergraduate education is indeed critical, members were struck by the impact that the increasing undergraduate enrollments are currently having on graduate education and the faculty’s ability to maintain the university’s reputation for top-rate research and graduate programs. In adopting a new series, the Graduate Council would expect such appointments to be made only if the department’s research program is stable and in cases where cost-savings is not the primary objective. Additionally, the Graduate Council notes that efforts will be put in place to limit the number of individuals appointed to the Teaching Professor series, as a percentage of the total number of faculty within the College. This percentage should not be changed (i.e., increased) readily or without sufficient input from the faculty. Concerns regarding the potential for hiring such individuals (over other faculty and other types of appointments) have been raised at other UC campuses, and thus efforts should be made to ensure that such issues do not happen here at UCLA.

Regarding the strategy to increase this classification in the College, members inquired about restricting the title to College appointments and why the pilot wasn’t being extended to other schools within UCLA, which may also have interest in establishing such a classification. Of course, we are supportive of establishing a joint Administration-Senate committee to oversee the implementation.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me via the Graduate Council’s committee analyst, Kyle Cunningham, at ext. 51162 or kcunningham@senate.ucla.edu.

Cc: Serge Chenkerian, MSO, Academic Senate  
Kyle Cunningham, Principal Committee Analyst, Graduate Council  
Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate
MEMO

Date         February 16, 2015

From         Rodney McMillian, Chair, Faculty Executive Committee  
              School of the Arts and Architecture

To           Joel Aberbach, UCLA Academic Senate Chair

RE            Teaching Professor Proposal Response

The Faculty Executive Committee of the School of the Arts and Architecture reviewed the Teaching Professor proposal at our February 13th meeting. The FEC discussed this proposal and expressed reservations about the idea of having “Master Teachers” exclusively devoted to teaching, who can make a contribution that isn’t based on research but instead based on pedagogy, is sound. Before we can support this proposal we need clarification on several points.

Initially the proposal makes it appear as though the impetus for this change is a means of addressing the increase in enrollments, yet the proposal states: "we envision the typical workload might consist of six course equivalents, comprised of five courses and one service element." This basically mimics that of regular rank faculty, making it unclear as to how this would serve the increasing number of courses that will be required.

Additionally, budgetary concerns also appear to be driving this proposal in that the College envisions hiring individuals to serve in the place of regular rank faculty, thus avoiding the cost of recruitment packages and avoiding the possibility of retention packages down the line. It appears that a differential salary line will be proposed for the “Teaching Professor” category, which essentially entails a lower pay scale for these positions, compared to ladder faculty. These professors are also not due to receive benefits commensurate with those in regular rank faculty. In other words, these individuals are apparently disposable, despite the working title "Teaching Professor." Is this an indication that no attempt would be made to retain these master teachers with proven track records should one of them receive an "outside offer?"

It is unclear how the creation of a "working title" of Teaching Professor, attached to the existing Lecturer PSOE/SOE series is going to create this überteacher. The present criteria for appointment and advancement within the Lecturer PSOE/SOE series would suggest appointees in this series must presently meet very high standards:

Criteria for Appointment, Promotion and Appraisal (The CALL)

In order to be appointed as Lecturer (SOE) or Senior Lecturer (SOE), assuming appropriate allocation of the FTE for the position, an individual must have demonstrated teaching ability of exceptional quality. Superior intellectual attainment as evidenced in the candidate's teaching ability is an indispensable qualification for appointment as Lecturer (SOE) or Senior Lecturer (SOE). It is incumbent upon the departmental chair to provide convincing evidence of such attainment. Pro forma statements will not suffice. Because candidates drawn from professional environments may often have had exceedingly limited experience in formal lecturing, the review committee has a special obligation to assure that the candidate possesses superior abilities in the classroom, and in other aspects of the organization and presentation of the subject. In support of its recommendation, the committee should furnish a detailed evaluation of the specific evidence available to it regarding these factors. The quality of a candidate's professional competence, research or other creative activity, and university and public service - whenever evidence of such attainments is available - may also be cited in those cases where they do provide collateral indication of qualifications to teach.
Appointment as a Senior Lecturer (SOE), with a salary rate at the level of Professor, Step 1, or above, should depend upon earned distinction in the field comparable to that attained by leading members of the professorial faculty in similar fields. It should thus be based entirely upon present teaching ability and upon professional attainment to date, rather than also upon the future responsibility for conduct and direction of research that is incumbent upon the professor. The outstanding teaching record which would qualify an individual for appointment at the rank of Senior Lecturer (SOE) can be evidenced by such attainments as novel and demonstrably effective teaching methods, the publication of high quality textual materials, or the collection and utilization of slides, films or other material for enriching the curriculum and enhancing the education of students.

The SOAA FEC questions the suggestion within the proposal that tenured faculty would see these "Teaching Professors" as a resource to whom they would turn to seek guidance regarding their own teaching methods. That a department might engage these individuals "to assist in the training of graduate student instructors," seems more to the point, thus absolving a regular faculty member from the necessity of teaching a TA practicum.

The proposal mentions that some currently tenured faculty might choose to “switch over” so they could focus on teaching instead of fulfilling research requirements. But since it’s a lower pay scale, what professors would choose to do so since that would be punitive?

Also, it appears that additional FTEs would need to be provided to a department by central administration or their respective Deans' offices in order to make appointments to this series. Those resources could be used to draft tenured professors. Or it appears that a department would be required to forfeit one of its current "soft" FTEs to make such a hire. The SOAA depends a great deal of the use of “soft” FTEs. Our school would not be able to afford hiring this new classification of lecturers. We get a lot more teaching value from utilizing Unit 18 lecturers.

Another question raised was how will this be different from the already established P. S. O. E or S.O.E (Prior to Security of Employment or Security of Employment) series that already exists? Lecturers PSOE/SOE are members of the Academic Senate and are therefore eligible to vote on departmental issues in accordance with By-law 55. Is it simply to give them a working title? What is there to gain?

Concerns expressed by the SOAA FEC at its meeting mimic those of Vice Chancellor Carole Goldberg in her letter of October 31, 2014. "The proposal provides convincing evidence that UCLA needs a cadre of Senate faculty "devoted both to teaching at the highest level of effectiveness and to creative endeavors focused on improvements and advancements in educational delivery. My particular concern, however, as Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel, is whether the expanded use of Lecturer PSOE and SOE, with the working title "Teaching Professor, is an appropriate way to serve that need."
April 15, 2015

MEMORANDUM

To: Prof. Joel Aberbach, Academic Senate Chair
From: Prof. Leah Lievrouw, Chair, GSE&IS Faculty Executive Committee

Subject: Proposal to establish "Teaching Professor" title/series for PSOE and SOE
Lecturers CC: Serge Chenkerian, MSO/Executive Assistant, Academic Senate

At its meeting on February 19, 2015, and again at its meeting on March 19, 2015, the GSE&IS FEC discussed the proposal from the College of Letters and Science, dated January 5 and circulated to FECs on January 22, which would establish the title "Teaching Professor" for members of the Pre-Security of Employment and Security of Employment Lecturer Series. The Committee's comments are summarized here; I realize that this response comes some time after your requested deadline in February, but I hope these remarks may still be useful as deliberations on the matter move forward.

The February discussion was brief and broadly supportive. However, as a consequence of the discussion of the proposal at the February 26 meeting of the Council of Faculty Chairs/Senate Committee Chairs, I was prompted to review the proposal again in detail, and brought it back to the FEC for additional discussion because it has major implications for teaching across UCLA (not just within the College) that warranted further comment. These included the following points:

The proposal is explicitly framed as a response to the dramatic rise in undergraduate applications and admissions at UCLA, suggesting that the best solution is to create a new contingent of full-time teaching faculty with the title of "professor" but without significant research or scholarly obligations, and paid at the Lecturer level

Lecturers holding the Teaching Professor title will carry full-time teaching loads of courses, not at the introductory or "service" level, but more advanced courses that would otherwise be taught by regular ladder faculty "in areas where the investment in recruitment packages and costly retentions does not justify a regular hire"

The proposal makes the economic case that such courses will be delivered more cheaply by Teaching Professors than by ladder faculty
Lecturers holding the Teaching Professor title will be expected to be "pedagogical experts" whose workload will include "creative work," e.g., service as instructional development/design consultants to regular ladder faculty, as well as full-time teaching -- one implication being that they would help remediate the otherwise poor teaching skills of ladder faculty.

The pedagogical expertise that is specifically being sought is skills in developing and teaching technologically mediated/online/blended courses.

In an extensive Committee discussion, FEC members raised a number of issues. There were strong concerns with the "Teaching Professor" title itself, particularly the inclusion of the word "teaching" in the title, because it might suggest that regular ladder faculty are either not fully committed to or responsible for teaching, or are less competent teachers than these specialists. One member stressed that exceptional subject matter expertise, i.e., what a faculty member "professes," is the basis of professorial status, teaching qualifications, and the Professor title in elite academic institutions, and suggested that the new title might serve to dilute or undermine the basis of the Professor designation across the UC. He also warned that faculty should assess such full-time teaching positions in terms of the heavy demands they might place on appointees' workload and welfare, and indeed should question this method as a response to growing demands from administration for larger teaching loads. He noted that the existence of the new title/series might actually encourage ladder faculty with extensive extramural funding to pull even further away from teaching, if they are able to relegate their teaching responsibilities to this new group of instructors.

Several members agreed; one suggested that although the "Teaching Professor" title is used at other UC campuses, the proposal for the new series at UCLA attempts to "do too much," i.e., solve difficult and longstanding institutional problems (political and administrative expectations and disputes regarding undergraduate enrollment, budgets, and faculty workload) with what appears to be a simple title change. He also suggested that given the current political negotiations between President Napolitano and Governor Brown, it may be a poor time for this type of intervention. Moreover, this member noted, any restructuring of faculty series "that insulates regular faculty from teaching is a profound mistake." Another faculty representative questioned why, if the unprecedented rise in undergraduate applications and enrollments is the key underlying issue, these appointees would not be expected to teach introductory courses, which are often the "bottleneck" courses that have the highest unmet undergraduate demand. She also noted the expectation that these appointees would be "pedagogical experts" and asked what the criteria for such expertise might be and how it would be evaluated as part of the personnel review process.

The GSE&IS FEC has two professional (adjunct and temporary) faculty representatives; one observed that appointees holding the Teaching Professor title would be required to carry routine administrative and committee work in addition to a full teaching load (though the number of courses that constitute a "full load" are not specified in the proposal), as well as "creative work" as course developers and pedagogical coaches for other faculty, with little or no increase in compensation. This member also wondered how the establishment of the new title and series aligns with existing union agreements. The second professional faculty representative said she appreciates the title change and the dignity and security of employment that it implies, but that it could raise concerns among the Teacher Education Program faculty who teach graduate students rather than large undergraduate courses, about the service and teaching obligations of current Lecturers, and whether current Lecturers would be grandfathered in under their current labor agreement.

Another faculty representative pointed out that under current arrangements, Lecturers are paid only for teaching, and asked how these appointees would be compensated for responsibilities and activities beyond teaching. Given the expectations for "creative" pedagogical assistance to other faculty, would these appointees be responsible for improving teaching performance in their home units? This member also asked what the perspective of the union might be about the new title and series. She criticized what she saw as the resource-driven motivation behind the proposal, which would meet undergraduate enrollment growth pressures without providing regular faculty lines, in an apparent effort to move the greatest number of undergraduates through courses at the lowest cost. Another faculty representative pointed out that technology is also a major subtext of the proposal, with the new title framed...
specifically to recruit instructors to design, develop and teach online courses, and assist and "encourage" regular faculty to shift more teaching online.

Other members suggested that it might be instructive to wait to see how the College implements the new title and series, and see how it works for them; some also suggested that it would be useful to get data on the appointment and advancement of "Teaching Faculty" from other UC campuses where the series is already in use.

The Committee agreed that overall, the proposal should prompt GSE&IS faculty to re-think the School's teaching, curricular, and staffing models in the School, especially the key role that professional faculty play in our programs.

Again, we hope these comments are helpful.