Executive Council
Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Thursday, March 17, 2016
1:10 PM to 3:00 PM
1003 Kemper Hall

Agenda Items
(Updated March 16, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:10-1:15</td>
<td>Meeting Summary Review/Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15-1:30</td>
<td>Chair’s Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-1:40</td>
<td>GE – Domestic Diversity – <em>see whiteboard posting</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:40-1:50</td>
<td>Search Waivers – <em>see whiteboard posting</em></td>
<td>2-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50-2:00</td>
<td>COCI: Policy on Online and Hybrid Courses – Dan Potter – <em>see whiteboard posting</em></td>
<td>9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-2:10</td>
<td>COCI: Policy on “Overflow” Course Delivery – Dan Potter – <em>see whiteboard posting</em></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10-2:55</td>
<td>Provost Hexter Update</td>
<td>13-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Four Year Degree Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Enrollment Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-“Professor of Teaching _____” (<em>see whiteboard posting</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consent Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Salary Equity CODVC Presentation (<em>see whiteboard posting</em>)</td>
<td>54-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future Executive Council Agenda Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Note: If unable to attend, please secure an alternate from your committee or organization and notify the Academic Senate Chair of your absence and the alternate’s name.
Date: February 5, 2016

To: EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLORS AND PROVOSTS
    ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR HARE

From: Susan Carlson
      Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Programs

Subject: Guiding Principles: Search Waivers for Academic Appointees at the University of California

On behalf of the UC Recruit Governance Board, I am attaching for your review proposed guidelines for the use of waivers in academic hiring, “Guiding Principles: Search Waivers for Academic Appointees at the University of California,” developed by the UC Recruit Governance Board and reviewed by Academic Personnel Directors and Vice Provosts for Academic Personnel/Academic Affairs from all campuses. The document describes new UC system-wide minimum standards for the consideration of the use of search waivers and allows campuses to set further restrictions as needed. The purpose of this memo is to brief you on the reasons we have developed these guidelines and to seek broader input.

Background

Conducting open recruitments for academic positions is the normal method for identifying and hiring academic personnel at the University of California, with the provision of waivers of recruitment given on a case-by-case basis according to established policies and procedures on each campus. As a result of recent and ongoing campus audits from the Department of Labor, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP), which oversees the University’s standing as a federal contractor, it has been necessary to carefully review and update existing practices to ensure they are compliant with federal regulations and are as consistent as possible across campuses.

*UC Recruit*, a system-wide applicant tracking system for all academic recruitments, provides a unique opportunity for shared practices and the establishment of common minimum requirements. The continuing development and oversight of the *UC Recruit* system is the purview of the UC Recruit Governance Board, comprised of representatives from campus Academic Personnel and Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity offices and UCOP. When first implemented on all 10 campuses, *UC Recruit* was not able to process waivers of recruitment, but the Governance Board agreed that such an enhancement to the system is a key component for open recruitment and consistent hiring practices, as well as reporting and document retention. The identification of common principles in this process has informed the business requirements, which *UC Recruit* staff have used to design new system capacity for the waiver process.
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The Governance Board met over many months to consider the conditions under which waivers of recruitment should be considered for academic positions, taking into account existing protocols on the campuses, established best practices, state and federal requirements, University policies, results from federal audits, and consultation with the UC Office of General Counsel and the Vice Provosts for Academic Personnel/Academic Affairs. The resulting “Guiding Principles” document reflects shared values of nondiscrimination, equal employment opportunity, and the hiring of a high quality diverse academic workforce, while being in compliance with state and federal laws.

These “Guiding Principles” are not UC policy; they should be considered minimum standards, which are allowed through APM - 500-16-f. The Guidelines allow campuses to set further restrictions on the use of search waivers if desired or if needed due to unique business requirements and to develop appropriate campus-specific examples for the search waiver categories/criteria.

I hope you will distribute to those on your campus who are involved in the academic recruitment process. Please provide me with any feedback on a final document by March 15, 2016.

Please contact Executive Director Nancy Tanaka (nancy.tanaka@ucop.edu) if you have questions.

Attachment: Guiding Principles: Search Waivers for Academic Appointees at the University of California

cc: Provost and Executive Vice President Dorr
    Vice President Duckett
    Vice Provosts for Academic Personnel/Academic Affairs
    UC Recruit Governance Board members
    Academic Personnel Directors
    AA/EEO Directors
    Associate Vice President Nation
    Academic Senate Vice Chair Chalfant
    Executive Director Baxter
    Executive Director Tanaka
    Deputy General Counsel Woodall
    Senior Counsel Reed
    Director Chester
    Director Lee
    Director Lockwood
Guiding Principles
Search Waivers for Academic Appointees
at the University of California

The University of California’s commitment to diversity, equal opportunity and nondiscrimination recognizes that a diverse academic employee workforce enhances our academic mission of teaching, research, and service. The University also recognizes that a diverse workforce is essential for maintaining our standing as a public university dedicated to serving the needs of an increasingly diverse state.

As an employer and federal contractor, the University of California is required to provide equal employment opportunity and to identify and address underutilization of protected classes, including women, underrepresented minorities, individuals with disabilities, and protected veterans in our academic job groups. Conducting full and open searches for academic employment positions supports the University of California in fulfilling these requirements under federal and state laws.

In rare circumstances, and on a case-by-case basis, the requirement of conducting an open search prior to review for appointment may be waived. The UC Recruit Governance Board is committed to creating a foundation of sound principles governing the use of search waivers system-wide. Although compliance with employment law and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) regulations determine the boundaries of search waivers, the content is driven by the University’s dedication to recruiting a high quality academic workforce as well as addressing its affirmative action goals. At a minimum, individuals under consideration must meet the high expectations for employment at the University of California.

Following are system-wide guidelines for circumstances where waivers of open searches may be considered. These guidelines should be viewed as minimal requirements, and campuses may choose to be more restrictive. In addition, campuses may wish to develop campus-specific expectations and examples. Waivers should be made for the minimum amount of time required; they cannot be extended nor repeated, unless specifically noted below.

SEARCH WAIVER CATEGORIES

A. SENATE FACULTY

1) Spousal/Partner Hire: The University of California recognizes that addressing the needs of dual career couples is an essential part of recruiting and retaining the highest quality faculty. A search waiver may be considered if the successful recruitment or retention of a senate faculty member is ultimately dependent on an academic appointment for his or her spouse/partner. A spouse/partner hire into a campus appointment is not an entitlement. Every spouse/partner hire must meet the qualifications and standard of excellence for the appropriate appointment. A spouse/partner hire is contingent on ultimate employment or retention of the associated individual. This search waiver is of indefinite duration.

1 This document is not intended to address student and training titles.
2) **Target of Excellence:** A search waiver may be considered for cases where there is an unusual opportunity to hire an individual whose distinctive qualifications and extraordinary promise or accomplishments will contribute significantly to the excellence of the academic mission of the University. Campuses are expected to establish their own definition and qualifications for a Target of Excellence hire that are consistent with these principles. In all cases, the individual would be on the short list of top candidates if an open search was conducted, would be highly sought after by peer institutions, and may be on the market for a very limited time period. Considerations for granting a waiver must include why it is not possible to conduct an open search in which the individual would be an applicant. This search waiver is of indefinite duration.

3) **President’s and Chancellors’ Postdoctoral Fellowship Recipients:** A search waiver may be considered if the candidate is a current or former recipient of a UC President’s or Chancellor’s Postdoctoral Fellowship. These UC postdoctoral fellowship programs support outstanding scholars in all fields whose research, teaching, and service will contribute to diversity and equal opportunity at UC. A list of current and former fellows is available at [http://ppfp.ucop.edu/info/fellowship-recipients/index.html](http://ppfp.ucop.edu/info/fellowship-recipients/index.html). This search waiver is of indefinite duration.

**B. NON-SENATE FACULTY AND OTHER ACADEMICS**

1) **Emergency Hire:** There is an urgent and unanticipated need to fill a position, there is not enough time to conduct a search, and the candidate has the expertise and is available to begin immediately. Emergency search waivers are made for a limited period of time, not to exceed one year. If the position is to be filled beyond the duration of the waiver, an open search must be conducted.

2) **Urgent Patient Care Need:** The appointment would alleviate a critical, unforeseen, and ongoing need in a specific area of patient care. An approved search waiver for urgent patient care need can be of indefinite duration.

3) **Spousal/Partner Hire:** The successful recruitment or retention of a senate faculty member or a member of the senior management group (SMG) is ultimately dependent on an academic appointment for his or her spouse/partner. A spouse/partner hire into a campus appointment is not an entitlement. Every spouse/partner hire must meet the qualifications and standard of excellence for the appropriate appointment. A spousal/partner hire is contingent on ultimate employment or retention of the associated individual. A spousal/partner search waiver can be of indefinite duration.

4) **Continuation of Training:** The candidate is a trainee of the campus (e.g., undergraduate or graduate student, postdoctoral scholar, fellow) who remains for a short period of time to complete a research project begun while in student or trainee status, or for a trainee who is hired by the campus to complete a clinical training program. Continuation of training search waivers are made for a limited period of time, not to exceed 18 months.

5) **PI/Co-PI/Leadership Status:** The candidate will be paid 50% time or more of their total effort from extramural funds awarded to the candidate and for which the candidate is
named as PI/Co-PI or holds an equivalent leadership role on the extramural funds. A search waiver based on PI/Co-PI/leadership status may be granted for the duration of funding; however, appointments can be made for a shorter period of time. Waivers remain in effect as long as funding continues; this may encompass multiple awards.

6) **Research Team:** A candidate is part of the existing research team of a **new faculty member**. A search waiver may be granted, but the waiver is only valid for an individual team member as long as they remain with the same research team and in the same series.

7) **Multiple Affiliated Employers:** Appointees whose position is dependent on two employers; a primary employer that is **formally** affiliated with UC and the UC campus. If an open search equivalent to a UC-search is conducted by the affiliate, the appointee may be granted a search waiver for the UC position. Campuses should establish a list of qualifying affiliates.

**EXEMPTIONS FROM SEARCHES AND SEARCH WAIVERS**

Certain categories of positions are exempt from open recruitment. They do not require search waivers; however, all other policies associated with a specific academic title apply to such exempt positions. An exemption is continuous in duration until one or more qualifying conditions are changed.

1) **Non-Salaried (0% time) and Without Salary (WOS) Appointments:** This exemption applies to appointees who are unpaid employees of the UC campus where the appointment is held.
   - The appointees in this category may have a UC employee ID number but will not receive salary from the University of California.
   - If an appointee is to receive salary from UC subsequent to the initial non-salaried or without salary appointment, an open search or an approved search waiver is required.

Non-salaried (0% time) and without salary (WOS) titles covered by this exemption include:
   - Volunteer Clinical Faculty
   - WOS non-senate faculty (e.g., HS Clinical, Adjunct) who do not receive pay from an institution affiliated with UC (see #7 above), excluding IX Unit titles.
   - WOS non-faculty academics (e.g., Professional Research Series)
   - Research Associate (WOS)
   - Clinical Associate (WOS)
   - Research Fellow (WOS)
   - Visiting Scholar/Visiting Titles (WOS)
   - Emeritus – including academic appointees who are conferred emeritus status as the result of an academic review

2) **True Visitor:** A visiting appointee who is a "true visitor," (i.e., is on leave from an academic or research position at another educational institution, research institution, or industry) and is visiting the campus for research activity or to teach a course in his/her area of expertise when appointed to a visiting faculty position is exempt from open search requirements.
3) **Recall Appointments for Retired Academics**: The University of California may recall to active service, for a part-time term appointment, academic appointees who have retired from the University. This exemption acknowledges that these appointees would have previously undergone a search or been approved on a search waiver for their pre-retirement appointment.

4) **Concurrent WOS Appointment**: A concurrent without salary academic appointment may be made for an appointee who is employed by the University in a staff, senior management group (SMG), or non-faculty academic title and who is asked to participate in occasional teaching activities that are directly related to the individual’s research or primary job. This exemption acknowledges that the primary paid appointment must have met the requirements for a search or search waiver under the appropriate personnel policy.

5) **Faculty Administrator Titles at Less Than 100% and Interim / Acting Positions**: A faculty member who is appointed to assume administrative responsibility in addition to, or in partial replacement of, his or her faculty responsibilities is considered a Faculty Administrator. Faculty Administrators are normally compensated with stipends and/or additional summer compensation, when appropriate. This exemption acknowledges that the underlying faculty appointment required an open search or approved search waiver and that the administrative responsibilities do not constitute a new position.

6) **Lecturer in Summer Session**: Faculty holding appointments in the associated department during the previous or following academic year and campus graduate students are exempt from recruitment requirements for assignment to Summer Session instruction. Individuals who do not hold a faculty appointment or graduate student status are subject to open search or waiver requirements.

7) **Internal Hires (Change in Series)**: Note that this exemption does not preclude an open search for appointment to any academic series when required by University or campus policy. Rather, it acknowledges that an exemption may be applied when the change in series is intended to recognize growth and development in professional skills, knowledge, and responsibility of the appointee. All initial appointments in the senate series require an open search or a search waiver per the criteria above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Exemption Allowed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Senate Faculty  
  e.g., Ladder, In Residence, Clinical X  
  *(For Lecturers with Security of Employment, see below.)* | Non-Senate Faculty  
  e.g., Adjunct, Health Sciences Clinical  
  or  
  Non-Faculty academic  
  e.g., Specialist, Professional Research Series, Project Scientists, Academic Coordinators | Yes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Exemption Allowed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Senate Faculty  
  e.g., Ladder, In Residence, Clinical X  
  *(For Lecturers with Security of Employment, see below.)* | Senate Faculty  
  e.g., Ladder, In Residence, Clinical X  
  *(For Lecturers with Security of Employment, see below.)* | Yes – provided that a national search was conducted for the initial senate series appointment

2 Or a search waiver was approved for a target of excellence or spousal/partner hire or PPFP hire

| Non-Senate Faculty  
  e.g., Adjunct, Health Sciences Clinical | Senate Faculty  
  e.g., Ladder, In Residence, Clinical X  
  *(For Lecturers with Security of Employment, see below.)* | No – open search or approved search waiver required

| Non-Senate Faculty  
  e.g., Adjunct, Health Sciences Clinical | Non-Senate Faculty  
  e.g., Adjunct, Health Sciences Clinical | Yes, excluding IX Unit titles

| Non-Faculty academic  
  e.g., Specialist, Professional Research Series, Project Scientists, Academic Coordinators | Non-Faculty academic  
  e.g., Specialist, Professional Research Series, Project Scientists, Academic Coordinators | Yes – if appointment is within the same unit/lab or equivalent

| Non-Faculty academic  
  e.g., Specialist, Professional Research Series, Project Scientists, Academic Coordinators | Faculty (any series)  
  *(For Lecturers with Security of Employment, see below.)* | No – open search or approved search waiver required

| Lecturer with Security of Employment series | Senate Ladder-rank Faculty | No – open search or approved search waiver required

| Senate Ladder-rank Faculty | Lecturer with Security of Employment series | Yes – provided that a national search was conducted for the initial senate series appointment

3 Or a search waiver was approved for a target of excellence or spousal/partner hire or PPFP hire

| Equivalent titles - APM 115  
  (e.g., Astronomer Series, Agronomist Series) with no underlying Senate Ladder-rank Faculty title | Senate Ladder-rank Faculty | No – open search or approved search waiver required
ON-LINE OR HYBRID COURSES

There is a growing interest in offering courses that use the World Wide Web and other Internet technologies. Some courses are taught entirely on-line and others are 'hybrids' or mixtures of on-line and in-class activities. In response, the Committee on Courses of Instruction has designed two additional "Learning Activity" codes to be used in course approval forms. These are WVL (for on-line activities that replace standard lectures) and WED (for on-line activities that replace standard discussions). The Committee expects that instructors will use one or both of these codes for all courses in which one or more hours/week of lecture/laboratory/discussion in one or more class sections are replaced by on-line formats. The Committee does not require the use of these activity codes if the on-line material merely supplements regularly scheduled lecture/laboratory/discussion sections.

The Courses Committee recognizes that 'on-line lecture' and 'on-line discussion' may often be inadequate (that on-line activities may do other things besides mimicking regular lectures and discussions), and we do not intend that the listed activities restrict what instructors do. But rather than add new activities, we ask that instructors select WED or WVL and then describe the activities more fully under Course Format. This description must include:

- **the nature of the activity and an estimate of the time required by a typical student to complete the activity.** This should be done for all major activities in the course.
- **instructor contact hours.** Describe how the instructor interacts with students and for how many hours per week or quarter.
- **how the course unit value conforms to University of California statewide regulation 760 (1 unit equals 30 hours of student work.)** In a 4 unit course, for example, the instructor must explain under course format how the average student will work for 120 hours (12 hours per week in a 10-week quarter).
- **examinations.** The Committee requires that midterm and final examinations (generally required in all undergraduate courses) be proctored to ensure that the person taking the examination is the student receiving credit. Examinations must be given in a traditional classroom or an Academic Senate approved testing center (as listed below). Exceptions must assure that examinations reflect individual student work and that a student's rights are protected under **Academic Senate Davis Division Regulation 538.**
  
  A. Current list of testing centers
     a. UC Davis testing center
     b. Other UC testing centers
     c. Consortium of College Testing Centers approved by the National College Testing Association (NCTA) - [http://www.ncta-testing.org/cctc/](http://www.ncta-testing.org/cctc/)

  (Revised 11/2012)

Faculty should be aware that the Registrar normally would not assign regular classroom space for sections with on-line learning activity codes. Furthermore, for courses without traditional lecture/discussions components, the instructor needs to coordinate with the Registrar the dates and times of any "in class" examinations. The Registrar will inform instructors within the first 3
weeks of the quarter of the room assignment(s) for the midterm examinations. Final examination
times for on-line-only courses will be assigned the "TBA" time slot.

The suffix “V” should be used to designate completely online courses.
The suffix “Y” should be used to designate hybrid courses.

Web-based Learning Codes:

**WVL** - On-line lecture - a fully-integrated on-line course with interactive text, graphics and/or executable programs; on-line student access to the instructor(s); measures to assure compliance with copyright laws.

1 unit for each ~ 30 hours per quarter of both on-line interactions and related off-line activities; the overall workload should be approximately that of any corresponding off-line course.

Examinations must be in a class setting at times listed in the Class Schedule and Registration Guide; exceptions must assure that examinations reflect individual student work and that a student's rights are protected under Senate Regulation 538.

Grades may also be based upon electronically submitted materials such as homework, research papers, and general participation (not more than 10% of the total grade, unless approved by the Committee).

**WED** - On-line Discussion - on-line discussion groups using list-processor or moderated e-mail, news groups and/or chat rooms; on-line student access to the instructor(s); measures to assure student privacy and civility in these activities.

1 unit for each ~ 30 hours of electronic discussion group related activity.

Grades for on-line discussion groups will normally be based on electronically submitted materials such as homework, research papers, and participation.
Background

Over the last year, the Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI) has received two requests from departments to use modes of course delivery in which some students have guaranteed access to in-person lectures while others do not. The committee is also aware that such practices have been implemented in other courses on campus without prior approval by COCI, in some cases over multiple years. These are not hybrid courses, in which all students participate in the same mixture of on-line and face-to-face learning activities, but are instead modifications of face-to-face courses in which some students do not have access to face-to-face lectures while others do. These approaches have been proposed as solutions to the lack of sufficient classroom space to accommodate current enrollments in some courses and/or lack of sufficient resources to hire instructors to teach additional, smaller sections of these courses. According to Academic Senate by-laws and the committee’s policies, approval by COCI is required for these types of course offerings because they represent a change in the learning activities associated with the course. Although COCI approved the two requests mentioned above, each on a one-time-only basis, the committee has decided that it will no longer approve any requests of this kind and that courses that continue to use these approaches in the future will be considered out of compliance with COCI policies. Specific terms of the new policy are included at the end of this document.

COCI encourages creativity through the use of a diversity of learning activities, and has helped to increase the number of on-line and hybrid courses offered at UC Davis by expediting their review and approval. At the same time, we affirm that solutions to space limitations for classroom-based courses should be found in ways that provide all students in a given course equal access to that classroom, via greater teaching resources and/or more robust facilities. The problem with proposals for the types of course delivery referenced above is not that they involve the addition of new learning activities to courses, but that they result in courses in which not all students are guaranteed equal opportunities to engage in all learning activities offered. Some have argued that this is not problematic because it is unlikely to have significant effects on students’ academic performance. There is no conclusive evidence to support this view, however, and due to both ethical and practical considerations, it is unrealistic to expect that meaningful data with sufficient sample sizes on the relative performance of student groups with differential access to course resources will be available on any reasonable timescale to inform policy decisions. But, more importantly, COCI believes that such data would in any case be irrelevant, because guaranteeing equal access by all students to all course resources reflects fundamental principles of fairness and equality that should underlie all of our educational policies. The fact that some forms of unfair or unequal treatment of students might be found not to have statistically significant effects on students’ academic performance does not render such practices acceptable. An additional argument that is often presented to justify these modes of course delivery is that, in practice, some percentage of students don’t attend lectures anyway. The committee believes that, whether true or not, this argument is also irrelevant. Our policies should
not be designed to condone, and even encourage, lack of attendance. As teachers, it is our responsibility to expect the best of our students, not the worst.

The committee recognizes that, in many, if not most, cases, these modes of course delivery are adopted as solutions for problems created by lack of space and resources, and that they are considered by the instructors as suboptimal but necessary temporary fixes, but these observations only underscore the fact that these practices are detrimental to the overall quality of instruction on the campus. The committee is also concerned that, in some cases, these modes of delivery may be used as relatively inexpensive (but again clearly suboptimal) ways to increase instructors’ student credit hours and/or decrease students’ time-to-degree. These are not acceptable justifications for compromising the quality of instruction. Departments must instead implement other approaches, in which all students in a course are treated equally, to address cases in which student demand exceeds available classroom seats for a course, such as offering additional sections or developing a separate, fully on-line version of the courses. In addition, COCI here reiterates its view, as expressed in previous statements, that the Senate and the Administration should include addressing limited space and resources for instruction on our campus among their highest priorities.

**Policy Statement**

COCI therefore proposes to adopt the following policy:

Effective immediately, the Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI) will not approve any proposals for course offerings in which the same modes of delivery are not guaranteed to be available to all students enrolled in the same course, including, but not limited to, establishment of separate on-line and face-to-face sections for the same course, simulcasting of lectures in overflow rooms, and over-enrollment of courses on the assumption that a certain percentage of students won’t attend lectures. All courses in which such practices are continued or newly implemented, whether on a trial or a permanent basis, will henceforth be considered out of compliance with COCI’s policies.
TO: Senate Committee Chairs and Executive Council

RE: Academic Senate Second Review: “Professor of Teaching ___” Proposal

Dear Colleagues:

The Provost has requested that the Davis Division formally consider the use of the working title “Professor of Teaching ___” for Senate faculty in the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series. Please note that the Davis Division previously considered a proposal from the College of Biological Sciences on this issue; see HERE for the Division’s response.

Since the time we previously considered the CBS proposal, there are two important events to note:

- UCLA has initiated a review on the same issue that has not yet been completed. You can find further information HERE.
- Revisions were made to UCD-APM regarding criteria for Appointment and Promotion in the LSOE series on 7/1/2015. You can find the relevant section HERE.

Attached to this cover memo are the following documents:

- Request from Provost.
- UCLA responses to the Professor of Teaching Proposal.
- Prior Davis Division responses.

Please work with your committee to enter a response via the ASIS Request for Consultation module by Friday, April 15. I strongly recommend that FEC Chairs consult their departmental representatives to the Representative Assembly for feedback. Thank you very much for your service to the Senate.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

André Knoesen
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Professor: Electrical and Computer Engineering

Cc: Departmental Representatives to the Representative Assembly
Chair André Knoesen  
Davis Division, Academic Senate

Dear André,

I write with a request that the UC Davis Academic Senate Executive Council formally consider the use of the working title “Professor of Teaching ___” for Senate faculty in the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series. I know that it was a topic of discussion, but with the strong support of the Chancellor, I return it to your attention.

As our campus and the UC system as a whole continue to invest not just in recruiting more faculty but in building a cadre of Senate faculty who are focused on increasing the effectiveness of our teaching, we are finding that systemwide policies for the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series (UC APM 285) are out of touch with the imperative to develop new research- and evidence-based methods for enhancing student learning, especially in large classes. UC policies for this series are now being studied by a joint Senate-Administration Task Force, and the group’s initial recommendations should be out for review within a few months. However, writing, review and implementation of what is likely to be a dramatically revised policy will almost certainly take another 1-2 years to complete. In the interim, it is important that we work creatively and efficiently to build Senate faculty capacity in this area under the auspices of UC Davis policy, as guided by APM UCD 285, which became effective on July 1, 2015.

One challenge we face is a lack of understanding of the scholarly and teaching expectations for faculty in the Lecturer with Security of Employment series, both within the current faculty population and the pool of potential applicants for these positions. This lack of understanding was reflected in some of the concerns mentioned in the Senate’s February 17, 2015 response to the proposal “Use of the title Teaching Professor for Lecturer PSOE” submitted by the College of Biological Sciences in September 2014. Similarly, as noted in the Senate’s response, some of the early advertisements used for our initial hires into the LSOE series in 2013-14 used language that did not adequately distinguish LSOE positions from those of Unit 18 Lecturers. Most of those early advertisements were identified and revised at the request of Academic Affairs, and more recent LSOE recruitments have used appropriate language that clarifies the roles to be played by these new Senate faculty members.

Professional expectations for LSOE faculty at UC Davis are described in new campus policy, effective July 1, 2015 (APM UCD 285), whereas those for Unit 18 Lecturers are presented in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that has been negotiated between the University of California and University Council, American Federation of Teachers (UC-AFT). The most fundamental differences can be summarized as follows. Unit 18 Lecturers are expected to be excellent classroom teachers and to carry very substantially higher teaching loads than ladder-rank faculty members, but are not required to engage in scholarship or service. The primary
reasons to hire Unit 18 Lecturers are to fill disciplinary gaps within our undergraduate curricula and to meet heavy teaching load needs that cannot be fulfilled through Senate faculty hires. In contrast, LSOE faculty members are expected to apply their scholarly expertise and experience to effect research-based transformation of our methods of teaching and our assessment of student learning. Teaching loads for LSOE faculty should be less than those for Unit 18 faculty, because LSOE faculty are expected to engage in substantial service and scholarship, as well as to be excellent classroom instructors.

Despite the clear distinction in professional expectations for Unit 18 Lecturers and LSOE faculty on our campus (as now put forth in APM UCD 285), it is clear that the current, formal UC titles (Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Lecturer with Security of Employment, and Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment) have created unfortunate confusion with Unit 18 faculty members holding Lecturer or Continuing Lecturer titles. The non-Senate Unit 18 faculty positions are not as attractive to potential applicants as are the Senate LSOE positions, and so the continued use of the LSOE titles in recruitment and other professional settings can inhibit our ability to attract top-tier candidates into these transformational Senate faculty positions. Potential candidates reading the titles for these positions cannot easily discern the scope, responsibility, and opportunity of the contributions we are inviting them to make to UC Davis. As a result, good people are not applying for these jobs or are discouraged once they are invited on campus and made further aware of the title confusion. (It may seem trivial, but the Chancellor and I were present at a recent dinner at College Park 16 as one guest bravely introduced herself, when it was her turn, as "a Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment"; we cringed for her.)

In recognition of all these limitations, at least four UC campuses (UCB, UCSD, UCR, and UCSC) are now using one of two working titles for faculty in the LSOE series--either "Teaching Professor" or "Professor of Teaching ___." UCLA is discussing doing so, and UCI is playing a leading role in organizing system-wide revisions to the series. Finally, although the joint Senate-Administration systemwide task force on the LSOE series is likely to recommend a formal title change, substantive revision of UC APM 285 will take time to implement.

Proposal: In view of these issues and the fact that recruitment into the LSOE series is continuing at UC Davis, we ask for the Executive Council to consider the following interim measure until such time that UC APM 285 revisions are complete. We propose that UC Davis adopt the following working titles for the full-time faculty within the four LSOE titles, as has been implemented at UC San Diego.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current APM title</th>
<th>Proposed working title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment,</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Teaching ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer with Security of Employment</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Teaching ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment</td>
<td>Professor of Teaching ____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have proposed the working title “Professor of Teaching ____” instead of “Teaching Professor of ____” because we concur with concerns expressed in the Senate's February 2015 response that the latter title could “contribute to the perception that teaching is not a substantial component of the Professor series”. In contrast, we feel that the working title “Professor of Teaching ____”
more accurately conveys the reality that faculty in this series are expected to develop and apply scholarly expertise towards improved teaching and student learning within their underlying discipline. In this sense, the proposed title closely parallels “Professor of Clinical ____”.

Finally, we have discussed the use of academic working titles with our colleagues across the UC system to ensure that our proposal is consistent with prevailing practice. To clarify, a working title is one that an individual is authorized by the campus to use in academic contexts, even though it is not a title to be found in the UC APM. A department may use the working title in recruitment documents, and an individual may use an authorized working title, for example, on the University’s web sites, on their business card, in professional correspondence, on a curriculum vitae, or in a publication.

The Chancellor as well as VP-Academic Affairs Stanton and VP/Dean-UE Carolyn Thomas join me in urging the serious consideration of this proposal by the Academic Senate. We all believe its adoption would represent be advantageous in multiple regards.

Sincerely,

Ralph J. Hexter
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

c: Chancellor Katehi
Vice Provost Stanton
Vice Provost and Dean Thomas
Assistant Executive Vice Chancellor Mohr
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.
November 12, 2015

Professor Leo Estrada  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

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.
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 will 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 deplores that fact that the administration’s commitment to ensuring the necessary FTEs 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 Halteck, 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 of all ladder faculty lines 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 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”. It slits it due to pay disparity for adjuncts?

8. Will there be a new committee formed to oversee the “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 melat! hafeck@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 in 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
DEAN JAMES HILDRETH  
FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR FRANK MCNALLY  
College of Biological Sciences

Re: Teaching Professor Working Title Proposal

The referenced proposal was initially discussed during the October 16, 2014, Executive Council meeting based on your request to expedite review. During Executive Council discussion, the Committee on Elections Rules and Jurisdiction (CERJ) was asked to review the proposal and confirm Davis Divisional authority to review and opine because some members were concerned the authority to review such a proposal may reside with the UC wide Academic Senate. Based on CERJ advice that Davis Divisional review was appropriate, on October 31, 2015, the Teaching Professor Working Title proposal (enclosed) was distributed to all standing committees of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate as well as the college and school Faculty Executive Committees. Comments were received from Academic Personnel – Oversight (CAP), Affirmative Action and Diversity, Faculty Welfare and Undergraduate Council; as well as responses from the Faculty Executive Committees from College of Biological Sciences, Engineering, Letters and Science and Graduate School of Management.

Overall responses were mixed with responses ranging from in favor/somewhat favorable to indifferent/opposed. As you know, the College of Biological Sciences (CBS) reported a faculty vote expressing overwhelming support for the proposal. Some responses recognized that the "Teaching Professor" working title could be a useful advertising and recruitment tool. While some responses were somewhat favorable, most raised concerns the campus must address.

There was acknowledgement that the academic title Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE), which also corresponds to the payroll title, fails to communicate the important work and role of LSOE. The Undergraduate Council (UGC) stated, “One area of agreement within UGC is that the phrase LSOE, let alone [Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment] (LPSOE), is not a natural usage. UGC would be in favor of a substitution; what that substitution should be is not obvious, however. Objections would be few if an advertisement included translations of LPSOE as “teaching-oriented professor” or “research expected on pedagogy.” That is, the phrasing in an ad can take more liberties than the APM. Any Senate faculty position should be advertised in a way to bring into consideration the largest number of strong, appropriate candidates. “The College of Letters and Science (CLS) reported, “An alternative, “Professor of Teaching Practice” was suggested; this title is apparently used elsewhere.”

Many respondents expressed concern about the unintended message sent within and outside of UC Davis by using the working title “Teaching Professor.” The Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity expressed concern that the working title “might somehow contribute to the perception that teaching is not a substantial component of the Professor series, which in terms
of public perception, is negative.” The Graduate School of Management stated; “the title “Teaching Professor” might suggest to some that those with the title “Professor” do not teach. This may seem like a small detail, but perhaps not given the current political environment.”

The Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (AA&D) is concerned “that adoption of the “Teaching Professor” is a much cheaper way to hire an instructor... Will this title create an imbalance among faculty? This position should not be used to reduce instructional costs but to increase quality of teaching.” The CLS opined, “It was clear to us that, on the one hand, departments could not be required to hire LSOEs/PLSOEs; but, on the other hand, that deans could offer departments “an LSOE or nothing. Several divisional deans stressed that they like the flexibility of being able to make offers to LSOEs as part of their “portfolio,” and that in some cases an LSOE was financially much more attractive than a regular professor.” As UGC stated, “…these positions, by whatever name, should not be created to reduce instructional costs but should be carefully considered as a way of increasing the quality of pedagogy. These faculty should present the most up-to-date understanding of the disciplines, and should complement, rather than substitute for more conventional professors. Departments are best placed to understand such matters. Each department has different disciplines and modes of scholarly work. Each department should continue to make the decisions that maintain the balance among teaching, service, research, and professional activities.

Respondents described confusion between the LSOE series and a Lecturer represented by Unit 18. UGC cited one example, “…lecturers in the University Writing Program direct entry-level writing, first year writing, the writing ambassadors program, prized writing, the advanced composition challenge exam, the writing across the curriculum program, and the writing minor. Most lecturers in the University Writing Program present at national conferences, publish regularly, develop and teach online and hybrid courses, do outreach to K-12 schools, work closely with industry, conduct assessment projects, and too many other professional activities to list here. The full-time teaching load for a unit-18 lecturer in the writing program is 7 courses (capped at 25 because of the high paper load). How would UCD distinguish “teaching professors” from lecturers who already engage in what the teaching professor evaluation framework describes?” AA&D asked an important question which should be addressed, “Since the primary focus of Unit 18 lecturers is to teach, why not make this title available to them?”

UGC raised concern regarding peer balance within departments, “Another point/counterpoint concerned the proportion of teaching professors (LSOE) in a department. If in a typical department of say 15 faculty, there was one or two "teaching professors" those faculty would be close to orphans in their own departments, or put differently, would have more in common with teaching professors in disciplines other than their own. At the other end of the balance, it might be that financial pressure would raise the number of teaching professors so that only a few of the fifteen faculty had the opportunity for research outside of their immediate teaching responsibilities, which would be detrimental to the overall research mission of UCD.”

Finally it is important to keep in mind that those holding an LSOE academic title are members of the Academic Senate and are all held to rights and responsibilities contained in the Standing Orders of the Regents, as well as the Bylaws and Regulations of the UC wide and Davis Division of the Academic Senate.
Davis Division of the Academic Senate Position:

Based on the summary above, there is support for clarifying the role and perhaps changing the academic title used for the LSOE appointments. However, given the important issues raised during review, we are unable to support the current proposal. By copy of this message, I am asking Provost Hexter to consider the matter. We have been informed there is support for use of the “Teaching Professor” working title outside CBS. If indeed there is broad campus interest, proponents should collectively engage a discussion and develop another proposal considering the CBS proposal and Davis Divisional feedback. We are willing to review the issue again if the proposal considers, addresses and, when possible, mitigates negative consequences if we opt to change the LSOE series academic title or for use of a working title.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

André Knoesen, Chair
Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Professor: Electrical and Computer Engineering

Enclosure

c: Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Hexter (w/enclosure)
   Vice Provost Stanton (w/enclosure)
Date: December 1, 2014  
To: Academic Senate Committees  
From: Divisional Chair André Knoesen  
Subject: Academic Senate Review: Teaching Professor Working Title Proposal

During summer session, I became aware that College of Biological Sciences was interested in using the working title “Teaching Professor” when recruiting Lecturer-Security of Employment (LSOE) and Lecturer-Potential Security of Employment (LPSOE). The College of Biological Sciences (CBS) Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) Chair provided a proposal for review by the Academic Senate.

While this proposal is generated by CBS, if the campus allows use of the working title proposed, it will be allowed across the campus. Therefore, committees are asked to evaluate the proposal and provide feedback concerning use of the “Teaching Professor” working title.

The review packet includes:
1. CBS FEC provided a proposal requesting use of the “Teaching Professor” Working Title.
2. CBS FEC provided additional background information to inform the consultation process.
3. As a result of Executive Council discussion, the Committee on Elections Rules and Jurisdiction (CERJ) was asked to review authority.
4. Proposal receipt acknowledgement. Communicated that the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs and Academic Senate Chair agreed the proposal impacted the campus.
5. A current draft of UC Davis APM 285 is provided for information only. The policy is not yet ready for formal campus review.

Attachments
Professor Andre Knoesen  
Chair, UCD Academic Senate  
RE: Use of the title Teaching Professor for Lecturer PSOE

Dear Andre,

A few departments in the College of Biological Sciences will be hiring lecturers with potential security of employment (PSOEs) this year, with more to come in the following years. We would like to use the title “Teaching Professor” for these positions, but this must be approved by the Academic Senate. You wrote a letter to Frank McNally, the incoming chair of the CBS Faculty Executive Committee stating that you would be willing to bring a proposal of this nature from the CBS FEC and Dean’s office to the Academic Senate. I am copying such a proposal below, which has been approved by the FEC and the Dean, James Hildreth.

We would like to be able to use the new Teaching Professor title in job ads that will go out for these positions this fall. We would be grateful if you would advise us whether there is anything we can do to expedite Academic Senate approval of our proposal for this purpose. In the best of worlds we would get this approval quickly and so could include the new title in ads going out in the next few weeks.

The proposal, which has been approved by both Dean Hildreth and the CBS Executive Committee, reads,

Job advertisements for Lecturer with potential for security of employment (PSOE) shall use the working title “Assistant Teaching Professor” to describe the position. Lecturers PSOE shall be allowed to list their title on syllabi, office doors, websites and letter heads as Assistant Teaching Professor, and Lecturers SOE as “Teaching Professor”. This working title does not change the rights or responsibilities of Lecturers PSOE/SOE as described in APM210, 283, 285 and 615.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please let me know if there is anything you’d like for us to do to help bring this to the Academic Senate in a timely manner.

Yours,

Steven M. Theg  
Chair, 2013-2014 CBS Faculty Executive Committee

James E.K. Hildreth, PhD, MD  
Dean, College of Biological Sciences
Advantages of the working title "Assistant Teaching Professor" for Lecturer PSOE and the working title "Teaching Professor" for Lecturer SOE.

prepared by Frank McNally, Chair College of Biological Sciences Faculty Executive Committee

The Dean and all five departments within the College of Biological Sciences (CBS) have agreed to meet needs for teaching, curriculum design, and assessment for accreditation by hiring a limited number of Lecturers PSOE, in addition to new Assistant Professors. An Assistant Professor requires significant start-up costs, currently $1,000,000, as well as laboratory space that the College does not have. A PSOE could devote significant time toward the assessment efforts required for WASC accreditation and development of innovative new teaching methods and classes. Lecturer PSOE's in CBS will also write and obtain education-oriented grants to support the college teaching mission. The current Associate Dean of Undergraduate Academic Programs in CBS is a Lecturer SOE as is the equivalent Associate Dean in the Division of Biology at UC San Diego. These examples are only given to emphasize that the expected contributions of Lecturer PSOE's are significantly greater than the expected contributions of a unit 18 Lecturer, the only other teaching title currently available.

Currently, the College of Biological Sciences has an open search for three PSOE positions and the Department of Chemistry is interviewing for PSOE/SOE positions. Because the titles “PSOE/SOE” are not understood outside the UC system, or even within it, use of the working title "Teaching Professor" will increase the quality of the applicant pool, and the likelihood of recruiting the top candidates in a national search. The working title "Teaching Professor" also gives the individual a huge advantage in applications for education-oriented grants.

Regarding the Teaching Professor working title at UC San Diego:
According to Kelly Lindlar, Director of Academic Policy UC San Diego, the teaching professor working title was one of several recommendations jointly agreed upon by the Senate Council and the Executive Vice Chancellor. She is currently making changes to UCSD’s PPM 230-20 and PPM 230-28. According to her, these changes will appear in the online version of the PPM early in 2015. The UCSD Division of Biology website currently lists their SOE’s as Teaching Professors.
http://biology.ucsd.edu/publicinfo/dwc?action=faculty_research_list
November 10, 2014

ANDRÈ KNOESEN, CHAIR
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

RE: Teaching Professor Working Title

You asked us to evaluate whether the Executive Council of the Academic Senate, Davis Division, has the power to approve the request set forth below:

Job advertisements for Lecturer with potential for security of employment (PSOE) shall use the working title “Assistant Teaching Professor” to describe the position. Lecturers PSOE shall be allowed to list their title on syllabi, office doors, websites and letter heads as “Assistant Teaching Professor,” and Lecturers SOE as “Teaching Professor.” This working title does not change the rights or responsibilities of Lecturers PSOE/SOE as described in APM210, 283, 285 and 615.1

Brief Conclusion

• The Code of the Academic Senate does not expressly authorize or forbid use of the proposed designation. The Code does not make clear whether “working titles” for Senate members are permissible at all and if so, what role the Senate or its committees plays in approving or disapproving them.

• Although the Code does not expressly authorize use of working titles, it is likely that the Senate, through its committees (including the relevant faculty), can approve the use of working titles under its general authorization to “organize” faculties, “govern []” colleges and schools, and adopt rules and regulations consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate. This conclusion is based on the assumption that the administration agrees with the use of the working title, and we express no opinion about any other scenario.

• It is appropriate for Executive Council to give advice on whether the use of the working title here is desirable or undesirable as a matter of general policy.

• It may be advisable to get input from the CAP Oversight Subcommittee.

1 It is our understanding that APM 615 was merged into APM 610, effective July 1, 2014.
Because the administration and relevant department are seeking the advice of Executive Council here, we express no opinion on whether the final decision to use the working title is reserved on the one hand to the administration or, on the other, to the department itself.2

We express no opinion on potential legal or political ramifications of the use of this designation, or on whether use of the proposed designation is consistent with the Academic Personnel Manual or is appropriate as a matter of Senate or University policy.

Scope of Review

We have reviewed the Code of the Academic Senate, including the Standing Orders of the Regents, the systemwide Academic Senate bylaws, regulations, and legislative rulings, the Davis Division bylaws and regulations, and the bylaws and regulations of the Schools and Colleges of the Davis Division. We have also reviewed prior legislative rulings and advice issued by the Davis Division CERJ.

Although authoritative interpretation of the Academic Personnel Manual is outside our jurisdiction, we have reviewed the systemwide APM, as well as UC Davis-specific APM provisions and the Regents Policies, for context and to aid our understanding.

Because this is a matter of first impression where the text of the Code of the Academic Senate offers little express guidance, we emphasize the description of CERJ advice given by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction: CERJ advice “suggest[s] the likely outcome should ... a Legislative Ruling be requested on the issues involved.”3

The Code of the Academic Senate Does Not Expressly Prohibit or Authorize the Use of the “Working Title” of “Teaching Professor”

The Code of the Academic Senate apparently does not use either the term “teaching professor” or the term “working title.” Moreover, we have located no provision in the Code that clearly prohibits (or authorizes) use of the “working title” of Teaching Professor or Assistant Teaching Professor using different words. We have also reviewed all instances of the use of the word “title” in the Code and found nothing relevant.

2 See Standing Order of the Regents 105.2(c) (“The several departments of the University, with the approval of the President, shall determine their own form of administrative organization.”). The systemwide and Davis Division bylaws have similar provisions. ASB 50(A) provides, “The government of each college and school is vested in its Faculty, except as limited by the authority of the Divisional Graduate Council and the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs. Each Faculty is directly responsible to the Division of which it is a committee.” ASB 55(B)(8) provides, “The tenured faculty members of a department shall establish the method by which personnel matters other than those listed in Paragraphs 1 to 6 of this Article B are determined. The method adopted must have the approval of the divisional Committee on Academic Personnel or its equivalent.” Similarly, DDB 137 provides, “Each Faculty is authorized to organize, to select its officers and committees, and to adopt any procedural rules and regulations consistent with Bylaws and legislation of the Academic Senate and the Davis Division.”

3 Systemwide Legislative Ruling 12.93B (emphasis added).
General Grants of Authority Probably Authorize the Senate, Through Its Committees, to Approve Use of the Working Title

In general, the President of the University is to “consult” with the Senate on actions to “appoint” Lecturers with Security of Employment. The scope of this duty to consult is not expressly limited.

Moreover, “[t]he government of each college and school is vested in its Faculty,” and each Division has the authority to “organize … and to adopt for the conduct of its business rules and regulations not inconsistent with the Bylaws and Regulations of the Academic Senate.” Finally, the Senate has authority to “determine the membership of the several faculties and councils.”

The language of these general grants of authority seems broad enough to encompass the matter at hand. Although the scope of these general provisions is certainly open to debate, we believe that a complete analysis leading to a Legislative Ruling probably would conclude that the Senate, through its committees (including the relevant faculty) could authorize the use of the working title as requested here.

There is at least one precedent for Senate approval of the use of titles that could be considered “working titles” for Senate members. The Senate, through the Committee on Academic Personnel – Oversight Subcommittee has consulted with the administration on the use of the title “Distinguished Professor,” although we have not been able to determine whether the Senate was involved with the creation of the title.

Executive Council Advice Is Appropriate

---

4 SOR 100.4(c). Although the appointments here are for Lecturers PSOE, it appears that they are intended to lead to the possibility of security of employment and thus potentially fall within the duty to consult. See also ASB 195 (University Privilege & Tenure Committee to “[a]dvise the President, the Academic Senate and its Divisions, and the Divisional Privilege and Tenure Committees on general policies involving academic privileges and tenure.”).

5 ASB 50(A). ASB 50(A) contains exceptions that apparently are not applicable here. See also DDB 137 (“Each Faculty is authorized to organize, … and to adopt any procedural rules and regulations consistent with Bylaws and legislation of the Academic Senate.”).

6 ASB 310; see also ASB 50(B) (“Except as otherwise provided, each Faculty may organize ….”).

7 SOR 105.2(c); see also ASB 305 (“Each Division shall determine its membership in accordance with this Section of the Bylaws and the Standing Orders of the Regents.”); DDB 1.A (“The Davis Division … shall have authority to organize … and to adopt for the conduct of its business rules and regulations not inconsistent with the Bylaws and Regulations of the Academic Senate and the Standing Orders of the Regents of the University of California.”).

8 The terms “Research Professor” and “Distinguished Professor” are in use on the Davis campus. The administration’s Academic Affairs website describes “Research Professor” as a “payroll title” and “Distinguished Professor” as an “honorary title.” We were unable to locate any of these titles – “Research Professor,” “Distinguished Professor,” “payroll title,” or “honorary title” – in the Code of the Academic Senate.

9 See Memorandum from William H. Casey, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel to Vice Provost Barbara A. Horwitz, July 29, 2009 (concluding that “above scale faculty can use the ‘Distinguished Professor’ title indefinitely.”).
The power of the President of the University to “appoint” University employees is qualified by an instruction to “consult with a properly constituted advisory committee of the Academic Senate” when the action involves a “Lecturer with Security of Employment.”\(^\text{10}\) The position in question here is designed to lead to possible appointment as a Lecturer with Security of Employment, so Senate consultation seems appropriate.

It appears that the Executive Council is a “properly constituted advisory committee” of the Senate in this respect. The Council is to “serve as liaison between the Division and the Davis campus Administration,”\(^\text{11}\) to “facilitate and expedite consultations between the administration and appropriate committees of the Division,”\(^\text{12}\) and to “attempt to anticipate emerging problems and to take measures to cope with them before they become urgent.”\(^\text{13}\)

**CAP Oversight Input May Be Desirable**

As noted, the Committee on Academic Personnel - Oversight Committee gave advice in 2009 on the question whether the title Distinguished Professor could expire. It may be appropriate to ask CAP - Oversight for advice here, given that several of its duties seem relevant: The subcommittee is charged with “consulting regularly with the Executive Council on policy regarding academic personnel,”\(^\text{14}\) as well as “striv[ing] to maintain consistent personnel standards within the Division,”\(^\text{15}\) and “confer[ring] with and advis[ing] the Chief Campus Officer on all matters of general policy regarding academic personnel.”\(^\text{16}\)

Sincerely,

John Hunt, Chair
Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction

Cc: Gina Anderson, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate

---

\(^\text{10}\) Standing Order of the Regents 100.4(c).
\(^\text{11}\) DDB 73(C).
\(^\text{12}\) DDB 73(C)(2).
\(^\text{13}\) DDB 73(C)(4).
\(^\text{14}\) DDB 42(B)(5).
\(^\text{15}\) DDB 42(B)(1).
\(^\text{16}\) DDB 42(B)(4).
September 3, 2014

DEAN HILDRETH
FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR McNALLY
College of Biological Sciences

Re: Teaching Professor Working Title Proposal

Thank you for the Teaching Professor working title proposal (copy enclosed). Your proposal requested expedited review. I am happy to take the proposal to the first Executive Council meeting for initial discussion.

I have discussed the proposed use of the “Teaching Professor” working title with Vice Provost Stanton. She informs me other deans have also expressed interest in using the working title. Vice Provost Stanton indicated she believes use of the working title is a campus-wide issue; and I agree.

We will be back in touch if there are questions and plan to provide advice late fall quarter 2014.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

André Knoesen, Chair
Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Professor: Electrical and Computer Engineering

Enclosure
cc: Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Hexter (w/enclosure)
   Vice Provost-Academic Affairs Stanton (w/enclosure)
   Former CBS Faculty Executive Committee Chair Theg (w/enclosure)
Davis Division Academic Senate

Request for Consultation Responses

Proposal-UCD Use of "Teaching Professor" Working Title

January 30, 2015

The enclosed proposal seeks approval to begin using the working title "Teaching Professor" for faculty in the Lecturer-Security of Employment Series.
AA&D Committee Response to Proposal-UCD Use of "Teaching Professor" Working Title

Although use of the new working title “Teaching Professor” may help in terms of attracting job candidates, the committee feels that there is substantial confusion already among students and the public about the difference between Lecturers and Professors. It’s very easy to see the term "Professor" and not appreciate the difference between a Teaching Professor and professors in the Professor series.

Another issue is that use of the term “Teaching Professor” might somehow contribute to the perception that teaching is not a substantial component of the Professor series, which in terms of public perception, is negative. In other words, the term Teaching Professor could inadvertently imply that Professors in the professor series don't teach or value teaching. There also is the assumption that Lecturers do not engage in research. Since this title is focused on teaching, lecturers can focus their research and publication on issues related to teaching pedagogy, which makes "Teaching Professor" a great fit for lecturers.

Finally, the committee is concerned that adoption of the “Teaching Professor” is a much cheaper way to hire an instructor than a Senate FTE. Will this title create and imbalance among faculty? This position should not be used to reduce instructional costs but to increase quality of teaching. Since the primary focus of Unit 18 lecturers is to teach, why not make this title available to them?
CAP Oversight Committee

December 12, 2014 4:39 PM

CAP finds no evidence that allowing the Teaching Professor title would influence the academic personnel process in any way because the standards are set in APM 285 and UCD-APM 285.
The CBS FEC collected a college-wide faculty vote to gauge support for this proposal. The results were:

84 yes (in favor of the proposal)
4 no (opposed to the proposal)
7 abstain
18 not voting (due to sabbatical or other reasons)
Response continued on next page.
To: Andre Knoesen, Chair  
    Davis Division of the Academic Senate

From: Niels Grønbech-Jensen, Chair  
    College of Engineering Faculty Executive Committee

SUBJECT: Teaching Professor Working Title Proposal

The Executive Committee has mixed opinions regarding the use of ``Teaching Professor'' when recruiting Lecturer-Security of Employment (LSOE) and Lecturer-Potential Security of Employment (LPSOE). The advantage is mainly a more tangible, and perhaps catchy, title, which may attract a broader pool of applicants to an open position. The disadvantages include: 

i) A discrepancy between advertised and position title, and 

ii) the introduction of an erosion of what the regular Professor means. It is further a concern that use of the working title is the beginning of making the title official in small increments. Thus, rather than a discussion about a working title, where a candidate is hired under one title into a position with another title, it may be better to have a new discussion about having an actual Teaching Professor title that has well-understood duties.
The L&S Executive Committee discussed this proposal at our January meeting. The discussion included both the particular question of the "teaching professor" title and the more general matter of the role of LSOEs.

On the first issue: while there was not a huge objection to the new title, concern was expressed that it carried an implication that regular professors did not teach, or at least did not have teaching as a primary responsibility. An alternative, "Professor of Teaching Practice," was suggested; this title is apparently used elsewhere.

More generally: there was a very strong concern that this discussion could be a prelude to an increased emphasis on LSOEs in place of regular faculty. It was clear to us that, on the one hand, departments could not be required to hire LSOEs/PLSOEs; but, on the other hand, that deans could offer departments "an LSOE or nothing." Several divisional deans stressed that they liked the flexibility of being able to make offers to LSOEs as part of their "portfolio," and that in some cases an LSOE was financially much more attractive than a regular professor. Executive Committee representatives from departments in which professors require substantial start-up funding -- either to set up labs or because some fields required off-scale salaries -- were especially worried that their departments would be pressured to hire LSOEs rather than regular faculty.

While no one on the committee opposes LSOEs/PLSOEs as a matter of principle, we are, as a committee, anxious that the balance among faculty not swing too far toward LSOEs. This requires some explicit mechanism for Senate participation. The proposed Executive Committee involvement in the deans' budgeting process could provide one form of oversight, but we would like to see a broader, Senate-wide mechanism: some top level committee that can regularly examining the faculty/LSOE balance and raise objections if the ratio starts to become unbalanced.
We have discussed the proposal and emphasize two points raised in other comments on this issue: (1) The title "Teaching Professor" might suggest to some that those with the title "Professor" do not teach. This may seem like a small detail, but perhaps not given the current political environment. (2) UCD should find an appropriate mix of LSOE and research faculty that ensures the research excellence of the institution. While the current proposal does not speak directly to this issue, the creation of more titles for teaching track implicitly raises the issue.
Faculty Welfare

January 14, 2015 11:17 AM

The Faculty Welfare Committee recognizes that the working title of "Teaching Professor" is a very useful advertising and recruitment tool and provides a more appropriate title to the outstanding Lecturers with SOE. However, some concern was expressed about its implication with regard to future hiring of regular (research) faculty vs. LSOEs, a creation of a two-tier system, and a possible shift in the University's mission. The committee recommends that the Academic Senate continue to monitor hiring trends to ensure that the appropriate balance is maintained.
Undergraduate Council

January 23, 2015 8:27 AM

Undergraduate Council Response: Proposal-UCD Use of "Teaching Professor" Working Title

On this issue, Undergraduate Council was unusually divided, unusual in the sense that most of the time UGC is close to unanimous. The considerable diversity on this issue had some relationship to members' fields and experience teaching very large classes, but mostly the differences were over philosophy. Some members of UGC hesitate about hiring even a few LSOEs campus-wide. Others consider LSOE a reasonable approach, but feel the name should remain what it is, namely LSOE. Others think the name "teaching professor" is fine. A final group considers that "teaching professor" should not be a LSOE but rather a conventional professor who specializes in pedagogy in large introductory classes (e.g., in biology).

This last category of specialist in the pedagogy of science was presented as innovative in those fields. Some other members of UGC responded, however, that individual departments could always seek out such a specialist without the endorsement of the whole campus.

A similar point/counterpoint concerned the implicit comparison between "teaching professor" and "professor." Almost everyone who is now classified as a "professor" does some teaching, some people a great deal of teaching. How would those outside UCD distinguish between "teaching professor" and "professor?" (It seems unlikely that any student will notice such distinctions as these.)

Another point/counterpoint concerned the proportion of teaching professors (LSOE) in a department. If in a typical department of say 15 faculty, there was one or two "teaching professors" those faculty would be close to orphans in their own departments, or put differently, would have more in common with teaching professors in disciplines other than their own. At the other end of the balance, it might be that financial pressure would raise the number of teaching professors so that only a few of the fifteen faculty had the opportunity for research outside of their immediate teaching responsibilities, which would be detrimental to the overall research mission of UCD. "Teaching professors" are unlikely to be involved with graduate education.

UCD now has what is a two-tiered system, namely senate faculty and lecturers (and that group could be broken into continuing lecturers and one-time visitors). Although LSOE has been allowed, it has not been common. As it becomes more common, the system will become one of three tiers. How easily will UCD be able to draw the lines? Are we prepared to re-classify some unit-18 lecturers as the use of LSOE expands? As one example, lecturers in the University Writing Program direct entry-level writing, first year writing, the writing ambassadors program, prized writing, the advanced composition challenge exam, the writing across the curriculum program, and the writing minor. Most lecturers in the University Writing Program present at national conferences, publish regularly, develop and teach online and hybrid courses, do outreach to K-12 schools, work closely with industry, conduct assessment projects, and too many other professional activities to list here. The full-time teaching load for a unit-18 lecturer in the writing program is 7 courses (capped at 25 because of the high paper load). How would UCD distinguish “teaching professors” from lecturers who already engage in what the teaching professor evaluation framework describes?

One area of agreement within UGC is that the phrase LSOE, let alone LPSOE, is not a natural usage. UGC would be in favor of a substitution; what that substitution should be is not obvious, however. Objections would be few if an advertisement included translations of LPSOE as “teaching-oriented professor or “research expected on pedagogy.” That is, the phrasing in an ad can take more liberties than the APM. Any Senate faculty position should be advertised in a way to bring into consideration the largest number of strong, appropriate candidates.

Another area of agreement within UGC is that these positions, by whatever name, should not be created to reduce instructional costs but should be carefully considered as a way of increasing the quality of pedagogy. These faculty should present the most up-to-date understanding of the disciplines, and should complement, rather than substitute for more conventional professors. Departments are best placed to understand such matters. Each department has different disciplines and modes of scholarly work. Each department should continue to make the decisions that maintain the balance among teaching, service, research, and professional activities.
The UC Davis Salary Equity Program, 2015-2016

MAUREEN STANTON, PHILIP KASS, ROBERTA LASKY, EVERETT WILSON
OFFICE OF THE VICE PROVOST FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
The 2015 equity program was based on work completed in 2013-2014

Off-scale salaries are more a function of recruitment and retention than academic progress.

The sheer number of faculty in this quadrant was very troubling when evaluating faculty equity.
The UC Davis Salary Equity Plan for 2015-2016

https://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/policies/compensation/equity_adjustment.html

Ladder-Rank Faculty Eligibility
• Appointment begins prior to July 1, 2015 (exception: LPSOE/LSOE/SLSOE)
• Off-scale salary is below the mean of the academic unit
• Assistant Professor Step 1 through Professor Step 4: 10-year progress rate ≥ 0.75
• Professor Step 5 and higher: 10-year progress rate ≥ 0.25
• Not on the Health Sciences Compensation Plan
The UC Davis Salary Equity Plan for 2015-2016

Analyses were done separately by academic unit, and where appropriate, by salary scale:

- Regular
- Business/Economics/Engineering
- Health Sciences Compensation Plan (School of Medicine)
- Academic Personnel Unit (School of Nursing)
- Strict Full Time (School of Veterinary Medicine).
The UC Davis Salary Equity Plan for 2015-2016

• Amount of funding available depended on academic unit and (where appropriate) the salary groups.
• 1.5% of July 1, 2015* total salary expended in unit/group, as mandated by UCOP.
• 1.0% of July 1, 2015* total salary expended in unit/group, as mandated by Provost Hexter for ladder rank faculty only.
  • Total = 2.5% of total salary expended in unit/group for ladder rank faculty.

* following 2015-2016 range adjustment
Both off-scales below the mean were moved 71.5% toward mean.

Mean off-scale

New mean off-scale
Contrasts with other UC campuses

**Berkeley:** Associate 1 to Professor 6 only, no retention offer in 8 years, “strong achievement” in 2-3 areas of review, “who work effectively to build and sustain Berkeley as a strong institution.”

**Irvine:** Vague, but included merit and comparative salaries from peer institutions.

**Los Angeles:** Vague, and done in consultation with equity advisors.

**Merced:** “The campus used a third of the pool for a campus-wide off-scale bump of $500 to each faculty member. Then additional salary increments were awarded so that every faculty member was [at least] at 65% of the mean off-scale of the discipline.”

**Riverside:** Left up to deans and sometimes dept. chairs. No consistency across academic units.

**San Diego:** Vague, but dealt with internal and external inequities.

**Santa Barbara:** 1% across the board; deans awarded 0.5% based on ”equity studies, recent personnel actions, and personal knowledge,” but was not consistently applied across units.

**Santa Cruz:** All faculty received increases based on scale, rank, and step for addressing inter-campus inequities (i.e., they do not believe there are large inequities on campus).
Advantages of the UC Davis approach

Targets inequities specifically identified by the 2014 UC Davis Salary Equity Task Force

Transparent: program details and examples on Academic Affairs website

Uniformity of approach across academic units

Utilizes objective eligibility criteria, including progress rates calculated by Academic Affairs

Centrally performed salary calculations – not delegated to academic units

Algorithm-based software program based on data in university databases

Respects structural salary differences between academic units and salary scales

Retains positionality: no off-scale salary inversion for eligible faculty

Strongly supported by UC Davis Academic Senate
The UC Davis Salary Equity Program

Overall effects:
• In most academic units, eligible faculty did not reach the July 1, 2015 mean off-scale salary, although substantial progress was made (depending on the unit).
• Approximately 750 ladder-rank faculty received equity adjustments out of approximately 1,500 ladder rank faculty at the university
• The differences in equity adjustments between women and men within academic units were typically small (< $200/year), with few exceptions.
## Number and percent of faculty impacted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit/Salary Scale</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>number receiving equity adjustments</th>
<th>percent of faculty receiving equity adjustments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE/ENV SCIENCES REG</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE/ENV SCIENCES BEE</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS: HArCS</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS: MATH &amp; PHYSICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS: SOCIAL SCIENCES REG</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS: SOCIAL SCIENCES BEE</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING (APU 3)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING (APU 5)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERINARY MEDICINE (SFT)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERINARY MEDICINE (clinical)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mean off-scale salaries pre and post equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit/Salary Scale</th>
<th>mean: pre-equity</th>
<th>mean: post-equity</th>
<th>percent increase in mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE/ENV SCIENCES REG</td>
<td>$8,099</td>
<td>$11,344</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE/ENV SCIENCES BEE</td>
<td>$8,071</td>
<td>$11,751</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>$18,714</td>
<td>$21,975</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>$11,639</td>
<td>$14,196</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>$8,539</td>
<td>$11,719</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>$4,267</td>
<td>$6,724</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS: HArCS</td>
<td>$6,554</td>
<td>$8,895</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS: MATH &amp; PHYSICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>$16,437</td>
<td>$19,839</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS: SOCIAL SCIENCES REG</td>
<td>$15,453</td>
<td>$18,367</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS: SOCIAL SCIENCES BEE</td>
<td>$43,667</td>
<td>$47,919</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>$19,106</td>
<td>$22,346</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING (APU 3)</td>
<td>$18,270</td>
<td>$19,821</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING (APU 5)</td>
<td>$22,530</td>
<td>$24,618</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERINARY MEDICINE (SFT)</td>
<td>$26,644</td>
<td>$30,490</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERINARY MEDICINE (clinical)</td>
<td>$24,836</td>
<td>$26,924</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coefficients of variation ($SD/\bar{X}$) pre and post equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit/Salary Scale</th>
<th>CV - pre equity</th>
<th>CV - post equity</th>
<th>% decline in CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE/ENV SCIENCES REG</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE/ENV SCIENCES BEE</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS: HArCS</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS: MATH &amp; PHYSICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS: SOCIAL SCIENCES REG</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS: SOCIAL SCIENCES BEE</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING (APU 3)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING (APU 5)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERINARY MEDICINE (SFT)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERINARY MEDICINE (clinical)</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How far academic units went in achieving their goals (mean offscale)

Academic unit/salary group

Percentage of goal achieved
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