



Davis Division Academic Senate

Request for Consultation Responses

Proposed Revisions to APM 285, 210-3, 133, and 740

June 2, 2017

The University invites comments on Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual Sections:

- 285, Lecturer with Security of Employment Series (APM - 285);
- 210-3, Instructions to Review Committees That Advise on Actions Concerning the Lecturer with Security of Employment Series (APM - 210-3);
- 133-0-B, Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles (APM - 133);
and
- 740, Leaves of Absence/Sabbatical Leaves (APM - 740).

Proposed revisions modify language intended to make the title more accurately reflect the requirements for advancement in the series and make hiring, evaluation, and promotion practices more consistent across the UC system.

CAP Oversight Committee

May 31, 2017 5:47 PM

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has reviewed the proposed changes to the system-wide APM Sections 285, 210-3, 133, and 740, concerning the introduction of the Teaching Professor title, the evaluation criteria associated with this title, and the corresponding policy with regard to sabbatical leaves and limitations on total period of service.

CAP previously provided feedback on the Teaching Professor title through its UCAP representative that, in line with the majority opinion of the UC Davis Academic Senate, expressed a number of concerns about the introduction and implementation of this title. The proposed APM changes provide no indication that this prior input was taken into account, and at this point CAP has no further suggestions.

Faculty Welfare

June 9, 2017 8:41 AM

Response continued on next 2 pages.

June 9, 2017

RFC: Proposed Revisions to APM - 285 and associated sections of the APM

The committee on Faculty Welfare reviewed the proposed revisions to APM - 285 and additional, associated sections of the APM. While the committee supports the many improvements offered by the revisions, it has significant concerns about the impact of the policy on UC. The main area of concern is the potential for growth of additional teaching-focused personnel and the impact of that growth on both the workload of traditional research faculty and the resources available to support their teaching.

Firstly, the committee finds the titles offered under the revisions to APM - 285 to be welcome and supportive of teaching-focused faculty, with Assistant/Associate/(Full) Teaching Professor being far better than the current LPSOE/LSOE/SLSOE. The new titles are recognizable outside of the University of California, where the former titles were not.

Secondly, the committee finds the broad range of areas for achievement in APM - 210-3 to be responsive to the range of needs faced by Departments. In particular, the ability for a Teaching Professor to succeed through the development of discipline-specific pedagogy, discipline-specific research, or their combination, provides useful flexibility that should allow Teaching Professors to be vital to their Departments. However, the potential to succeed in a range of pursuits is potentially problematic with respect to fair and equitable review. While conditions for success may be somewhat unclear in the Professor series, the potential lack of clarity appears compounded in the Teaching Professor series. Further, the lack of specificity could be doubly difficult because review committees for Teaching Professors will be comprised largely of those in the Professor series. The fairness of merit and promotion will need attention from the Senate and the administration, particularly as some campuses have recently increased hiring into APM - 285 positions.

Thirdly, the committee has broad concerns that these revisions to APM are part of a larger trend in favoring Teaching over Research. The UC has a historic focus on research, and our students and the larger public expect that scholars engaged in research will teach UC classes. This is indeed a hallmark of a UC education that differentiates it from the state's other great high education institutions, CSU and the Community Colleges. UC must hold steady to promote the pedagogical value of instruction-by-researcher, and it should not be abandoned for the sake of budgetary pressure or efficiency. Where additional teaching support is required, UC has historically hired Lecturers of various types who are nearly fully committed to teaching, and this has enabled those in the Professor series to maintain a lighter teaching load. The recent trends in budgets, and uncomfortable enrollment demands by the Governor that have been agreed to by the President, have driven student to faculty ratios higher and have increased workload on Professors.

Based on discussion in the Committee, recent increases in Professor Series workload appear real, and to be disparate among Departments, and the Committee strongly recommends that the Senate join with the Administration to thoroughly assess historical workload. That UC has larger enrollments and larger research expenditures, simultaneously, suggest an increasing workload that should be quantified. Our committee deliberations underscore deep inequities in nominal teaching load among Departments, and this appears unjust. Specific notes from the Committee discussion highlight some of the issues:

- Teaching loads of Professors in different Departments varies from 2 courses per year to 4 courses per year (among the committee; perhaps wider variation across the Campus or the System)
- TA support for Professors in undergraduate courses varies widely by Department, with typical support being 10 TA hours per week for a 40 person class in one Department, and 0 TA hours per week in a 149 person class in another
- In some Departments, Professors not meeting a specific student credit-hour objective (e.g., 500 student credit hours per year) suffer an increase to their teaching load by an additional course in the following year; other Departments have no student credit hour requirement for Professors
- Some Departments have significant pay inequities, where LSOE are paid more than Professors

The above inequities, that are apparent in the small dataset of our Committee roster, are concerning. They suggest a lack of actively managing student growth in a manner that is sustainable, and that respects and supports faculty welfare.

A minority viewpoint among the Committee is that the above inequities demand that the changes to APM - 025 and associated policies be stopped, and not continued until they can be considered in the context of data on teaching workload by research faculty and other instructional staff (to include lecturers, adjuncts, Clinical Professors, LPSOE/LSOE/SLSOE and so on), aggregated by unit (e.g., College or School).

Bringing Teaching Professors to UC could improve teaching, reduce teaching-related workload for Professors and thereby facilitate research; however, the Committee is concerned that lavishing teaching resources on Teaching Professors could reallocate already scarce resources, thereby negatively affecting Professors and hindering their research. The Committee therefore recommends that Senate join with the Administration to assess the impacts of any increases in hiring of Teaching Professors to ensure they have measureable and positive impact on UC's students, programs, and faculty welfare.

The committee also offers these additional points of feedback:

UC DAVIS: ACADEMIC SENATE
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

- The proposed revision could clarify the circumstances under which current UC employees (e.g., Unit 18 lecturer) would be hired into this track; is the position appropriate for new PhD graduates, with limited teaching experience?
- It seems unclear why issues of diversity are a part of Scholarly Achievement, since they may fit better with Teaching and/or Service
- There is concern with creating a second-rate position with the title Professor, and if Teaching Professors are to be successful, they must stand as equal at UC; the Senate and the Administration should take steps to ensure this equality

FEC: College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences

June 5, 2017 1:22 PM

The proposed revisions to APM 285, 210-3, 133 and 740 were discussed at the CA&ES FEC meeting of May 1st and comments were requested from all FEC members. The following represents a summarization of those comments.

CA&ES-FEC is strongly in favor of the changes proposed to APM 285, 210-3, 133 and 740. Specifically the change in title from the very awkward LPSOE to Teaching Professor is welcome. The new title will be far more meaningful than the current LPSOE and will allow us to attract superior candidates. It was also felt that the title 'Teaching Professor' recognizes the critical contributions that an individual who focusses primarily on teaching and pedagogy can make to the UC mission.

Clarifications to APM 285 and 210-3 will also improve the review process for these candidates. The emphasis in the candidates review on teaching excellence and innovation is appropriate. The flexibility offered in the review category 'Professional and scholarly' is also welcome as it allows for the recognition of "outstanding and externally recognized contributions to the development of pedagogy and/or theoretical or applied research in the discipline. Achievement and leadership in pedagogy could include development or application of innovative methods of teaching or evaluative tools to assess the impact of teaching. Contributions to the advancement of professional practice or professional education, including equitable access and diversity in education, should be evaluated in this category when they present new ideas or scholarly research."

Overall, CA&ES FEC considers this a timely and important initiative.

FEC: College of Biological Sciences

June 7, 2017 3:28 PM

The proposed revisions to APM 285, 210-3, 133 and 740 were discussed at the CBS FEC meeting of June 2nd and comments were requested from all FEC members. The following represents those comments.

The FEC is supportive of the new title of Teaching Professor for LPSOE position. We also feel that the emphasis on teaching excellence for this position is appropriate. However, we feel that the emphasis on teaching innovation is not appropriate. Teaching excellence certainly does not preclude innovation, but we don't feel that requiring innovation in teaching is necessary. Instead, we suggest using the term "Scholarly" rather than requiring work that is specifically innovative.

FEC: College of Engineering

June 16, 2017 4:24 PM

Response continued on next page.



FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

ONE SHIELDS AVENUE
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616

June 16, 2017

TO: Dr. Rachael Goodhue
Academic Senate Chair

FR: Anh-Vu Pham
Chair, FEC Engineering

RE: RFC on Systemwide APM Review for LSOEs

The College of Engineering Faculty Executive Committee (COE FEC) has discussed the Systemwide Review of the Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual (APM) related to Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOEs).

Regarding the title of 'Teaching Professor', the COE FEC had previously expressed opposition to its use and there exists concern that despite the committee's consistent disapproval, this matter continues to be brought forward for discussion. Having said that, the committee is in agreement that though this isn't the perfect title, there does not appear to be a better option at this time.

In the big picture, the COE FEC is concerned about growing a group of faculty whose primary purpose is something other than research, considering UC Davis' reputation as a premier research institution. The committee understands that, in the current budget climate, hiring LSOEs is more cost effective than hiring ladder rank faculty due to the savings of startup packages, but would encourage keeping the number of LSOEs as small as possible and revisiting this issue if and when the budget situation improves.

FEC: College of Letters and Science

June 7, 2017 5:22 PM

On June 5, 2017, the L & S FEC discussed the Proposed Revisions to APM 285, 210-3, 133, and 740.

The general consensus from the committee is that the proposed changes still leave it ambiguous as to whether scholarly activity is or is not required for advancement in the LPSOE series. On some pages "or" language is used (e.g., page 41: "The review committees must take exceptional care to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility"), on others "and" language is used (e.g., page 2: "LSOE faculty have responsibilities in teaching, scholarly activity, and service;" page 49: "requires evidence that the professional and scholarly achievement and activity. . . are recognized. . . externally by experts in the field"), on others "and/or" language appears (e.g., page 49: "requires evidence of significant distinction in pedagogy and/or in the underlying discipline. . . and that is externally recognized as having a broad scholarly impact"), and in one place the APM states that the candidate has to have demonstrated "superior intellectual attainment" (page 52: "Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced particularly in excellent and innovative teaching as well as in professional and scholarly achievement").

While we appreciate the desire for having flexibility in the requirements for advancement, it needs to be decided—and clearly articulated—whether scholarly activity (including externally recognized scholarly activity in the form of publications) is or is not a requirement for merits and promotions.

As written, it is also vague what counts as scholarly activity. For example, does polling your students about their lecture preferences in a survey format count as scholarly activity or do "Teaching Professors" also have to publish? Moreover, do they have to publish specifically in instruction and pedagogy (e.g., as described on page 7) or can they publish in other topic areas?

The APM needs concrete and clearly defined expectations for how candidates would be evaluated at tenure. This also affects hiring decisions—do you hire the candidate who is an outstanding teacher but does not engage in scholarly work or do you hire the person who is a less outstanding instructor but involved in scholarship?

If you want to make scholarly activity a requirement, what happens to tenured faculty who have transferred to the LSOE series due to shifting priorities and now primarily (or only) focus on teaching? Would you have different requirements for new hires (i.e., require publications) into the series versus those previously tenured in a faculty position (i.e., not require publications)?

Finally, L & S FEC members took issue with the premise argued on page 7: "The Teaching Professor titles that have or lead to security of employment are faculty positions designed to meet long-term instructional needs of the University that cannot be fulfilled by an appointee in the ladder-rank professorial series."

Ladder-rank faculty engaged in scholarly work are at the cutting edge of their fields. They can answer a wide range of questions from inquiring students in ways that allow students to move beyond more basic textbook descriptions. Many of our ladder-faculty are outstanding, award-winning teachers. The motivation for hiring more LPSOEs appears to be more budgetary than pedagogical.

Members also expressed enthusiasm for increasing faculty incentives for designing new classes or innovating instruction for current classes. We need more investment in pedagogic advancement for ladder-rank faculty. It is misguided to assume that ladder-rank faculty do not prioritize and are not

invested in teaching.

Kristin Lagattuta, Chair

FEC: Graduate School of Management

June 1, 2017 12:04 PM

We generally endorse the move to "teaching professor," although we would have preferred "clinical professor". We find it unfortunate that the series requires scholarly activities as we may prefer that some people in this series focus on program innovation, development, and execution rather than writing/creating scholarly works. Adding this requirement will narrow the applicant pool.