

Increase Lecturer Power in Research

**Report prepared by Stephanie Lain for the UC-AFT on September 8, 2017
(Updated September 21, 2017)**

Acknowledgments

The investigative project described in this document was funded by a grant from UC-AFT. Work on the project ran from May 2017 through mid-September 2017 and was carried out by the Increase Lecturer Power in Research committee, comprised of Sarah Carvill, Stephanie Lain, and Matthew Lasar. Interviews were conducted by all three members of the committee. Stephanie Lain compiled the information and wrote the report. Matthew Lasar contributed a snapshot of his own experience as a lecturer engaged in professional activities outside of teaching. Tony Hoffman contributed the section that describes the current state of the NSF Professional Development Fund.

We would like to acknowledge and thank the UCSC lecturers who agreed to be interviewed for this project. Their insights and willingness to discuss their work and experiences with funding have been invaluable. We also wish to thank UCSC Field Representative Jeb Purucker and Vice President of Organizing Roxi Power for sharing their knowledge of funding issues and providing leads on people to contact.

Introduction

In 2016-2017, the members of UCSC Local 2199 identified a need to investigate the research activities of lecturers in an effort to highlight these endeavors and expand access to funding opportunities through the UC system. In April 2017, we proposed to undertake the following actions in order to better understand the issue:

1) Conduct a detailed assessment of the needs of lecturers with respect to research support. The assessment would consist of a survey administered to members asking whether or not they have applied for grant support in the past and to comment on impediments (if any) they've experienced when attempting to apply for funding in their position as a lecturer. In cases where impediments were encountered, we planned to conduct follow-up interviews with the members involved to learn the details of their cases.

2) Meet with UCSC administrators to clarify which funding opportunities lecturers are currently allowed to pursue. In particular, we wished to identify the University's rationale in restricting lecturer access to funding opportunities. This is with the understanding that having more information will help us better plan our campaign for the next round of bargaining.

3) Collect media accounts surrounding the issue of lecturer research.

4) Identify and pursue avenues for publishing lecturers' stories. If we are successful in encouraging our members to submit their stories for publication, this could potentially raise the profile of UC lecturers and help us connect with advocacy groups at the national level.

5) Draft and submit a report detailing the committee's actions and summarizing the main findings.

Needs assessment

In April of 2017, a survey was administered to lecturers that asked a series of questions designed to elicit information about lecturers' research activities and access to funding. The questions themselves and percentage and number of responses are listed below.

"Have you applied for grants for research or instructional improvement while employed at UCSC?"	50% yes; 50% no (N=40)
"If you answered "yes" to the previous question, how many times have you applied for these grants?"	Varied responses but most had applied more than once (N=24)
"Have you received a grant(s) for research or	51.4% yes; 48.6% no (N=37)

instructional improvement while employed at UCSC?"	
"Was the grant from: 1) campus sources, 2) extramural funding, 3) I have not received any grants/NA?"	37.1% campus sources; 11.4% extramural funding; 51.4% I have not received any grants/NA (N=35)
"When you received grants, were you able to be the Principal Investigator or did your work have to be officially conducted under the name of a Senate member or someone else?"	24.2% under my name; 12.1% under the name of a Senate member or someone else; 63.6% NA (N=33)

"Have you ever encountered an obstacle to applying for funding? If 'yes', please describe." Four members responded "No" to this question. The other responses were as follows:

"Many obstacles, but mainly not eligible to apply for funding with current status."
"No support."
"I received the funding approval after the event I needed it for had occurred. Therefore, I could not use it and had to say 'no thanks'."
"The non-senate faculty grant program offers very little money and not for book writing."
"This is slightly off-topic but I won the excellence in teaching award and the nominal prize money was put in a FOAPAL in my department and I can't get access to it without filing forms that validate I am using the funds for my research which is fine but years ago that same award came as a check from the UC regents."

Follow-up interviews with lecturers

After receiving the results from the survey and reading the comments, we decided to conduct follow-up interviews with 10 of the lecturers who had responded positively about having applied for funding in the past and who had agreed to be contacted for the purpose of a follow-up interview. The interviewees came from several divisions: Arts, Humanities, Physical & Biological Sciences, and Social Sciences. In the beginning stages of the interviews, we were made aware of proposed revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual, revisions which primarily affect the current Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series (not represented by Unit 18) but which may have important repercussions for our members as well. Discussion of this issue can be found in the appendix.

Overview

The follow-up interviews revealed details that were not apparent from the initial round of questioning. These details provide insight into the kinds of research and other professional activities lecturers are involved in, as well as the obstacles they encounter in seeking compensation for these activities, financial or

otherwise. When we began the interviews we realized that the term “research” did not fully encompass the range of non-teaching, yet professional, activities in which many of our members are engaged. Various descriptors were proposed, including “non-classroom creativity” and “significant creative works”. We finally settled on “professional activities” as a term designated to cover both research and creative work.

It perhaps goes without saying that the money, time, and energy spent on professional activities outside of a lecturer’s main teaching responsibilities amount to a significant expense. We believe they also result in a net benefit, not only to the lecturer (and, by extension, his or her teaching), but to the University and society at large. While a main purpose of this report is to share our lecturers’ stories, we are at the same time concerned about protecting the identities of those who were kind enough to donate their time and speak with us in depth. A decision was made to report in a general way, without revealing identifying details, about the obstacles the interviewees have faced in gaining support for their professional activities, the kinds of help they’ve received, how they’ve been able to overcome barriers and their observations on what it means to be a lecturer.

In our interviews, we found that the professional activities our members are most engaged in include: presenting at conferences, serving on panels, conducting experiments, writing articles (including peer-reviewed journal articles), writing books, performing music, creating and performing works of art. All of the members we interviewed reported experiencing some hardship in obtaining support for their professional activities outside of teaching, though many had received encouragement and help from their departmental chairs or other Senate Faculty colleagues.

Clearly, there are numerous discentives for lecturers pursuing professional activities not directly related to their teaching. Of these, the most obvious relate to the review process and the fact that members of the personnel committee are not obliged to consider a lecturer’s non-teaching professional achievements when renewing the appointment, granting continuation, or contemplating a merit increase. Departments are afforded the autonomy of deciding how they will regard a lecturer’s professional achievements outside of the classroom, or if they will regard them at all. Under the current framework of our contract, any time spent away from teaching constitutes a risk (insofar as it utilizes resources that *could* be devoted to teaching). At the same time, it provides little possibility of return.

Departmental funding for lecturer professional development (teaching-related or otherwise) is minimal to non-existent. Although lecturers are eligible to apply for funding related to course development (see “Funding opportunities and our contract” for more details), it is at the discretion of the University to determine the validity of any project proposal before allowing it to proceed through the system.

For these reasons, it is not surprising that for professional development activities directly related to teaching, most of the lecturers we interviewed had relied on the union's Non-Senate Faculty (NSF) Professional Development Fund (PDF) as their primary funding source.

As far as professional development activities not directly related to teaching were concerned, lecturers either: 1) funded their projects themselves, 2) collaborated with Senate Faculty colleagues who were eligible to apply for funding, 3) sought funding from college endowments, or 4) received an exception to policy in order to apply for external funding. Solutions 1 & 2 were by far the most common; 3 & 4 were quite rare.

Snapshot

Perspective offered by Lecturer Matthew Lasar:

"I have been teaching in the Department of History at UC Santa Cruz since the winter of 2003. I am a Continuous Appointment lecturer and have been so for around seven years. I think I have a very good relationship with the history department. Everything is cordial. The department's principals appear to appreciate my work. I am treated well within the context of my academic status. My review letters are excellent so far. But unacknowledged in them is the fact that I have written three history books, three academic journal articles, and an anthology entry. I have given papers at various conferences. I have written articles related to my field in *Wired*, *Ars Technica*, and *The Nation* magazine. I have been quoted in *The New York Times* at least four times on the status of local and community radio in the USA. A publication I co-founded, *Radio Survivor*, is a member of the Library of Congress' Radio Preservation Task Force. None of this is mentioned in my reviews.

In pursuit of my last book, *Radio 2.0: Uploading the First Broadcast Medium*, I applied for a non-Senate faculty grant for support for my writing. I was informed that this grant does not support writing. Nor does it support the purchase of history books, I was told. Eventually, I received approximately \$1,700 to attend the SXSW conference in Austin, where I attended various panel discussions about radio. In the acknowledgments of the book I thanked the then chair of the history department for his assistance in obtaining this grant. That is the extent to which this history department, or any history department, has helped me in any formal way in the production of my scholarship since I received my Ph.D. in 1997.

Thus, I experience myself as, for all practical purposes, an amateur historian who coincidentally happens to teach at a university history department. I have occasionally thought about bringing this matter up at an academic department meeting, but I have never attended such a gathering in the 15 years that I have taught at UCSC. Nor do I expect to be invited to one. It should also be noted that I no longer teach any courses in my research field: the history of radio and electronic/digital media.

In 2016 I received a Teaching in Excellence Award from the University. At the award ceremony for myself and seven other faculty, Chancellor George Blumenthal gave an excellent speech in which he mentioned the importance of teaching and research. 'At UCSC, it's not either or—we value both and do both exceedingly well,' the Chancellor is quoted as saying at this annual event. After the ceremony, I contacted Dr. Blumenthal and asked if I could have a bit of his time. He graciously invited me to his office and generously listened as I quite bluntly expressed my disagreement in this regard. I told the Chancellor that I think that at UCSC and the rest of the University of California, it is 'either or,' at least for lecturers. In fact, that stark division functions as the separation line between tenured and non-tenured faculty at UCSC. But the problem is not that lecturers don't create, it is that the fruits of their creativity are not formally recognized or valued by their respective departments or the University."

Funding opportunities and our contract

There is a section of our contract that specifically addresses our ability, as lecturers, to apply for certain types of grants aimed at pedagogical activities.

Funding for pedagogical activities

From UCAFT Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (Article 8: Instructional Support, Section C):

- 1) NSF may apply for grants for instructional improvement and course development and may apply or be nominated for teaching awards. NSF are eligible for and may request course support funds, and such requests shall not be capriciously denied, or denied solely on the basis of bargaining unit membership.
- 2) Information pertaining to available campus instructional grants and awards shall be made available to NSF by the same means as those used for other instructional appointees.
- 3) At the sole discretion of the University, an NSF may be granted Principal Investigator status in accordance with Contracts and Grants Policy.

Of interest, is Section E from the same article that decisions about what activities do or do not constitute instructional support are left to the University and are not arbitrable:

Section E (Arbitrator's Authority):

In any grievance alleging a violation of this Article, the Arbitrator shall have no authority to review the University's decisions whether or not to provide grants for instructional improvement and/or course development, or to bestow a teaching award under Section C.1. The arbitrator shall have no authority to modify University procedures in Section A. or to substitute her/his judgment for that of the University with regard to the determination of whether infrastructure or resources are or are not available, as described in Section A.

More on the function of the NSF Professional Development Fund¹

At UCSC, final awards for the grants are overseen by the University's Academic Personnel Office (APO) (at other UCs this responsibility is handled by other offices, usually official granting offices).

The lecturer contract for the university grants \$200 per (Full-time Employee) FTE for the grant program. In the last three years, that has amounted to about \$34,000 per annual granting cycle. In the last five years or so we have spent most of that money each year; our current budget is about \$5,200 and we will get an infusion of \$34,000 in September.

UCSC's program is divided into small grants (of less than \$750) and large grants (of \$750 and more). The program is divided this way so that: 1) small grants for activities (which receive quick approval by the NSF PDF council chair) can be given throughout the year, and 2) larger grants can be reviewed more carefully once a year, by the entire council.

Roughly 90% of received applications are approved for funding (the rejected applications are either incomplete or cannot demonstrate pedagogical relevance. Some rejected applications ask for materials that departments should provide; this is a problem particularly in the arts departments where classes are offered with insufficient materials).

The following table shows the number of grants that were awarded at UCSC over the past three years.

AY	Large Grants	Small Grants
2014-2015	20	9
2015-2016	22	8
2016-2017	14	23

MOST grants are for conference attendance or training, usually where a lecturer is giving a paper, presentation, recital or providing some kind of conference leadership.

MOST grants are for lecturers in the social sciences and particularly the humanities. There has been a constant push to generate interest in the grant program among the STEM lecturers.

MOST applications are from repeat applicants, i.e., people who have successfully used the program and continue to apply. The perception of the

¹ We are grateful to NSF PDF Council Chairperson Tony Hoffman for contributing the information that corresponds to this section. The version that appears here is from an email exchange and has been lightly redacted for style.

committee is that new and pre-six lecturers under-utilize the program. In the last three years the committee has tended to favour the new applicants, adopting a “spread the wealth” strategy rather than concentrating funds into a small, expert pool of applicants.

Funding for activities NOT related to pedagogy

The University’s “Contracts and Grants” webpage provides detailed information about who is eligible to apply for grants in the UC System.

From UCOP Research Policy Analysis and Coordination (Chapter 1-500: Principal Investigator Guidelines):

Section 1-510 (Solicitation Authority), “No solicitation or application for extramural support of research, training, or public service programs or projects shall be made officially in the name of the University without the prior approval of The Board of Regents or of an authorized Officer or official of the University, as set forth in Chapter 13, Legal Authorities and Principles, of this Manual.”

Section 1-530 (Who May Submit Proposals), title groups eligible to submit proposals for research or training contracts or grants:

- 1) Members of the Academic Senate, including emeriti.
- 2) Appointees in the Agronomist series, including emeriti.
- 3) Appointees at 50 percent or more of full time in the Adjunct Professor series.
- 4) Appointees at 50 percent or more of full time in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series.
- 5) Appointees at 50 percent or more of full time in the Professional Research series.
- 6) Appointees at 50 percent or more of full time in the Specialists in Cooperative Extension series.

Put simply, employees in the title group “Lecturer” are not eligible to submit proposals for extramural funding for research, training contracts or grants.

At the outset of this project, we had hoped to uncover a reason for the prohibition on lecturers applying for funding. That goal, in hindsight, seems unrealistic. We do not have access to anyone involved in that level of decision-making in the administration and if we did, it is unlikely they would be willing to speak openly with us about the rationale for excluding lecturers. From our members, we have heard that, in their interactions with administrators, concerns about lecturer accountability are sometimes brought up. Lecturers are perceived as freelancers, temp workers whose contracts might run out before the terms of the grant can be fulfilled.

Some of the best opportunities lecturers have had in the UC system have come in the way of college endowments. Each endowment comes with its own set of requirements, but endowments as a whole are often remarkably unrestrictive when it comes to faculty rank. An endowment bestows funds that are primarily dedicated to research. However, it also integrates teaching and professional activities in that to fulfill the terms of the endowment, the award winner may be asked to give a seminar in his or her research area.

Media accounts and avenues for publishing lecturer stories

National media accounts

The Chronicle of Higher Education has a regular series of contributors that cover issues pertaining to lecturers. In 2013, it established a website to begin collecting data on adjunct wages and working conditions in different parts of the country (<https://data.chronicle.com>). Most of the articles published in The Chronicle of Higher Education have to do with the rise of adjunct labor or working conditions. Less common are articles that speak to the professional achievements of lecturers. In February of this year, an article appeared that took on the issues of lecturer achievement, working conditions, and faculty complicity, all in one go.

The author was Harvard College Writing Program instructor Kevin Birmingham and the article was a print version of the acceptance speech he gave after winning the Truman Capote Award in 2016, the largest annual cash prize in English-language literary criticism. Birmingham used the occasion of his speech to condemn the working conditions of adjuncts across the country, commenting on low wages and lack of job security, issues which are uncomfortably familiar to us all. Birmingham's criticism focused most sharply on the hypocrisy exhibited by humanities faculty that continue to market intellectual work to potential grad students, knowing full well that these students, even if they finish, will have few job prospects ahead of them. In Birmingham's words, "If you are a tenured (or tenure-track) faculty member teaching in a humanities department with Ph.D. candidates, you are both the instrument and the direct beneficiary of exploitation."

Admonitions aside, Birmingham makes the valid point that literary criticism (and, one might add, all intellectual work) is shaped by how it is produced, funded, and disseminated. In his words, "It matters that literary critics almost always work under the auspices of universities. It matters that criticism receives the support of fellowships, grants, and awards." Our work is meant to form part of a larger conversation. It should be valued and nourished by the academic institutions that house us.

Local accounts

At UCSC, as at the other UCs, we have examples of many accomplished lecturers who, despite the limitations imposed on them by the boundaries of their position, have managed to excel in their disciplines and garner media attention

for their work. In this section we focus on the profiles of two UCSC lecturers, Peter Weiss-Penzias and Gary Young.

Weiss-Penzias is a lecturer in Chemistry and self-described atmospheric chemist who conducts research on the atmospheric cycling of mercury. He received a National Science Foundation award in the amount of \$320,000 to fund a project to investigate mercury levels in coastal fog, water, plants, and animals. Weiss-Penzias and his colleagues have discovered 10 times more mercury in the West Coast's fog than in rainwater, a fact which was previously unknown. Through their research, Weiss-Penzias and colleagues have been able to track how mercury cycles through the environment and enters the food chain. Their research has been reported on in the Al Jazeera documentary "The Science of Water Sustainability", in an NBC Bay Area report on air quality, in the local Santa Cruz Sentinel newspaper and GoodTimes magazine, on the National Science Foundation news page, in Chemical and Engineering News magazine, in SFGate, and other publications.

Young is a lecturer in Literature, as well as a poet, artist, and book printer. He is the founder of Greenhouse Review Press, which produces letterpress broadsides, fine art books, and trade books. He has received numerous awards from the Poetry Society of America, including the Lucille Medwick Memorial Award, the Shelley Memorial Award, the William Carlos Williams Award (for best book of the year published by a university, literary, or independent press), and the Lyric Poem Award. Young has received grants from the National Endowment for the Arts and National Endowment for the Humanities. His print work appears in collections that include the Museum of Modern Art, the Victoria and Albert Museum, and the Getty Center for the Arts, as well as in special collection libraries throughout the country. In 2010, Young was named the first-ever Poet Laureate of Santa Cruz County. A recent article in the Tuesday Newsday section of the UCSC website reported on the publication of a new collection of Young's poems titled *In Japan*. Articles on Young's work have appeared in the local Santa Cruz Sentinel and in the San José Mercury News.

Stories like Weiss-Penzias' and Young's are encouraging in that they show it *is* possible to maintain a world-class creative or research profile while employed as a lecturer. It also matters that these lecturers have won prestigious awards in their respective fields and that their achievements have been recognized in the mainstream media. In addition to the high-quality undergraduate instruction lecturers provide, it shows that there are those among us who are capable of making blockbuster contributions in the form of research or creative activities. This argument provides an important cornerstone and is a precursor to any call for parity.

Conclusions

Our needs assessment showed that 50% of the UCSC lecturers who responded to our survey had actively sought out grants for research or instructional

improvement during the time of their employment. We infer from this data that a substantial number of our membership maintain active teaching, research, or creative profiles and are looking for ways to sustain their professional activities.

Of those who had received grants while employed by the University, most received them from campus rather than external sources (37.1% versus 11.4%). One flaw in our survey design was that we failed to ask if the grants received from campus sources came from the NSF PDF or from other sources. Most of the money allotted to the NSF PDF in the past three years has been awarded, with small amounts being carried over from year to year. The awards have gone primarily to researchers in the social sciences and to those who have applied for funding in the past.

Campus sources (and most likely, the NSF PDF) are our members' primary avenue for funding, though a small percentage (11.4%) of lecturers have been able to secure funding for their projects from outside the University. Follow-up interviews with our members revealed that it has often been possible to form collaborations with Senate Faculty members and access funding indirectly. This approach is not without its perils. Such an arrangement reinforces the power hierarchy that exists between Senate Faculty members and lecturers and makes our members (the less powerful members in the cohort) vulnerable to abuses, such as having others usurp their work or ideas. It is worth mentioning that several of the lecturers we interviewed reported having excellent relationships with the chairs of their departments or other Senate Faculty members. These colleagues have offered to stand in as Principal Investigators so that our members can apply for the funding necessary to bring their projects to fruition. In several instances, Senate Faculty colleagues have offered to share lab space, specialized software, and equipment. Most of the members we surveyed (24.2% versus 12.1%) replied that they were able to be listed as Principal Investigators on their own projects. While it is encouraging to know that some of the members interviewed have been able to carry out projects either independently, or in collaboration with Senate Faculty colleagues, the fact remains that lecturers have an unequal status at the University. In this situation of professional apartheid, we have occasional glimpses into what it must feel like to be full-fledged faculty, but on the whole, our experience is one of exclusion and alienation.

What is problematic about the current state of the lecturer contract with regard to access to funding is that it stifles the professional development of our members by narrowing the scope of potential research avenues and limiting their access to funds. Oddly enough, the University administration recognizes the value of having a teaching cadre that is *also* engaged in what it calls "intellectual pursuits". This is in line with national calls for university faculty to establish a better balance between teaching, research, and service (Ryan, 2016; Boyer, 1990). Some of our members who have been most successful at securing funding for their professional development activities have also been able to fund

ways for their undergraduate students to work as research assistants and thus gain valuable training.

The problem from our perspective is that the solution the administration has identified to address this issue involves expanding a position (Teaching Professor) that affects a relatively small number of University employees. The proposed solution ignores the vast body of teaching professionals who are currently responsible for undergraduate instruction in the UC system- the Unit 18 Lecturers. Many of these teaching professionals already perform the research and service obligations detailed in the proposed language for LSOEs. Why hire a new faculty member to perform a job that's already being done? Rather than expand an obscure position, why not promote the experienced and qualified professional who knows the institution, who knows the students, and who has a proven record of being able to do the work?

A lack of access to funding impinges on lecturers' possibilities for advancement within the UC system. There are no merit-based pathways between Non-Senate Faculty and Senate Faculty, though both are engaged in similar professional activities. It is the balance of responsibilities between teaching, research, and service that differs. Restricting the degree of participation of lecturers in the academy blunts their competitive edge, lessening the possibilities of promotion within the system and limiting their chances for professional growth. In the modern gig economy and in the absence of job security, chances to grow and make our mark assume an importance they might not have had 15 years ago.

Recommendations

The recommendations put forth in this section are a collection of views expressed by the committee members and interviewees associated with this project.

General remarks

We identify a need for a point person (or, even better, a committee) to stay current on issues related to funding lecturer projects. This person would be tasked with disseminating information to members about their rights and responsibilities with respect to funding. Interviews conducted in connection with this project and conversations with the UCSC NSF PDF chairperson Tony Hoffman confirm that the NSF PDF program is a valuable asset to our members and is indeed the only means of funding for many of our lecturers' projects. It is important that we support local NSF PDF committees in their efforts to reach new and pre-six members, as this is the most vulnerable sector of our union community and the one least likely to have access to outside funds.

One of our members proposed the idea of building coalitions of lecturers who work in a similar area and applying as a block for funds to complete bigger projects. This is something individual locals may want to consider, moving forward.

In thinking about how best to promote the idea of increased lecturer power in research, we favor an approach that emphasizes the potential for improved student outcomes. Though there are valid and completely justifiable arguments for increased lecturer power based on equity, we are sceptical that such arguments could move the administration in the direction of policy change. On the other hand, universities are generally receptive to ideas that appear to improve students' odds for success, at least on paper. We know that a professionally-engaged lecturer does not "only teach". They also serve as a mentor to students who are exploring the discipline as a career option and need to acquire job skills. Lecturers who engage with their intellectual communities are able to write convincing letters of recommendation for their students and place them in jobs or graduate programs. As we widen the net of our expertise, we deepen the base of information that is then passed on to our students. None of this is, of course, news. The University has long recognized the value of the "teaching, research, service" triad; the concept is explicit in their proposed restructuring of the LSOE series. We conclude there is no reason our members should be barred from participating in academic work to the best of their ability. We are the fastest-growing sector of academia, the backbone of the modern undergraduate education system, and ultimately, our university's most important investment.

Comments from Statewide Council Members

The Statewide Council received a copy of this report in advance of their September 16th meeting. During the meeting, a short presentation of the report was given and members had a chance to respond with comments or questions. Several useful comments were made in response to the report.

1) *Principal Investigator Status*- It was pointed out that with respect to the issue of Principal Investigator status, this is perhaps something that can be lobbied for on a departmental level and does not necessarily require a systemwide response. Similarly, the issue of whether research (pedagogy-related or otherwise) will be considered in the review process is one that may vary between campuses or between departments within a same campus. Therefore, members may want to consider organizing strategies at a local level.

2) *Instructional Grants*- Increasing applications for instructional grants was suggested as an important step to broadening overall lecturer access to funds. Our contract DOES allow us to apply for these grants and we should consider instructional grants in addition to the NSF PDF when seeking to fund our projects.

3) *STEM Lecturer Participation*- It was noted that the low STEM participation in applying for the NSF PDF grants is consistent with levels of STEM membership and engagement across the UCs, signalling a need to reach out to lecturers who teach in these fields.

4) *California Digital Library Open Access Repository*- The librarians would like to encourage lecturers to consider housing their publications in the California Digital Library (<http://www.cdlib.org>), a resource which is open to all faculty members. Information about the open access repository can be found at: http://www.cdlib.org/services/access_publishing/publishing/.

Specific actions

We ask the Statewide Council to consider the following specific actions as they contemplate our goals for the next round of bargaining.

In light of the findings outlined in this report, we recommend that:

- 1) The University remove the restriction on professional development funds that limits their use to pedagogical activities.
- 2) The published research or significant creative output of lecturers be recognized in performance reviews.
- 3) Pre-six lecturers who have published research or have produced significant creative work receive accelerated continuing reviews.
- 4) Continuing lecturers who have published research or produced significant creative work receive expanded continuous appointments.
- 5) Continuing lecturers have the right to teach at least one course in their research field.
- 6) Continuing lecturers who are engaged in a verifiable creative project (who have, for example, a book contract, a performance series, a gallery show, or a sponsored documentary film) receive one sabbatical per three-year appointment period.
- 7) Continuing lecturers engaged in a verifiable creative project have access to "course abatement," that is, the option to shuffle their courses into two quarters rather than three, without losing their benefits. In other words, a de facto sabbatical.

Thank you for taking the time to read this report and consider our suggestions.

Resources and references

Birmingham, K. (2017, February 17). The great shame of our profession. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved from

http://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Great-Shame-of-Our/239148?cid=at&utm_source=at&utm_medium=en&elqTrackId=acde7248c564f2c8177b7d5793751e8&elq=a0413b89c28e476e8b1eac69c96734f&elqat=1&elqCampaignId=5123

Boyer, E. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: priorities of the professoriate. *The Carnegie Association for the Advancement of Teaching*. Retrieved from <https://depts.washington.edu/gs630/Spring/Boyer.pdf>

Non-Senate Faculty Professional Development Fund (NSF PDF)
https://apo.ucsc.edu/docs/nsf_prof_dev.html

Ryan, V. (2016). Redefining the teaching-research nexus today. *MLA Humanities Commons*. Retrieved from <https://profession.mla.hcommons.org/2016/11/01/defining-the-teaching-research-nexus-today/>

UCOP Research Policy Analysis and Coordination (Chapter 1-500: Principal Investigator Guidelines) <http://www.ucop.edu/research-policy-analysis-coordination/resources-tools/contract-and-grant-manual/chapter1/chapter1-500.html>

Peter Weiss-Penzias (website) <http://research.pbsci.ucsc.edu/metx/pweiss/>

Gary Young (website) <http://www.gary-young.net>

Appendix

Issue of proposed revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual affecting the LSOE series

In the process of information-gathering, we were able to review a series of documents (see attached) in which the University describes proposed changes to the title and responsibilities to the LSOE series.

The stated reasons for the changes include a desire to: 1) clarify the role of LSOEs, 2) address the rise in undergraduate student numbers and teaching obligations, and 3) acknowledge a growing congruence between the LSOE and the professorial series.

The two main changes in the language describing the responsibilities associated with this series include the following:

- 1) A shift from “teaching” to “Teaching *excellence and innovation*”

- 2) A shift from “professional achievement and activity” to “Professional *and scholarly* achievement and activity.”

The new language reflects a particular emphasis on teaching innovation and scholarly contributions to pedagogical and curricular development:

Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced particularly in excellent and innovative teaching as well as in professional and scholarly achievement and activity, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to security of employment positions. Insistence on this standard for holders of the teaching professorship is necessary for maintaining the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to education. The review committee must further evaluate whether the candidate has a record of excellence in teaching and innovation while engaging in a program of professional and scholarly activity that is both sound and productive.

At first glance, the newly-designated Teaching Professor series, if approved, seems like it could serve as a natural bridge between lecturers and the professorial series. The Teaching Professor position might be desirable for those lecturers who are engaged in research or creative activities in their field. However, our concern with the proposed changes stems from the fact that there is no mention of a pathway to advancement for lecturers. Lecturers will continue to be funded through pool money for temps while the Teaching Professor series will be funded through permanent hiring lines. Furthermore, with the proposed expansion of the Teaching Professor series, there is little incentive for the University to support lecturer research.

Concerns about the proposed changes were discussed during the UCAFT Statewide Council meeting held on July 22nd. It was decided that the council would take a closer look at the issue to determine how the rise of LSOEs has affected individual campuses thus far and in particular, if lecturers have been displaced.

Update September 16th- In a follow-up to the question of how the proposed changes to the LSOE series will affect Unit 18 members, Bill Corman issued a memo stating that, after reviewing the revisions, he does not believe a case can be made at this time that the creation of the Teaching Professor classification is an unlawful taking of work out of Unit 18. However, members should remain vigilant of working conditions on their individual campuses and report instances of lecturers being replaced or of any changes that affect the nature of their work. In the meantime, an RFI will be filed to determine how many lecturers have been moved to PSOEs and how many PSOEs have been promoted to LSOE in the past 5 years.