



Representing faculty,
librarians and academic
researchers of the
University of California

www.ucaft.org

California Federation
of Teachers, American
Federation of Teachers,
AFL-CIO

Berkeley/San Francisco
Davis
Irvine
Los Angeles
Merced
Riverside
San Diego
Santa Barbara
Santa Cruz

March 14, 2018

Susan Carlson
Vice Provost
Academic Personnel and Programs
UC Office of the President

Dear Vice Provost Carlson:

I am writing on behalf of 4500 UC lecturers to provide feedback on the proposed changes to APM 285. Since lecturers make up 30% of UC general campus faculty, and at least 58 lecturers have been converted into LPSOE/LSOEs in the recent past, we are stakeholders in these revisions.

In general, we applaud efforts to increase teaching faculty job security, elevate teaching faculty status, and re-center education as an integral part of the University's mission. However, the best way to accomplish these goals is to invest in current teaching faculty, i.e., lecturers, instead of increasing the use of other title codes.

We fear that, since there is much overlap between the revised LPSOE/LSOE job description and the work that lecturers currently do, expansion of LPSOE/LSOE appointments and murky distinctions between LPSOE/LSOEs and lecturers may unjustly constrain lecturer contributions to education at the UC. We have serious concerns that the implementation of the proposed revisions will swiftly and directly deprofessionalize and further marginalize UC lecturer faculty.

Through the Continuing Appointment, the University already recognizes that lecturers fill long-term instructional needs. In actual fact, lecturers are currently performing much of the work described in the revisions to APM 285: not only do we teach one-third of undergraduate credit hours across all UC campuses, but we design curricula and individual courses, train graduate students in teaching methods and pedagogical scholarship, publish books and articles, present our work at conferences and symposia, and engage in creative endeavors. While pedagogical innovation has been struck from the second revision to APM 285 as part of the LPSOE/LSOE job description, it is important to note that lecturers often lead pedagogical innovation in our departments and mentor other faculty in best pedagogical practices. We serve on departmental, divisional, and Senate committees. Some of this labor is currently uncompensated, and we perform it voluntarily with a collegial spirit on the principle of accepting opportunities for inclusion when they are available. We are assessed and promoted on the basis of excellence in our respective fields, teaching excellence, academic responsibility, and University co-curricular and community service. These criteria are practically indistinguishable from those required in the APM 285 revisions.



In other words, there is little reason for excluding lecturer faculty from the rights, privileges, and responsibilities conferred by the revisions to APM 285. We are deeply concerned that these revisions will reserve job security only for employees with administrative duties, while faculty who carry the heaviest teaching loads will be made ever-more expendable. This in turn will increase administrative costs and, contrary to the intent of the revisions, divert resources *away* from classroom instruction.

Additionally, these revisions threaten to detract from faculty solidarity and cohesion. Increasing hierarchical layers within faculty ranks will be detrimental both for LPSOE/LSOEs, who will feel disadvantaged with respect to ladder-rank faculty, and to lecturers, who will resent that others doing similar or even identical work are more highly compensated and perceived as having higher status. The two-tier system of ladder-rank and contingent faculty that currently exists creates considerable strain among faculty in general. As the UCLA Academic Senate noted in their feedback on the proposed revisions, expanding to three tiers will only aggravate those stresses. Concerns that campuses have expressed about the impact of the proposed revisions on faculty gender equity should not be taken lightly. Currently, women faculty are disproportionately appointed as lecturers, and the proposed revisions could further exacerbate gender discrimination.

The UC-AFT contract prohibits practices, activities, and programs that preclude access to Continuing Appointments. We trust that revisions to APM 285 are not being undertaken with the explicit intention of undermining Continuing Appointments. Regardless of intent, we profoundly hope that any revisions will not have that effect in actual practice. UCLA and UC Riverside's Academic Senates have both noted in their feedback that these revisions risk weakening UC-AFT and being perceived as union-busting. We are especially wary of attempts to diminish represented faculty through misclassification in unrepresented job titles. Upholding the UC-AFT contract in good faith is essential to respecting lecturer faculty colleagues.

Contingency takes a severe toll on UC faculty and our students. Because of artificially depressed appointment percentages, many lecturers earn poverty wages and are excluded from benefits eligibility, despite the extremely high cost of living near most UC campuses. Even full-time lecturers are forced to cobble together additional part-time jobs to make ends meet. This results in less faculty availability for students and inhibits highly trained, exceptionally qualified, and deeply experienced faculty from exercising their greatest abilities. It would be a shame to carve out enhanced privileges for a new cadre when 30% of existing UC faculty lack sufficient support.

Campus responses to the proposed revisions have often focused strongly on the potential for "Teaching Professor" titles to generate greater intra- and extramural respect for teaching faculty. Generating that respect for a few hundred LPSOE/LSOEs at the expense of thousands of lecturers would expose the University to charges of hypocrisy. Greater investment in current lecturer faculty is essential to maintaining and advancing the UC's tradition of pedagogical excellence. This would reflect a true system-wide commitment to teaching at the UC.

Sincerely,



Mia L. McIver, Ph.D.
Lecturer, UCLA Writing Programs
President, University Council-American Federation of Teachers

CC: Shane White, Ian Smith