



1156 HIGH STREET

SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA 95064

Office of the Academic Senate
SANTA CRUZ DIVISION
125 CLARK KERR HALL
(831) 459 - 2086

December 6, 2023

JAMES STEINTRAGER
Chair, Academic Council

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 55

Dear Jim,

The Santa Cruz Academic Senate has reviewed your request for feedback on revisions to Senate Bylaw 55 proposed by the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP), and endorsed by the 2022-23 Academic Council. The Committees on Academic Freedom (CAF), Academic Personnel (CAP), Career Advising (CCA), Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CODEI), Faculty Welfare (CFW), Planning and Budget (CPB), Privilege and Tenure (CPT), and Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections (CRJE) responded. Our Division was split on its support of the proposed revisions: some committees enthusiastically endorsed, one committee did not support, and several committees had split levels of support.

Committees in support applaud the desire to align voting rights with existing Senate equity principles, and agree that the inclusion of Teaching Professors/LSOEs in personnel decisions at departmental, divisional, and campus levels can be of great benefit to all. CODEI suggested that failing to grant full departmental voting rights to Teaching Professors/LSOEs raises equity and diversity issues, especially for those divisions with significantly higher percentages of female faculty in the Teaching Professor series. CCA suggested that the current unequal participatory treatment of Teaching Professors/LSOEs sends a message of marginalization and unwarranted stratification between divisional colleagues, and this disparity can lead to alienation, disenfranchisement, job dissatisfaction, and potential attrition. The committee further notes that denying Teaching Professors/LSOEs the experience of reviewing and evaluating personnel files also denies them a valuable learning opportunity, thus weakening their own cases for merit increases and promotions.

The CAP response pointed out that since 2019-20 the Teaching Professor/LSOE series has been evaluated in a process that parallels that of ladder rank faculty. CAP members felt that the parallel in the research aspect of personnel review is especially significant. Teaching Professors/LSOEs engage in research that is disciplinary- and/or pedagogy-based, and as such, their ability to assess the research of all faculty colleagues parallels that of ladder faculty, who evaluate research from diverse disciplines

in the personnel review process. As such, the committee feels that the proposed revision of Bylaw 55 is a somewhat overdue but consistent change that logically follows from the previous formal acknowledgement of Teaching Professors/LSOEs as Academic Senate members with equal privileges and a parallel review process.

CPT did not feel that the case for the proposed changes was made in the review materials, and as such, does not support the proposed revisions. The committee suggested that the only explicit argument for the change, included in the review cover sheet, is that the current wording of Bylaw 55 “has fostered inconsistencies”, but suggested that this is not the only inconsistency that Bylaw 55 allows. For example, voting rights for Associate Professors may be extended in one department, but not in another. As such, the committee sees no obvious reason why the inconsistency that concerns Teaching Professors/LSOEs is singled out as problematic. In the committee’s opinion, “the case has not been made that there is a problem to solve, and that it is worth solving.” As criteria for the category of research and creative work for which Teaching Professor/LSOE are evaluated varies from department to department, the committee suggests that departments should make their own decisions about voting rights.

CPT was not the only committee to raise these concerns. CFW and CAF members were split in their support. However, CFW noted the considerable variability across campus in the voting rights afforded Teaching Professors/LSOEs vis-a-vis the personnel review process, and recognized that the variability in rights may be due to the variability in how these positions are configured for diverse pedagogical needs. Therefore, the committee could see the rationale of the status quo of departmental autonomy in the provision of voting rights. Similarly, some members of CAF noted that Teaching Professors and Research Professors are recruited, reviewed, and promoted according to different criteria, and the two series are distinct and perform different functions. CAF noted that the difference could introduce an academic freedom concern, given that a core tenet of academic freedom (as defined in APM-10) is that faculty are evaluated by their peers.

At the same time, CFW members recognized that differential treatment of faculty in the Teaching Professor series (in the current version of Bylaw 55) may codify the sense of hierarchical relations between faculty in the two series, potentially negatively impacting the morale of Teaching Professor/LSOEs. The committee suggested that the positive impact of the proposed changes to Bylaw 55 might outweigh the downsides of eliminating the autonomy of individual departments. However, the committee noted that possible effects of the proposed changes are difficult to determine without data, and given that the influx of Teaching Professors is relatively recent. The committee further suggested that a campus study of the experiences and overall welfare of Teaching Professors/LSOEs would be highly informative to determine the relative benefit of the proposed changes.

Although some members had concerns about the potential impact of the proposed revisions, CAF supported the move to create equity between the two series, and suggested that the change was an excellent step toward mitigating an unnecessary (and increasingly irrelevant) perception of hierarchy in Senate faculty roles. The committee claimed that it is time to put aside a structural difference in voting rights that dates to an era when the term “lecturer” generally connoted an adjunct relationship to the institution.

In this review, committees raised concerns about implementation. Responding committees noted that at UC Santa Cruz, many departments have delegated voting rights across the ranks and to Teaching

Professors/LSOEs, though the degree of delegation is inconsistent across the disciplines. The change contemplated by the proposal will have a differential impact on the departmental cultures across our campus and our sister campuses. As such, the Santa Cruz Division would welcome an implementation plan, as well as a statement regarding the flexibility (if any) that departments would have in their interpretation and implementation of the proposed Bylaw.

In addition, there is one revision we recommend to the wording of the proposed policy. Rather than “All tenured faculty...” we believe that 55.B.1 should be modified to read: “All faculty in a department with tenure or security of employment...”. We believe this change would preserve the spirit of the proposed bylaw while conforming more faithfully to the goal of equal consideration for ladder faculty and Teaching Professors.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,



Patty Gallagher, Chair
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

cc: Roger Schoenman, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom
Maureen Callanan, Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel
Susan Gillman, Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel
Kimberly Helmer, Chair, Committee on Career Advising
Gabriela Arredondo, Chair, Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
Alexander Sher, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
Raphael Kudela, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
Onuttom Narayan, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure
Eleonora Pasotti, Chair, Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections
Matthew Mednick, Executive Director, Academic Senate