Report and Recommendations of the College of Arts and Sciences

Task Force on Instructor-Rank Faculty

Submitted to

James White, Interim Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Stephen Mojzsis, Chair of the Arts and Sciences Council

March 15, 2019

Task Force Members:

Jenny Knight, MCDB, Associate Professor (co-chair)
Rolf Norgaard, PWR, Teaching Professor (co-chair)

Janet Casagrand, Integrative Physiology, Senior Instructor
Cathy Comstock, Farrand RAP, Senior Instructor
Tammy Fredrickson, SLHS, Associate Clinical Professor
Steve Lamos, English/PWR, Associate Professor
Mary Long, Spanish and Portuguese, Senior Instructor
Adam Norris, Applied Math, Senior Instructor
Eric Stade, Mathematics, Professor
Glenda Walden, Sociology, Instructor

Table of Contents

Executive Summary **3**

Background and Task Force Charge **7**

Motivation and Exigence
Task Force Formation and Charge
A Brief History of Discussions about Instructor-Rank Faculty
Composition of the Task Force
Timeline and Nature of the Task Force's Work

Institutional Context and our Core Commitments **11**

Who are Instructors?
Four Core Commitments
Links to various Key Strategic Initiatives and Imperatives

Findings and Recommendations **15**

Teaching Loads that Fail Students and Denigrate Service. **17**

Chaotic and Inconsistent Communication of Policy **23**

Falling Behind: Low Pay and Compression **26**

Years of Service on an Uncertain Career Path **30**

Not at the Table: An Unwelcoming climate **33**

Appendices **37**

Full Task Force Charge
Academic Futures White Paper on Instructor Teaching and Service
Summary List of Recommendations

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Motivation

The changing nature of the academic labor force, and the changing nature of teaching, have brought the once peripheral, and often temporary, role of Instructors into the center of higher education. Instructor-rank faculty now make career-long contributions to the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S) and to the campus, and together with tenure-stream faculty, constitute our "core faculty." And yet, for decades, the ranks of Instructors have grown without sufficient or intentional planning, and without a rational understanding of their role in the academic landscape. Moreover, current strategic planning and visioning initiatives in the College and on the Boulder campus make the recommendations of this Task Force timely and highly relevant.

The Charge and Work of the Task Force

In April 2018, Interim A&S Dean James White and Arts and Sciences Council Chair Stephen Mojzsis worked together to form the A&S Task Force on Instructors. *Its charge is broad: to examine the status and function of Instructors and Senior Instructors in the context of the mission of the College of Arts and Sciences.* Key areas of consideration include workload and its effect on teaching and service, the communication of policy, compensation, Instructor career paths, and unit and College climate with regard to Instructor-rank faculty. The Task Force consisted of ten members, drawn from the three A&S divisions: three tenured Professors, one Teaching Professor, four Senior Instructors, one Associate Clinical Professor, and one Instructor.

The Task Force sought broad input from various stakeholders: Instructors themselves, tenure-stream faculty, and A&S chairs and directors. We held multiple open-ended listening conversations with Instructors, we met with chairs and directors from all three divisions, and convened several Town Halls as we developed our recommendations. Numerous one-on-one side meetings were also held. Multiple updates were provided to the Arts and Sciences Council, and interested parties beyond A&S were also kept abreast of our work: several Regent Hall administrators and the Executive Committee of the Boulder Faculty Assembly.

Core Commitments that have Guided our Work

Four key commitments guided the Task Force's work. Our recommendations, and how those recommendations respond to the current environment, all proceed from these commitments:

- *Students First.* The Task Force most emphatically does not represent the pleadings of Instructor-rank faculty as one specific group. Rather, in our deliberations, we consistently prioritized that which is good for the College of Arts and Sciences, good for its core faculty, and most especially good for our students.

- *Core Faculty.* We proceed with the understanding that tenure-stream faculty and Instructor-rank faculty should both be considered as "core faculty." Although the respective roles and duties of these two groups do indeed differ, as well they should, we seek, where possible and appropriate, parity between these two faculty groups.

- *T1 at the R1.* We proceed from the understanding that CU-Boulder is preeminent as a research institution, as an "R1." The question then becomes: What kind of teaching faculty does an R1 institution deserve? We can and should have T1 at the R1.

- *Make Instructors Visible.* We cannot address the problems that this report considers, much less improve our collective lot, if Instructor-rank faculty remain as they long have been: a shadow faculty.

Findings and Highest-Priority Recommendations

The full Task Force report offers 39 recommendations, ranked in "priority/impact" as medium, high, and highest. We introduce here in the Executive Summary the ***13 highest-priority recommendations***:

<u>Teaching Loads that Fail Students and Denigrate Service</u>

By far the most central and pressing concern expressed by Instructors (and acknowledged by chairs and directors) is the shift in workload. For some twenty years in Arts and Sciences, a 100% appointment, with a 3/3 course load, and a 75/25% teaching/service merit ratio was the default Instructor appointment. Since about 2013, the default option for a 100% appointment has shifted to a 4/4 course load and an 85/15% teaching/service merit ratio. In addition to negative impacts on Instructor morale and efficacy, we are concerned about the inevitable effect of this workload increase on student engagement, success, and retention. We recommend that the College:

- Reframe the relationship between teaching and service to address the significant role of instructionally-related service. (**Rec. 1a**)
- Establish a 3/3 teaching load that includes a new category of professional development in addition to service, for a 70/20/10 teaching/service/professional development merit ratio, with no reduction in pay for current instructors and the new base salaries for new hires. This would be the standard benchmark for full-time Instructor positions. (**Rec. 1d**)

These highest-priority recommendations reflect not a reduction in teaching effort but rather a reallocation of time towards high-impact teaching practices and student interactions in recognition of the diverse forms in which teaching and teaching-related service activities occur. They also reflect the necessity for Instructors to engage in professional development that ensures currency in the field and directly benefits their teaching and student learning. Tenure-stream faculty ensure their pedagogical currency in large measure through their research; instructor-rank faculty rarely have an officially recognized research component to their work, and thus need to have professional development activities recognized as essential to their effective teaching.

Chaotic and Inconsistent Communication of Policy

The second area of concern, voiced in equal measure by discouraged Instructors and perplexed and frustrated chairs and directors, is the chaotic and inconsistent communication of policy. Faculty Affairs guidelines for Instructor reappointment and promotion are often ignored or misinterpreted. There is broad confusion among chairs and directors on how to update by-laws and policies pertaining to Instructors, and they spoke at length about the need for "work arounds" to make A&S policies serve the needs and interests of their units. We recommend that the College:

- Develop policies regarding Instructor-rank faculty that strike a balance between consistency and a full recognition of the distinctive needs/roles of individual units. (**Rec. 2a**).
- Improve the clarity, implementation, and effective communication of campus-level policy (Office of Faculty Affairs) regarding Instructor-rank faculty at the College level (e.g. alternating full/expedited review for Senior Instructors; new Teaching Professor designation). Ensure timely review of reappointment dossiers and issuance of contracts. (**Rec. 2b**)

Falling Behind: Low Pay and Salary Compression

Research has shown that broad respect for the work of Instructor-rank faculty goes a long way toward fostering job satisfaction. However, respect alone is not adequate compensation for work. Low starting wages and considerable salary compression, especially for long-serving Instructors, emerged as very high priority issues in our discussions. We recommend that the College:

- Continue to address the base starting salary for new Instructors to offer a living wage in Boulder, to permit competitive searches, and to reward Instructors appropriately for their valuable work at the university. (**Rec. 3a**)
- Address, through targeted funds, severe salary compression among long-serving Instructor-rank faculty created by previous increases to the floor salary (and which will only be exacerbated by recently implemented increases to the floor). This recommendation should be implemented in the context of recognizing career merit, and compression/career merit should be revisited on a periodic basis. (**Rec. 3c**)
- (Re)Design merit systems in units so that merit criteria match contracts and actual work, and to ensure that Instructor-rank faculty can qualify for the full-range of possible merit designations. Units should have mechanisms in place to reward Instructor scholarly or creative work (work essential to currency in the field), even when such activity is not contractually required. (**Rec. 3e**)

Years of Service on an Uncertain Career Path

The Task Force found that even after decades of service, Instructor career paths are uncertain, and any security tenuous at best, given finite three-year reappointments. Many Instructors have a career-long commitment to the College, and represent some of our foremost campus citizens. A

career in service of CU should be honored. For many Instructors, that is hardly the case. We recommend that the College:

- Ensure the existence of clear policies in every unit for standards for reappointment as well as promotion of Instructors through ranks (Instructor to Senior Instructor, and to Teaching Professor). Instructors should not be disadvantaged in their careers by the absence of such unit policies, or an unwillingness to create them. (**Rec. 4a**)
- Create additional Instructor lines. An undue reliance on Lecturer positions does not serve students or the College well, and is corrosive to the spirit of the university. (**Rec. 4j**)
- Develop clear policies for Instructor searches that would facilitate a path to Instructor positions for highly qualified, long-time Lecturers by (1) recognizing their CU-Boulder contributions even as rigorous searches are conducted, and (2) implementing a transitional cost-sharing plan so that financial considerations do not stand in the way of deserved transitions from Lecturer to Instructor status. (**Rec. 4k**)

Not at the Table: An Unwelcoming Climate

It is easy to dismiss references to "climate" as unduly vague or difficult to remedy, but climate is the bedrock on which all of our findings and recommendations rest. In some units, Instructors are not allowed to vote; in others, they are not even allowed to attend faculty meetings; in still others, multiple Instructors share one vote. On top of all of this, Instructors are currently required to sign a contract in which they waive all grievance rights. Instructors often thus remain invisible, unrecognized, vulnerable, and un-thanked. We recommend that the College:

- Mandate consistent minimum voting rights for Instructor-rank faculty in all departments and programs across the College. These minimum voting rights would be consistent with the voting rights enumerated in BFA and ASC By-laws. Although any department or program can restrict these minimum voting rights and meeting attendance given the specific issue under discussion (e.g. personnel matters), such restrictions should be regarded as limited exceptions to the principles of broad participation by Instructor-rank faculty in department and program affairs, regular attendance at department and program meetings, and inclusive participation in unit and College faculty culture. (**Rec. 5c**)
- Revise the Instructor contract for employment, which in its current form fails to extend to Instructors the full rights normally extended to faculty members. (Instructors are currently forced to sign a contract with the Regents that waives all grievance rights, and includes provisions for dismissal for cause that depart from faculty norms.) (**Rec. 5e**)
- Establish a standing "Faculty Affairs" committee on the Arts and Sciences Council that could take over from a possible short-term Task Force implementation committee. In addition to other duties, such a Faculty Affairs committee would be able to monitor over the long term the status of Instructors and advocate for desired change. At least one-third but no more than one-half of the membership of such a committee should be comprised of Instructor-rank faculty. (Such an ASC committee may begin as an ad-hoc committee, but we anticipate the need for the committee to be ongoing and thus deserves to be constituted as a standing committee.) (**Rec. 5k**)

BACKGROUND AND TASK FORCE CHARGE

Motivation and Exigence

Some five decades ago, CU-Boulder's faculty workforce was predominantly tenured or tenure-track, and undergraduate courses were predominantly taught by them. Indeed, many tenured or tenure-track faculty focused wholly or in large measure on classroom teaching. Instructor-rank faculty were far fewer in number, and the positions were seen in temporary terms, or as way stations to tenure-track appointments.

Times have changed. Not only have both the College of Arts and Sciences and the broader campus become far more reliant on Instructors and Senior Instructors, but also faculty in these positions now often make career-long professional contributions to the College and campus that have deep and ongoing relevance to their missions. Rostered Instructors and Senior Instructors on multi-year contracts now join tenure-stream faculty as the "core faculty" of the College of Arts and Sciences, and of the campus as a whole. Their respective responsibilities and professional activities surely differ—as well they should, given the differing roles each plays in the university. Nevertheless both groups contribute in vital ways to our educational mission, and to the success of our students.

Given this shift in the composition and mission of our faculty, an examination is long overdue of (1) the role of A&S Instructors and Senior Instructors, (2) the policies and workloads that affect their teaching and service, and (3) the professional environment in which they work:

- For decades, the number of Instructor-rank faculty has grown without sufficient or intentional planning, and without a rational understanding of their role in the academic landscape of our College and campus.
- Current strategic planning and visioning initiatives in the College and on campus make the recommendations of the proposed Task Force on Instructors timely and highly relevant.

Task Force Formation and Charge

The need for a Task Force on Instructors became apparent in late fall and early spring of Academic Year 2017-18, when Interim A&S Dean Jim White met on several occasions with members of the standing Boulder Faculty Assembly Instructor-Track Faculty Affairs Committee (BFA-ITFAC). (Such meetings with the A&S Dean have been a regular feature of ITFAC's work over the last several years.) The outcome of these meetings was Dean White's expressed interested in forming an Arts & Sciences College Task Force on Instructors. To ensure an expeditious start and a well-informed committee, Dean White wished to draw, in part, on ITFAC members as the Task Force membership was being developed.

Concurrently, Arts and Sciences Council chair Stephen Mojzsis saw the value of the Task Force and eagerly wished to co-sponsor its work. Members of the Task Force wish to thank both Jim White and Stephen Mojzsis for their active support of this endeavor.

An announcement about the formation of the Task Force and the charge for its work went out to the College in late April 2018. Nominations to participate on the Task Force were considered in May 2018, and the Task Force began its work in June 2018. The A&S website publicized the work of the Task Force that same month:
https://www.colorado.edu/asmagazine/2018/06/22/task-force-examine-role-workload-instructors

In brief, the charge to the Task Force is as follows (the full charge can be found in the appendix to this report):

> *The Task Force shall examine the status and function of Instructors and Senior Instructors in the context of the mission of the College of Arts and Sciences.* Although considerations of other non-tenure-track faculty (e.g. lecturers) may be included as deemed relevant, the focus of the Task Force's work will be on Instructors and Senior Instructors (job classifications 1105 and 1104, respectively). Its work will likewise focus on the College of Arts and Sciences, although its findings may also have broad relevance to the campus.

Key areas of consideration reflected in the Task Force's charge include workload and its effect on teaching and service, the communication of policy, compensation, Instructor career paths, and unit and College climate with regard to Instructors.

A Brief History of Discussions about Instructor-Rank Faculty

This Task Force is mindful of its place in a series of campus conversations about Instructors that goes back some 25 years. We are also well aware that while the work of the Task Force is focused on the College of Arts and Sciences, its recommendations have broad relevance for the entire campus.

- *Instructor Bill of Rights (IBOR).* Discussions with BFA and Administration leading to agreements in the mid-to-late 1990s. IBOR is often invoked as a milestone in our institutional history, but its provisions have been rarely followed.

  https://www.colorado.edu/bfa/sites/default/files/attached-files/Instructor%20Bill%20of%20Rights.pdf

- *Ad-hoc Committee on Instructors.* A focused if brief effort in 2008-09, chaired by Jeffrey Mitton, which led to the more extensive BFA committee the following year.

- *BFA Ad-hoc Committee on the Status of Instructors (2009-10).* A campus-wide committee that led to a substantive report and 18 recommendations, endorsed by the Boulder Faculty General Assembly.

  https://www.colorado.edu/bfa/sites/default/files/attached-files/bfainstr_finalreport_040210.pdf

- *BFA Instructor-Track Faculty Affairs Committee (2011-present).* This standing committee continues to advocate for Instructor-rank faculty on a campus-wide basis.

  https://www.colorado.edu/bfa/committees/instructor-track-faculty-affairs-committee-itfac

The current Task Force is thus the first group to address Instructor-rank faculty issues in the context of the College of Arts and Sciences, and likewise affords an opportunity to update campus-wide discussions with the first formal report in a decade. Because Arts and Sciences is the largest school/college on campus, changes in its policies and functioning can readily affect the rest of the campus community.

Composition of the Task Force

In forming the Task Force, Jim White and Stephen Mojzsis sought to draw on both tenured A&S faculty and Instructor-rank faculty who have long experience with instructor issues in the College and on campus. The Task Force consists of ten members (three tenured faculty, one Teaching Professor, four Senior Instructors, one Instructor, and one Associate Clinical Professor), of whom seven have current or prior experience on the Boulder Faculty Assembly Instructor-Track Faculty Affairs Committee. Members of the Task Force were drawn from all three divisions of the College of Arts and Sciences. Collectively, the Task Force members have more than 200 years of experience in the College and on the campus.

Jenny Knight, Associate Professor, MCDB, co-chair, jennifer.knight@colorado.edu
Rolf Norgaard, Teaching Professor, PWR, co-chair, rolf.norgaard@colorado.edu
Janet Casagrand, Senior Instructor, IPHY
Cathy Comstock, Senior Instructor, Farrand RAP
Tammy Fredrickson, Associate Clinical Professor, SLHS
Steve Lamos, Associate Professor, ENGL
Mary Long, Senior Instructor, SPAN
Adam Norris, Senior Instructor, APPM
Eric Stade, Professor, MATH
Glenda Walden, Instructor, SOC

Timeline and the Nature of the Task Force's Work

The Task Force met virtually every week during the Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 semesters. The following time line reflects the key activities of the committee and its interest in outreach to various stakeholder groups:

- Open-ended Listening Conversations with Instructors: September-October
- Conversations at divisional meetings with chairs and directors: October-November

- Focused Town Halls, with areas of concern/provisional recommendations identified: November
- Clarifying/developing recommendations: November-January
- Drafting report: January-February
- Informal Comment – circulation of draft report: Early March
- Final Report Delivered: Mid-March
- Formal ASC / Dean Consideration (also, circulation to BFA, Council of Deans, Office of Faculty Affairs, *et al.*): Mid-March-May

In addition, the Task Force sought data from Rob Stubbs (Office of Institutional Research), William Kaempfer (then Senior Vice Provost), and Paul Chinowksy (then Assoc. Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Student Success). The Task Force was also in touch with the Office of Faculty Affairs (Jeff Cox, and more recently Michele Moses).

Rolf Norgaard provided updates to the Arts and Sciences Council on three occasions in Fall 2019, and Dean Jim White attended meetings in early December and early February, at which time the Task Force shared draft recommendations-in-progress. We also sought the advice of Amy Lavens, Arts and Sciences Assistant Dean for Finance and Operations, regarding budgetary matters in late January.

INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT AND OUR CORE COMMITMENTS

Who are Instructor-Rank Faculty?

The question "Who are Instructors?" is important to address at the outset. Confusion and misunderstandings abound.

The term "Instructor" is often used loosely and equivocally on the Boulder campus. In a generic or unofficial sense, it is used to denote any non-tenure-track individual who teaches a course, oversees a teaching lab, or in any other way contributes to the teaching mission of the campus. However, "Instructor" has a precise and technical meaning, specified in job classifications (1104 and 1105). We also note that clinical-track faculty (clinical assistant, associate, and full professor), chiefly rostered in the Department of Speech, Language, and Hearing Sciences, have positions that parallel Instructor-rank faculty. The *Boulder Campus Guidelines for the Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Lecturer and Instructor Rank Faculty* (issued by the Office of Faculty Affairs) notes the following. https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/sites/default/files/attached-files/lecturer_instructor_appointment_evaluation_promotion_guidelines_2017_revisions_remediated_091917.pdf)

> Rostered full-time instructors are considered by the University of Colorado to be part of the regular faculty, which is also comprised of the tenure-track faculty. Instructors contribute over a number of years, and sometimes over an entire career, to the teaching and service missions of the university; they may pursue their own research or creative work alongside their university duties, work that may enrich their contributions. Rostered instructors should be considered as continuing members of their departmental, college, or school community; they should participate in the governance of the department, in particular in relation to curricular matters (although they may not be involved in personnel decisions concerning tenure-track faculty). As rostered faculty, they are reviewed as part of the annual merit process.
>
> Schools and colleges should analyze where they need continuing, perhaps career-long contributions to their missions by non-tenure-track faculty. In those cases, and in those cases alone, positions should be created for rostered instructors on multi-year (usually three year), renewable contracts. The campus should do what it can to integrate these instructors into the university community and to provide them with working conditions conducive to the performance of their duties. In other cases, where part-time or temporary employees are needed to teach classes, units should hire lecturers.

To offer some perspective on the vital, ongoing role of Instructor-rank faculty in meeting the educational mission of the campus, we note the following (drawing in part from campus Data Analytics):

- Approximately 212 Instructor-rank faculty were rostered, as of Spring 2017, in the College of Arts and Sciences (of a grand total of 431 rostered campus-wide).

- In 2017, Instructor-rank faculty made up (by headcount, with totals including Lecturers) 19% of the entire faculty of A&S.

- In 2017, Instructor-rank faculty in A&S taught:
    - 34% of 1000-level courses
    - 20% of 2000-level courses
    - 29% of 3000-level courses
    - 22% of 4000-level courses
    - 1% of 5000-8000-level courses

- Instructors and Senior Instructors are part of the faculty merit pool

- Instructors and Senior Instructors with appointments of 50 percent or more are full voting members of both the Arts and Sciences Council and the Boulder Faculty Assembly.

- There are many Instructor-rank faculty with more than twenty, even thirty, years of service. Unlike Lecturers, they perform valuable service at multiple levels (unit/department, College, campus, system, national).

A further misunderstanding is that Instructor-rank faculty are seen as contributing chiefly to first-year and lower-division courses—courses that are often denigrated or dismissed as preparatory to the "real work" of disciplines at the upper-division. This too is false. Instructor-rank faculty do teach many lower-division courses that provide "Foundations for Excellence" to ensure success throughout the collegiate career; however, many Instructor-rank faculty teach a significant number of courses at the upper-division (see figures above). Moreover, Instructor-rank faculty (the vast majority of whom have PhDs or other terminal degrees) actively participate in graduate education by mentoring and providing pedagogical training to CU-Boulder's graduate students. This is the case in units as disparate as the Department of Mathematics and the Program for Writing and Rhetoric. Clinical-track faculty in the Department of Speech, Language, and Hearing Sciences devote the vast majority of their work to graduate education.

In short, issues pertaining to Instructors and Senior Instructors should *not* be seen as the special pleadings of a limited number of people whose work has little bearing on the campus's mission or little relevance to the rest of the faculty. Far from it. *Because instructor issues speak directly to the educational mission of the campus, they are vital to the welfare and success of our students. Ours is a shared enterprise; we are one faculty.*

Four Core Commitments

In pursuing its work, the Task Force held paramount four core commitments. Our recommendations, and how those recommendations respond to the current environment, all

proceed from these commitments. We urge readers of this report to consider and embrace these commitments as being essential not only for the well-being of Instructor-rank faculty but also for the broader success of the College of Arts and Sciences and the campus as a whole.

- ***Students First***. The work of the Task Force most emphatically does not represent the entreaties of Instructors as one specific group. In our deliberations, we consistently prioritized what is good for the College of Arts and Sciences, what is good for its core faculty, and most especially what is good for our students. This is an ethical consideration. But it also makes sense in more pragmatic terms. Given the extent to which CU-Boulder is reliant on student tuition dollars and our reputation, doing right by our students ensures that the institution at large will thrive.

- ***Tenure-stream faculty and Instructor-rank faculty are all "Core Faculty."*** We proceed with the understanding that tenure-stream faculty and Instructor-rank faculty should both be considered as "core faculty." The roles and duties of these two groups do indeed differ, as well they must. But they also complement one another, and the work of each is enabled by the other. Rather than thinking in strictly hierarchical terms, we prefer to emphasize synergy. The recommendations offered in this report seek to achieve, where possible and appropriate, parity between these two faculty groups. To do anything less is to undermine our mutual success in ways corrosive to the very spirit of our institution.

- ***T1 at the R1.*** One might easily presuppose that the work of a Task Force on Instructors would focus almost exclusively on teaching, and leave aside the research mission of the College and the campus. We turn the assumption on its head and seek to proceed from the understanding that CU-Boulder is preeminent as a research institution, as an "R1." The question then becomes: What kind of teaching faculty does an R1 institution deserve and require to fulfill its mission? The recommendations in this report reflect our desire to see that the College and CU-Boulder become known as excellent teaching institutions that are, at the very same time, internationally recognized research institutions. We can and should have "T1 at the R1."

- ***Make Instructors visible.*** To realize the prior three commitments, we add a fourth: we must make the work of Instructors visible—to our students, other faculty, administrators, and the general public. We cannot address the problems that this report considers, much less improve our collective lot, if Instructor-rank faculty remain as they long have been: a shadow faculty. In many units, Instructors have been, for decades, an afterthought—their work ignored, their voices unheard, their accomplishments left uncelebrated. Lending visibility and respect to Instructor-rank faculty also makes evident how they enable the work of tenure-stream faculty. We accomplish little if we leave Instructor-rank faculty—some 25% of full-time faculty on campus—in the shadows.

Links to Other Ongoing Strategic Initiatives

The work of the Task Force did not proceed in isolation. We have been very mindful of several key initiatives on campus, and how our recommendations might further and support those initiatives. Likewise, the broad engagement of the campus in such initiatives, and the considerable consensus that has formed around their outcomes, give us confidence that our report and recommendations will be viewed as an integral part of, and indeed necessary for, these initiatives.

- **Arts and Sciences Strategic Plan.** The A&S Strategic Plan focuses on "teaching to inspire," a role especially suited to Instructor-rank faculty. The plan likewise asks that the College to prioritize research to define "the frontiers of knowledge," a goal which Instructors, by shouldering a good deal of instructional work, can help tenure-stream faculty accomplish. The third key strategic imperative is creating a "welcoming culture." Here the College has much to accomplish to integrate Instructor-rank faculty into the intellectual life and governance structures of units and the College as a whole. These are important goals, and Instructor-rank faculty are essential to achieving them.

- **Academic Futures**. Key features of this campus-wide discussion include (1) developing a common student-centered approach to learning, (2) fostering an inclusive culture, and (3) renewing our commitment to teaching excellence. Addressing the concerns of Instructor-rank faculty is essential to achieving each of these three goals. We note in particular (4) the desire to embrace the "public" in our public university, and call attention to the considerable role that Instructor-rank faculty play in outreach and service learning. If we fail to fully integrate Instructors as "core faculty," we will likewise fail to make good on this Academic Futures vision.

- **Foundations of Excellence.** Given its focus on improving the first-year experience in all of its dimensions, the Foundations of Excellence initiative clearly places Instructor-rank faculty as a key requisite for success. The ability of Instructors to *engage and retain* students is essential to this first-year initiative, and more generally to the success of our campus. If enacted, the recommendations in this Instructor Task Force report will help ensure that we achieve the goals of Foundations of Excellence.

- **IDEA Plan.** The second "Action Area of Focus" in the IDEA Plan speaks to the need to attract and retain diverse faculty. This is especially important for teaching faculty, as they most actively engage with students, and can embody change and diversity for students to see. Yet given the low salaries for Instructors, and problems regarding inclusion that are already evident for Instructors irrespective of their ethnicity or gender, it is hardly surprising that the College and the campus have much to accomplish in this Focus Area.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Task Force went to considerable lengths to engage the College and Campus community in our work. We held numerous listening sessions early in Fall 2018, attended by Instructor-rank faculty from a variety of A&S units. We learned much about the lived experience of Instructors—some of it new, and much confirming what we ourselves have experienced and understood over many years at CU-Boulder. These listening sessions were critical, and helped ensure that our recommendations reflect the needs and desires of Instructors.

In early-to mid-October we met with unit chairs and directors at divisional meetings, and in some instances held detailed side conversations with associate deans and with chairs/directors. It was interesting—and we should add, gratifying—to hear that many chairs and directors shared the concerns of Instructors. We gathered various suggestions about how, from an administrative perspective, we might improve the circumstances of Instructors, and better draw on their passion and experience. These suggestions are reflected in many of our recommendations.

Based on both the listening sessions with Instructors and our engagement with chairs and directors, we developed, in broad strokes, the recommendations that are included in this report. We tested these draft recommendations at a series of Town Halls, attended by not only Instructors but also tenure-stream faculty. We likewise tested these recommendations in several meetings with Dean Jim White, and offered updates at several Arts and Sciences Council meetings.

The general findings and specific recommendations that follow reflect the shared consensus of various stakeholders. We organize these findings into **five categories**:

Teaching Loads that Fail Students and Denigrate Service
Chaotic and Inconsistent Communication of Policy
Falling Behind: Low Pay and Compression
Years of Service on an Uncertain Career Path
Not at the Table: An Unwelcoming Climate

The recommendations we offer correspond to each of these five categories. The recommendations follow from, and seek to redress, the concerns that were brought to the Task Force by Instructors, tenure-stream faculty, and administrators alike. Where necessary or helpful, we comment briefly on the specific rationale behind the recommendation. To help prioritize the recommendations, and to aid in implementation, we rank each of our recommendations along three dimensions: ***Priority/Impact, Implementation,*** **and** ***Resources***. We incorporate our recommendations as we discuss our findings in each of the five categories. For convenience, the appendix to this report presents a summary list of all recommendations.

It is only natural that we focus on problems and concerns in these findings. We hasten to add, however, that in the course of the last months we have discovered that several units are exemplary in their treatment of instructors. This is heartening, as we need a set of *local best*

practices upon which to guide our work. These best practices are likewise reflected in many of our recommendations.

1. TEACHING LOADS THAT FAIL STUDENTS AND DENIGRATE SERVICE

By far the most central and pressing concern expressed by Instructors (and acknowledged by chairs and directors) is the shift in workload. For some twenty years in Arts and Sciences, a 100% appointment, a 3/3 course load, and a 75/25% teaching/service merit ratio was the default Instructor appointment. Since about 2013, the default option for a 100% appointment has been a 4/4 course load and an 85/15% teaching/service merit ratio. The burden of such a heavy teaching load, and the costs of not valuing service—both psychological and real—have been unmistakable. And it cannot help but have an effect on student engagement, success, and retention.

The shift to a default Instructor contract of a 4/4 teaching load with an 85 /15 merit ratio has created five related problems:

1) *Opportunities for "high-impact" teaching have been diminished significantly.*

This campus has recently been championing the value of "high-impact practices" (HIPs) — i.e., measures promoted by campuses across the globe (including CU-Boulder) to meet students' needs as individual learners, to provide students with individualized, focused attention, and to engage them in significant problem-solving activity (https://www.aacu.org/leap/hips). The AACU finds that these practices are especially important for both student satisfaction and retention as does a range of other scholarship. Studies across the nation are documenting the need for more faculty hours spent with students and the corresponding negative effects on students with the lack of that engagement (see, for example, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.2202/1949-6605.1474). In the last five years, CU-Boulder has followed suit, implementing First-Year Seminars, various retention initiatives, and service learning and community engagement opportunities. These "high-impact practices" can help make "T1 at the R1" a reality.

Ironically, however, the A&S decision to change the default standard teaching load from 3/3 to 4/4 diminishes Instructor opportunities for precisely this sort of teaching. On a 3/3 load with class sizes of 19, a typical writing teacher in the PWR might conference with each of her students three times per semester for at least 20 minutes in addition to normal class activities (e.g. teaching grading and responding to student drafts, other office hours, and various service commitments. This amounts to 57 hours of one-on-one high-impact teaching across the semester—a sizable amount of work that many instructors take on for the good of their students. Instructors in other disciplines likewise play a disproportionate role in high-impact practices. They spent similar amounts of time weekly on a 3/3 load, teaching a wide variety of courses and engaging with students. A 3/3 load makes T1 at the R1 possible.

By contrast, a 4/4 load with classes of 19 demands 76 hours for the same kind of high-impact teaching (not to mention more class time, more grading and responding to more essay drafts, and the same amount of service). Such an added load that requires either more personal sacrifice on the part of the Instructor in order to provide high-impact teaching or that some of

these activities be truncated—say, by offering fewer or shorter conferences, by assigning fewer essays, or by offering less substantial feedback. (And, indeed, multiple PWR Instructors have reported to Task Force members exactly this sort of scaling back as their load has increased.) Instructors in other disciplines are likewise forced to reduce individualized attention to students and limit or do not engage in pedagogical innovation, or risk burnout—and even illness. The increase in the teaching load to 4/4 fails to factor in the increased demands on email contact, office-hour traffic, the scheduling and supervision of disability-related exams, and an almost inevitable increase in preparation for different and more diverse courses.

We worry that the short-term benefits afforded by a 4/4 contract with an 85/15 merit ratio in terms of a measure like student credit hours (SCH) are being had at the expense of long-term benefits to issues including student retention, satisfaction, and success.

2) *Courses formerly taught as optional overloads are now required.*

On the old default 3/3 teaching load, Instructors could opt to teach an overload during semesters when they had the time, energy, and motivation to do so: indeed, in a program such as the PWR, as many as 30% or so of the Instructor-rank faculty might choose to teach an overload during a given semester. Remaining Instructors, however, routinely opted to remain on a 3/3 load—doubtless because of the opportunities for high impact teaching as outlined above.

Under the new 4/4 default, however, what was once optional is now standard: that is, what was once an option for those with added time and motivation was now made the baseline for all teaching. Furthermore, those who preferred to remain on a 3/3 load were reduced to a 75% appointment. This has created a bifurcated Instructor position in which, as noted above, high-impact teaching activities are de-incentivized as a matter of contract. One Instructor summed up her position succinctly within one of our recent Task Force Town Hall meetings: I have, she stated, "too many students in too many classes: either I need fewer students or fewer classes" to continue to provide the level of excellence the students and the campus merit.

3) *Opportunities for service—especially teaching-related service and professional development—are diminished*

The shift to 4/4 in A&S has been accompanied by a shift to an 85/15 merit ratio—which effectively diminishes the value of service activity by 10% for Instructors.

Now, if service were little more than serving on a single department committee, as was regularly implied in public fora by those who implemented this 4/4 policy, then perhaps this change would be justifiable. This definition, however, is quite inadequate, and fails to reflect the true nature of service engaged in by Instructor-rank faculty. Teaching-related service and professional development are crucial to currency in the field. For tenure-stream faculty, such currency and its ability to invigorate teaching are usually seen as a function of their research. Given that contracts for Instructor-rank faculty exclude research, service related to professional development becomes the only avenue for maintaining currency in the field. (A full discussion

of the relationship between teaching and service was addressed in an Academic Futures White Paper, which is included in the appendix.)

Contractually speaking, service stands as the primary merit category in which Instructors can earn credit for teaching-related service, to help oversee programmatic innovation, to run labs, and to otherwise contribute directly to the pedagogical health of their programs. Service also stands as a traditional merit category for professional development—attending conferences, publishing on pedagogical topics, etc. This point about professional development is particularly important given that the Instructor contract has no formal merit category through which to recognize Instructor research and publication related to classroom pedagogy and domain content.

Still further, promotion to Senior Instructor and Teaching Professor require a profile of service at the campus and even national level, something increasingly difficult to achieve given College and campus policies regarding service. Service goes to the heart of who instructors are and what they do. If the campus trivializes service, we are well on our way to a loss, over time, in educational quality, and further loss of the voice of Instructor-rank faculty within units, the College, and the campus.

Instructor-rank faculty already engage in a good deal of professional development, but for little if any reward or recognition. Whether attending conferences, engaging in peer mentorship, developing courses and curricula, publishing on pedagogical innovations and research, or simply staying current with journals in the field, Instructor-rank faculty do so, often eagerly, but only after already putting in long hours of work, and with little encouragement or reward.

New instructor contracts at a 4/4 load with 85/15 merit ratios focus on increased classroom teaching, but come at the expense of service vital to student retention and success. They additionally undercut the ability of instructors to remain current in the field, and to apply innovative, evidence-based practices. These options also actively discourage instructors from performing instructionally-related service pertaining to curriculum and pedagogy that is vital to their units and to our campus. Teaching is thus seen in narrow ways—seat time in formal classes and the generation of student credit hours. Instructor service is likewise seen in shortsighted ways—as simply attending faculty meetings or sitting on a committee. It is so much more. Many departments could not continue to function without the service Instructors provide in a wide variety of functional areas, such as development and implementation of curriculum, course coordination, student placement and assessment, and outreach and recruitment. Instructionally-related service is the place where instructors imagine and act on the future.

4) *The recent increase to both Instructor and Senior Instructor base pay simply does not apply to those not on a 4/4 contract.*

We applaud the campus and A&S for recent efforts to raise the base or floor pay for Instructors to $52,000 per year and for Senior Instructors to $60,000 per year. We note, however, that these increases apply only to those on 100% contracts—and thus exclude the sizable number of Instructors who have opted for 3/3 teaching loads so as to maximize opportunities for high-impact instruction. We also note that this recent increase has created

salary ambiguity for those who have chosen 75% contracts so as to maximize their high-impact work: Do they receive raises of any sort? If so, how much? Given that many of them make just above $39K (75% of $52K), why are they be penalized for a contractual choice that A&S administrators insisted would not impact them or their careers negatively? Still further, there is a class of Instructor who seeks to shift from a 4/4 load at 100% to a 3/3 load at 75% so as to offer more of the high-impact teaching practices outlined above. (Indeed, several PWR faculty have recently made this choice and explained their rationale to members of this Task Force orally and in writing.) Do these Instructors lose pay as a result of their choice to work more directly with students? Those who most want to pursue high-impact teaching now seem to be paying an extra financial penalty for doing so.

5) *Instructor morale, already low, is waning.*

Our Task Force has repeatedly heard compelling personal stories of burnout and fatigue related to each of the four problems above. Indeed, the following comments from Instructors participating in our recent A&S Town Hall were common:

> --Several Instructors noted that differences with respect to workload are not clearly delineated, especially with respect to service between those on 100%-time contracts and those on 75%-time contracts.
>
> --Several Instructors noted that there is no consistency across units with regard to teaching big classes: in some units, teaching a 400-person lecture is counted as teaching two courses; in others, it isn't.
>
> --Several Instructors noted that service seems overwhelming: one mentioned that, each semester, she sits on the unit's honors committee, coordinates teaching assistants, serves as Instructor representative on multiple committees, and writes as many as 25 letters of recommendation, all while teaching four courses. She finds this load to be unsustainable.
>
> --Several Instructors suggested that their service expectations have become less clear once their contracts shifted from 3/3 to 4/4.
>
> --Several Instructors suggested that they would like to see a specific merit category in their contracts for professional development. Another expressed interest in the ability to occasionally apply for a one-course release to do research as part of her overall professional development as a teacher: such a release would afford her a clearer sense of balance and further currency in the field.

We do not ground our recommendations, however, on these personal factors alone, or even in the main. More compelling for us is the inevitable effect this workload has on student engagement, success, and retention. Those effects are muted by the desire of Instructors to continue to go the extra mile, to extend themselves, again and again, to students. What is unsustainable on a personal level becomes, however, a structural limitation at the institutional level. We fear that the College and the campus will eventually pay a steep price as student

retention fails to meet institutional goals, and overworked, demoralized instructors reduce assignments, respond in the most perfunctory fashion to student work, shorten office hours to a minimum, shirk co-curricular teaching opportunities, fail to maintain currency in their fields, and in general cut corners—all in an effort to save their sanity. Instructors are productive and engaged when their work is respected. Right now, with Instructors being asked to teach more, service is squeezed out, to the detriment of A&S and the campus. Indeed, in this climate, the teaching itself is likely to suffer. The present 4/4 teaching load fails our students.

1. Recommendations on Teaching, Service, and Professional Development

a. Reframe the relationship between teaching and service to address the significant role of instructionally-related service.

Teaching loads that only capture traditional classroom teaching and service that only accounts for traditional committee service need to be rethought. Instead, we need to see teaching, traditional service (e.g. committee work), teaching-related service (e.g. curriculum development, program assessment, laboratory coordination, and the like), and professional development as inextricably linked. *This recommendation, essential to nearly all that follow, starts with a practical recognition of the valuable work that instructors already do, and then seeks arrangements to appropriately honor and compensate for that work.*

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Immediate Resources: High

b. Change the merit weighting for full-time appointments to 70% teaching, 20% service, and 10% professional development.

This 70/20/10 merit weighting respects Instructors' substantial service contributions alongside their need for the professional development that allows them to remain current in their discipline and/or grow in their teaching practices. Chairs and directors should work with instructors to modify this 70/20/10 weighting where appropriate to develop optimal merit ratios that reflect both the needs of the unit and the professional interests of the Instructor.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

c. Develop a set of examples of pre-approved options for course equivalencies and service-intensive work to better recognize the distinctive service rendered by many Instructors, and to reduce the burden of individually negotiated MOUs.

A number of instructionally-related activities lie beyond traditional classroom teaching, yet are also not committee service. Such activities are essential both to the smooth functioning of academic units and to student learning. A flexible set of options for course equivalencies is thus essential. Any such list of options should be construed as a set of examples, provided for guidance, and not as an exhaustive list meant to preclude other possibilities. Tenure-stream faculty might also benefit from such examples.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

d. Establish a 3/3 teaching load that includes a new category of professional development in addition to service, for a 70/20/10 teaching/service/professional development merit ratio, with no reduction in pay for current instructors and the new base salaries for new hires. This would be the standard benchmark for full-time Instructor positions.

This recommendation follows from 1a, and the need to reframe relationships between teaching and service. It is also aligned with the desire to achieve "T1 and the R1" and seeks to correct problems that have arisen with the 4/4 teaching load. Current teaching loads are not in the best interests of students, nor do they accurately reflect the complete range of work performed by instructor-rank faculty. Chairs and directors should use this benchmark as they develop contracts that address the needs of the unit and the interests of the instructor. *This recommendation reflects not a reduction in teaching effort but rather a recognition of the diverse forms in which teaching and teaching-related activities occur.* Instructor salaries should remain at their current levels, and instructors on 75% appointments should not be disadvantaged by this change. Overloads would be permitted for those who have the bandwidth and interest to undertake them, and would blunt the financial impacts of this recommendation. Administrators should consult with instructors on contract options well in advance of reappointment. Instructors should be able to negotiate workloads in a manner consistent with tenure-stream faculty.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Near-term Resources: High

e. Establish, beyond current funding options, an annual pedagogical research and professional development fund for Instructors (in an amount equal to that provided to tenure-stream faculty). Funds can be rolled over for one year. This funding is an analog to current research funds provided to tenure-stream faculty.

Professional development in the service of "currency in the field" is essential for the Instructor-rank faculty, and should be supported appropriately. Although extended to all Instructor-rank faculty, the funds could only be used for eligible activities, and may not be called upon by all Instructors every year, making the resource investment rather modest.

Priority/Impact: Medium Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Moderate

2. CHAOTIC AND INCONSISTENT COMMUNICATION OF POLICY

The second area of concern, voiced in equal measure by discouraged Instructors and perplexed and frustrated chairs and directors, is the chaotic and inconsistent communication of policy. The gaps in communication have seemed most often to occur between Faculty Affairs and A&S, as well as between A&S associate deans and the chairs and directors in their divisions.

Instructor reappointment and promotion have been special areas of concern. In some cases, contracts have been significantly delayed due to confusion over the process. In others, such as the new expedited review for Senior Instructor reappointments, the policy approved by Faculty Affairs was subsequently incorrectly presented on the A&S website. In fact, the Faculty Affairs policy was developed to lighten the burden both on long-serving Senior Instructors who must still reapply for their positions every three years and likewise on their departments, yet the policy that emerged on the A&S website did neither. To the credit of the A&S administration, discussions since then have led to the promise that future alternate reviews for Senior Instructors will indeed be expedited in ways that lighten the burden on Instructor-rank faculty, and in a manner that those involved have found very positive.

Consider, likewise, the implementation of the honorary working title of Teaching Professor to deserving Senior Instructors. Many department chairs within A&S reported to us that they were unaware of the protocol for nomination, or in some cases, had nominated individuals and never heard back from A&S. Conversely, other schools and colleges have brought forward deserving nominees relatively quickly, with the result of underrepresentation and devaluation of the A&S Teaching Professors.

When members of the Task Force met with chairs and directors, there was broad confusion about how to best update by-laws and how to create effective promotion policies. In fact, chairs and directors have on more than a few occasions contacted the BFA Instructor-Track Faculty Affairs Committee for guidance on dealing with opaque (and changeable) A&S policies—policies that do not necessarily comport with Office of Faculty Affairs guidelines.

Many chairs actively voiced the need for model documents and a clearing house for best practices. In the absence of such guidance, many units have done nothing. One A&S department has Instructors who have served for close to 20 years and never been promoted to Senior Instructor; the unit has essentially failed to implement procedures for promotion, effectively freezing Instructors in rank. In addition, some unit by-laws are well out of date, other units resist including Instructor-rank faculty in faculty meetings, and some do not include voting rights for Instructor-rank faculty at all.

On these policy concerns, the A&S website offers little guidance, and at some points only adds to the confusion. In an apparent effort to streamline various pages of the website, important information was deleted. A case in point is a series of agreements and explanations (presented as an FAQ page) about the then new 4/4 load, approved by the then Dean. Those understandings included the agreement that Instructors who stayed at a 3/3 load, now 75% time, would in nearly all respects be treated as 100%-time faculty. But with the page gone, institutional memory fades, and those Instructors are now being actively disadvantaged.

In meetings with division chairs and directors, we were especially interested in how units developed "work arounds" of A&S policies to serve the needs of their units. Understanding those "work arounds" provides a clue regarding what more effective policies might look like. By far the most important area of concern were course equivalencies for teaching-related service. Chairs and directors expressed a willingness—indeed, a genuine need—to offer course equivalencies for instructionally related work (e.g. coordinating labs, conducting assessment, overseeing large multi-section courses) that may not be credit-generating or otherwise resemble traditional "students-in-seats" teaching. Such work is vital to the functioning of units, yet they often found A&S administrators did not comprehend the need and/or were resistant to their efforts to offer such course equivalencies. While consistency is important, policies that are sufficiently flexible to accommodate unit-level needs are also critical.

Given the chaotic and inconsistent communication of policy, it is hardly surprising that new chairs and directors are uncertain how to deal with Instructor-related issues. New associate deans are themselves perplexed by this policy landscape, and given that they are new on the job, actions by new chairs, directors, and associate deans can easily compound the problems. Ultimately, it is Instructors themselves who feel the real effects of this ineffective and inconsistent communication of policy.

2. Clarity and Effective Communication of Policy

a. Develop policies regarding Instructor-rank faculty that strike a balance between consistency and a recognition of the distinctive needs/roles of individual units.

The degree to which current units have to develop workarounds to the current system of policies suggests that unit needs/roles are not fully respected.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

b. Improve the clarity, implementation and effective communication of campus-level policy (Office of Faculty Affairs) regarding Instructor-rank faculty at the College level (e.g. alternating full/expedited review for Senior Instructors; new Teaching Professor designation). Ensure timely review of reappointment dossiers and issuance of contracts.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

c. Develop and maintain a more effective and up-to-date web portal for information on policies and opportunities for Instructor-rank faculty.

A proposed Arts and Sciences Council standing committee on faculty affairs can help monitor the A&S site, just as the Boulder Faculty Assembly should work in concert with

the Office of Faculty Affairs to ensure the accuracy of information and the effectiveness of its communication.

Priority/Impact: Medium Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Moderate

d. Develop a clearinghouse or more transparent database for best practices and model documents regarding Instructor policy (e.g. by-laws, reappointment and promotion guidelines, merit systems) to assist units in the College as they develop or update policies.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

e. Improve orientation on Instructor issues for new chairs/directors and new associate deans/deans by reviewing and updating faculty handbooks as they exist at various levels (e.g. unit, division, college, campus) and by having explicit discussions on Instructor issues at the time of on-boarding.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

f. Include new Instructors in orientations for new faculty by integrating a special session specific to their needs during on-boarding events sponsored by the College and/or Faculty Affairs.

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

3. FALLING BEHIND: LOW PAY AND SALARY COMPRESSION

Research has shown that respect for the work that Instructor-rank faculty do goes a long way toward fostering job satisfaction (see for example Adrianna Kezar's 2013 article in *Research in Higher Education*). However, respect alone is not adequate compensation for work. Low base wages and considerable salary compression, especially for long-serving Instructors, emerged as very high priority issues in our discussions with Instructors. The high cost of living in the Boulder/Denver metro area only exacerbates this problem. Chairs and directors are aware of this, and expressed both embarrassment about low instructor salaries and concern over the difficulty of recruiting for open Instructor lines, especially at the national level.

In early February 2019, the Chancellor announced a raise to the base starting salary for Instructors on 100% appointments from $40K to $52K, with a newly established floor for Senior Instructors of $60K. The Task Force members wish to thank the administration for seeking to address salary issues on a campus level. In addition to the tangible reward, the good will expressed by the Chancellor and others in upper-administration is heartily welcome.

Upon closer scrutiny, however, the Task Force found that the new base pay still falls short of addressing the issues we and so many others have voiced. In the context of A&S teaching loads, and of the shift from a 3/3 to 4/4 load for a 100% appointment, consider the following:

Date	Teaching load	Base pay	Pay per course
Mid 1990s	3/3	$30K	$5,000/course
2009	3/3	$40K	**$6,667/course**
2013	4/4	$48K	$6,000/course
2019	4/4	$52K	**$6,500/course**

The above figures follow how A&S determines compensation on the basis of course load, as per the A&S website: https://www.colorado.edu/asfacultystaff/personnel-administration/policies-procedures/faculty-regular-non-tenure-track/reappointments-1. The A&S calculations do not consider merit ratios. In other words, considered on a per-course basis and in light of A&S teaching loads, newly hired Instructors, even with the 2019 pay raise, still *earn less* than they would have, per course, in 2009, a full decade ago.

There are further complications with the recent pay increase, in light of A&S contract options. When A&S converted default Instructor contracts to a 4/4 load (100% time, $48K base), they offered the option of a 3/3 load (75% time, $40K base). Instructors who chose the 3/3 load were assured by A&S administrators that a 75% appointment was functionally the same as a 100% appointment. However, the new pay increase does not help those Instructors on 3/3 contracts, as they are already making $40K, just above the 2019 pay raise amount of $39K. In addition, Senior Instructors who have received merit pay increases over the past 6-7 years are already close to the $60K salary, meaning they also would not benefit, or benefit little, from the new base salary. Still further, there is the aforementioned issue of Instructors and Senior Instructors opting to shift from 4/4 100% positions to 3/3

75% positions for a variety of reasons: what happens to their salaries—especially in light of these new floors—seems very much unclear.

If the recent pay raise for starting Instructors is proving inadequate given A&S teaching loads, matters do not appear better as the Task Force sought to consider the Boulder context. The median earning level in Boulder County for full-time work in 2017 was $66,400 (https://www-static.bouldercolorado.gov/docs/2016_AMI_Chart-1-201612221304.pdf) Instructor salaries do not look good in this context, especially considering that nearly all A&S Instructors have Ph.D.s or other terminal degrees. The Task Force also considered long-term metrics. Such metrics are indeed vexed and may be of limited utility (e.g. the growing gap between Instructor starting salaries over time vs. average assistant professor starting salaries over time, or modest increases in Instructor starting salaries vs. larger tuition increases over the last 20-30 years). Whatever their flaws, such long-term comparisons nevertheless offer a compelling picture of how Instructors are being left behind. The College and the campus, in strategically planning an "academic future," should be aware that this future cannot be realized without the Instructors who have been historically disadvantaged and marginalized. We can't look forward without addressing that financial (and cultural) legacy.

Thus far, our discussion reflects issues regarding base or starting salaries. An even *greater problem*, widely voiced in our town hall meetings, is the issue of *salary compression*. We hasten to note that salary compression is a major issue for tenure-stream faculty as well, and we readily seek common cause with them in this regard. Although compression is a serious concern among tenure-stream ranks, these faculty have two possible remedies working in their favor: market forces at their initial hire, and the option of a competitive outside offer. Instructor-rank faculty are precluded from benefiting from the former, and rarely can seek remedy through the latter. Moreover, because adjustments in the base only seldom occur, long-serving Instructor-rank faculty often make just above any new base that is announced, and don't benefit directly in any way.

Two further features contribute to the problems in salary compression. One is the absence of an increment to the base, received upon promotion to Senior Instructor and Teaching Professor. Guidelines published by the Office of Faculty Affairs stipulate that such an increment should be given upon promotion, but individual units and A&S rarely have followed through on such a policy. A second feature is the merit exercise itself. An argument often advanced in favor of increases to the base salary is that such an increase contributes to a larger merit pool. However, in units where the merit criteria are framed chiefly in light of tenure-stream activities, this argument is irrelevant. Criteria for merit raises should match the actual work Instructors perform, and the merit exercise should ensure that Instructors can score along the full range of merit categories, including "exceeds expectations" and "far exceeds expectations."

Severe compression in the Instructor ranks has created a crisis in morale. Not surprisingly, many of the long-serving instructors in our campus discussions particularly favored addressing compression. Wages are so low, and teaching loads so high, that these instructors are particularly disadvantaged. Given that many of our finest instructors have served 20, 25, even 30 years and beyond, A&S should feel an obligation to recognize career merit as a means to remedy compression.

3. <u>Compensation: Base Salary and Compression</u>

a. Continue to address the base starting salary for new Instructors to offer a living wage in Boulder, to permit competitive searches, and to reward Instructors appropriately for their valuable work at the university.

The Task Force appreciates the efforts of the Chancellor and the Provost in early February to raise base salaries for instructors (despite the several issues we have addressed above in the implementation of that raise). Base salaries need to be reviewed and raised as needed every five years, with attention paid in particular to any resulting compression.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Near-Term Resources: High

b. Ensure that Senior Instructors earn 110-115% of Instructor salaries, as per the recent raise to the new minimum starting salary and per current Office of Faculty Affairs Guidelines, and in light of recommendation 3a.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Moderate

c. Address, through targeted funds, severe salary compression among long-serving Instructor-rank faculty created by previous increases to the floor salary and which will only be exacerbated by recently implemented increases to the floor. This recommendation should be implemented in the context of recognizing career merit, and compression/career merit should be revisited on a periodic basis.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Moderate

d. Ensure, through College and unit cost-sharing, that Instructors receive a minimum $2k bump to the base salary upon promotion to Senior Instructor and to Teaching Professor, per existing Office of Faculty Affairs Guidelines. Going forward, this recommendation will help address compression.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Moderate

e. (Re)Design merit systems in units so that merit criteria match contracts and actual work, and to ensure that Instructor-rank faculty can qualify for the full-range of possible merit designations. Units should have mechanisms in place to reward Instructor scholarly or creative work (work essential to currency in the field), even when such activity is not contractually required.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

4. YEARS OF SERVICE ON AN UNCERTAIN CAREER PATH

The Task Force noted at the outset of this report that Instructor positions are no longer temporary way-stations to other, and presumably better opportunities. They are now more often career positions. In that light, it is necessary to better manage that career path, to the benefit of the individual, the College, and the campus. Unfortunately, even after decades of service, Instructors still experience tenuous security and an uncertain career path.

Instructors voiced pressing worries about the security of their jobs, even as campus enrollments increase. Such worries seem most to affect the significant number of Instructors who work in the Residential Academic Programs (RAPS) or other similar instructional and first-year experience programs. Recent discussions about rethinking the first-year experience (or even abolishing RAPS) have led to a heightened sense of insecurity. Ideally, all Instructors would develop ties with more traditional (and presumably more stable) academic units and disciplinary homes.

A constant refrain heard in our discussions is the demoralizing prospect of reapplying for a job every three years—even when Instructors are 20 or 30 years into their career on campus. That prospect also becomes burdensome when reappointment guidelines remain unclear, or when promotion guidelines are non-existent. Unclear or contradictory policies about alternating full and expedited review for Senior Instructors, and about promotion to Teaching Professor, only add to perceptions of uncertainty and a sense of not being valued.

Many voices also called for more appropriate titles for Instructor-rank faculty, such as Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, and Teaching Professor. Even if instituted only as 'working titles', such titles would better respect the work of a large portion of our full-time faculty. Likewise, we heard from both Instructors and chairs and directors that Instructors should be encouraged to serve in administrative capacities where their talents and energy can advance the work of the College.

The focus of the Task Force's charge is, in the main, Instructor-rank faculty. But we would be remiss if we did not address the plight of Lecturers in our College and on our campus. Lecturers provide a valuable service, in that they can fill temporary instructional needs. However, when filling those "temporary" needs, Lecturers often serve for 5 years, or 10 years, or more, many carrying full-time loads, without the benefit of a full-time rostered Instructor position. The Task Force found an undue reliance on Lecturers: by headcount, our faculty is 30% Lecturers, 20% Instructors, and 50% tenure-stream faculty. We urge the College and the campus to ask: are these ratios befitting of an R1 institution? The ongoing overuse of Lecturers undermines the spirit of our institution, and shows that there is a demonstrable need to hire more Instructors. Moreover, we need to ensure that long-serving and highly effective Lecturers have a clear pathway to Instructor positions.

It is important to note that many Instructors have a long-term commitment to the campus, and represent some of our foremost campus citizens. A career in service of CU should be honored. For many instructors, that is hardly the case.

4. <u>Career Path</u>

a. Ensure the existence of clear policies in every unit for standards for reappointment as well as the promotion of Instructors through ranks (Instructor to Senior Instructor, and to Teaching Professor). Instructors should not be disadvantaged in their careers by the absence of such unit policies, or an unwillingness to create them.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

b. To promote stability and job security, traditional disciplinary units and Residential Academic Programs (and other programs employing instructors) must work together to ensure that Instructors in the RAPS and other such programs have well established ties and ongoing communication with traditional disciplinary units.

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

c. Develop and reward participation in a College-wide mentoring program for newly hired Instructors, consistent with the mentoring programs available to tenure-stream faculty.

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

d. Clarify/revise College policy on alternating expedited and full reviews for Senior Instructors to align College policy with its intended purpose as approved by the Office of Faculty Affairs. (A key purpose of this campus policy is to relieve the burden on well qualified Senior Instructors to prepare materials to reapply for their positions on a near constant basis.)

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

e. Clarify and better communicate policies and procedures at the unit and College level for promotion to the honorary rank (working title) of Teaching Professor. The body reviewing Teaching Professor dossiers at the College level should include some representation by Teaching Professors.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

f. Develop (to the extent permitted by Regent Law) a full range of teaching faculty titles (Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, Full Teaching Professor), as is becoming common nationally. At a minimum, develop such titles as "working titles."

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Long-Term Resources: Low

g. Provide one-year notice to Senior Instructors in the event of program discontinuance or reorganization.

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

h. Permit and encourage Senior Instructors to apply for and serve in administrative capacities, as appropriate to their experience and expertise (e.g. RAP directors, department associate chairs for undergraduate education). As a general rule, well qualified Instructor-rank faculty should be able to compete for many such positions, and position announcements should avoid restricting applications to tenured faculty except as necessary.

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

i. Encourage contract flexibility for late-career Senior Instructors who can provide valuable service to the College beyond normally expected teaching duties.

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

j. Create additional Instructor lines. The undue reliance on Lecturer positions does not serve students or the College well, and is corrosive to the soul of the university.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Long-Term Resources: High

k. Develop clear policies for Instructor searches that would facilitate a path to Instructor positions for highly qualified, long-time Lecturers by (1) recognizing their CU-Boulder contributions even as rigorous searches are conducted, and (2) implementing a transitional cost-sharing plan so that financial considerations do not stand in the way of deserved transitions from Lecturer to Instructor status.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Long-Term Resources: Moderate

5. NOT AT THE TABLE: AN UNWELCOMING CLIMATE

This final category in our set of five findings and recommendations concerns an unwelcoming climate. It is easy to dismiss references to "climate" as unduly vague or difficult to remedy, but climate is the bedrock on which all of our findings and recommendations rest. We should not dismiss, for example, the cumulative effect of references in published announcements to "faculty and Instructors," when Instructors are by definition members of the regular faculty.

A recent study by USC Professor Adrianna Kezar finds that among the most important determinants of non-tenure-track faculty efficacy are campus policies regarding their treatment as faculty: she asserts that positive departmental policies "shape [non-tenure-track] performance and ability to create quality learning experiences" while "unsupportive policies impact preparation, advising possibilities, create poor curricular designs, result in missing key materials, among many other negative results." ("Examining Non-Tenure Track Faculty Perceptions of How Departmental Policies and Practices Shape Their Performance and Ability to Create Student Learning at Four-Year Institutions." *Research on Higher Education* 54.5 (2013): 571–598.)

Instructors are often not allowed to be at the table (or, as Hamilton would have it, not even "in the room"). This is no exaggeration. In at least one A&S department, Instructors are not allowed to attend faculty meetings, much less vote. As an ethical imperative, the Task Force strongly believes there should be a minimum floor for Instructor voting rights that applies to all units in the College. As a matter of principle, the College should actively encourage (if not require) that Instructors participate fully and broadly in the intellectual climate, governance arrangements, and service opportunities of the unit.

Another often-voiced concern, and a further demonstration of an unwelcoming climate, is the contract with the Regents that Instructors are required to sign in order to secure a reappointment. Instructors must waive any and all grievance rights—rights that are seen as a bedrock in the campus Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty document. What's more, Instructors can be dismissed for cause by being charged with (not convicted of, mind you) anything more than a simple traffic ticket. When a member of the Task Force had occasion to ask the chief legal counsel of the campus to defend the nature of this contract, he demurred, and said he could not defend it. Recent revisions to the By-laws of the Regents have devolved some Instructor policy issues from the system to the campus level, so we hope this issue can be solved by instituting a new campus-level contract. As it stands, the current contract is demeaning to Instructors.

Beyond such specific concerns lies the pervasive invisibility of Instructors. The College and the campus will eagerly tout one of several high-impact practices (learning communities, writing intensive courses, service learning, internships, community engagement, among others) with little awareness of how these initiatives often require the widespread and time-intensive involvement of Instructors. When students seek letters of recommendation, they turn to those who have known and supported them—and in many cases it is an Instructor who writes that letter.

All too rarely are Instructors welcomed, acknowledged, or thanked. Moments when congratulations are in order are not taken up, much less actively embraced. In one A&S unit, the first word of a successful reappointment is an email message that one must submit to an official background check. Yes, strange as it may seem, such a message is greeted by Instructors as good news. In the last several years, five long-serving Senior Instructors in Arts and Sciences have been promoted to the honorary rank of Teaching Professor. Yet there has been not a word on the A&S website. There are all too few stories about the significant roles of Instructors in the life of the College, and the lives of their students. It would appear that Instructors and their achievements are something few in the College prefer to talk about. They are, after all, not at the table.

5. <u>Changing Institutional Culture</u>

a. Develop and implement consistent and repeated executive-level messaging that Instructor-rank faculty are valued members of the College and campus "core faculty."

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

b. Consistent and repeated messaging to *internal* constituencies about the significant roles of Instructor-rank faculty in teaching and service, and to *external* constituencies that honor and publicize their contributions. At meetings, ceremonies, in newsletters and similar publications, and on the web (at unit, College, and campus levels), make visible and honor the work of Instructor-rank faculty. Create, maintain, and publicize databases of instructor innovations, contributions, and accomplishments.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

c. Mandate consistent minimum voting rights for Instructor-rank faculty in all departments and programs across the College. These minimum voting rights would be consistent with the voting rights enumerated in BFA and ASC By-laws. Although any department or program can restrict these minimum voting rights and meeting attendance given the specific issue under discussion (e.g. personnel matters), such restrictions should be regarded as limited exceptions to the principles of broad participation by Instructor-rank faculty in department and program affairs, regular attendance at department and program meetings, and inclusive participation in unit and College faculty culture.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

d. Mandate revisions to unit by-laws to include Instructor-rank faculty in unit governance processes and in the participation/operation of appropriate committees. Ensure that Instructor-rank faculty have access to service opportunities.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

e. Revise the Instructor contract for employment, which in its current form fails to extend to Instructors the full rights normally extended to faculty members. (Instructors are currently forced to sign a contract with the Regents that waives all grievance rights, and includes provisions for dismissal for cause that depart from faculty norms.)

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

f. Provide material conditions for work that reflect the faculty member's duties, and not necessarily just the faculty member's rank (e.g. Instructors require sufficient privacy for meetings with students, access to computer resources, access to budgets for supplies and materials needed for teaching, and office space with appropriate ventilation, heating, and cooling).

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

g. Ensure that Instructor-rank faculty have broad access at unit, College, and campus levels to awards, grants, prizes, fellowships, and committee participation. Eligibility restrictions for "tenured or tenure-stream faculty only" should be limited to special cases. Instructors are willing and eager to compete with tenure-stream faculty on the merits of their proposals and the quality of their work.

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

h. Continue to make progress in improving benefits packages for Instructor-rank faculty, in an effort to achieve parity, where possible and appropriate, with tenure-stream faculty. We welcome recent improvements in family-leave policies for Instructor-rank faculty, but they still fall short of what can and should be done.

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Moderate

i. Require chairs/directors to report on the status of Instructors in their unit as part of an annual report or meeting with the Dean.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

j. Work with the Office of Faculty Affairs to include an explicit and required section in the ARPAC Self Study report on the status of both Instructors and lecturers in the unit.

Priority/Impact: Medium Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

k. Establish a standing "Faculty Affairs" committee on the Arts and Sciences Council that could take over from a possible short-term Task Force implementation committee. In addition to other duties, such a Faculty Affairs committee would be able to monitor over the long term the status of Instructors and advocate for desired change. At least one-third but no more than one-half of the membership of such a committee should be comprised of Instructor-rank faculty. (Such an ASC committee may begin as an ad-hoc committee, but we anticipate the need for the committee to be ongoing and thus deserves to be constituted as a standing committee.)

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

l. In the event of a reorganization of the College of Arts and Sciences, this Task Force report and its recommendations must continue to be considered and addressed. Should divisions within the College acquire more autonomy, it is ever more important that broad consistency and equity be achieved across organizational boundaries.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

APPENDICES

Task Force on Instructors

Formed jointly by
James White, Interim Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences
Stephen Mojzsis, Chair of the Arts and Sciences Council

April 10, 2018

Background

Some five decades ago, CU-Boulder's faculty workforce was predominantly tenured or tenure-track, and undergraduate courses were predominantly taught by them. Indeed, many tenured or tenure-track faculty focused wholly or in large measure on classroom teaching. Instructor-rank faculty were far fewer in number, and the positions were seen in temporary terms, or as way stations to tenure-track appointments.

Times have changed. Not only have the College of Arts and Sciences and the campus become far more reliant on Instructors and Senior Instructors, faculty in these positions now often make career-long contributions to the College and campus that have deep and ongoing relevance to their missions. Rostered Instructors and Senior Instructors on multi-year contracts now join tenure-stream faculty as the "core faculty" of the College of Arts and Sciences, and of the campus as a whole. Their responsibilities and professional activities surely differ, as they should. But both groups contribute in vital ways to our undergraduate mission, and to the success of our students.

An examination is long overdue of (1) the role of A&S Instructors and Senior Instructors, (2) the policies and workloads that affect their teaching and service, and (3) the climate in which they work:

- For decades, the ranks of instructors have grown without sufficient or intentional planning, and without a rational understanding of their role in the educational landscape of our College and campus.
- Current strategic planning and visioning initiatives in the College and on campus make the recommendations of the proposed Task Force on Instructors timely and highly relevant.

Charge to the Task Force

The Task Force shall examine the status and function of Instructors and Senior Instructors in the context of the mission of the College of Arts and Sciences. Although considerations of other non-tenure-track faculty (e.g. lecturers) may be included as deemed relevant, the focus of the Task Force's work will be on Instructors and Senior Instructors (job classifications 1105 and 1104, respectively). Its work will likewise focus on the College of Arts and Sciences, although its findings may also have broad relevance to the campus.

We charge the Task Force to investigate and develop recommendations on a set of interrelated issues that include but are not limited to the following:

- Appropriate distinctions among non-tenure-stream faculty positions and roles
- Teaching responsibilities, workloads, and course assignments
- Service, including instructionally-related service activities
- Professional development, access to funding opportunities, and pedagogical research accounts
- Polices regarding inclusive recruitment, hiring, contracts, reappointment, and promotion through ranks
- Access for long-serving and highly qualified lecturers to instructor-rank positions
- Career management and access to appropriate administrative positions
- Issues and policies regarding salary, benefits (e.g. family leave), merit, and salary compression
- Implementation of campus policy (e.g. Teaching Professor, alternating expedited and full review for senior instructors)
- Effective and consistent communication of A&S instructor policy
- Working conditions (e.g. access to office space, computers, office supplies, classroom/lab equipment)
- The presence and role of instructors in unit and College By-laws
- Role and voting rights in unit and College-level faculty governance
- Climate and collegiality at both the unit and College levels
- Ongoing assessment and accountability regarding instructor issues

Task Force Composition

The Task Force shall be composed of Teaching Professors, Senior Instructors and tenured Associate and Full Professors, drawn from a range of A&S units and departments. (Members of the Boulder Faculty Assembly Standing Committee on Instructor-Rank Faculty Affairs who are rostered in A&S can offer, in part, an initial pool of possible Task Force members.)

The Interim Dean and the ASC chair shall consult on the Task Force composition, designate a Task Force Chair (or Co-Chairs), and extend invitations to participate in its activities. Given the challenges of scheduling meetings with faculty who have high teaching loads, the optimal committee size may be eight members, but certainly no more than ten.

Projected Time Line and Deliverable

The Task Force shall be constituted before the end of the Spring 2018 semester, to permit some modest organizational and research work to commence.

The Task Force shall be in ongoing communication with the Interim Dean and ASC chair, and formally report on its progress in December 2018.

The Task Force shall complete its duties and offer a thorough report, with findings and recommendations, to both the Interim Dean and the ASC Chair by the end of February 2019. This timeline will facilitate comment, deliberation, and formal action, as appropriate, in March and April, 2019.

The report shall be shared with relevant bodies/persons who have an ongoing interest and stake in instructor issues, for example the Boulder Faculty Assembly, the Office of Faculty Affairs, the Council of Deans, and the Provost.

Rethinking the Outdated Binary of Teaching and Service to Unleash Innovation and Support Student Success

A White Paper for the Academic Futures Initiative
Submitted on behalf of Boulder Campus Instructor-Rank Faculty

Boulder Faculty Assembly
Instructor-Track Faculty Affairs Committee
November 16, 2017

Instructor-rank faculty have been engaged participants in the Academic Futures discussions. Many have attended town halls and themed sessions, and many are designated "listeners" who are supporting the process. We share much in common with our tenure-stream colleagues, and their hopes and dreams for the campus are quite often our own.

For tenure-stream faculty, the constraining binary that needs rethinking is the one between research and teaching. Rethinking the limiting binary between teaching and service is every bit as vital for instructors. For decades, our campus has defined teaching quite narrowly—as students in seats, and student credit hours on budget ledgers. Definitions of service have likewise been unduly narrow—as our own presence in seats at faculty and committee meetings. **We submit that the campus can achieve a brighter Academic Future by rethinking the inherited—and inherently limiting—binary models of teaching and service. Doing so would unleash innovation among instructor-rank faculty and likewise help improve student success.**

This white paper draws attention to the teaching and service that instructors perform, and more particularly to current policy constraints that make it difficult for instructors to help the campus realize the future it desires. These constraints (most particularly in the College of Arts and Sciences) have to do with the severely diminished role for service in instructor contracts and unduly narrow understandings regarding course equivalences.

Given the campus's interest in broadly imagining a new future, talk of policy constraints might seem insignificant, or unduly technical. This is most assuredly not the case. **Instructionally-related service performed by instructors is an important place to imagine our future, and course equivalences are vital incubators for change.**

Instructor-track faculty comprise about 25% of full-time faculty on our campus. If we fail to draw on the talents and expertise of instructors, and if we constrain their ability to work toward a common future, then this entire initiative, despite what hopes we all share, will surely fail. We cannot drive toward a future by relying on only three of four cylinders. Instructors are eager to power this future.

Why Instructor Service is Central to the Campus's Academic Future

In its core logic, the primary service performed by instructors is curricular in nature, and consists of instructionally-related activities. Such service is central to the value, role, and identity of instructor-track faculty, and maintains and fosters their professional currency in a field. Service is likewise central to student success. More generally, such instructionally-related service provides a place for instructors to imagine a future—for themselves and for the campus.

The service performed by instructors adds enormous **value** to the unit, school/college, and the campus. Broad in its range and impact, instructor service is most especially salient in its relation to curriculum, instructionally-related activities, and student success and retention. Whether service is related to developing new curricula, innovative pedagogical perspectives, and meaningful assessment tools; or to overseeing multi-section courses and the training of lecturers and graduate students; or to mentoring students and fostering relationships that help ensure retention and success, instructors and the service they perform are central to the undergraduate mission—and to the future the campus now wishes to imagine.

Service is a defining feature that distinguishes **faculty roles.** Service is one of the main responsibilities that instructors *share with tenure-stream faculty*, and it is what connects both tenure-stream faculty and instructors to the campus community and its ongoing welfare. The service roles of instructors and TT faculty sometimes differ, but these roles are both necessary and complementary. Instructors are eager to perform service when that service is recognized and appreciated, and they perform this service well.

Service differentiates instructors from lecturers. Although lecturers and instructors both engage in a good deal of teaching, it is instructor service that builds an identification with the campus and helps sustain its educational mission over time. Lecturers perform a valuable but limited role in the classroom alone, based on changing and immediate instructional needs, and are not expected to engage in the very service that is central to the role of instructors and their contributions to the institution.

What is less commonly understood is how service shapes the **professional identity** of instructors. For tenure-stream faculty, professional identity is largely tied to research. But because instructors are not rewarded for research (though many instructors are in fact research active), their engagement with the campus and their disciplines through service becomes central to their professional identity and the management of their careers over time. It is also a crucial part of their identity as teachers, since it is often through service—mentoring, advising, taking part in co-curricular activities—that instructors can become close to their students and help to assure their success.

Service is also fundamentally important to the ability of instructors to maintain and expand their **currency in the field**. For tenure-stream faculty, currency in the field is driven largely by research activities, and their awareness of new developments in their respective fields informs, in turn, their classroom teaching. Given that instructors are not rewarded for research,

service remains a key vehicle for ensuring that classroom teaching reflects best practices. Professional development activities such as instructionally-related committees, workshops, seminars, and conferences have considerable value for maintaining currency. Because currency in the field is a central criterion for reappointment, opportunities and rewards for service should not be discounted as a minor afterthought to an instructor's contractual obligations, but recognized as a vehicle for ensuring the professional development necessary for keeping classroom instruction at a high level.

Given high teaching loads, instructionally-related service becomes the only vehicle for instructors to contribute to the fresh thinking and innovation that will **help the campus move toward a desired future.** Discussions in the Academic Futures initiative often involve rethinking undergraduate teaching, pedagogical innovation, new approaches to curricula, ensuring student success and retention, and fostering a deeper sense of belonging among our students. These desired outcomes, and more, hinge on the active engagement of instructors. Together with our tenure-stream colleagues, we wish to work toward that academic future. Yet current policies conspire against that engagement.

Concerns regarding Service

Recent policy changes in Arts and Sciences, and on campus generally, run counter to broadly shared goals of fostering undergraduate teaching excellence and achieving a shared academic future because they undermine and/or denigrate instructors' service contributions.

The ability for instructors to perform service, and to have that service appropriately recognized and valued, has been undermined by recent policies and developments. Two policy areas are of particular concern as the entire campus thinks about its future.

Devaluing Service in Instructor Contracts

For some twenty years in Arts and Sciences, a 100% appointment, a 3/3 course load, and a 75/25% teaching/service merit ratio was the default instructor appointment. That appointment is no longer possible, with the default option for a 100% appointment now being a 4/4 course load and an 85/15% teaching/service merit ratio. The costs of not valuing service—both psychological and real—have been unmistakable.

New instructor contracts focus on increased teaching, but come at the expense of service ensuring that instructors have enough time to mentor, advise and take part in activities that are vital to student retention and success. It additionally undercuts the ability of instructors to remain current in the field. These options also actively discourage instructors from performing service related to curriculum and pedagogy that is vital to their units and to our campus. Instructor service is often seen in shortsighted ways—as simply attending faculty meetings or sitting on a committee. It is so much more. Instructionally-related service is the place where instructors imagine and act on the future.

Climate surveys suggest that instructor morale is low, and the reasons go well beyond understandable concerns about pay. Instructors are productive and engaged when their work is respected. Right now, with instructors being asked to teach more, service is squeezed out, to the detriment of A&S and the campus. Indeed, in this climate, the teaching itself is likely to suffer. Moreover, promotion to senior instructor and teaching professor require, among other things, a profile of service at the campus and even national level, something increasingly difficult to achieve given college and campus policies regarding service. Service goes to the heart of who instructors are and what they do. If the campus trivializes service, we are well on our way to turning instructors into lecturers, with an associated loss, over time, in the quality of undergraduate education. And in treating instructors in this way, the campus at large is one step closer to becoming a community college. This is an academic future none of us desire.

Course Equivalences

By all accounts, there has recently been close scrutiny across campus of "course equivalences." Given the higher teaching loads and reduced rewards/opportunities for service in the contractual arrangements noted above, these course equivalences are vital if instructors are to perform any meaningful service and pedagogical innovation. In the absence of course equivalences (and administrative positions made possible by them), important service will go unaddressed or will be performed poorly by already overtaxed and demoralized instructors.

Course equivalences are incubators for instructors to help realize the change that the campus desires. Given high teaching loads, the work of instructors is already highly constrained. We have become quite efficient in delivering undergraduate education. But those very efficiencies may prevent us from imagining, developing, and realizing future changes and improvements to that education.

When long-standing course equivalences are limited and allowed only through a process of petitioning, the effort to request and argue for course equivalences is itself cumbersome, and represents a considerable waste of time and energy. Individual requests made by chairs and directors create an enormous amount of work. And a one-size-fits-all model serves units poorly, as service needs associated with curriculum and teaching vary among units.

Paths Forward toward a Shared Future

We strongly urge that renewed attention be paid to the service performed by instructors, and that the material and contractual conditions under which instructors work need to facilitate the performance of that service, so intimately tied to instructionally-related activities, student success, and the general future of the campus.

We believe that this recommendation can be operationalized in a variety of ways that will serve both undergraduate education for the campus at large and individual instructors:

- *Encouraging innovative arrangements spanning teaching and service*. For decades, we have been caught in a rigid binary that separates teaching and service, most often to the detriment of both. **The Academic Futures initiative is an opportunity to re-envision the relationship between teaching and service.** Indeed, many of the innovative ideas that have been discussed in town halls and themed meetings involve, in one way or another, a fresh look at these two areas of faculty activity. But we cannot envision, much less realize, that future when policies tie us, ball and chain, to the past.

  Associate Vice Chancellor Jeff Cox and Provost Russ Moore have both invited us to think about the future in ways that are not tied to current budget models. Those models need to reflect and support, they tell us, the future we desire. We submit that the same should be said for models of academic labor. **Let us envision a future, and then permit the flexibility needed to arrange teaching and service activities in ways that would help us realize that future.**

  Administrators should welcome and reward innovative ways of spanning and connecting teaching and service. For example, instructors might be particularly well positioned to offer intensive mentoring of at-risk students or students seeking more extensive faculty contact. Innovative arrangements to this end should be encouraged. Likewise, many instances of high-impact teaching and learning often require a close connection between teaching and service that current contracts fail to value or reward. Co-curricular activities also invite us to rethink teaching and service. For tenure-stream faculty, research is often the means by which to rethink curriculum and pedagogy, to explore options for change. For instructors, service can provide that same opportunity. But it is largely an opportunity withheld.

- *Creating flexible contractual arrangements.* In their design and execution, instructor contracts should reflect not just the importance of teaching but also the central role of service. Although most chairs and directors understand and appreciate the service performed by instructors, associate deans, deans, and higher administrators are more removed from the work of instructors. Service is all too often an afterthought, if that. We urge the campus to re-envision instructor contracts so as to place service in its proper, legitimate role. If an 85/15% teaching/service merit ratio remains a baseline, we strongly recommend that units be allowed to tweak that ratio (and associated course loads) to reward instructors who have a clear record of performing valuable service.

- *Ensuring robust but flexible parameters for course equivalences across all units*. Given the important service instructors perform that is related to instruction, pedagogy, curriculum, assessment, advising, and other aspects of student success and undergraduate education, course equivalences should not be reduced or otherwise viewed with suspicion. Where instructors and their chairs and directors can make effective arguments for such course equivalences, those arguments need to be entertained, and indeed encouraged. Units should be encouraged to develop a set of characteristic situations in which service would be performed for course equivalences so that administrators and faculty are not constantly spending valuable work time justifying individual occurrences. Likewise, units should get together to compare best practices and to better understand

how needs differ among units. Course equivalences for curricular and instructionally-related activities are both needed and legitimate, but the approval process must be streamlined.

If we are to realize a better academic future, and thereby improve undergraduate education, the campus needs to recognize and facilitate instructor service. Failing to do so, we risk disengaging a large proportion of our faculty, the very faculty most often in the position to give close attention to student success and retention, and to revitalized pedagogy. Failing to do so, we ignore a reservoir of talent, energy, and good will without which our dreams will not come true.

Instructors are willing and eager partners in our Academic Future. Let us craft policies that unleash their potential.

Rolf Norgaard, Teaching Professor, PWR (Chair)
Janet Casagrand, Senior Instructor, IPHY
Cathy Comstock, Senior Instructor, Farrand
Janet Donavan, Senior Instructor, Political Science
Jenny Knight, Associate Professor, MCDB
Steve Lamos, Associate Professor, English/PWR
Adam Norris, Senior Instructor, Applied Math
Eric Stade, Professor, Mathematics

SUMMARY LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Recommendations on Teaching, Service, and Professional Development

1a. Reframe the relationship between teaching and service to address the significant role of instructionally-related service.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Immediate Resources: High

1b. Change the merit weighting for full-time appointments to 70% teaching, 20% service, and 10% professional development.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

1c. Develop a set of examples of pre-approved options for course equivalencies and service-intensive work to better recognize the distinctive service rendered by many instructors, and to reduce the burden of individually negotiated MOUs.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

1d. Establish a 3/3 teaching load that includes a new category of professional development in addition to service, for a 70/20/10 teaching/service/professional development merit ratio, with no reduction in pay for current instructors and the new base salaries for new hires. This would be the standard benchmark for full-time Instructor positions.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Near-term Resources: High

1e. Establish, beyond current funding options, an annual pedagogical research and professional development fund for Instructors (in an amount equal to that provided to tenure-stream faculty). Funds can be rolled over for one year. This funding is an analog to current research funds provided to tenure-stream faculty.

Priority/Impact: Medium Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Moderate

2. Clarity and Effective Communication of Policy

2a. Develop policies regarding Instructor-rank faculty that strike a balance between consistency and a recognition of the distinctive needs/roles of individual units.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

2b. Improve the clarity, implementation and effective communication of campus-level policy (Office of Faculty Affairs) regarding Instructor-rank faculty at the College level (e.g. alternating full/expedited review for Senior Instructors; new Teaching Professor designation). Ensure timely review of reappointment dossiers and issuance of contracts.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

2c. Develop and maintain a more effective and up-to-date web portal for information on policies and opportunities for Instructor-rank faculty.

Priority/Impact: Medium Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Moderate

2d. Develop a clearinghouse or more transparent database for best practices and model documents regarding Instructor policy (e.g. by-laws, reappointment and promotion guidelines, merit systems) to assist units in the College as they develop or update policies.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

2e. Improve orientation on Instructor issues for new chairs/directors and new associate deans/deans by reviewing and updating faculty handbooks as they exist at various levels (e.g. unit, division, college, campus) and by having explicit discussions on Instructor issues at the time of on-boarding.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

2f. Include new Instructors in orientations for new faculty by integrating a special session specific to their needs during on-boarding events sponsored by the College and/or Faculty Affairs.

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

3. Compensation: Base Salary and Compression

3a. Continue to address the base starting salary for new instructors to offer a living wage in Boulder, to permit competitive searches, and to reward instructors appropriately for their valuable work at the university.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Near-Term Resources: High

3b. Ensure that Senior Instructors earn 110-115% of Instructor salaries, as per the recent raise to the new minimum starting salary and per current Office of Faculty Affairs Guidelines, and in light of recommendation 3a.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Moderate

3c. Address, through targeted funds, severe salary compression among long-serving Instructor-rank faculty created by previous increases to the floor salary (and which will only be exacerbated by recently implemented increases to the floor). This recommendation should be implemented in the context of recognizing career merit, and compression/career merit should be revisited on a periodic basis.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Moderate

3d. Ensure, through College and unit cost-sharing, that Instructors receive a minimum $2k bump to the base salary upon promotion to Senior Instructor and to Teaching Professor, per existing Office of Faculty Affairs Guidelines. Going forward, this recommendation will help address compression.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Moderate

3e. (Re)Design merit systems in units so that merit criteria match contracts and actual work, and to ensure that Instructor-rank faculty can qualify for the full-range of possible merit designations. Units should have mechanisms in place to reward Instructor scholarly or creative work (work essential to currency in the field), even when such activity is not contractually required.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

4. Career Path

4a. Ensure the existence of clear policies in every unit for standards for reappointment as well as the promotion of Instructors through ranks (Instructor to Senior Instructor, and to Teaching Professor). Instructors should not be disadvantaged in their careers by the absence of such unit policies, or an unwillingness to create them.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

4b. To promote stability and job security, traditional disciplinary units and Residential Academic Programs (and other programs employing instructors) must work together to ensure that Instructors in the RAPS and other such programs have well established ties and ongoing communication with traditional disciplinary units.

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

4c. Develop and reward participation in a College-wide mentoring program for newly hired Instructors, consistent with the mentoring programs available to tenure-stream faculty.

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

4d. Clarify/revise College policy on alternating expedited and full reviews for Senior Instructors to align College policy with its intended purpose as approved by the Office of Faculty Affairs. (A key purpose of this campus policy is to relieve the burden on well qualified Senior Instructors to prepare materials to reapply for their positions on a near constant basis.)

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

4e. Clarify and better communicate policies and procedures at the unit and College level for promotion to the honorary rank (working title) of Teaching Professor. The body reviewing Teaching Professor dossiers at the College level should include some representation by Teaching Professors.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

4f. Develop (to the extent permitted by Regent Law) a full range of teaching faculty titles (Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, Full Teaching

Professor), as is becoming common nationally. At a minimum, develop such titles as "working titles."

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Long-Term Resources: Low

4g. Provide one-year notice to Senior Instructors in the event of program discontinuance or reorganization.

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

4h. Permit and encourage Senior Instructors to apply for and serve in administrative capacities, as appropriate to their experience and expertise (e.g. RAP directors, department associate chairs for undergraduate education). As a general rule, well qualified Instructor-rank faculty should be able to compete for many such positions, and position announcements should avoid restricting applications to tenured faculty except as necessary.

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

4i. Encourage contract flexibility for late-career Senior Instructors who can provide valuable service to the College beyond normally expected teaching duties.

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

4j. Create additional Instructor lines. The undue reliance on lecturer positions does not serve students or the College well, and is corrosive to the soul of the university.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Long-Term Resources: High

4k. Develop clear policies for Instructor searches that would facilitate a path to Instructor positions for highly qualified, long-time lecturers by (1) recognizing their CU-Boulder contributions even as rigorous searches are conducted, and (2) implementing a transitional cost-sharing plan so that financial considerations do not stand in the way of deserved transitions from lecturer to Instructor status.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Long-Term Resources: Moderate

5. Changing Institutional Culture

5a. Develop and implement consistent and repeated executive-level messaging that Instructor-rank faculty are valued members of the College and campus "core faculty."

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

5b. Consistent and repeated messaging to *internal* constituencies about the significant roles of Instructor-rank faculty in teaching and service, and to *external* constituencies that honor and publicize their contributions. At meetings, ceremonies, in newsletters and similar publications, and on the web (at unit, College, and campus levels), make visible and honor the work of Instructor-rank faculty. Create, maintain, and publicize databases of instructor innovations, contributions, and accomplishments.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

5c. Mandate consistent minimum voting rights for Instructor-rank faculty in all departments and programs across the College. These minimum voting rights would be consistent with the voting rights enumerated in BFA and ASC By-laws. Although any department or program can restrict these minimum voting rights and meeting attendance given the specific issue under discussion (e.g. personnel matters), such restrictions should be regarded as limited exceptions to the principles of broad participation by Instructor-rank faculty in department and program affairs, regular attendance at department and program meetings, and inclusive participation in unit and College faculty culture.

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

5d. Mandate revisions to unit by-laws to include Instructor-rank faculty in unit governance processes and in the participation/operation of appropriate committees. Ensure that Instructor-rank faculty have access to service opportunities.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

5e. Revise the Instructor contract for employment, which in its current form fails to extend to Instructors the full rights normally extended to faculty members. (Instructors are currently forced to sign a contract with the Regents that waives all grievance rights, and includes provisions for dismissal for cause that depart from faculty norms.)

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

5f. Provide material conditions for work that reflect the faculty member's duties, and not necessarily just the faculty member's rank (e.g. Instructors require sufficient privacy

for meetings with students, access to computer resources, access to budgets for supplies and materials needed for teaching, and office space with appropriate ventilation, heating, and cooling).

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

5g. Ensure that Instructor-rank faculty have broad access at unit, College, and campus levels to awards, grants, prizes, fellowships, and committee participation. Eligibility restrictions for "tenured or tenure-stream faculty only" should be limited to special cases. Instructors are willing and eager to compete with tenure-stream faculty on the merits of their proposals and the quality of their work.

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

5h. Continue to make progress in improving benefits packages for Instructor-rank faculty, in an effort to achieve parity, where possible and appropriate, with tenure-stream faculty. We welcome recent improvements in family-leave policies for Instructor-rank faculty, but they still fall short of what can and should be done.

Priority/Impact: Moderate Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Moderate

5i. Require chairs/directors to report on the status of Instructors in their unit as part of an annual report or meeting with the Dean.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

5j. Work with the Office of Faculty Affairs to include an explicit and required section in the ARPAC Self Study report on the status of both Instructors and lecturers in the unit.

Priority/Impact: Medium Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low

5k. Establish a standing "Faculty Affairs" committee on the Arts and Sciences Council that could take over from a possible short-term Task Force implementation committee. In addition to other duties, such a Faculty Affairs committee would be able to monitor over the long term the status of Instructors and advocate for desired change. At least one-third but no more than one-half of the membership of such a committee should be comprised of Instructor-rank faculty. (Such an ASC committee may begin as an ad-hoc committee, but we anticipate the need for the committee to be ongoing and thus deserves to be constituted as a standing committee.)

Priority/Impact: Highest Implementation: Immediate Resources: Low

5l. In the event of a reorganization of the College of Arts and Sciences, this Task Force report and its recommendations must continue to be considered and addressed. Should divisions within the College acquire more autonomy, it is ever more important that broad consistency and equity be achieved across organizational boundaries.

Priority/Impact: High Implementation: Near-Term Resources: Low