

DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE FACULTY SENATE

REPORT FROM THE FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON
WAYS AND MEANS TO IMPLEMENT THE GENERAL FACULTY
RESOLUTIONS CONCERNING FACULTY WORKLOADS AND
TEACHING ASSISTANTS

Professor Philip Gough, Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to Implement the General Faculty Resolutions Concerning Faculty Workloads and Teaching Assistants, has forwarded the following report to the Secretary of the Faculty Senate. This report will be discussed and acted upon by the Faculty Senate at its next meeting on March 6, 1978.

H. Paul Kelley, Secretary
The Faculty Senate

REPORT FROM THE FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON
WAYS AND MEANS TO IMPLEMENT THE GENERAL FACULTY
RESOLUTIONS CONCERNING FACULTY WORKLOADS AND
TEACHING ASSISTANTS

"Public confidence is the only real endowment of a state University", remarked a former president of The University of Texas, H. Y. Benedict. In the past decade, the Permanent University Fund has mounted past the billion mark, but our real endowment has fallen sharply.

There is more than one reason for this. The fact that the cost of education has soared while the value of a degree has decreased must be as important as any. But we of the faculty must accept part of the blame. We have asserted that a university must be more than a collection of classes and that a faculty must do much more than teach in the classroom, but we have not explained clearly just what these things are, nor why they are important. We have asserted that we work long hours, far in excess of any full-time job, but we have been at no great pains to prove it. Finally, to charges that some of us have tolerated abuses, overutilized and overworked teaching assistants, and generally neglected the instruction of our lower division students, we have replied only that these charges are greatly exaggerated, and we have questioned either the comprehension or the values of our critics.

It is, we hope, a conviction shared by the entire faculty that if we are to stop the erosion in public confidence, we must change our ways. A year ago, the General Faculty passed a series of resolutions (see D&M 12414-17 of the General Faculty) to this end, promising to develop a responsible plan for defining and reporting faculty workloads and teaching, to increase the University's emphasis on teaching, especially of lower division students, and to improve our use and treatment of teaching assistants. Shortly thereafter, this committee was charged to find ways to implement these resolutions.

We present below four sets of recommendations which we believe would meet the goals of the resolutions. Because several of our recommendations address more than one objective, they are not in simple correspondence to those resolutions. But together we believe they will meet their objectives.

The first set of recommendations deals with the definition of our work and teaching loads. The second concerns our reporting of our work. The third set deals with our use of teaching assistants. Our fourth and final set of recommendations call for improvements in our undergraduate program.

WORK LOAD AND TEACHING LOAD

Since 1972, The University of Texas has defined the minimum faculty work load as four organized courses or the equivalent. To show our compliance with this requirement, each semester our chairmen must list the courses taught by each faculty member and letter codes for those "equivalent" activities, like research, editing, or administration, which bring the faculty member's total work load to the equivalent of four courses. These reports are certified at higher levels, and then offered to the Board of Regents as evidence that each full-time faculty member is meeting the minimum work load.

We believe this work load accounting system is bankrupt, for at least three reasons: First, the current system is not credible. It is viewed with complete skepticism by significant segments of the public. It is widely viewed as a system of misrepresentation, by which we purport to be teaching when, in fact, we are doing other things. It is easy to see why this is so. Only very few of us actually teach four courses. The majority of us meet the work load requirements by using at least one "equivalent" (our chairmen list J, Research, for most of us), and very many of us, especially in the sciences and engineering, claim two. As a result, the median course load we actually carry is less than three. Moreover, we permit considerable latitude in assigning credit for teaching an organized course, so that, for

example, in some departments, teaching credit is assigned for supervision of teaching assistants who actually meet the class. In consequence, while the current definition of our work load suggests that we teach a minimum of four courses per semester, the number of courses we actually teach is probably closer to two.

We in the university community understand that there is no discrepancy here. If teaching four organized courses is considered a full work load at any institution of higher education, then a faculty member at a major university who teaches two such courses, individually instructs several graduate students, and maintains an active research program, is certainly carrying a full load. We also understand that coordinating the work of a group of teaching assistants may require as much, or even more, effort per week than giving three lectures to a class.

But for many skeptics, these equations do not hold. Doing research, however meritorious, is not the same as teaching classes; coordination of other's teaching is not the same as lecturing. In consequence, such skeptics view the current workload of "four courses or the equivalent" as misleading, if not fraudulent. And the idea that the faculty are not earning their salaries is widely held. The current workload formula, intended, we believe, to show the public that UT faculty work full time, has had, we fear the opposite effect.

Second, in using the organized course as the unit by which faculty work is to be measured, the current work load formula has tended to distort instruction at the University. If a professor is given teaching credit only for organized courses, then it is understandable that the professor will tend to force all of his or her teaching into that framework. So where a professor would otherwise be heavily engaged in individual instruction of undergraduates, that professor will now seek to enroll ten of them in a class. Where a faculty member would otherwise spend virtually unlimited hours working with individual graduate students, now that faculty member will ask that five of them register for a course in research. In all such cases, if the faculty member is to be honest, then the nature of the instruction (if not its reporting) must be distorted.

If the organized course corresponded to a meaningful unit of work, then this distortion might be justifiable, if only for purposes of accounting. But it clearly does not. The variation in content, in required preparation, and in methods of evaluation of student work from department to department (and even from course to course within the same department) is enormous. Each of us has examples which show that one course requires many times the work of another. Thus we conclude that the use of the organized course as the unit of faculty work, far from having beneficial effects, has had only negative effects on teaching at the University.

Finally, where a work load requirement should help the University rid itself of any unproductive faculty, without interfering with the work of the productive, a requirement defined in terms of organized courses may do just the opposite. If a tenured professor does nothing but show up to teach three courses, his colleagues can do little more than insist that he show up to teach a fourth. At the same time, the University can neither recruit nor retain the most industrious, productive or distinguished scholar if he wishes to teach only one organized course.

For all of these reasons, then, we conclude that the current minimum faculty work load reporting system should be replaced.

We have considered a number of alternative ways of defining our required work load. For example, we considered at length the idea of reducing the minimum number of organized courses from four to three, and drastically reducing the number of acceptable equivalent activities. Such a system would improve upon the present one, for by reducing the number of equivalences, it would reduce the discrepancy between the teaching we purport to do and the teaching we actually do. But a nine hour minimum cannot be acceptable across higher education in the state, or even within the U. T. System. If we were to fight for such exceptional treatment, it should be in a better cause, for a nine-hour minimum would have disastrous consequences for many of our departments, especially in the sciences and engineering. In these disciplines the maximum organized course load at most major universities is

two courses per semester, and for many it is less. Clearly, if we were to adopt a mandatory nine-hour load we could not hope to have science and engineering departments of the first class, for we would not be able to recruit and retain a first class faculty in competition with comparable universities.

Considerations like these have led us to reject any definition of minimum faculty work load in terms of units like student contact hours, credit hours, or even simply (if vaguely) "teaching hours." We believe that the vast majority of faculty at this university are working very hard at educationally legitimate and beneficial activities, prominently including direct classroom instruction. But we cannot define the great variety of faculty activities in terms of instructional units: either we create a formula so simple it requires distortion of the activities, or we create one so complex that it precludes credibility.

We are led to the conclusion that we must define a minimum work load in terms of a full week's work, the only thing we all have in common: with very few exceptions, we work at least 40 hours per week.

We recognize that this is a concept abhorrent to many faculty members. As professionals, we would be judged by what we produce, not by the number of hours required to produce it. Moreover, there are few perquisites of the academic life more attractive than the flexibility of our schedules, and the definition of our work in terms of hours per week immediately suggests the ominous prospect of a future time-clock.

Our committee has felt these misgivings as keenly as anyone. But we can see no better means of regaining public confidence in our work, no better means of clearly and concisely describing the diversity of our educational activities while retaining the flexibility necessary to our diverse departmental missions.

The first advantage of defining a minimum work load in terms of a 40-hour week is that all but a few of us work much more than this, and we believe that we should have little difficulty in documenting this fact. But second, and more important, it would afford us the opportunity to present an open and positive account of our work, while preserving the healthy diversity in which the University thrives. Obviously, we should not stop at the mere announcement of a 40-hour minimum work week; in addition, each department should be required to state, as precisely as possible, the work load of its faculty, and to relate that work load to the mission of the department and the resources available to it. These statements should then be reviewed by representatives of the entire University. If they are approved, then the departmental requirements should serve as the standard against which the work of each of its faculty is judged.

We believe that such a system has enormous advantages over our present system, or any other we can think of. In the first place, it would afford the flexibility and diversity which we believe are essential to allow our various departments to strive for academic excellence. At the same time, since each department would be required to justify its standards, it would afford the University the opportunity to modify the policies of any department which cannot justify them, and to amend any policies which are inconsistent with the goals of the University as a whole. Secondly, if and when a department's policies are approved, its specific requirements should provide far more stringent demands on each of its faculty than any general university requirement. Thus not only will a department have real and effective means to deal with any faculty who do not perform, it will also have criteria for performance in which its conscientious faculty can take pride.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Our first set of recommendations, then, are these: WE RECOMMEND THAT:

1. The minimum faculty work load at The University of Texas at Austin shall be defined as 40 hours per week;

2. Each department shall state what duties constitute a 40-hour week for its faculty;
3. A standing committee on faculty work loads shall be created to assist the administration in evaluating departmental statements and certifying faculty compliance with departmental requirements;
4. Immediate corrective action shall be taken against any faculty member found not in compliance.

WORK LOAD REPORTING

Our second set of recommendations concern reporting. A work load defined in terms of organized courses leads directly to a brief measure of compliance, one defined in terms of a 40-hour work week does not. We believe that if we are to show that we are in compliance with this more general requirement, we must provide a full, detailed, and verifiable accounting of how we worked 40 hours.

We expect that more than one of our colleagues will say that such an elaborate report of our work can only be made at the expense of that work, that it would be far more productive to spend our time with students, in the laboratory or in the library, than in completing still more paperwork. We agree. But we believe that in this instance, we cannot afford not to provide such reports: we must show that we are accountable. There is a widespread suspicion outside the University that faculty are reluctant to reveal, if not anxious to conceal, their activities; if we have any hope of being allowed to determine how we will spend our time, we must show that we are willing to report exactly how we spend it.

There are other good reasons to increase the detail of our reports. For one thing, much of the public, including the Legislature, has little idea of what we do besides teaching classes. We should welcome the opportunity to place such information on record for those who have the right and the obligation to examine it. For another, if we are serious about increasing the University's emphasis on good teaching, as many of us say we are, we must improve the information base on which any change might be founded.

All of these arguments lead us to conclude that we must greatly increase, in both breadth and depth, the information which each of us provides to the University. We have stopped short of specifying the precise form these individual faculty reports should take. For one thing, we are led to believe that the Coordinating Board is about to introduce a state-wide report form for individual faculty, and this form must provide the basis for any the University might adopt. But we can suggest some minimum dimensions for our reports.

First, it should be obvious that our current Annual Reports are totally inadequate. We believe we must file reports every semester.

Second, we believe we cannot stop with simply listing the numbers, or even the names, of the courses we teach. We must report, at a minimum, the kinds of courses they are (e.g., lecture, lecture plus discussion, seminar, etc.); we must also report whether we taught the course alone, and if not, the manner in which we shared instructional responsibility with any teaching assistants. We should also be called upon to provide reasonable estimates of how much time we spent on these courses outside of class meetings in student consultations, preparation of lectures and correction of assignments, and the like.

We also should not fail to include the individual instruction, both formal and informal, we do with both undergraduate and graduate students, our supervision of honors papers, and theses, and dissertations, and our supervision of all kinds of apprenticeships from teaching to nursing. We should also mention all our indirect teaching activities, like the devising

of our new courses, or reviewing our department's curriculum, or sponsoring meetings of our student honorary societies.

We believe we must also provide a much more detailed accounting of how we spend our time in research and service. In particular, we believe that we must report how much time we spend each week on each of our research projects, and show whether those projects are funded (and, if so, by whom.)

Finally, we believe we must report exactly how many hours, if any, we spend each week working outside the University, for whom, and whether that work is reimbursed or not.

We anticipate objections that such reports would be useless, because they would not be trustworthy. We reply that any system of accounting can be falsified, and so any system we might propose requires some degree of trust; we hope it need not be assumed that we cannot be trusted to give honest accounts of our activities. The proposed system, in any event, would be easily verifiable. In addition both individuals and departments must certify the report's accuracy. Hence unlike the kind of survey recently conducted by T.A.C.T., these reports, like income tax returns, would provide a basis for punitive action if falsified. Moreover, because each faculty member must certify a report of all his work not just the courses taught, it would be much easier than it is now for a department to identify and eliminate abuses. Because each department will have set its own standards of performance, it will have an important stake in seeing that those standards are met. Finally, and we think most constructively, we believe the requirement of complete reporting, coupled with the prospect of careful departmental and administrative scrutiny, will encourage industry and discourage the very abuses we wish to eliminate.

We believe then, that as soon as possible, we must devise a form which will allow us to report and certify all our activities and estimates of the time they require; these reports must be completed each semester, and carefully examined by each department.

We believe that a substantial increase in individual reporting is essential. We also believe that we must increase the extent of departmental reporting.

In particular, we believe that each department should report, each semester, what courses it is teaching, in how many sections, and who is teaching those sections. That is, each department should present, as clearly and simply as possible, the primary data which would enable the University and the interested public to see who (i.e., teaching assistants, assistant instructors, junior faculty, or senior faculty) is teaching the students (lower division, upper division, and graduate) in that department. The reasons for this proposal are simple: the people of Texas have a right to this information, and we frequently hear the complaint that it is difficult for interested parties to obtain it. We believe that we have an obligation to make it readily accessible. And beyond this, we believe that if the University harbors any significant failures to meet its responsibilities to its students, those failures are departmental, rather than individual. It is our belief that publication of such data will help correct any failures.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Therefore, WE RECOMMEND THAT:

5. The University adopt, as soon as possible, a new and detailed individual faculty work report, to be filed each semester and departmentally certified, this report to serve as the measure by which compliance with the work load requirement is to be assessed as described in earlier recommendations, and
6. Each department must file, each semester, a report showing who (i.e., what kind of instructor) is teaching each section of each of its courses.

TEACHING ASSISTANTS

In recent years, the University has been severely criticized for its use of teaching assistants; it has been alleged that these T.A.'s are underprepared, overworked, and underpaid. We will ultimately return to the use of the T.A.; here we will be concerned with their treatment.

A preliminary observation is in order. In the work of this committee, we have found enormous diversity across the University in both the use and treatment of T.A.'s. In a number of departments, T.A.'s are used only to assist regular faculty; except for laboratory or discussion sections, no T.A. is ever given major responsibility for a class. In other departments, T.A.'s are routinely given virtually complete responsibility for two classes each semester. In consequence, none of the charges which have been leveled at the University can be said to be true of every department, and some of our departments are guilty of none; these departments have good reason to resent wholesale accusations against the University. But at the same time, most abuses which has been charged to us have been true of one or another department and some departments appear to have been guilty of most of them; the University as a whole can take little pride in its past use and treatment of T.A.'s. Thus all of us should share a concern to guarantee that T.A.'s are used wisely and treated equitably throughout the University.

In our view, the most serious charge which has been leveled at the University is that we have permitted unprepared and unqualified T.A.'s to teach our students. The extent of our past guilt can be debated, but we believe that there can be no debate about the future: we must not permit this to happen again.

We trust that every department is now making serious and sustained efforts to train its teaching assistants properly before placing them in any classroom. But we believe that we cannot rely on the good intentions prevalent in the present climate to assure that departments will continue to employ only fully qualified teachers. We believe that the University should make it impossible for a department to do otherwise.

There is one obvious step we might take toward this end. If we could promote our T.A.'s to Assistant Instructors when they were qualified to teach a course, then we could eliminate the unqualified teachers simply by prohibiting the use of the T.A. as primary instructor in any course at the University.

This proposal would have its cost: The salary of an A.I. is higher than that of a T.A. But the increased cost of instruction would surely be justified if the requirement for promotion to A.I. were both strict and strictly applied (and we think it is obvious that they must be; for anything else would make a sham of the proposal.) The increased cost of replacing T.A.'s by A.I.'s should be justified by the increased quality of instruction alone, and the abolition of the unqualified teacher from the University's classrooms must be worth almost any price.

We believe that the University must guarantee that our several departments would provide the training necessary to qualify their students for any course they might be called upon to teach as graduate students. We believe that such regulations would not only benefit our undergraduate students, but our graduate students as well, for they would require that our departments recognize that training graduate students in teaching is necessary. We are concerned, though, that our departments should not take the training required by these regulations to be sufficient.

In inquiring about the extent to which our various graduate faculties provide training in teaching for their graduate students, we again encountered enormous diversity. But if we were to frame any general indictment, it would be that too few of our graduate programs attempt to provide their graduate students with training and experience across the range of courses they are likely to teach when they become faculty. Too often, the only experience our students receive as T.A.'s is in an introductory course, and too often no provision is made for the student to lecture to, or even assist in, more advanced courses in the discipline. We believe every department

should prepare its students to teach all courses they will be called upon to teach.

In our investigation, we have also frequently encountered the complaint that T.A.'s are not given adequate office space, access to telephones, office supplies, and secretarial assistance. We also observe that similar complaints can be made by many faculty; resources of this sort are not ample at this university. But we feel very strongly that if we are to ask our graduate students to share our teaching responsibilities, then we should also be prepared to share whatever resources we may have. So we urge every department (and especially those who wish to put graduate students in the classroom), to provide its T.A.'s and A.I.'s with an adequate share of the available resources.

The most serious complaint we have heard from T.A.'s and their spokesmen is that the demands of their work as students, combined with the demands of their work as teachers, are excessive. We recognize that, to some extent, a conflict between these roles is unavoidable; both will place demands on the graduate student, and even the best must find the demands of the two roles competing. But we think that there is compelling evidence that, in some cases, those demands are excessive. To be appointed as a T.A., the University requires that a graduate student must be registered for 9 hours; at the same time, some T.A.'s have been given total responsibility for two sections of courses like freshman composition which require extensive work outside of class.

We believe that these T.A.'s have a valid complaint. But in trying to help them, we are confronted with a dilemma, and both horns of the dilemma are deeply set. On the one hand, the nine-hour requirement is intended to assure that our graduate students make continuous progress toward what should be their primary objective, the graduate degree. On the other, there is brute financial fact; if these students are to maintain their current stipends, to cut their teaching loads in half would double the cost (unless the section size were doubled, or someone else volunteered to teach them.)

We will not try to tell any department how to solve this problem, but we feel strongly that some departments should lessen the burden of their T.A.'s.

RECOMMENDATIONS

WE RECOMMEND, then, THAT:

7. No Teaching Assistant shall be permitted to assume major responsibility for any class at the University, with the exception of laboratory or discussion sections clearly labeled as such.
8. An appointment to the rank of Assistant Instructor shall require prior departmental certification of qualification to teach undergraduate courses.
9. Every department shall carefully examine the possibility of training its graduate students to teach a wider range of courses, by giving them the opportunity to assist, and even to lecture, in such courses.
10. Each department, with the active and meaningful participation of its graduate assistants, shall determine the minimum hours per week required to carry out each of the duties it requires of its assistants, and then guarantee that none is required to devote more hours per week to the total duties required than the number of hours for which the assistant is paid.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

We believe that our work load requirements should be redefined, that we must substantially increase our reporting of our work, and that we must improve our treatment of graduate students who help us teach. But we are concerned that none of these things will suffice to restore public confidence in the University, for we believe that neither work load nor reporting nor treatment of T.A.'s is at the root of public distrust. Instead, we think it is this:

Since the Second World War, and especially within the last two decades, our society has demanded more and more individuals with more and more education. In consequence, more and more students have come to the University, and more and more of them have sought graduate degrees. And so undergraduate education has cheapened, while graduate education has become increasingly important.

The University of Texas at Austin and the majority of its faculty, reached academic maturity in this period. In consequence, most of us place undergraduate teaching is relegated to second place.

We are a major graduate university, and we cannot overestimate the importance of graduate education at UT Austin. But we must remember that the University is not just a graduate school. There are more than 30,000 undergraduate students on this campus, and the state of Texas has entrusted their education to us. We have a legal and moral obligation to provide them the best education we can.

We believe that the University has provided its undergraduates a good education, at least as good as the student might receive anywhere in Texas. But our obligation is to provide them the best we can, and we believe we have fallen short of this.

We think it cannot be denied that we, as faculty, have shied away from teaching undergraduate courses. We hasten to say that we know that there are many exceptions to this statement, both departmental and individual; but we maintain it is a valid generalization. There are too many lower division courses being taught by T.A.'s; the undergraduate courses taught by faculty are generally too large, at least to permit any meaningful interaction between student and faculty. Most of us spend far more hours in contact with graduate students than undergraduates.

There are good and valid reasons for some of these things. In some instances, a department simply has too few faculty to teach undergraduates in great numbers in anything but large classes. If some teaching must be delegated to T.A.'s, then it might best be lower division courses. It should be understandable that many, if not most, of us would prefer to teach graduate students (or at least advanced undergraduates), selected for their intellects, interested in and strongly motivated to study the subjects closest to our own hearts. Finally, graduate education simply does require an enormous amount of individual attention, and if we are to be the major graduate university in the state (and region), we must continue to make the task of training graduate students an important part of our mission.

But we argue that the time has come to increase our attention to undergraduate education. In this era, a great public university must present a proper balance of graduate teaching, research, and undergraduate education. If, over the last several decades, the scales have tipped toward graduate teaching, then history argues that we must redress the balance: we must rededicate ourselves to the education of our undergraduates.

Our final recommendation then, may be summarized as this: we call for the faculty to rededicate itself to undergraduate education.

A rededication to undergraduate education should be reflected in our curriculum, our faculty, and our allocation of faculty to our curricula. We offer some suggestions in each area.

Curriculum. A rededication to undergraduate education should have important consequences for our curricula. We would argue that our present curricula have developed, over the past twenty years, largely to serve our graduate programs. In at least some disciplines, the curriculum would

appear to have been tailored to prepare students for graduate work. Many courses tend to be highly specialized, suitable only for very advanced students with very particular interests; in consequence, enrollments in these courses tend to be very small. With many faculty teaching such courses, we have been forced to teach introductory and other lower division courses in increasingly large classes, or else turn such courses over to T.A.s.

We think it is imperative to reverse this trend. The proportion of our undergraduates who will go on to graduate work is shrinking, while the proportion who are studying for work and citizenship is steadily increasing. We believe our curricula should be shaped to meet the challenge offered by the latter students.

We believe we must soon re-examine our curricula, particularly in our non-professional programs, to see if they are adequate for undergraduate education in the coming decade and beyond. But we stop short of calling for a full University curriculum review, for such a task would require a much greater effort than we can afford in the present emergency. We do suggest that each and every department and college, when planning its teaching schedules for the coming semesters, carefully consider each of its offerings to determine whether that course will best serve the interests of our undergraduate students, and to eliminate any offerings which do not serve the purpose, so long as such elimination would not seriously weaken a graduate program.

Faculty. We can and should improve ourselves as an undergraduate teaching faculty. To begin with, we should hire as new faculty only individuals who have demonstrated a potential for excellent undergraduate teaching and the desire to engage in it.

We think it is fair to say that this has not been standard practice at the University in the recent past. While there are exceptions, we think it is fair to say that most departments at the University (as at comparable institutions) have used potential for research and scholarship as the primary consideration in faculty recruitment.

We would not have the University lower its standards with respect to research and scholarship in recruiting. The importance of these things to a great university cannot be questioned. Moreover, we view excellence in research and scholarship as conducive to excellent teaching; in our experience, the best researchers tend to be the best teachers, and in most fields, good teaching is impossible without good scholarship. But the correlation is not perfect, and each of us has colleagues who are superior scholars but inferior teachers.

We believe that we cannot afford any more. We must seek to recruit only faculty who are talented on both dimensions. We recognize that this will have its cost; we will inevitably lose some outstanding prospects in research and scholarship who are not good teachers. But we argue that whatever we lose here is nothing in comparison to what we will lose if we continue to prize research and scholarship over the teaching of our undergraduate students.

We would make a similar argument with respect to our standards for promotion and tenure. The policies of the University state that a successful candidate for promotion and tenure in any and every field must demonstrate competence in both teaching and research, and excellence in at least one; we believe that the evidence suggests that the University has maintained higher standards in research than in teaching.

We would not have the University lower its general standards for promotion and tenure with respect to research and scholarship. We believe that research and scholarship provide the foundation of a great University; they are at the very heart of graduate education, and they contribute very importantly to undergraduate education as well.

But we believe that the University cannot afford to continue to weigh one factor more heavily than the other. (Given the difficulty of attaining tenure in these times, we hesitate to suggest that our standards of teaching excellence should be elevated). We believe that the University might well consider one modification of its promotion policies.

We think it can be argued that research and scholarship are not equally

important in all fields. At the same time, a surprisingly large number of departments who responded to our questionnaire volunteered the opinion that true excellence in teaching should be sufficient grounds for promotion and tenure.

We recognize the problems with which this proposal is fraught. We do not know how to measure the quality of teaching; in particular, we do not know how to distinguish good teaching from popular teaching. But we believe that our policies should not exclude the possibility that a department could make a case for promotion on grounds of teaching alone, and we urge the University to modify its policies to permit it.

We believe we must do everything we can to increase the teaching ability of the faculty we recruit and the faculty we retain. But these efforts to improve our total faculty are limited by the fact that most of our future faculty is already here and tenured. If we are to effect a thorough change in the quality of our undergraduate teaching, we must improve the undergraduate teaching of all of our faculty.

We know of no sure way to accomplish this. We can think of one thing which might help.

A sure incentive to excellent teaching is continuous evaluation. We cannot recommend mandatory student evaluations; there are serious problems associated with student evaluations. But, we do recommend that each department should be required to make an annual evaluation (which might include student evaluation) of the teaching of each of its faculty.

We can and should improve our curricula; we can and should improve our faculty and its teaching. But we are convinced that the most significant improvement we can make is in our assignment of faculty to our curricula.

We believe that if there is any valid charge against the faculty of this university, it is that too many of us have left the teaching of lower division students, and especially freshmen, to teaching assistants.

We recognize that many factors have contributed to this, and that we can offer excuses for much of it. Enrollment at the University has grown faster than the faculty; given our very large student-faculty ratios, if we are to give proper attention to our graduate programs, and if class size is to be kept conscionably small, it follows that our teaching staff must be expanded beyond the faculty. Since our graduate students need both financial support and teaching experience, their employment as teaching assistants to teach our beginning courses serves three purposes at once. Moreover, some will argue that there is no reason to suppose that graduate students cannot teach these courses better than the faculty would.

We believe that each of these arguments is debatable. But even if we admit their validity, they must be weighed against what we take to be a basic principle: we, the faculty, have the responsibility of teaching every student at the University.

There are faculty (and administrators) who disagree. For example, one has written us that senior faculty should teach advanced graduate courses, younger faculty (generally assistant and associate professors) should teach advanced undergraduate courses, while "junior faculty", namely teaching assistants and assistant instructors, should teach the introductory courses in his discipline.

We flatly disagree. We believe that the entering freshman has as much right to be taught by a full professor as an advanced graduate student. We do not see that any other principle can have educational priority (nor, apparently, does the public, for nothing seems to anger the citizen more than seeing T.A.'s where he expects faculty to be). Thus we conclude that faculty of all ranks should teach students of all levels, and that no course should primarily be taught by T.A.'s.

We have searched in vain for regulations which would realize our convictions. We have found none that would do so without doing grievous harm. At one extreme, for example, A.I.'s (or T.A.'s) might be prohibited from assuming responsibility for any class. But we could do this only at great cost to our graduate training programs. Many graduate students are apprentice faculty, and they must be given teaching experience, especially in today's highly competitive academic market.

At another extreme, each faculty member might be required to teach an introductory course at regular intervals. (We would note that at least one of our most distinguished departments does just this, regularly rotating the responsibility for their "service" courses.) But this would have exactly the wrong effect on any department which chooses to use only the most skilled lecturers among its faculty in its introductory courses, and surely such departmental behavior is wholly praiseworthy; what is important is that faculty teach in these courses, not that all faculty do.

In the end, we recognize that proposals like these are flawed because they are misdirected. Our aim is not to reduce the number of graduate students who are teaching at the University, it is to reduce the number of students who are taught by them. Nor is our aim to increase the number of faculty who are teaching undergraduates, it is to increase the number of undergraduates taught by faculty.

We offer instead a direct proposal. We believe that every course at the University, possibly excepting discussion, laboratory, and recitation sections, should be taught primarily by faculty. We intend by this that while any given section of any given course might be taught by a graduate student, the majority of all students registered for that course should be taught by faculty with the rank of instructor or above. We would like to believe that every department of the University would subscribe to this principle, and so we incorporate it in our last recommendation.

We recognize that some departments would have difficulty conforming to this principle, and a few would have great difficulty; the University could not reasonably expect immediate conformity from every department. We also acknowledge that there might be justifiable exceptions to the rule; there may be courses at the University from which the faculty might be exempted on educationally legitimate grounds. But we believe that principle should not be hedged with qualifications, so our last recommendation is blunt. It is certainly not the least of our recommendations, for we believe that none of the faculty might choose to adopt could bring more credit to the University.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Our FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS, then, ARE THESE:

11. Each department shall use the education of its undergraduate students as a primary factor in determining its course offerings each semester.
12. The University shall hire as new faculty only those who have demonstrated a potential for excellent undergraduate teaching and the desire to engage in it.
13. The promotion and tenure policies of the University shall not preclude promotion on the basis of teaching alone.
14. Every course at the University, excluding laboratory and discussion sections, shall be taught primarily by faculty with the rank of instructor or above.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip Gough, Chairman
Bonnie Rickelman
John W. Brokaw
James Daniel
Neill Megaw