

Dear David,

Below please find a rationale for the proposed revision of AR 2:9 (Lecturer Series Faculty). I submit this proposal for consideration, discussion and endorsement by the University Senate.

**Rationale for the Proposed Revision
of
AR 2:9 (Lecturer Series Faculty)**

The administration's decision in 1998, motivated by a request from the College of Arts and Sciences, to make greater use of full-time Lecturer Series faculty in those targeted departments that bore the heaviest responsibility for lower-division (undergraduate) instruction was driven by an inescapable fact: the significant shortfall in lower-division instruction performed by full-time faculty could not be mitigated by a plan that relied solely on the increase of tenurable faculty or an expansion of the TA ranks. Such a plan is both unaffordable, and would lead to unjustifiable and unsustainable bloat of graduate programs in certain departments.

On average tenure-track and tenured faculty teach one course per academic year in the lower-division. Instructional responsibilities in the upper-division and graduate programs, obligations that must be borne largely by tenurable faculty, militate against a more substantial participation of tenurable faculty in lower-division instruction. Past practice has assigned Lecturer Series faculty between six and eight lower-division courses per academic year.

No public research university can satisfy its instructional obligations in the lower-division without the judicious use of non-tenurable, full-time faculty.

Five principles guided the University's plan to expand the use of full-time lecturers in lower-division instruction:

- 1) the vast majority of full-time faculty hiring will continue to be for tenure-eligible (tenure-track or tenured) positions;
- 2) the outcome of a strategy that employs the use of full-time, non-tenurable faculty shall be to further reduce the University's dependence upon part-time faculty instruction, particularly with the increase in small-group breakout sessions arising from the new General Education curriculum;
- 3) a ceiling could and should be established on the number (or percentage) of positions that may be filled by non-tenurable, full-time faculty (e.g., Lecturer Series faculty);

- 4) appointments as Lecturer Series faculty may be restricted to units or programs where such appointments would be particularly appropriate and beneficial;
- 5) the terms of Lecturer Series faculty appointments should be comparable to those that exist at nationally ranked universities, and recognize the valuable contributions Lecturer Series faculty make to the instructional mission of the University; these employment terms to include:
 - a) regular employee benefits
 - b) the opportunity for professional advancement to a senior rank within the Lecturer Series
 - c) the opportunity for multi-year contracts
 - d) the opportunity for periodic professional development

The 1998 revision to the Administrative Regulation on Lecturer Series faculty extended regular full-time benefits to this series of faculty. A subsequent revision in 2005 created the opportunity for promotion consideration to the newly created rank of Senior Lecturer. It is time to complete some unfinished business by affording Lecturer Series faculty the full complement of employment terms identified in item #5 above, the conditions of employment they would enjoy if employed at one of UK's aspiration benchmarks (e.g., UNC, Illinois, Penn State, Indiana and UCLA).

The proposed revision to AR 2:9 is therefore motivated by a fundamental "do right" principle; the terms proposed will help ensure that we attract and retain outstanding Lecturer Series faculty and bring to this series of faculty the appropriate professional recognition within the University. I believe the proposed revision of AR 2:9 is faithful to the aforementioned five principles.

Sincerely yours,

Swamy