

Report of the Instructional Faculty Working Group
Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Humanities Division
Yale University

April 10, 2023

MEMBERS

Karen Anderson, Provost's Office
Jessica Brantley, English
Emily Coates, Theater and Performance Studies
Alison Coleman, English; President's Office
Bryan Garsten, Humanities; Political Science
Shiri Goren, Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations
Mick Hunter, East Asian Languages and Literatures
Kathryn Lofton, American Studies; Religious Studies; FAS Dean's Office
John Mangan, FAS Dean's Office
Constantine Muravnik, Slavic Languages and Literatures
Paul North, Germanic Languages and Literatures
Lourdes Sabé, Spanish and Portuguese
Quan Tran, Ethnicity, Race, and Migration
Nelleke Van Deusen-Scholl, Center for Language Study
Jason Zentz, FAS Dean's Office

BACKGROUND

The work of instructional faculty is indispensable to the achievement of Yale's educational mission. To consider how to support these colleagues and ensure that Yale is a leader in developing equitable and inclusive conditions for instructional faculty, FAS Dean Tamar Gendler formed the Instructional Faculty Working Group (IFWG) in fall 2020. Chaired by John Mangan, senior associate dean and FAS dean of faculty affairs, and Kathryn Lofton, FAS dean of humanities, the IFWG's specific remit was instructional faculty in the humanities – the FAS division that currently employs the largest number of instructional faculty – though some of its efforts required thinking about principled alterations to policy and process that would affect all instructional faculty in the FAS.

The IFWG formed in response to several factors. One point of departure was the 2017 Report on the Status, Pay, and Conditions of Non-Ladder Faculty issued by the FAS Senate. This report argued that “a comprehensive review of the status, pay, and conditions of non-ladder faculty in FAS is long overdue.”¹ Another factor was the desire to publicize and interrogate the efforts by the FAS Dean's Office to support the professional lives of instructional faculty (Appendix A). Inclusive governance demands that faculty and faculty leadership acknowledge criticisms and work to achieve better working conditions for faculty at every rank. The IFWG sought to bring the FAS Dean's Office and, where policy demanded, the University, to engage with the recommendations of the 2017 FAS Senate report, and to consider other issues that had become pressing since then.

A final prompt necessitating the IFWG and its engagement of issues related to instructional faculty is a national conversation about the growth and conditions of adjunct faculty. This conversation is reflected in a spate of new books, including Joe Berry and Helena Worthen's *Power Despite Precarity: Strategies for the Contingent Faculty Movement in Higher Education* (Pluto, 2021), Herb Childress's *The Adjunct Underclass: How America's Colleges Betrayed Their Faculty, Their Students, and Their Mission* (Chicago, 2019), Adrianna Kezar, Tom DePaola, and Daniel T. Scott's *The Gig Academy: Mapping Labor in the Neoliberal University* (Johns Hopkins, 2019), as well as multiple reports by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The 2020–21

¹ It was this report that, among many other constructive recommendations, urged the FAS toward use of the identifier “instructional faculty” rather than through the long-standing and negation-driven “non-ladder faculty.” FAS Senate, Report on the Status, Pay, and Conditions of Non-Ladder Faculty in FAS, https://fas-seas-senate.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/Reports/FAS-Senate_2017-04-13_Non-Ladder-Faculty.pdf, p. 4.

Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession by the AAUP found that in fall 2019, 63.0 percent of faculty members in the United States (excluding research and medical school faculty) were on contingent appointments. Roughly one-third of these contingent faculty (20.0 percent of the total) were on full-time appointments and approximately two-thirds (42.9 percent of the total) were part-time. Only 26.5 percent of faculty members were tenured, and only 10.5 percent were on the tenure track.² Across the full set of US institutions, the ratio of tenured/tenure-track to contingent faculty has stayed relatively constant (at around 37:63) over the past two decades.³ Within the AAUP's category of doctoral universities, there is a much lower proportion of contingent faculty, but the past twenty years have seen a dramatic shift from a 60:40 ratio to 50:50, with most of that shift happening prior to 2013.⁴

Across the country, the economic conditions for adjunct faculty members are difficult to desperate. Sixty-five percent of contingent faculty have no access to employer-provided health care, and 64 percent of contingent faculty do not have a retirement plan with their academic employer. Sixty percent of contingent faculty in higher education make less than \$50,000 annually, and in most states adjunct faculty members do not have rights to unemployment insurance.⁵

2 American Association of University Professors, The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 2020–21, https://www.aaup.org/file/AAUP_ARES_2020-21.pdf, pp. 13–14, fig. 6. These data come from the 2019–20 provisional release of the IPEDS HR survey component. “Faculty” refers to academic employees with faculty status at degree-granting nonprofit institutions in the US participating in Title IV federal financial aid programs. Only nonmedical faculty with IPEDS categories of “primarily instructional” or “instructional/research/public service” are included in these figures. “Contingent” encompasses all faculty who are neither tenured nor on the tenure track, including those at institutions that have no tenure system. The dataset is available for interactive exploration at <https://data.aaup.org/academic-workforce/>.

3 For 2006–2019 (61.5 percent contingent faculty in 2006, 62.9 percent in 2019, 62.5 percent average across the 14 years): American Association of University Professors, The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 2020–21, https://www.aaup.org/file/AAUP_ARES_2020-21.pdf, p. 14 and fig. 6. For 2002–2021 (60.0 percent contingent faculty in 2002, 63.5 percent in 2021, 62.9 percent average across the twenty years): American Association of University Professors, Makeup of the Academic Workforce by Appointment Type, <https://data.aaup.org/academic-workforce/>, with default settings filtered to only include those with faculty status.

4 40.8 percent contingent faculty in 2002, 48.5 percent in 2013, 52.1 percent in 2021; 44.9 percent average for 2002–2012; 50.1 percent average for 2013–2021. American Association of University Professors, Makeup of the Academic Workforce by Appointment Type, <https://data.aaup.org/academic-workforce/>, with default settings filtered to only include those with faculty status at AAUP Doctoral Universities.

5 American Association of University Professors, The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 2021–22, https://www.aaup.org/file/AAUP_ARES_2021-2022.pdf, p. 34; An Army of Temps: AFT Adjunct Faculty Quality of Work/Life Report, https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/qualitylifereport_feb2022.pdf.

Due to strategic engagement by instructional faculty, academic unit chairs, and administrative leadership, the salary and benefits of Yale instructional faculty far exceed the national average. Further, the proportion of instructional faculty in the FAS and the School of Engineering & Applied Science (SEAS) was 38 percent,⁶ lower than the university-wide and national figures.⁷ But still, this figure of 38 percent does represent a slight increase over a long-standing status quo. Throughout the 2000s and early 2010s, the proportion of instructional faculty in FAS and SEAS stayed slightly under one-third, but the average for both 2015–2018 and 2019–2022 was 37 percent. In the FAS (without SEAS), the percentage of instructional faculty has exceeded 40.0 percent in four of the last six years, whereas it had never passed 33.7 percent prior to 2015.⁸ Teaching by instructional faculty is integral to the learning of Yale students.

As we celebrate the work of Yale instructional faculty, we also witness national trends. The AAUP, taking a panoramic view of higher education, underlines two facts. First, an increase of contingent faculty appointments accompanies a decline in the number of faculty who are appointed each year to tenure-track positions. Second, because faculty tenure is the only secure protection for academic freedom in teaching, research, and service, the declining percentage of tenured faculty means that academic freedom in the United States is increasingly at risk. Universities must meet the “existential threat” adjunctification poses with renewed investment in the centrality of tenure to the discovery and dissemination of knowledge.⁹ As C. Vann Woodward wrote in the 1974 Report of the Committee on Freedom of Expression at Yale: “The history of intellectual growth and discovery clearly demonstrates the need for unfettered freedom, the right to think the unthinkable, discuss the unmentionable, and challenge the unchallengeable.”¹⁰

6 FAS/SEAS faculty type data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and analyzed by the FAS Dean’s Office. These FAS/SEAS data form a subset of the dataset Yale reports annually to IPEDS, so they follow the same criteria and definitions as the IPEDS-sourced data provided by AAUP.

7 The contingent faculty proportion was 52 percent at Yale University, 52 percent across AAUP doctoral universities, and 63 percent across all degree-granting nonprofit institutions in the US participating in Title IV federal financial aid programs. American Association of University Professors, *Makeup of the Academic Workforce by Appointment Type*, <https://data.aaup.org/academic-workforce/>, fall 2021, with default settings filtered to only include those with faculty status.

8 FAS/SEAS and FAS faculty type data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and analyzed by the FAS Dean’s Office.

9 https://www.aaup.org/file/AAUP_ARES_2020-21.pdf, p. 17.

10 C. Vann Woodward, “Of Values and Priorities,” Report of the Committee on Freedom of Expression at Yale, <https://yalecollege.yale.edu/get-know-yale-college/office-dean/reports/report-committee-freedom-expression-yale>.

In the last several years, the Division of the Humanities at Yale has increased the overall number of tenure-track searches conducted and prioritized recruiting tenure-track assistant professors. At the same time, the FAS Dean's Office has worked to minimize the use of part-time appointments and improve the baseline expectations for full-time instructional appointments.¹¹ The instructional faculty recruited to Yale are highly trained educators whose research supports their teaching to the positive benefit of faculty colleagues and Yale students. They hold post-graduate degrees from the best institutions of higher education and are distinguished practitioners in their respective fields of journalism, business, science, culture, and the arts. They are vital members of their curricular communities. Their appointments are competitively remunerated, and the vast majority are fully benefits eligible.¹² The FAS at Yale seeks to be a faculty defined by respect and inclusion for all ranks.

Improving working conditions for all faculty is an ongoing process. Over its three years of reflection and research from 2020 to 2023, the IFWG set an agenda of action items derived from the FAS Senate Report and conducted a detailed review of the policies of peer institutions regarding instructional faculty. The working group decided to work against the pernicious features of casualization and contingency through increased equity, recognition, and stability for instructional faculty.

This document outlines the accomplishments of the IFWG, identifies issues of future concern, lists the accomplishments of the FAS Dean's Office (Appendix A), and offers an updated discussion of course equivalents (Appendix B). It provides this information to support transparent collaboration between instructional faculty, department chairs, and the FAS Dean's Office in the measurement and acknowledgment of instructional faculty participation in the education of Yale students.

¹¹ Even as the proportion of instructional faculty has increased within FAS and SEAS as described above, that is entirely due to growth in full-time appointments (from 18 percent in 2002 to 24 percent in 2022). The proportion of part-time faculty appointments has remained stable, at around 14 percent. FAS/SEAS faculty type data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and analyzed by the FAS Dean's Office.

¹² As of fall 2022, 84 percent of FAS/SEAS instructional faculty and 85 percent of FAS instructional faculty were at least half-time, which is the minimum threshold for Yale-sponsored health benefits and retirement plans (Workday data, analyzed by the FAS Dean's Office).

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY WORKING GROUP

The Instructional Faculty Working Group instigated conversations that resulted in the following new policies:

Increases to Course Rate Minimums

The minimum course rate for instructional faculty will be adjusted on a regular basis in response to increases in the cost of living. In addition, instructional faculty in the FAS who hold non-PhD terminal degrees or have suitable experience and expertise in their disciplines are now eligible for the same minimum course rate currently paid to those who do hold a PhD. As the appropriate credential to teach in some disciplines may not be a PhD, this policy change is an important step towards recognizing the diverse educational backgrounds of our instructional faculty.

Short-Term Medical Disability

Unlike full-time instructional faculty, part-time instructional faculty who are otherwise benefits eligible (50–99% FTE) were previously ineligible for short-term medical disability. Now all benefits-eligible instructional faculty, even those who are part-time, are eligible for this benefit.

Phased Retirement

For a three-year period beginning July 1, 2023, active full-time senior lecturers II, senior lecturers, senior lecturers II, professors in the practice, professors adjunct, senior research scientists, and senior research scholars in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences with at least fifteen years of continuous full-time faculty service at Yale and who are at least sixty-five years of age may enter the Phased Retirement Plan for Certain Term-Limited faculty as early as July 1, 2023 and no later than July 1, 2026.

Such a change allows instructional faculty access to a benefit previously only available to ladder faculty and M&P staff. It allows for better short- and long-term planning for departments, increasing transparency, stability, and flexibility to the curriculum.

The IFWG strongly recommended senior lecturer I be included in this benefit. In the future it is important that senior lecturer I be considered for it. This will be an area of ongoing inquiry by the FAS Dean's Office and faculty leadership.

Emeritus Status

Emeritus/emeriti titles may be awarded to members of the instructional and research faculty in the FAS in certain ranks when they retire or resign from Yale. Henceforth,

FAS senior lecturers II, senior lecturers, senior lecturers II, professors adjunct, senior research scientists, and senior research scholars are eligible to be nominated for emeritus status.

To be eligible for nomination, a faculty member must have reached age fifty-five, held full-time faculty appointments at Yale for at least fifteen consecutive years, and the combination of age plus years of service must equal at least seventy-five. To be granted emeriti titles, the nomination of a faculty member in one of these ranks must be voted on by the faculty of their department or program; if successful, the nomination must be approved by the FAS Dean, by the Office of the Provost, and by the Corporation by the final semester of the individual's non-retired status. Considerations for approval include the faculty member's role as educator, scholar, and member of the Yale community as described in Section II.B of the Faculty Handbook.

PI Status for Senior Lecturers II and Senior Lectors II

FAS instructional faculty with the rank of senior lector II or senior lecturer II are now eligible to serve as principal investigators for a sponsored award without requiring approval of a provost or dean. This policy change recognizes senior lecturers II and senior lecturers II as highly experienced, long-serving faculty members well acquainted with university policies and procedures, who have achieved the highest ranks of their faculty classification. It is an acknowledgment that, while job duties of senior lecturers II and senior lecturers II are primarily instructional, a component of promotion to these ranks could include research and publication. In the case of lectors, it is required, and in the case of lecturers, it is not discouraged.

Additional Resources and Opportunities for Instructional Faculty

The policy changes outlined above are among a series of recent measures that the IFWG instigated to support FAS instructional faculty. Others include extending the FAS faculty lunch program to instructional faculty on full-time, multi-year appointments; providing laptops to instructional faculty on full-time, multi-year appointments; and introducing SAL2 (Scholars as Leaders; Scholars as Learners) programming designed specifically for instructional faculty. Appendix A offers several more advancements on behalf of instructional faculty.

FUTURE ISSUES

In its research and reflection, the IFWG identified several issues for which there was little space for progress presently. However, its members are certain these will be issues that repeat in importance in the years to come.

Tenure. Many of our peer institutions offer tenure to professors in the practice. Currently Yale does not offer tenure to any member of its instructional ranks, placing Yale at a competitive disadvantage in its recruiting of distinguished practitioners.

Research. Instructional faculty are appointed for their leadership in teaching, not research. Yet many instructional faculty have robust research profiles. And the promotion to senior lecturer II requires “documentation of pedagogical innovations or research relevant to the language program.” Although the Center for Language Study (CLS) offers travel support, it is not adequate to cover the expenses of presenting at a major conference, and the CLS has a limited number of grants to extend. In addition, there are differences among academic units and Macmillan councils with respect to instructional faculty research support. Currently, some lecturers have access to research funds, and some do not. If instructional faculty ranks grow, so too will be requests for acknowledgment of instructional faculty as researchers. The FAS will need to provide consistent and equitable research and professional development support for instructional faculty of certain ranks.

At any rank, being cognizant of or engaging in relevant research enhances what a faculty member can bring to the seminar room, lab, or lecture hall. The larger question is whether institutional funding should be made available to instructional faculty in an organized way to support research that is *not* directly related to pedagogy. The default stance has always been that it should not be provided because doing so would amount to a dramatic paradigm shift in the instructional ranks, currently understood in practice as “teaching appointments” and defined as such in the *Yale University Faculty Handbook*. Moreover, a change in this understanding would require broad discussion within the FAS, with the Office of the Provost, and with the professional schools, since the instructional ranks used in the FAS are university-wide entities. At bottom is this question: is it appropriate to support, in any kind of organized institutional way, instructional faculty research leading to outcomes that will never be scrutinized under the standards of tenure? If we ultimately determine that such research should be supported, should a research profile on some level then become a requirement in some or all of the instructional ranks? How we answer these questions will have broad implications not least for hiring, reappointment, and promotion processes within the instructional ranks.

Community. As indicated by Appendix A, the FAS Dean's Office has sought to encourage the inclusion of instructional faculty in major service committees and decision-making bodies. Yet across the FAS, at the department and program level, inclusion remains inconstant. Inclusive practices might include welcoming instructional faculty at faculty meetings and other departmental functions, visibility in newsletters and websites, and participation in admissions and search committees.

CONCLUSION

The Instructional Faculty Working Group establishes this report as a record of the work involved in creating a community of recognized, fair, and respected labor. Every policy changed required faculty across ranks organizing to advocate for better policy. Every policy recorded included detailed, long-range engagement with administrative staff in multiple offices to coordinate faculty management. Every policy adjusted reflected consultation with large numbers of instructional faculty to confirm that the adjustment expanded the capacity for instructional faculty to teach and grow as intellectual leaders. Improving the social life of a community organized by rank distinctions is a persistent effort. It requires vigilance, collaboration, and commitment to equality. Without attention, inequalities expand.

As faculty leaders of all ranks continue to work together in the decades ahead, we call upon them to understand the life work of instructional faculty as a part of the moral mandate for the modern research university. Advancing knowledge requires intellectual freedom, financial security, informational access, and institutional commitment. Yale should remain an institution that supports its entire faculty, whose teaching forms its academic mission.

APPENDIX A

Since the formation of the FAS Dean's Office (FASDO) in 2014, there have been many improvements in the support offered to instructional faculty.

Inclusion and Governance

- FAS faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching are no longer referred to as “non-ladder” faculty. Instead, FASDO categorizes these faculty members as *instructional* faculty.
- The Office of the Provost now includes full-time instructional faculty on multi-year appointments in New Faculty Orientation.
- Since 2014, FASDO includes a standing committee – the Teaching Resource Advisory Committee (TRAC) – that attends exclusively to instructional faculty matters.
- The FASDO website includes greater availability and clarity of appointment and review procedures.
- In collaboration with the Office of Institutional Research, FASDO has improved the records and categorization of instructional faculty, providing better data to support the implementation of new measures for support and recognition.
- The hiring of additional FASDO staff has meant better response times to individual concerns.
- FASDO is working to streamline letters of appointment to ensure greater equity across instructional faculty members.
- FASDO has increased representation of instructional faculty on FAS-wide committees (e.g., Faculty Activity Committee) as well as YCDO and Presidential committees to ensure more visibility and better inclusion of their ranks.
- The FAS Senate included instructional faculty in its membership since inception.
- At the urging of FASDO leadership, departments that have historically limited the presence and voice of instructional faculty in their departmental meetings and general governance have become much more inclusive. In the humanities currently fifty percent of the departments and programs include instructional faculty in faculty meetings; FASDO continues to work on improving this percentage.

Course Relief and Leaves

- FASDO collaborated with the Center for Language Study to institute a fellowship program whereby language lecturers can receive one course release and apply this time to design and execute a project that enhances their professional development as teachers.
- Instructional faculty are eligible to participate in several of the SAL2 (Scholars as Leaders; Scholars as Learners) programs which includes professional development and mentoring opportunities to foster their growth as teachers and University citizens.

- FASDO supports the Professional Development Leave program for instructional faculty. This program awards semester-long leaves on a competitive basis to instructional faculty at full pay for the purpose of pedagogical development.
- Instructional faculty now receive the same teaching relief for childrearing (TRC) as ladder faculty.

Reappointments and Promotion

- FASDO has streamlined the reappointment review process for lecturers and lecturers. This includes a “chair’s reappointment review” that now alternates with the standard full-review process. Such an alternating expedited review recognizes the strength of instructional faculty, acknowledging that full reappointment reviews every three to five years, depending on the term of appointment, were, in most cases, unnecessary.
- To create greater opportunities for lecturer advancement, FASDO added the rank of senior lecturer II.

Benefits and Compensation

- Full-time instructional faculty on multi-year appointments receive ITS-supported laptops; ITS and FASDO determine support for instructional faculty on single-year or part-time appointments on a case-by-case basis.
- FASDO now offers conference travel support for instructional faculty up to \$500 per academic year if they are presenting a paper, chairing a panel, serving as an officer of a professional association, contributing as a stated participant in a formal discussion, or participating in some other significant way.
- The Center for Language Study offers competitive conference travel support for lectors up to \$1,000 per academic year.
- FASDO expanded the subsidized lunch program. This program – through which the FAS Dean’s Office pays the lunch costs for faculty who choose to eat in one of the residential college dining halls – has long been open to all FAS ladder faculty and all FAS full-time instructional faculty on multi-year appointments. Now added to this roster is an additional group of full-time FAS instructional faculty: those who simultaneously hold both a teaching and research appointment whose teaching accounts for at least half of their effort.
- At the final Yale College faculty meeting of the academic year, faculty leaders now read tributes for long-serving instructional faculty alongside those for retiring ladder faculty.
- In spring 2021, FASDO increased the course rate minimum for instructional faculty with doctoral degrees, and FASDO leadership made significant structural salary adjustments that raised median salaries for instructional faculty.

APPENDIX B

The Instructional Faculty Working Group seeks to encourage better transparency about non-classroom student-focused, curricular, or departmental work done by instructional faculty.

Course equivalents are the metric used by the FAS to quantify instructional faculty effort applied outside the classroom in service of their department or program. A **course equivalent** refers to a segment of work with applied effort understood to be equal to what a faculty member applies in teaching a classroom-based course. Course equivalents are allocated in faculty letters of appointment to acknowledge expected academic responsibilities outside of the classroom. Letters of appointment in the humanities might say, for a full academic year, “six courses – or providing an equivalent number of courses and service,” or “four term courses and two course equivalents.”

Most but not all full-time instructional faculty in the humanities are expected to teach six courses or provide an equivalent number of courses and service. Most but not all full-time senior instructional faculty teach four to five courses with one to two course equivalents. In many language programs, new lecturers teach a full course load and gain the course equivalents upon promotion, presumably because with seniority comes increased leadership responsibilities. Such leadership could be in the form of serving as a course or language program director, developing new courses and materials, mentoring younger colleagues, or serving on high-volume committees. In less-commonly-taught languages with a single instructor, however, senior lecturers may teach 3:3 to stage a full language curriculum that gives students the opportunity to fulfill the distributional language requirement in Yale College.

Course equivalents may be allocated to instructional faculty for the following kinds of work:

Course direction or coordination. Course coordination usually occurs when at least two instructors are teaching different sections of the same course. Responsibilities include ordering books; designing syllabi, tests, and assessments; updating the course management site; holding regular staff meetings for the course instructors; organizing all-course meetings and events; managing enrollment; and making suggestions for future hiring.

Language program direction or coordination. Responsibilities include overseeing the design and implementation of the language curriculum including advanced content classes, evaluating learning outcomes and revising the curriculum as necessary, providing professional development for instructors, assigning courses and other responsibilities to program members, managing placement exams, recruiting students,

advising students, coordinating across language units at Yale, initiating or holding events, training graduate students, and mentoring other instructional faculty.

Serving as a department officer. Department officer positions include director of undergraduate studies (DUS) or associate director of graduate studies (ADGS).

CLS Fellowship. Such fellowships offer an opportunity to work on an instructional innovation project.

Senior essay advising. Advising more than four senior essays in one year can equal a course equivalent.

Departmental service and professional development activities. Such service includes committee service within departments, for Yale College, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, the University, and relevant professional organizations.

Curricular programming. Involvement with telecollaborative exchanges, study abroad programs, and language tables, when they occupy a course equivalence of time, are significant acts of service.

Graduate student education. This includes mentoring exchange students, training part-time acting instructors (PTAI), preparing students for language exams, and overseeing those exams.

Time-sensitive service. Responding to specific curricular or programmatic building needs, e.g., creating several new courses at once, starting a new program, working with a cluster of new graduate student instructors, or training a new lector.