

**UTFA's Response to OCUFA's Questions on Teaching Intensive  
Appointments – A Working Document  
March 4, 2010**

**Compiled by Terezia Zoric, Chair, UTFA Teaching Stream Committee 2008–10, in  
consultation with UTFA colleagues**

**1. Where did the impetus to include such [teaching stream] positions in the collective agreement come from - an employer proposal, or the faculty association?**

Faculty who today would be classified as 'teaching stream' have always been a part of the faculty mix at the University of Toronto. Thus, it is nearly impossible to point to the precise genesis of a teaching-intensive (or even teaching-only) 'stream' at the University of Toronto. According to UTFA Historian Bill Nelson,

Before the Haist Rules were adopted in the 1960s no clear distinction was made between teaching faculty from whom research and publication was expected and faculty whose University duties encompassed teaching only. Tutors, or people who were to become tutors, had, after some years' satisfactory service, permanent appointments on the same basis as tenured faculty members. As the requirements for tenure became more formal in the early 1970s, the tutor category became a kind of catchall for teaching members of faculty who were not in a tenure stream, their numbers amounting eventually to about 9% of all total faculty members.<sup>1</sup>

This manner of separating teaching stream from tenure stream faculty created a problematic hierarchy and paved the way for difficult terms of employment for the minority stream, including lack of permanency. UTFA's efforts through the 1970s and 1980s to improve and give some 'regularity' to Tutors' and Senior Tutors' appointments, salaries, progress-through-the-ranks, and job security were largely unsuccessful, and were effectively ignored by the University Administration.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, the impetus for the current configuration of the teaching stream came from UTFA, emerged most immediately from the work of a joint committee mandated by a mediated settlement, and required nearly a decade of concerted advocacy and negotiation. In 1999, UTFA and the University Administration signed policy language that replaced renewable contracts with continuing appointments, and although a tiny number of teaching stream faculty chose to remain Tutors and Senior Tutors (whose responsibilities did not extend much beyond teaching), the newly conceived stream created two new ranks: Lecturers and Senior Lecturers. Faculty in this newer stream earn continuing appointments based on teaching effectiveness (excellence) and pedagogical/professional development.<sup>3</sup> The

---

<sup>1</sup> Nelson, W.H. (1993) *The Search for Faculty Power: The History of the University of Toronto Faculty Association, 1942-1992*. Toronto: The University of Toronto and Canadian Scholars Press, pp.158-59.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Administrative service is considered, "where such service is related to teaching duties or to curricular and

latter category can and most often does include an array of activities that notably encompass both traditional and non-traditional forms of research and scholarship.<sup>4</sup>

**2. What has been the trend over time in the use of teaching stream positions? Are the numbers growing (assuming no negotiated caps)? Are there particular faculties or departments that have disproportionate numbers of these positions?**

To begin with, UTFA has never negotiated or otherwise sought to establish a cap or fixed proportion of teaching to tenure stream appointments—and we are highly wary of language implying *a priori* that there is such a thing as a “disproportionate number” of teaching stream faculty. *De facto* a concern of this type suggests a lower status to a type of work and a type of professional focus and expertise that we all agree is invaluable.

If this question is meant to reflect a concern for precarious and lower status academic employment, this is not appropriate in the UTFA case given the long term policy context, negotiations history, and a culture that has, in *many* ways successfully, already vigorously sought to counteract these precise outcomes.

Long –term trends

We are also not entirely sure what is meant in this question by "trend". Teaching stream faculty more often teach proportionately more undergraduate classes. There are of course several exceptions. Teaching stream faculty have also been very active in developing curricula, various teaching technologies, first-year learning experience initiatives, and service learning, to name only some areas of strength. There also appears to be a consistent trend toward teaching stream faculty accepting formal administrative roles, including: Program Coordinators, Executive Directors, Directors, Associate Chairs and Chairs, and Associate Deans.

Growth Rate<sup>5</sup>

The number of teaching stream appointments is growing, but not hugely, and to a greater extent at one of our three campuses – University of Toronto Scarborough Campus (UTSC, the eastern ‘suburban’ campus). Teaching stream appointments continue to constitute less than a fifth of all faculty appointments.

Academic Units with More Teaching Stream Faculty

Nearly a third (32%) of all teaching stream appointments are in the Humanities. Other areas with significant numbers include the Physical Sciences and the Health Sciences

---

professional development.”

<sup>4</sup> This includes “conducting pedagogical and/or discipline-based research; publishing work, including creative and professional work; ... developing curricula; creating new teaching technologies....” “Course Load in the Teaching Stream: The 80/20 Problem,” *UTFA Newsletter*, March 2007.

<sup>5</sup> All of the following is based on data that provides a snapshot for the 2008-09 academic year, and excludes the following teaching stream members: clinicians, those on LTD, those on other unpaid leave, those without a higher educational degree, and those with senior administrative positions.

(especially Nursing). St. George (downtown) Engineering and Computer Science and St. George Social Sciences also host relatively large numbers of teaching stream faculty.

**3. What do you know about the job satisfaction of individuals hired into these positions? Are there any particular problems that seem to be widespread with respect to the terms and conditions of their employment?**

Two thousand and eight UTFA survey data suggest that the job satisfaction levels for teaching stream members are comparable to the broader pool of faculty members of which they are a part. However, certain issues and problems are particularly relevant to the teaching stream.

**Major Problems**

Inadequate Security in the Teaching Stream<sup>6</sup>

Security issues take four forms for the teaching stream, outlined only briefly below.

1. Security of the initial appointment -- Currently, a significant proportion of U of T lecturers, even those meant to be on a continuing track, are hired on year-at-a-time contracts. Some, even when performance has been excellent, have been terminated before reaching year five. *Teaching stream faculty at the rank of lecturer should be hired on initial three-year appointments. A three-year review should occur, as it does in the tenure stream, and then the probationary appointment should be renewed for another two years. The review for promotion to senior lecturer would then be conducted in the fifth year, the only exception a negotiated extension of the probationary period at the lecturer's request.*

2. Security of workload -- (Also see section on workload below.)

3. Security of the continuing appointment – Currently, even continuing appointments may be terminated "by reason of curricular change as determined in a multi-year academic plan approved by the Vice-President and Provost, where such change removes an area or field of teaching" and no alternative employment is available. *Appointments policy should not outline a protocol for termination but instead should focus on the permanence of teaching stream positions. UTFA views security of the continuing appointment as the number one priority for the teaching stream and is currently seeking to negotiate improvements.*

4. Security of the grievance or appeals process -- The grievance procedure currently in place for those teaching stream faculty who are denied promotion to the continuing rank of senior lecturer is poorly designed. (Teaching stream faculty do not appeal to the

---

<sup>6</sup> This section is an adapted and edited version of *Celebrating the 10th Anniversary of the Teaching Stream: Are we secure?* By Cynthia Messenger, Chair, UTFA Appointments Committee. UTFA Newsletter. University of Toronto Faculty Association. No. 1 (2009–10), October 9, 2009.

University Tenure Appeal Committee, because they are not reviewed for tenure.) Like our tenure appeals mechanism, it is insufficiently arm's-length, and the inadequate procedures that accompany it ensure neither transparency of process nor rigour in the production of evidence. *All of our appeals and grievance procedures should be redesigned to include access to third party arbitration, a system of dispute resolution that would give our faculty recourse to the arbitral jurisprudence that has been accrued over the years in other cases in Canadian universities.*

### Workload<sup>7</sup>

Workload is a central issue of concern for the teaching stream at University of Toronto, consistent with a more general problem of escalating and unregulated workloads affecting our colleagues in the tenure and librarian streams as well. Extensive research and outreach conducted by UTFA<sup>8</sup> confirms the existence of a crisis of excessive, escalating, and inequitable workloads for *all* faculty and librarians, but also point to some specific and acute problems among the teaching stream.

There are numerous dimensions to the workload problem, including how increasing enrollments and inadequate resources devoted to teaching are causing faculty workloads to escalate and pose significant threats to both “the student experience” and “academic freedom in teaching”. UTFA teaching stream members have told us about their painful familiarity with a range of unacceptable practices:

- excessive teaching-related workloads that
  - make scholarship and/or service contributions extremely challenging;
  - force faculty to work after hours, through lunch, or skip breaks to get work done;
  - interfere with access to and time for collegial discussion in the faculty members' field of expertise;
- arbitrary increases in teaching assignments for lecturers; being asked to take on extra duties for no extra compensation, including the assignment of substantial teaching and administrative duties that never get counted in workload totals;
- during off-term periods, being required or pressured to teach, including one-on-one teaching, credit and non-credit courses, etc.
- pressure from chairs or unit or division heads to teach on (paid or un-paid) overload;
- absent or inadequate TA support.

It is noteworthy that among surveyed faculty and librarians (2008), teaching stream members were *most* likely to express concern that “the quality of education at the University of Toronto is affected by workload issues”. These are some of the reasons that teaching stream faculty have been so strongly supportive of UTFA's efforts to negotiate new language to manage workloads, and more generally confirm a particular

---

<sup>7</sup> For a detailed report on teaching stream workload concerns see **Appendix One—Excerpt from UTFA Proposals on Workload for Faculty and Librarians (Without Prejudice)**. Tuesday, May 19th, 2009 Available online at [www.utfa.org](http://www.utfa.org).

<sup>8</sup> Highlighted findings from UTFA's research on workload have been published through Bargaining Report #2 for 2009-2010 (available on our web site at [www.UTFA.org](http://www.UTFA.org)).

and valued place for teaching stream members within the overall academic work process as specialists in teaching, pedagogy, learning outcomes, and so on.

### \*\*\*The Problem of Part-time Appointments in the Teaching Stream

This is a real, very serious problem of disproportionality.

Just over a quarter of all appointments in the teaching stream at U of T are part-time, and therefore leave faculty ineligible to secure continuing appointments. More than a third of these 'part-time' appointments are at 75% full-time (formal full-time status is afforded only to appointees at 76% or above). Data indicate that a substantial number of part-time appointments are for several years, often as much as a decade.

### The Need to Change Titles, Reduce Hierarchies, and Enhance the Dignity and Respect Accorded to Teaching Stream Faculty

Currently, teaching stream faculty at the University of Toronto share the title of "Lecturer" with non-permanent and often part-time CUPE sessional lecturers, and this is a source of confusion for students, colleagues, and the broader academic community. Unfortunately, the title of Senior Lecturer, well regarded in the UK, carries little respect in a North American context. *Title change is currently a central focus of a joint UTFA-Administration working group on "Professors of Practice."*

There are, for example, symbolically and substantively powerful undercurrents within the relevant OCUFA (and CAUT) bargaining advisories and policy statements that seem to suggest that teaching work is less valuable than research, that the hierarchy that places tenure stream faculty above teaching stream faculty and librarians is natural and inevitable, and that no one in their right mind would ever *choose* to focus their career as a faculty member on teaching-intensive work – academic work that has a scholarly component if not in equal measure. (Hence the repeated joint obsession with minimizing the number of teaching stream appointments and providing teaching stream faculty with opportunities to transition to 'real' faculty appointments in the tenure stream.)

UTFA's position is that, in university contexts in which this is deemed relevant such as UTFA's, that it would be more helpful if greater energy instead went into bargaining, policy reform, and advocacy geared toward enhancing the status of teaching, preserving time for teaching stream faculty to engage in research-related activities, and to having their traditional and non-traditional forms of *scholarly work recognized and compensated*. *UTFA has worked very hard to do precisely this consistently for some time, (although at times unevenly), especially in the latest round of bargaining.*

At U of T as elsewhere, teaching stream faculty are more likely to be women than their tenure stream colleagues, are rarely paid equally for work of equal value, have less access to merit pay, fewer opportunities for promotion, have little or no access to research funds, and are subject to routine if banal expressions of disrespect, as when we are told we are 'rather impressive considering we're not "real faculty".' *The antidote to this nonsense is multi-faceted, but surely begins with the recognition that these are all equity issues, and that teaching stream faculty deserve more respect from all quarters than they currently*

enjoy.

#### **4. Would you recommend other faculty associations adopt the model at your institution? Why, or why not?**

Increasingly, UTFA executive members are converging on a preference for a unified stream--perhaps a mega-stream, or greater convergence among the streams--that would contain differentiated distributions of activities/efforts for each faculty member. It is our position that this would be the best strategy to reduce or eliminate the problems outlined in question 3, above.

What is at stake here is faculty choice on how they focus and develop their efforts and expertise (i.e. in research, in teaching, in both, etc.) and that – major issues of workload, security, a culture of respect for the university’s role as a whole (in research AND teaching) all being equalized – a robust teaching stream option may in fact be preferred across many university campuses.

See Appendix Two for a sample model of how a unified and tenured stream with differentiated yet flexible appointments might work.

If a unified stream with differentiated emphases is impossible, UTFA’s model (with some reforms) IS recommended. That is, it ought to be a teaching intensive –not teaching only -- stream with a clearly defined and protected scholarly dimension to it.

Necessary policy reforms include:

- the need for secure, tenured appointments;
- dedicated time and support for scholarly activities (broadly defined) and a concomitant limit on teaching loads that ensure they are no more than 50% higher than the teaching loads of research stream faculty in the same unit.

Helpful mindset changes include recognition of the following:

- that it is impossible to be a credible faculty member in higher education without significant engagement (based on time to do so) in scholarly activities.
- as Boyer (1990) reminds us, that scholarship is more than ‘discovery’ and is closely linked to teaching.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered*. San Francisco, CA: Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching. From the Executive Summary: The Boyer report articulated a new paradigm for faculty scholarly activity which expanded the concept of scholarship, traditionally viewed as the scientific *discovery* of new knowledge, to include three other equally important areas: the scholarship of *integration*, the scholarship of *application*, and the scholarship of *teaching*. The first two functions of scholarship, discovery and integration, reflect the investigative and synthesizing traditions of academic life. The third function, application, is the engagement of the scholar in extending and applying knowledge to address consequential outreach and community service issues. The fourth function, teaching, involves scholars in sharing the results of their scholarship with others.

## Appendix One

### Excerpt from UTFA Proposals on Workload for Faculty and Librarians (Without Prejudice).

Tuesday, May 19th, 2009

Available online at [www.utfa.org](http://www.utfa.org)

#### 4. Guidelines Specifically Applicable to Teaching Stream

*For the Teaching Stream, the following definitions apply:*

Scholarship refers to any combination of discipline-based scholarship (including research), the scholarship of teaching and learning, and creative/professional activities. Teaching stream faculty engaged in any one of these areas are engaged in scholarship.

Teaching load refers to the elements for measuring FCEs in the Workload Principles document referred to above.

Workload shall be interpreted comprehensively, consistent with the principles articulated above, and specifically for the teaching stream, shall refer to teaching load, scholarship, and service activities

#### *Specific measures*

1. In general, teaching loads are too heavy and do not allow time for service and/or scholarship. Teaching loads of 3.5 and 4 FCEs per year are considered “normal” by some unit heads but are seen as unmanageable by faculty. Depending on how a “course” or “teaching” is defined, and depending on the faculty member’s other duties, even teaching loads of 3.0 FCEs per year are proving too heavy. Calculation of teaching loads is unsystematic and problematic. For example, courses that run three hours per week are, in some cases, not differentiated in terms of workload from courses that run two hours per week. Lab instruction is time-consuming, but is often not assigned enough credit in terms of teaching load. UTFA seeks agreement that the teaching load of a teaching stream faculty member, when all teaching-related work is counted, should not exceed either a) the total of 50% more than the normal teaching load of his/her tenure stream colleagues or b) 3.0 FCEs (except where the faculty member has agreed to a temporary overload for which compensation is paid).
2. The “80/20” PTR formula, although it appears in no policy or guideline, has been adopted by unit heads and has been used to assign punitive teaching loads. The University should make explicit a formula that reflects more clearly the scholarship component that is implied in all teaching stream appointments. This formula would normally be articulated as follows: no more than 60% teaching; no less than 20% scholarship; 20% service. This formula should be flexible, however, and, at the beginning of each academic year, teaching stream faculty

should be permitted to choose a variation on the formula annually in consultation with the unit head.

3. Teaching stream faculty are often asked to teach in all three terms, in violation of the Memorandum of Agreement, Article 8. Often, teaching stream faculty feel that they must volunteer to teach in a third term in order to spread out a too-heavy course load. Faculty report being so busy with teaching and administrative duties that they cannot take the annual one-month vacation. Three-term teaching that is mandatory or that is the result of excessive teaching loads violates Article 8 and should be stopped immediately, wherever it is occurring. Unit heads should be alerted to the vacation issue and should ensure that work is organized and distributed to allow all faculty to take vacation.
4. Workload expectations indicated in appointments letters are arbitrarily increased by chairs and deans. Faculty feel that they have little recourse, especially if they are lecturers (not yet senior lecturers). Chairs, principals, and deans should be reminded regularly that appointments letters are contractual agreements and may not be violated.
5. Many recent hires have been given higher teaching loads than their colleagues. The appointment letter of a new hire should reflect loads that are equitable with those established in the teaching stream in the unit. The practice of giving new hires heavier loads violates Article 8. Temporary reductions in teaching loads for pre-promotion faculty are encouraged and should be based on equitable loads. See # 6 below.
6. No policy is in place to reduce teaching loads and service for pre-promotion faculty. Academic culture within a unit often plays a role in determining workload. Service, for example, is routinely reduced substantially for pre-tenure faculty but not for pre-promotion faculty in the teaching stream. Teaching stream faculty are increasingly carrying the burden of service. The research culture in the tenure stream strives to “protect” research time. No analogous “protection” is provided teaching stream faculty who should, according to the PPAA and rigorous promotion guidelines, be engaging in scholarship. A reasonable teaching load and service reduction for pre- promotion faculty should be implemented, one that is applied fairly and consistently for each faculty member who is at the rank of lecturer in a continuing position.
7. Tenure stream faculty have had course loads reduced in recent years, but in some cases no analogous reductions have been implemented for the teaching stream. Any reduction in teaching load in the tenure stream within a unit should be accompanied by an analogous reduction in the teaching stream.
8. Administrative tasks are arbitrarily increased, with no accompanying reduction in teaching load. Teaching and coordinating large sections carry a heavy administrative burden. Coordinating TAs often falls to teaching stream faculty,



who are rarely accorded enough teaching release for this kind of duty. Any increase in administrative tasks should be accompanied by teaching release.

9. Teaching release is more generous for professorial faculty who take on administrative positions than it is for teaching stream faculty who take on the same or similar positions (e.g., program coordinator/director or associate chair positions). Faculty in both streams who take on administrative positions should receive analogous compensation and analogous teaching release in terms of percentage of teaching load.
10. In some units, teaching stream faculty must wait for professorial faculty to select courses and schedules each year. These teaching stream faculty feel that they are left with the least desirable courses and the worst teaching schedules. Because they have no control over course selection, teaching stream faculty cannot properly develop areas of teaching expertise. In some units, tenure stream faculty are assigned upper-level courses that tend to have lower enrolments, leaving high-enrolment first and second-year courses to the teaching stream. As permanent members of the university, teaching stream faculty should teach at all levels, and students at all levels should benefit from their teaching skills. The workload committee in each unit, in consultation with the chair, principal, or dean, should create a means by which the unit head may assign courses, perhaps on a rotating basis, that allows the teaching stream access to all courses which they are qualified to teach.

## Appendix Two

### Sample Unified Stream (with Differentiated Activities) Model

1. The default for the conventional professoriate would be 40:40:20 for research\*:teaching:service.
2. The default for the teaching-intensive professoriate would be (no less than 20):(no more than 60:20) for pedagogical development & research\*:teaching:service. Teaching duties would not make
3. The default for the ‘professional’ professoriate would be (30-40):(40-50):20 for research\*:teaching:service.

\*Research here more expansive than some current interpretations and is inclusive of both traditional and non-traditional forms of scholarship, including creativity in the arts and creative professional activities (e.g., professional innovation/creative excellence; exemplary professional practice; contributions to the development of professional practices). See <http://www.ecf.toronto.edu/apsc/research/framework/achievement.html> for an example of University of Toronto divisional guidelines on CPA.

All faculty would be governed by the same basic terms and conditions and the same procedures and criteria for promotion and tenure would be fairly and equitably applied to all.

All faculty would have available to them the titles and ranks of “Assistant/Associate/Full Professor”.

Standards for promotion and tenure would be modeled after the conventional professoriate, with slight variations.

For conventional professors and professional professors (1& 3 above), excellence in teaching or research (broadly defined) and competence in the other would be required. Also, there would be a need for “promise of future intellectual and professional development.”

For the teaching-intensive professoriate (2 above), excellence in teaching would be required as well as for “promise of future intellectual and professional/pedagogical development.”

The research contributions (broadly defined) of conventional professors and professional professors (1& 3 above) would normally be evaluated; in the case of the teaching-intensive professoriate (2 above), faculty may elect to do so.