

## **Peggy CONKLIN**

---

**From:** Michael Arnold  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 22, 2020 8:55 PM  
**To:** Peggy CONKLIN; David Noyce; Ian Robertson  
**Subject:** APC: Feedback on Teaching and Research Professor positions

David and Ian:

As requested in the February APC meeting, I solicited feedback from APC members with strong feelings about the Teaching and Research Professor positions. Below is a summary of feedback I received. Please let me know if I can do anything else regarding this issue.

All who responded with strong feelings were in favor of adopting both positions.

### **Strong comments about Research Professor title:**

A) The expectations of research professors as a research advisor (to undergraduates, graduate students, and post-docs) should be spelled out at a high level in the draft document. For example, expectations regarding advising should include: maintaining a positive and supportive environment; providing professional training of researchers; etc. (same expectations given to tenure-track professors who advise researchers).

### **Strong comments about Teaching Professor title:**

1) The teaching professor position should NOT replace the lecturer position.

Teaching Professor should have a much higher level of responsibilities to the instructional mission of the college (e.g., emphasis on curricular contributions and innovation, as already nicely explained the draft document) and be setup as a career position – not a temporary (e.g., 1 year) position.

At the same time, lecturers should be given time to do the kind of things that would lead eventually to becoming a Teaching Professor. In this way, the title change would be a reward for doing these duties.

2) Teaching Professors should be able to hold grants for teaching purposes and education innovation – and this should be clearly explained in the draft document describing the position. Moreover, if the goal is to recruit and keep the best educators, they should be able to devote time to research (i.e. a certain percentage of their working hours should be devoted to research), they should be able to lead grants on engineering education innovation (i.e. they should have PI status), and, this is related, they should have access to funding (internal and/or external) to perform and disseminate their research, and to build their stature.

3) Service to the teaching mission of the department ought to be at least as valued (if not more valued) than scholarly publication in journals related to engineering education. Teaching staff who run large senior design programs, deal with ABET Accreditation, advise large student organizations, completely retool old and outdated courses, etc. should warrant promotion to Teaching Professor as they are the ones doing the day in/day out work that drives excellence.

THUS, considering points 2 and 3, there seem to be (at least) two modes by which Teaching Professors are valued in CoE: (i) via education research innovation; (ii) service to teaching mission of departments above and beyond lecturing (e.g., retooling courses, ABET).

### **Other comments on Teaching Professor:**

4) One item that caught by surprise in the Teaching Professor promotion section is the mention of supervising thesis research. Thesis research seems to have a pretty clear technical research component. It was assumed teaching professors would not be able to supervise M.S. or Ph.D. student technical research.

5) Just because faculty have an assistant, associate, full progression doesn't mean that these titles need to be attached to the Teaching Professor as well. Given that Teaching Professors are not eligible for tenure these distinctions seem less important. Perhaps instead of Teaching Professor being a progression within its own title, it should be a promotion for a Lecturer once the lecturer has a majority of responsibilities on the Teaching Professor list. There were many comments related to this from the ME department and some had the general feeling that the requirements for a Teaching Professor ought to be carefully differentiated from the responsibilities of a lecturer and that most lecturers already fulfill most of the items listed in the document for Teaching Professor. Their jobs wouldn't be nearly as interesting if they didn't have those responsibilities and the commensurate expectations.

6) If teaching professors are to be doing teaching, research (in engineering education), and service, shouldn't they be fully-fledged faculty in Engineering Education? On the contrary, if teaching professors are just to be doing teaching and service, there are reservations as to whether this is the best way to attract the best educators (unless there is a significant salary difference with a lecturer who is simply teaching).

7) It would be good to make sure that there are no future difficulties related to obtaining a dual role waiver to perform engineering research during the summer for a Teaching Professor. This is currently very easy for lecturers and needs to be equally easy for Teaching Professors. This would negate the idea that research enhances teaching, which is one of the reasons why students choose to go to places like the UW-Madison rather than non-research institutions. On a more personal level, this would be devastating to several current teaching staff in ME.

8) An alternate teaching title (lecturer?) should be reserved for instructors in the college with a Master's versus PhD degree.

One question: It was not clear if Teaching Professors would still be on 9-months contracts renewed yearly?

Michael S. Arnold  
Professor  
Department of Materials Science and Engineering  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
248 MS&E Building  
1509 University Avenue  
Madison, WI 53706  
Office: (608) 262-3863  
Fax: (608) 262-8353  
email: [michael.arnold@wisc.edu](mailto:michael.arnold@wisc.edu)  
web: <http://homepages.cae.wisc.edu/~arnold/research.html>

On Mon, Mar 2, 2020 at 10:05 PM Michael S. Arnold <[michael.arnold@wisc.edu](mailto:michael.arnold@wisc.edu)> wrote:

APC:

- 1) The APC will not meet Wed. March 18. Enjoy the spring break.
- 2) That does not mean there is not work for you to do! **I need feedback prior to March 11** regarding the possible creation of Professor of Research and Professor of Teaching positions in the CoE. First drafts of guidelines for these positions are attached. We discussed them briefly in the February APC meeting. Now that you have had time to reflect, please let me know if you have strong feelings about any of the following:

*Should the CoE adopt either or both of these positions? Should these complement or replace existing positions in the CoE (such as lecturer)? What major aspects are missing from the guidelines document or should be removed?*

Of course, you are encouraged to discuss with faculty in your department. I will summarize the comments I receive, share them with the APC via email, and share them with the Dean's office – who will use the comments to guide decision making and/or revise the guideline documents.

Regards,

Mike

Michael S. Arnold  
Professor  
Department of Materials Science and Engineering  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
248 MS&E Building  
1509 University Avenue  
Madison, WI 53706  
Office: (608) 262-3863  
Fax: (608) 262-8353  
email: [michael.arnold@wisc.edu](mailto:michael.arnold@wisc.edu)  
web: <http://homepages.cae.wisc.edu/~arnold/research.html>