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Introduction

The numbers of continuing lecturers and their roles in the College have expanded greatly in the last three decades. In the late 1970s they were a small, disparate group of language instructors, laboratory supervisors, and a few isolated individuals teaching in areas in which the University had no special expertise and did not intend to develop it. There was little expectation that lecturers would dedicate themselves to the College, and the College in turn invested little in them.

Today, lecturers do a very significant share of undergraduate teaching in the College, perform a large portion of undergraduate advising, and occupy many vital administrative posts. They have continuing appointments with opportunities for advancement, serve for many years, and are the fiber that binds and gives continuity to many of the University’s essential programs. The high quality of their contributions, as distinct from the number of those contributions, is evident in many ways, most prominently in their numerous awards for outstanding teaching.

This Task Force on the lecturer faculty in Weinberg College was not charged with studying why these changes occurred or with assessing their desirability. With regard to causes, we see many factors at work, but perhaps most important has been the University’s desire to raise its stature as a leading center of research and graduate education, which necessitates giving tenure-track faculty more time to focus on research and professional commitments. Although the tenure-track faculty has increased 25% since 1986, and although enrollments have remained steady during the last two decades, the number of courses taught by the tenure-track faculty has declined. The University’s research faculty have, in fact, been so successful in obtaining grants and research-center memberships that the resulting need for replacement teaching has become predictable, and this predictability has led to the hiring of lecturer faculty. Also contributing to the increase in the numbers of lecturer faculty are the lower teaching loads resulting from the market for research faculty, and the number of course reductions that tenure-track faculty receive as commitments at times of hire and retention.

Expanding the numbers and diversifying the roles of the continuing-lecturer faculty have helped Northwestern become a major national research university, while still maintaining or even improving the quality of instruction and academic services for undergraduates. Determining the extent to which the reduction of undergraduate contact with tenure-track faculty is a lamentable development was beyond the purview of this Task Force, but it is an important question that should be addressed.
One consequence of these developments is rooted in a persistent perception of lecturers as, so to speak, mere fill-in teachers. The most important finding of this Task Force is that too often lecturers are not accorded the respect they deserve as members of the faculty. They are seemingly invisible to far too many members of the tenure-track faculty who have little appreciation of the multiple roles played by lecturers, and do not fully understand their vital contributions to the University’s pedagogical and even, directly and indirectly, its research mission. Department chairs, program directors, and administrators who routinely work with lecturers are somewhat more informed and appreciative, but even their knowledge can be limited and uneven, and they have done little to educate the rest of the faculty about the important roles lecturers now play.

In its faculty of continuing lecturers, the College has assembled a group of expert teachers, advisers, and administrators, who mostly enjoy what they are doing and see themselves as contributing to the quality of an excellent university. They do not see themselves as incidental members of a research faculty, and they share the common desire that their aspirations and accomplishments be recognized. These lecturers hold advanced degrees, spend many years perfecting their craft, and in many cases have noteworthy scholarly credentials. They deserve greater recognition and support for their outstanding work, and need to be viewed as valuable and integral members of a distinguished professoriate.

Lecturers are often not well integrated into the overall faculty. Despite their confidence in the quality of their achievements, many feel insecure professionally, underappreciated, and underpaid. Tenure-track faculty and administrators often refer to themselves as “regular faculty,” leaving the impression that lecturers are somehow “irregular.” While our sense is that the distinction is usually not meant pejoratively, it has the effect of marginalizing lecturers who in many cases have served the College longer than and as devotedly as most “regular faculty.”

Many lecturers do not participate meaningfully in the intellectual, professional, and social life of their departments and are not accorded opportunities to have input into matters regarding curricula and undergraduate teaching. They are often excluded unnecessarily from faculty meetings and other forums that would provide a sense of faculty integration, and they are not usually encouraged to organize symposia or other programs that would showcase their contributions and highlight their value to the larger faculty.

There are important exceptions to these broad generalizations. There are lecturers who feel comfortably interwoven into their departments or programs and who do not view their position as one of inequality. In some areas there is very little distinction between tenure-track faculty and lecturer faculty with respect to governance, departmental service, and citizenship. In these instances, opinions of lecturer faculty are sought out and valued, and lecturers are recognized for their roles in a variety of departmental activities. Some lecturers even actively collaborate with tenure-track faculty in research. The Task Force believes that all lecturers should enjoy this standing, and that the College as a whole would benefit if these exceptional cases became the norm.
Where a culture of insensitivity to lecturers has developed, it can and should be changed. By bringing to light the central roles that lecturers now play in the College’s intellectual and pedagogical activities, the Task Force hopes to create the conditions that lead to a more appreciative environment in which lecturers will be seen to be important professional colleagues. Our recommendations aim to achieve these broad goals, as well as to address the specific issues we were asked to consider, namely: lecturers’ titles, their roles in governance, recognition and support for professional growth and scholarly activities, compensation, teaching loads, reappointment and promotion, spousal and partner hiring, and diversity.

The Task Force collected information and sought opinions from many sources. We prepared and distributed surveys to three groups: chairs and program directors, the tenure-track faculty, and the lecturer faculty. We not only invited written responses to these surveys but also encouraged personal contacts with Task Force members. We met in free and open discussion with many individuals and groups, including lecturers from the three divisions of the College, lecturers from particular departments and programs, the college advisers (all of whom are continuing lecturers), department and program chairs, assistant chairs and directors, the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, the Council on Language Instruction, and the Dean of Weinberg College. We reviewed various College and University documents pertaining to lecturer faculty, studied tabulations of teaching activities and awards, and examined summary data on salaries and benefits. Finally, we collected some information on the experiences and policies of other universities in order to weigh the College’s situation in the light of national trends and to see how other institutions are dealing with similar issues.

We begin our report with a demographic and professional profile of the College’s lecturer faculty and of the many contributions they make. The following sections take up each of the specific issues in our charge. Although in each section we will make recommendations, the order in which they appear does not represent a hierarchy of priorities; our recommendations are of equal priority.

**Demographic and Professional Profile of Continuing-Lecturer Faculty**

Currently there are 576 full-time faculty in WCAS; of those, 135 or 30% are members of the lecturer faculty. It is clear that the lecturer faculty are crucial to the teaching mission of the College; its members teach 42% of its courses and 35% of its undergraduate enrollments (specifically, for example, between 40% and 50% of enrollments in Economics, about 50% of enrollments in Biological Sciences). This is a change of great magnitude reflecting the fact that the number of continuing lecturers has increased nearly 165% since 1986. As the following table shows, these lecturers are arrayed across three ranks: lecturers, senior lecturers and college lecturers.
Lecturers in Weinberg College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Lecturer</th>
<th>Number of Lecturers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturers</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Lecturers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lecturer rank, into which most lecturers are hired initially, contains the largest number. Ideally, after several years in rank and with a record of strong teaching evaluations, lecturers are promoted to the ranks first of senior and then college lecturer. Promotions are based on quality of teaching and associated duties rather than length of time in rank.

Lecturer faculty teach in all three divisions – Sciences (I), Social Sciences (II) and Humanities (III) – of the College. As reflected in the table below, most lecturers are in Division III, where a majority of them teach foreign languages.

### Lecturers by Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Number of Lecturers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division I Lecturers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division II Lecturers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III Lecturers</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As currently constituted the lecturer faculty teach a significant number of courses in all three divisions, but they are fully responsible for the teaching of foreign languages at least through the intermediate level in the College.

Women constitute a large majority of lecturer faculty in the College, as the table below shows.

### Lecturers by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the tables below reveal, women constitute the majority of lecturers in the Humanities and Social Sciences, while men constitute a majority in the Sciences. Women are highly concentrated in Division III where they are largely responsible for language teaching; this is the lowest-paying division for lecturers in the College.
### Division I Lecturers by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Senior Lecturer</th>
<th>College Lecturer</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Division II Lecturers by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Senior Lecturer</th>
<th>College Lecturer</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Division III Lecturers by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Senior Lecturer</th>
<th>College Lecturer</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the next table reveals, the degree to which lecturer faculty in the College lack racial diversity is remarkable.

### Lecturers by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pacific Islander</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data show that the overwhelming majority of lecturers in the College are white. The small numbers of Hispanics and Asians are largely concentrated in teaching foreign languages. Until the addition of a new lecturer who will join the faculty next year, African Americans have been unrepresented except for one administrator with the rank of senior lecturer who does not teach.
As the next table shows, two-thirds of the lecturer faculty are concentrated in just eight departments and programs.

### Units of Largest Concentration of Lecturers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th>Senior Lecturers</th>
<th>College Lecturers</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage of all Lecturers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish and Portuguese</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French and Italian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African and Asian Languages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, some lecturers in the College play other roles in addition to teaching. The table below reflects the myriad assignments of lecturers.

### Roles of Lecturers by Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th>Div 1</th>
<th>Div 2</th>
<th>Div 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Lecturers in Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Lecturers Holding Joint Appointments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures Who Teach Only</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Lecturers in administration include those who have administrative assignments in programs, departments, or the College, as well as teaching responsibilities.

** Lecturers may hold joint positions in different departments, faculties (teaching and research), and Northwestern schools, and in the University and other area institutions.

Having established a snapshot of the lecturer faculty, we turn to their professional activities.
Most members of the lecturer faculty teach in the classroom or laboratory, sometimes coordinating multiple sections of a course, frequently teaching large numbers of freshmen and sophomores and thus effectively recruiting majors for their departments. They hold office hours, schedule review sessions, rank placement examinations, advise independent studies and senior theses, and write letters of recommendation. And in addition to their teaching, some lecturers now

- coordinate study-abroad initiatives and field studies
- perform committee and other service in programs, departments, the College, and the University
- attend faculty meetings and vote on College legislation
- serve as administrators in programs, departments, and the College
- hold positions as student advisers
- manage educational facilities
- serve as masters and fellows of residential colleges where they present Firesides and interact with students in other ways
- supervise undergraduate research projects
- advise undergraduate student groups organizing scholarly conferences
- pursue scholarly and creative projects and publish and present their research and creative work
- hold mutually beneficial joint appointments in Northwestern and in institutions outside the University, such as Adler Planetarium and the Chicago Botanic Garden
- assist with advising graduate students

As can be readily seen, lecturers are engaged in numerous pedagogical and administrative tasks that enable the College to pursue its intellectual and administrative mission. More fully to appreciate the “unseen” contributions of lecturers, we take a closer look at lecturers’ work in student advising and administration.

Of the 72 Weinberg faculty teaching advising-linked Freshman Seminars in 2005-06, 33 were members of the lecturer faculty. Freshman advisers spend new-student week with their freshmen and continue to advise them through their freshman year. In the spring quarter of that year, each freshman is assigned to a Weinberg college adviser, who counsels a given cohort of students through graduation. All 12 college advisers are members of the lecturer faculty, with departmental or program appointments. Since they remain with their cohorts of students through the sophomore, junior, and senior year, these members of the continuing-lecturer faculty are deeply literate about nearly every aspect of the undergraduate experience. They advise students regarding majors, travel abroad, graduate school, and employment. Though advisers are trained to direct students to health professionals for help with physical, mental or emotional problems, they are, nonetheless, their students’ first advocates and are friendly faces they can count on. Furthermore, given their experience with students “on the ground,” the advisers have proven invaluable to the Dean’s Office in providing feedback on policies and curricular issues, feedback not otherwise available from any other source.
From the week they arrive on campus, therefore, through the day they graduate, Weinberg students are advised primarily by lecturers who have mastered the bureaucracy, learned the curriculum, and built networks among academic and administrative units across campus, all toward the goal of excellent advising throughout a student’s career. In the current report on the Weinberg advisers program, each adviser was evaluated on a scale modeled on the CTEC 1.0-to-6.0 system. The overwhelming majority of advisers received 5.0 and above. Student comments reflected their satisfaction with the advising system. As one student put it, “Having a college adviser has made my experience at Northwestern infinitely better. She has helped me to find the right study-abroad program and choose some great classes, and encouraged me to apply to things I would never have otherwise even known existed, let alone thought I had a chance of getting. Thanks!”

Twenty-five members of the lecturer faculty hold administrative positions within departments or programs; generally they are either assistant or associate chairs, or assistant or associate directors (currently one lecturer is an acting director of a program and two are the ongoing directors of programs). Additionally, all of these lecturers teach, with teaching responsibilities ranging from one to four courses.

The responsibilities of lecturer-administrators vary among divisions and departments. Many work with graduate students. In a number of departments, for example, they negotiate with The Graduate School to obtain annual funding for students. In some cases they allocate and supervise graduate teaching assistants. Many assistant chairs or directors also work with the registrar to construct and keep track of their unit’s entire schedule of courses. In this capacity they not only assist graduate students who have teaching assignments, but they also are deeply involved with their unit’s undergraduate curriculum and the negotiation of teaching assignments with the tenure-track and continuing-lecturer faculty.

In addition to serving as assistant chairs and assistant directors, increasing numbers of continuing lecturers serve as directors of undergraduate studies (DUS) in their departments and programs. Since many freshmen are advised by lecturers, and since the cohort of college advisers who counsel sophomores, juniors, and seniors are lecturers, the fact that a lecturer may be a DUS raises the possibility that the students majoring in a given department will be formally advised throughout their Northwestern careers by members of the lecturer faculty. Even in the quasi-administrative DUS position, the amount of interaction undergraduates have with lecturers continues to grow.

**Lecturer Titles**

The progression of lecturer titles should be logical and clear to audiences inside and outside the University. A title should convey a lecturer’s rank in a manner that is easy to grasp, and it should embody an appropriate level of respect. Currently the progression of lecturer titles in WCAS is lecturer, senior lecturer, and college lecturer. There is a consensus among Northwestern’s faculty and administrators that the title of college lecturer is neither logical nor clear. It does not convey to internal or external audiences that it re-
fers to the highest rank that a lecturer can achieve at Northwestern. **This Task Force agrees and recommends that the title, College Lecturer, be replaced.**

By polling lecturer and tenure-track faculty, department chairs, and members of the Task Force, we were able to agree on our top recommendation: **Assistant Professor of Instruction in…, Associate Professor of Instruction in…, and Professor of Instruction in…**

Because there was considerably less dissatisfaction with the titles of the other two ranks of lecturers, options that received moderate-to-considerable support included:

- Lecturer, Senior lecturer, Distinguished Senior Lecturer
- Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Professor of Instruction in…
- Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Professor of the Practice of…
- Lecturer, College Lecturer, Senior Lecturer

Should the titles of “Professor of Instruction in…” be adopted, the Task Force does not expect the positions of lecturer and senior lecturer to disappear. Those titles would presumably continue to be used – with the added advantage of greatly increased clarity – to designate short-term, part-time, many adjunct and perhaps certain administrative appointments.

**Governance**

We carefully considered whether there should be a uniform policy determining whether lecturers be allowed to vote in their respective departments. We discovered that faculty governance varies widely across departments. For example, some departments have only one or two lecturers while in others, lecturers may outnumber the tenure-track faculty. It is obvious that these differences generate very different implications pertaining to voting. Additionally, departments differ in terms of voting procedures, cultures, and governance structures. In light of such variation, the Task Force agreed not to make a recommendation for a uniform policy regarding matters of governance and lecturer faculty.

Instead, we thought it would be useful to develop a body of coherent expectations regarding governance that would be strongly encouraged at the departmental level. The guiding principle is that lecturers should either be able to vote on undergraduate curricula and teaching matters or have access to systematic mechanisms through which they have input regarding pedagogically related matters. As one chair noted, “I think that our lecturers have valuable insights about the curriculum and pedagogy at the University, and that these avenues [participation in faculty meetings] should be open to them so that they are included in our community.” Where appropriate, lecturer faculty should be encouraged to attend meetings of unit faculty and be able to provide and share information relevant to their concerns. Department chairs should educate themselves about the concerns and interests of the lecturer faculty and introduce them into departmental decision-making
venues as appropriate. Departments may wish to designate an individual whose job is to routinely bring forth issues and concerns of the lecturer faculty.

Finally, we are pleased that many lecturer faculty are able to vote in College faculty meetings on matters pertaining to undergraduate curricula and teaching. In particular, College policy permits senior and college lecturers who have the PhD or other relevant terminal degree and who have served more than four consecutive years to vote, except on issues concerning policies and procedures for promotion and tenure of tenure-track faculty. We think it is unnecessary to place rank-and-time restrictions on the franchise that prevent some continuing lecturers from voting in this forum. **We recommend that all members of the lecturer faculty be able to vote on undergraduate curricula and undergraduate teaching matters at WCAS faculty meetings.**

**Professional growth and scholarly and artistic activities**

Currently there exists a false dichotomy in Weinberg College’s culture that draws a line between tenure-track faculty on one side, with high-profile scholarly agendas, and the lecturer faculty on the other, with a commitment to teach. In reality a spectrum exists on which the tenure-track faculty members cluster at one end where there is an expectation of an extremely high level of scholarly productivity, but with important teaching responsibilities. Lecturers are clustered at the other end, with teaching as their main contribution and their core interest; but their teaching must be informed by advances in their field. To think about the faculty arrayed across this spectrum helps us recognize that the portfolio of all Weinberg faculty members should include current and advanced knowledge in their scholarly field and a repertoire of pedagogies for teaching that knowledge. Tenure-track faculty members have the important charge of helping to produce that knowledge; lecturers assume a very large percentage of the responsibility, given their numbers, for disseminating that knowledge in the classroom.

Changing the metaphor from “dichotomy” to “spectrum” allows the Weinberg community to acknowledge that a faculty constituted of both tenure-track and lecturer positions is the best arrangement for achieving dual and potentially conflicting ambitions of the College and Northwestern: to attract and retain tenure-track faculty members of the first rank and to attract and retain stellar undergraduates. In order for Northwestern to compete effectively as a top research university, given fiscal constraints, it must deploy resources strategically. This results in leaving crucial areas of a first-rate undergraduate curriculum uncovered by the tenure-track faculty; in Weinberg College these curricular gaps are filled by lecturer faculty.

In rethinking how to judge the importance of scholarship to the lecturer faculty’s teaching mission, this Task Force identified as most important those scholarly activities with a pedagogical component. Many of our lecturers are nationally recognized scholars of pedagogy in their field. In the languages, for example, substantial numbers of lecturers contribute to innovations in language instruction here and nationally. In laboratories, lecturer faculty develop innovative experiments and techniques, and in art studios, all lecturers
are practicing artists. As the number of lecturer faculty performing administrative jobs in programs and departments increases, so does their interest and expertise in curricular matters, always the place where scholarship meets pedagogy. The College should make adequate resources available for producing articles, books, teaching technologies, and conferences with a particular focus on pedagogy.

In addition to lecturer faculty engaged in scholarship with an emphasis on pedagogy, a number pursue research without a direct pedagogical component. Again, we think it useful to place these two pursuits along a spectrum, not opposed to each other, because all scholarly activity has implications for teaching. In addition, lecturer scholarly output is enhanced because among the lecturer faculty are a number of spousal and partner hires who often come to Northwestern directly from graduate school or from a previous tenure-track position, and who maintain their research portfolio within the constraints of the lecturer position.

In making recommendations to support the scholarly and artistic efforts of the lecturer faculty, therefore, the Task Force recommends giving priority to those efforts with a clear and demonstrable pedagogical component, while leaving open the possibility of support for other, less directly pedagogical projects as resources allow.

The Task Force recommends a number of reforms to help lecturer faculty maintain their high teaching standards in an environment that makes them feel rewarded for their prodigious efforts. These recommendations concern resources for scholarly activities, the way in which such activities are acknowledged, and the leave policy.

Resources. Currently there are resources available to lecturer faculty: course enhancement funds; freshman-adviser research accounts; small grants from the Council on Language Instruction; University research grants; subvention grants; grants from the Center for Interdisciplinary Research in the Arts; grants from the Searle Center for Teaching Excellence; research assistantships from the Residential Colleges; and funds from the Alumnae of Northwestern. Some of these are resources for teaching initiatives, some for scholarly pursuits.

However, resources available to lecturer faculty can be enhanced in two ways. First, knowledge of these resources needs to be disseminated among lecturers more widely and effectively. This responsibility should be shared by the Dean’s Office, department chairs, and program directors. In the conclusion of this report we recommend an orientation program for new lecturer faculty; contact information for all these sources of funding should be provided at that orientation. Additionally, all departments and programs should make sure that lecturers are included in all listservs used to alert faculty to opportunities on campus and beyond.

The second improvement concerns increasing available funds. Currently lecturers can apply for Hewlett funds for large costly teaching initiatives, and to the University Research Grants committee for funding at a relatively high level. Less available to lecturers is a source of funding for opportunities that arise in the course of the year, a place to
which they can apply for smaller funds with a fast turnaround. In the languages, the Council on Language Instruction (CLI) has a fund of $5000 to cover the needs of sixty language instructors. Lecturers in other fields may secure limited funds from their departments or programs. A very limited amount of funding is currently available in the Dean’s Office. We recommend increasing the CLI fund to $20,000 so that it can adequately cover the scholarly needs of language instructors. These funds would be accessed through a competitive process where initiatives are funded based on merit. We also recommend that the Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies and the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Academic Affairs collaborate to identify funds and establish a procedure by which lecturer faculty can apply competitively for support of scholarly projects. Again, the highest priority would be projects that have a pedagogical component, but this fund would differ from the Hewlett Fund for Curricular Innovation because the projects could be used to enhance lecturers’ professional or scholarly development as well. Potential requests could include funds to participate in conferences, to buy research or artistic materials or software, and to cover costs of faculty collaboration across institutions.

Finally, we note that among all the opportunities for support for which lecturer faculty are eligible, they are ineligible to apply for Humanities Center Fellowships. As the Humanities Center metamorphoses into the Humanities Institute, with a significant infusion of funds, this is a propitious time to examine that exclusion and to keep the lecturer faculty in mind as new initiatives develop.

Factoring scholarly efforts into evaluations of lecturer faculty members. Lecturers are hired to teach and are expected to be excellent teachers. In being considered for salary increases and promotions, therefore, a lecturer’s teaching, in all its manifestations (in the classroom or lab or studio, as director of theses or independent studies, as field studies advisers, etc.) is the single most important criterion for retention and advancement. Thus, lecturers should be encouraged by their departments or programs and the Dean’s Office to participate in their field beyond Northwestern, especially focusing on pedagogical projects that combine scholarship and teaching innovations. While such efforts will enhance a lecturer’s vita supplement, they will not compensate for inadequate teaching. Conversely, a lecturer who meets the highest standards of teaching will not be penalized for not producing scholarly work.

Leave policy. Currently the leave policy allows lecturers to apply for a quarter of leave every eight years. Our first recommendation is that this policy be better advertised. This policy should be covered during the orientation session for incoming lecturer faculty. Department chairs and program directors should be more aware of this policy, and bring it to the attention of their lecturers in a timely fashion. The Task Force does not put forth a specific recommendation about decreasing the number of years before which a lecturer can apply for leave, though we discussed the issue at length. We do recommend, however, that the Dean’s Office examine the current policy and determine whether it is consistent with sustaining the best teachers over the long-term.
Promotion Evaluations

Promotion evaluations of the lecturer faculty should occur more frequently and systematically. Currently, according to the WCAS Chair's Handbook, “General guidelines for promotion dictate that candidates shall be full-time members of the Northwestern faculty in a given rank for at least six years, although exceptions may be made in special cases. Should a lecturer be recommended for promotion and fail to be promoted, no rule or expectation holds that he or she shall leave the faculty. A lecturer who is not promoted in a given year may be recommended again after a suitable time.” Our findings indicate that these guidelines have led to a very uneven practice of such promotions across the College, with some departments regularly considering their lecturers for promotion while others do so haphazardly and infrequently. The net result is that 49% of the WCAS lecturers currently hold the rank of lecturer, 36% are senior lecturers, and 15% are college lecturers. In comparison, among the WCAS tenure-track faculty (where the timeline of the promotion from assistant to associate professor is clear and uniform across the College), 21% hold the rank of assistant professor, 21% are associate professors, and 58% are professors. Currently 22 lecturers have been in the lecturer rank between six and 28 years; 34 senior lecturers have been in rank over the same time period. Since the most significant salary increases are typically tied to promotion steps, the current lack of uniformity in lecturer promotions across the College contributes to salary inequities felt keenly by a significant fraction of the lecturers.

We recommend that all full-time continuing lecturers at the rank of lecturer be considered by their departments for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer by their sixth year of service. We believe that the resulting consistent pattern of lecturer promotion considerations will improve lecturer performance and morale and help reduce current salary inequities. Those lecturers not recommended for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer by their department or the College at the time of their sixth-year review can continue to serve on the faculty as lecturers and be reconsidered for promotion at a later time. For these individuals, this initial review should provide suggestions for improvement on which they could build for success at their next review. In the case of the promotion of senior lecturers to the rank of college lecturer, there should be no explicit timeline. Yet we urge departments to stay abreast of the performance of senior lecturers and to conduct timely promotion reviews for them as well. The primary criterion for promotion of lecturers should remain superior performance as a teacher and/or adviser and/or administrator, not time served.

Reappointment Procedures

Having stable positions to which continuing lecturers are regularly reappointed is highly preferable for both administrative efficiency and quality control. Stable positions help to insure continuity in curriculum, student advising, and faculty/student interactions. They also help to provide lecturers with the security they need to pursue their work without constant employment worries. Some departments, such as the languages, would find it difficult to survive without lecturers, and those lecturers should be given multiple-year
contracts that reflect an ongoing commitment. From the lecturer's perspective, it is cer-
tain that appointment security and stability rank high in the position's attractiveness. The
College would not be able to attract talented lecturers if there were not an expectation of
continued employment.

The Task Force recommends that quality of teaching and ability to fulfill teaching
needs not covered by tenure-track faculty should be the criteria for reappointing
lecturers. Formal written evaluation of need and performance – for forwarding to the
Dean’s Office – may take place at any time. The Task Force suggests that, minimally,
performance evaluation of faculty at the rank of lecturer should take place every two
years, at the rank of senior lecturer every three years, and at the rank of college lecturer
every five years.

To enhance stability in the lecturer ranks, we recommend that many multiple-year
contracts be made rolling appointments, rather than the current contiguous
appointments. Instead of reappointing a senior lecturer every two years to a new two-
year term, for example, this lecturer would be reappointed each year to a new two-year
term. The Task Force suggests that appointments at the rank of senior lecturer typically
be for two or three years and be renewed annually, and that appointments at the rank of
college lecturer be for three or more years and be renewed annually. These evaluations
should include an examination of the quality of the faculty member’s performance of
program or department responsibilities in addition to teaching.

Salaries and Retirement Benefits

Salaries. As noted earlier, many lecturers feel underpaid for the amount of time and
effort they devote to their jobs. Several chairs said that in their opinion lecturers in their
departments are underpaid. While respondents acknowledged having little hard informa-
tion, some surmised that over the years the salary gap between tenure-track and lecturer
faculty has been widening – which may be the case or may be a misperception: the Am-
erican Association of University Professors reports that university-wide lecturer salaries
at private independent doctoral institutions have not changed much relative to those of
assistant professors over the last five years, averaging about 75 percent of assistant pro-
fessor salaries. But, then, for reasons noted below, AAUP figures must be used with
caution.

The average nine-month salary rates of the 123 continuing lecturers in 2005-06 who have
teaching responsibilities and who are almost all full-time and fully paid by WCAS are
shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All lecturers</td>
<td>$48,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division I</td>
<td>56,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division II</td>
<td>57,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III</td>
<td>42,993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lecturers  43,096  
Senior lecturers  49,724  
College lecturers  60,355

Owing to differences in types of positions and appointments, it is difficult to match these figures precisely with other data. The AAUP publishes average salary data for a rank entitled “Lecturer,” which may correspond approximately to the aggregate of the College’s three ranks. Its reported average for 2005-06 for all doctoral institutions is $48,507, about the same as the current average for all Weinberg lecturers. (The AAUP figure presumably averages the salaries of lecturers across the university, and so will include those in law, management, medicine, etc). The AAUP’s average for lecturers at private-independent (not church-affiliated) doctoral institutions in 2005-06 was $55,278 (as above, this figure presumably averages all of a university’s lecturers’ salaries). By this reckoning, the average in the College is about 12 percent below university-wide figures at similar institutions. Such figures, however, are vulnerable to definitional inconsistencies, biases associated with self-reporting, local cost-of-living differences, and other factors that affect specific market conditions.

The average lecturer salary in Division III is about 25 percent below those in Divisions I and II, which are roughly the same. The pattern is similar to that observed in the 2005-06 median salaries of Division III assistant professors in the College. The lower average in Division III evidently reflects national differences in demand-and-supply conditions. However, the shortfall for Division III assistant professors is about 10 percent whereas the shortfall for Division III lecturers is about 25 percent. The average lecturer salary in Divisions I and II is about 85 percent of the median salary of assistant professors in those divisions; Division III lecturers average about 72 percent of the median of assistant professors in that Division. Of course, the differences in salaries between the lowest and highest divisions would be captured even more starkly were salary ranges used, given that averages do not capture the wide variation in lecturer salaries across disciplines and ranks.

Accurate comparative data for lecturer salaries by rank are scarce. This is true in part because salaries are mainly determined by the local market, and the ranges observed reflect differences in what the University must offer to attract and retain faculty in various fields. It could be argued that the observed salary differences are satisfactory, since lecturers and the University mutually agreed to them, and turnover is relatively low.

Yet it was clear to various respondents to the Task Force’s surveys of chairs, tenure-track faculty, and lecturers, to lecturers and others who appeared before the Task Force, and to members of the Task Force itself that some salaries are unacceptably low. Indeed, what may appear to be acceptable salary rates established by pure market conditions can be grossly misleading. Lecturers with relatively low salaries in Division III, for example, argued that because of economic need, they were forced during the academic year to teach overload courses in WCAS, teach evenings, or hold part- or full-time positions
elsewhere. There seems little doubt that for some lecturers the perception of under-compensation contributes to their sense of relative alienation.

This perception is not determinate, however, since the quality of instruction provided by most lecturers in all three divisions is relatively high. And while a noticeable employee turnover might be expected if salaries were markedly low, the lecturer faculty as a whole remains a relatively stable group. Indeed, a significant number are over age 55 and have served at least 15 consecutive years at Northwestern.

Without positing definitive conclusions, the Task Force considered possible ways of addressing this situation of market-driven but unacceptably low salaries.

- It was suggested, for example, that the market might be redefined and the case made that a logical salary level at which to aim would be that of a tenure-track assistant professor at a very good liberal-arts college where first-rate teaching is valued and faculty members are not pressured to publish. A department might recommend to the administration that salaries be offered and maintained at that rate.

- The Task Force recommends that the current trend of making appointments to the lecturer faculty chiefly on the basis of national searches be strengthened, one aim being to increase the diversity of the lecturer faculty, another possibly to shed light on issues of compensation.

- Senior lecturers are paid on average 15 percent more than lecturers, and college lecturers receive 40 percent more than lecturers. Obviously, lecturers’ salaries benefit greatly from promotion, and the average salary for all lecturers would rise significantly if more were in the higher ranks. At present, 49 percent of lecturers are in the lowest rank. By contrast, 21 percent of tenure-track faculty are in the rank of assistant professor. The relatively low number of lecturer promotions seems inconsistent with the length and quality of their service, and as is noted above, the Task Force recommends, as one strategy to improve salaries, that promotion procedures be revised to assure more timely consideration of candidates.

- For tenure-track faculty, major salary increases typically occur at times of promotion or receipt of an outside offer or major external award. Lecturer faculty do not appear to have a well-established timetable for promotion, nor, in some departments, do they seem to have strong advocates for their advancement. They are expected to devote themselves to teaching, not to earning external recognition. Annual increases for many lecturers in rank appear to have been modest, and promotion to a higher rank requires initiative from a chair or program director herself who may be overcommitted. It may be that the salaries of some lecturers reflect an inertia that stalls the initiation of promotion reviews. As just noted, one way to increase the average lecturer salary is through promotion. And one part of this process must be department chairs who are alert to prospects and possibilities.
The Task Force recommends that when the Provost and the Dean hold discussions acquainting new chairs with their responsibilities, the chairs be alerted to the interests of the lecturer faculty in many areas but particularly with respect to promotion and compensation.

- The Task Force considered whether the annual salary-setting process might be biased against lecturer faculty. Thus, a chair given a total dollar increment to be allocated to all ongoing faculty may diminish lecturers’ increments as a way of responding to pressures to retain tenure-track colleagues. We weighed recommending that departments receive separate increment allocations for tenure-track and lecturer faculty, with possibly different percentage increases for each. Yet in that arrangement a chair might be given a smaller percentage increase for lecturers than she might unilaterally have allocated to lecturers from a single pool. Moreover, any two-pool allocations that were unequal could easily become a source of controversy. Additionally, the Task Force concluded that two pools could restrict the current flexibility of chairs. If in making salary recommendations chairs and administrators can be made more sensitive to the contributions and needs of lecturer faculty – a major goal of this report – members of the Task Force believe that the current single-pool arrangement is preferable.

Whether any of the strategies above are attractive, the salaries of some lecturers, especially in Division III, remain for the Task Force a cause for concern. If the differential between assistant professor salaries in Division III and those in Divisions I and II is taken as a rough indicator of differences in market conditions, it can be argued that lecturer salaries in Division III should on average be about $8000 higher. Reasonable reservations may obtain about citing specific dollar differentials in relation to the local market conditions, but the Task Force strongly recommends that salaries for relatively low-paid lecturers in Division III receive a targeted increase from the Dean followed by special attention over the next few years. Program directors, department chairs, and College administrators need continuously to be aware of any salary that seems out of line with the contributions of a lecturer faculty member.

For some time now the Provost’s Office has had a policy of publishing summary information on the salaries of tenure-track faculty by school and rank. The Task Force recommends that, given the size and importance of the continuing-lecturer faculty, information on their salaries now be included in the annual report. We are confident that if these measure(s) we have recommended are implemented, lecturers will be more adequately compensated for their important contributions.

Benefits: retirement contributions. All groups with whom the Task Force met were emphatic that members of the continuing-lecturer faculty at the rank of lecturer be eligible for Plan A retirement contributions. Tenure-track faculty are eligible for this plan wherein they contribute 5 percent of their salary and the University makes a 10 percent contribution. Lecturers who have been promoted to the rank of senior or college lecturer are eligible for Plan A, but continuing Northwestern faculty members at the rank of lec-
turer are offered the less generous Plan B, designed for staff and part-time faculty, in which contributions depend on age, according to the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 24</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>No match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-39</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only those faculty members at the rank of lecturer who are age 50 and over are eligible for the retirement contributions accorded tenure-track faculty (including entry-level assistant professors, college fellows, and instructors who do not yet have the PhD); research faculty with professorial rank; professional librarians (MLS degree); visiting assistant, associate, and full professors; and senior and college lecturers.

Survey data and meetings conducted by the Task Force made it apparent that lecturers are aware of the difference between the plans, and that it affects their job satisfaction. Plan B can be an impediment to hiring and retaining top-quality lecturers, and grouping lecturers with staff and part-time faculty seems incongruous with their central role as classroom faculty and mentors to our undergraduates.

**The Task Force recommends that Plan A be made available to the continuing-lecturer faculty regardless of rank, that is, to all lecturer faculty whose Northwestern appointments – subject to curricular need, available resources, and job performance – are ongoing.** The cost of extending Plan A to lecturers depends on the age distribution of the group and on their salaries. At present, we have no full-time continuing lecturers under the age of 24. There are 25 such lecturers in the 24-39 age group and 13 in the 40-49 age group. Assuming the average annual lecturer salary of $43,096 for each of these faculty, we estimate that the cost to the University of extending Plan A eligibility to them would be about $95,000 annually. The Task Force believes that the benefits of this change would far outweigh its cost.

**Benefits: phased retirement.** The University’s Faculty Handbook cites two reasons for responding to tenure-track faculty who are interested in a plan for phasing in their retirement: the faculty member’s judgment about what is best for him or her personally, and the University’s responsibility to maintain superior programs of teaching and research. In particular, the University must be able to plan ahead in faculty hiring. These reasons apply as well in the case of lecturer-faculty members.

**The Task Force recommends that lecturers who meet the same eligibility requirements criteria as those met by tenure-track faculty – being 55 years or older, having served 15 or more consecutive years at Northwestern – have the same options available to them, namely, the opportunity to make an agreement with the Dean that the**
A faculty member will retire following two or three years of half-time teaching, during which years the faculty member will receive 60% of salary, retain the ability to purchase medical insurance at the rate for full-time faculty members, and be able to supplement reduced income by withdrawals from retirement accounts.

Currently, 37 members of the lecturer faculty are 55 years of age or over. Of that number, 25 have been full-time Northwestern faculty members for 15 or more consecutive years.

Teaching Loads, Course Overloads, and Course Reductions

Teaching loads. The standard teaching load for a full-time lecturer is six courses per year, typically two each quarter, except in the language departments, where it is nine courses per year, typically three language sections each quarter. The larger nine-course assignment for foreign-language lecturers is meant to result in a comparable workload, because class sizes are small (normally 15 students), and duplicate classes limit the number of preparations in a given quarter, year, or span of years.

Some foreign-language lecturers argue that the time requirements of teaching a language class may be larger than those of a literature class, or of a typical class in other areas of instruction, and suggest a reduction in the annual nine-section load. A recent survey of foreign-language lecturers by the College’s Council on Language Instruction found that language classes typically meet half an hour more per week than literature classes and average two additional hours of preparation. But the study’s scope was limited and estimates are rough, and tenure-track faculty have heavy research and service demands. The Task Force regards this as an important issue, however, not only of fairness to foreign-language lecturers, but also of assurance of high-quality instruction. We found that similar differences exist in teaching loads among lecturers at other universities, and we hope that our recommended improvement in salaries of foreign-language lecturers will create a more agreeable balance between workloads and rewards.

Overloads. If enrollments are unexpectedly high or if a lecturer who has been assigned a course with a suitable enrollment is not able to teach it, a program or department may, with the agreement of the College, invite a colleague to teach an overload. Outside of the language departments and programs, this is a relatively straightforward procedure; the circumstances vary only in detail and the instances are few.

In the language departments, enrollment fluctuations are greater. One model for dealing with these (which ignores the matter of overloads per se) is for a department to maintain a short list of competent people in the community who are very good teachers and can step in on short notice as adjunct lecturers. If a department can identify two or three such individuals and employ them on a regular basis – rather than hiring only full-time lecturers – it is much easier to address increases or decreases in enrollment. As a rule, however, the language departments tend to hire full-time lecturers and, when enrollments rise unexpectedly, to ask them to teach overload courses.
In some instances, the need of a department or program for overloads becomes predictable, and in a context in which full-time lecturers’ salaries are perceived to be inadequate, lecturers may come to rely on overload stipends. In some cases lecturers compete to teach overload classes in order to improve their earnings. The situation is further complicated when a department or program has an internal rule that a lecturer who receives a course reduction for being a language coordinator is ineligible to teach an overload. Such lecturers may believe that the responsibilities they have as coordinator are equivalent to teaching a course, and in their view they may need the additional income as much as lecturers who are not coordinators. While it may appear unwise for a faculty member both to have a course reduction and to teach an overload, this arrangement may be legitimate if coordinators have duties and responsibilities that are equivalent to those they would have with a normal teaching load.

The Task Force recommends that salaries receive attention such that they rise to a range in which the economic need for lecturers to increase income that prompts the desire to teach overloads at Northwestern or accept heavy additional teaching elsewhere during the nine-month academic year will be minimized. The quality of teaching offered Northwestern students must remain superlative. It should not be threatened or compromised by overload teaching or teaching elsewhere.

The Task Force recommends, moreover, that in language departments and programs with increasing numbers of enrollments, hiring should be adjusted to keep up with demand, so that students are taught by lecturers who are teaching the commonly established full-time load of nine sections and not more.

*Teaching Reductions.* Lecturers’ teaching loads can be reduced for a variety of reasons. They may take leaves of absence from normal duties for illness, personal reasons, or research. Research leave, typically related to teaching, is usually for one paid quarter in eight years. The College may top up a lecturer’s salary if the lecturer wins a prestigious research grant that does not pay the lecturer’s full salary, so that the lecturer can take two or three quarters of leave.

A lecturer may have a reduced teaching load for service to a department or program in the College, often with one of these titles:

- associate chair for department administration
- assistant chair
- director, associate director, or assistant director of a program
- director of undergraduate studies in a department or program
- associate director of undergraduate studies in a department
- study-abroad coordinator
- language coordinator

A course reduction for such service, by arrangement with the College, might be one course from a teaching load of six courses, with larger or smaller workloads requiring
flexibility in determining appropriate reductions. For doing equivalent work, lecturers on nine-course loads should be compensated equivalently, that is, with 1.5-course reductions — one course in one year, two courses in the next. Language coordinators are compensated by means of one-course or multiple-course reductions from a nine-course load.

By prior agreement with the Dean’s Office, the assigned course load of a lecturer who teaches very large numbers of students per course in several courses, and manages numbers of teaching assistants, may be reduced by a course. Additionally, in a small number of cases, continuing lecturers have agreements for reduced teaching that permit them to pursue their research. The Task Force recognizes that occasionally such arrangements may be in the best interest of the College and University but urges nonetheless that they remain truly exceptional.

In recent years in the language departments, there has been an increase in the number of lecturers appointed to the administrative post of language coordinator, resulting in one- or multiple-course reductions from a nine-course load. The aim is to generate efficient and competently managed processes in which placement examinations are carefully constructed, given, marked, and ranked; syllabi are carefully designed; issues of enrollment (adding or dropping section, adding or dropping enrollments) are handled promptly; texts are carefully chosen; all of the sections of a given course are kept to the same calendar; etc. Efficiency and quality of instruction are improved by assigning such tasks to one person, and many instructors are relieved of administrative tasks, thus permitting their fuller concentration on teaching. This arrangement seems especially appropriate for language programs with large and growing enrollments, multiple sections of the same courses, newly arriving lecturers who need to learn local mores, and (in some departments) teaching assistants who need training.

The Task Force recommends that departments, in consultation with the Dean, appoint language coordinators only when there is a demonstrable need, and when their work as coordinators will be fully equivalent in effort and value to the teaching that will not be done as a consequence of the teaching reductions. All duties of language coordinators and teachers should be spelled out in writing. When there is a clear equivalence, the Task Force sees no reason why a language coordinator should be denied the opportunity of teaching an overload if the same opportunity is available to non-coordinator colleagues. If the work of a coordinator is less than the work of teaching the course, however, the reduction should not be granted or when the need exists, should be combined with other duties that produce equivalency.

More generally, in the context of teaching reductions and salary rates, the Task Force recommends that all chairs and program directors, in consultation with the Dean, examine their departmental accounting procedures to determine the equivalency between teaching reductions and the service or administrative duties for which they were originally granted. A lack of equivalency could mean that fewer faculty are actually needed to achieve the required amount of teaching.
In terms of lecturer faculty in particular, it is possible that in some units the granting of teaching reductions and overloads may have evolved as an attempt to compensate for low salaries. This, however, is not an acceptable strategy for addressing faculty salaries. Therefore, it may be that some course reductions for lecturers are not equivalent to the service or administrative duties for which they were initially granted. In such instances, the Task Force recommends that the number of lecturers in the College be reduced correspondingly, and that first consideration be given to using any such reductions to address salary inequities among lecturers.

Teaching Awards

Teaching awards are especially important for lecturers because they honor the primary teaching duties for which lecturers are hired. Currently, according to the WCAS website, "Each year the College selects three members of the ordinary faculty to receive Distinguished Teaching Awards… A fourth Distinguished Teaching Award, the Arts and Sciences Alumni Teaching Award, is reserved for members of the lecturer faculty.” All of the faculty awards come with a $2500 stipend, except for the award given to the most senior tenure-track faculty member in a given year, who receives a $3000 stipend. All Weinberg awards are one-time; there are no terms to serve. Given that lecturers teach 42% of the WCAS undergraduate courses and 35% of the WCAS undergraduate enrollment, we recommend that at least one additional WCAS Distinguished Teaching Award be established and awarded annually to lecturers.

In the case of the University-wide McCormick teaching awards, the WCAS website states, "In 2005-06, the University will select at least four new McCormick Professors. The term of each award is three years. Each McCormick Professor receives a salary supplement of $7000 and a professional development fund of $3000 annually… One McCormick Distinguished Lectureship / Clinical Professorship will be awarded in 2005-06 to recognize outstanding instruction by a member of the Lecturer faculty… The term of the award is one year and it carries a salary supplement of $5000.” In our survey of lecturers, several raised the issue of teaching awards with particular concerns regarding disparities in the number, term, and compensation of the McCormick Awards between tenure-track and lecturer faculty. One lecturer stated "this class discrimination is damaging to morale… Lecturers are concerned that teaching awards are more routinely given to tenure-track faculty, in order to honor those prestigious researchers who are also excellent teachers. This leaves little room for recognition for lecturers, who are expected to be excellent teachers.” Another added, "recognition of teaching excellence should be blind to the length of one's job security. Our students usually see no difference between the titles of lecturers and professors; the University shouldn't either where teaching is concerned.” These distinctions work against the integration of tenure-track and lecturer faculty and exacerbate the pejorative view that lecturers are not real faculty. We urge the College to work with the University to eliminate the current inequities in the awarding of Northwestern's most prestigious teaching honor to tenure-track and lecturer faculty.
Finally, Weinberg has increased its number of awards to include an award for best research mentorship and one for community building, for which lecturer faculty are eligible. The Task Force recommends that the College continue to think of additional ways to provide public recognition for outstanding teaching. In particular, lecturer faculty direct senior theses, supervise independent studies, and mentor many of the growing number of students receiving grants to conduct research over the summer, without recompense. Given the mandates of The Higher Order of Excellence II, these areas of independent work by students will continue to grow. They are labor-intensive (each student requires her or his own faculty adviser in all three examples), and public recognition of the lecturer faculty’s participation will help keep members engaged in this critical growth area in Weinberg’s curriculum.

Spousal and Partner Hiring

Growing numbers of qualified, experienced, gifted, and devoted lecturers have come to Northwestern through arrangements for hiring or retaining tenure-track faculty. This phenomenon reflects the fact that hiring dual-career couples has become an inescapable feature of academic life nationally. Indeed, spouses and partners of University employees now make up 15% of the WCAS lecturer faculty. The question is not whether to engage in spousal and partner hiring but how best to practice it.

Northwestern’s experience indicates that care in managing partner hiring reaps important benefits for undergraduate education. Our strategy has protected many important goals, including teaching quality, faculty stability, salaries, and departmental hiring plans. We believe that such hiring should continue to be used cautiously in tenure-track recruitment and retention cases. The Task Force’s role here, then, is less to make recommendations than to articulate the (sometimes implicit) guiding principles and cautions that have made our practices successful to date.

Suggested guidelines. First, the central criterion for hiring a partner into a lecturer position is quality of teaching. Such appointees must be very good teachers. A partner hire should be employed only when a case can be made that the College is hiring a stellar couple.

Second, departmental hiring plans must be protected. When departments are asked to take a full-time partner lecturer into a newly-created position, the presence of this lecturer should not later become an argument against replacing another retiring or departing lecturer (or other faculty member), since the partner hire—even if excellent—may not have been the one the department would have made if it had been authorized to conduct a search in the field of its choice. Thus, ideally, partners who receive lecturer-faculty offers as part of hiring or retention packages for tenure-track faculty members should be hired into newly created positions rather than existing lecturer lines. The latter should be filled through competitive national searches. Partners should be encouraged to apply for existing lecturer-faculty lines when they open, but there should be no presumption that partners will be preferred over other candidates.
Third, partner lecturers should normally be evaluated, renewed, and promoted according to the same procedures and standards as other lecturers, although it might be necessary to offer somewhat longer initial contracts in order to make the positions attractive. The Task Force considered whether partners might be hired into limited-term rather than renewable lectureships to encourage them to enter subsequent national searches for permanent positions at Northwestern or other area institution, but the lack of stability implied in such an arrangement could be unattractive to the couples we seek to recruit. We believe that renewable contracts are more effective.

One of the goals of this report is to highlight trends and structures that have been operating unexamined. In that spirit, we mention three concerns that should be kept in mind when partner hires are contemplated.

**Diversity and partner hires.** The practice of partner hiring exists in potential tension with the goal of faculty diversification (on which, see below). In the past, routine procedures have led to the hiring of overwhelmingly white and disproportionately female numbers of lecturers. But as academia diversifies, well-executed partner hiring may increase the diversity of the lecturer faculty. Thus partner hires should also be seen as possible opportunities to increase diversification.

**Field.** The Task Force is aware that hiring both partners in the same department can introduce unintended complications. We make no firm recommendation other than to caution deans and department chairs to be aware of the potential risks and benefits. Seen from one perspective, for example, forbidding the hiring of a partner lecturer in the same department as his or her tenure-track partner smacks of the old anti-nepotism regulations. Seen from another, the same guideline might somewhat reduce the awkwardness of discontinuing the employment of a partner because of substandard performance.

**The impact on the College’s budget of hiring spouses and partners.** Unless the central administration responds to the burgeoning pressure for partner hires with additional funding, each new such position stretches the WCAS salary pool to cover additional faculty members who – although they may be excellent teachers offering unique learning experiences for undergraduate students – may not fulfill essential teaching or administrative needs. Thus, partner hires may encourage the College to spend limited funds on marginal teaching needs at the expense of the existing tenure-track and continuing-lecturer faculty and perhaps even of standard course offerings. Again, we make no specific recommendations, but we recommend care in implementation.

**Diversity among the Lecturer Faculty**

At the outset, this Task Force discovered that there were no African American lecturers, and that the few Hispanic and Asian lecturers are concentrated largely in foreign languages. We recognize that the concept of a continuing-lecturer faculty as a corporate unit is a relatively recent development, and we believe that the lack of diversity came about
largely because it proceeded undiagnosed. Consequently, the diversification of the lec-
turer faculty has never been a goal of the College, or of its departments and programs.

This obvious lack of racial and ethnic diversity among the lecturer faculty is incongruent
with Northwestern’s goal of faculty diversification. Given the strong relationship bet-
ween diversity and academic excellence and the fact that lecturers are in many respects
the face of the University for many undergraduates, recruiting a diverse lecturer faculty
must become a priority. This Task Force thus finds the current situation intolerable and
in need of urgent change.

We are optimistic about the possibility of success in this venture. It is true that there are
historical barriers to the diversification of the lecturer faculty. Minority PhDs have been
fewer in comparison with white PhDs and may have benefited from (appropriate) efforts
of universities nationwide to diversify their tenure-track faculties, making it harder in the
short term to attract minority lecturer faculty. In addition, spouse-and-partner hires and
retentions have typically increased the numbers of whites and females in the lecturer fac-
tulty rather than diversifying it. At the same time, the majority of lecturer positions in the
College are attractive and reasonably well remunerated, making it likely that recruitment
of the growing numbers of minority PhDs, both as direct hires and as spouse-or-partner
hires, will become easier.

The Task Force recommends that, above all, efforts to diversify the lecturer faculty
begin immediately. They must include, but not be limited to, the following
strategies:

- Formal adoption of diversification of the lecturer faculty as an explicit goal
  of the College, departments, and programs
- Aggressive recruitment of minority candidates through national searches
  that target institutions and networks where minorities are likely to be
  identified
- Appropriate increase in lecturer status and remuneration in fields or depart-
  ments in which these lag, so that lecture positions are attractive to a wide
  range of candidates
- Hiring of minority candidates when candidates are equally qualified
- Attention to diversity among the factors considered in spousal/partner
  hiring, once teaching ability has been established

The tenure-track faculty is only marginally more diverse than the lecturer faculty. Thus,
in the view of the Task Force – and this is very important – diversification of the lec-
turer faculty must supplement, and not replace, aggressive efforts to diversify the
tenure-track faculty and administration. In addition, we need to realize that for the
foreseeable future, the lecturer faculty will be disproportionately female. For this reason
we should be especially vigilant to ensure that revised contract, benefits, promotions, and
salary standards reflect no subtle gender biases in addition to those lecturers already
suffer.
Conclusions

We began this report with the paramount concern that lecturer faculty in the College are largely invisible to tenure-track faculty, administrators, and the University community. On the basis of numerous interviews with members of these constituencies and of other pertinent data, we conclude that lecturers are too often viewed and treated as second-class citizens whose crucial pedagogical and administrative efforts are not adequately recognized and rewarded. We further learned that many lecturers are not integrated into the larger faculty and are not respected. These outcomes stem from a culture of insensitivity to lecturers that ignores or neglects them rather than granting lecturers the status and rewards befitting faculty members at Northwestern University.

This Task Force recommends that actions be taken to immediately address this culture and begin the journey towards its elimination. We advocate the establishment of a culture of lecturer inclusivity wherein there exists a social, professional, and intellectual climate that welcomes lecturers and recognizes and respects their contributions. We believe that the following steps, along with the detailed recommendations we have made in the text of this report, will construct a culture of lecturer inclusivity:

- Initiation of efforts to educate the College and University about the vital pedagogical and administrative roles played by the lecturer faculty (such efforts to be led by department chairs, programs directors, and College and University administrators)
- Inclusion of detailed information about the lecturer faculty and lecturer-faculty issues in the University’s and the College’s annual orientations for new chairs
- Development of clear job descriptions and clearly related levels of compensation for work performed by lecturers
- Determination of clear procedures for the timely evaluation and promotion of lecturer faculty
- Development of concrete mechanisms for achieving the systematic input of lecturer faculty in faculty governance
- Introduction of procedures that recognize and support the scholarly and artistic activities of lecturer faculty; provision of resources for the professional growth of lecturer-faculty members
- Establishment of an adequate number of teaching awards for the lecturer faculty coupled with appropriate symbolic and material compensation
- Development of a policy on service by lecturers on College and University committees
- Development of procedures that would ensure that all lecturers receive appropriate salaries and normal faculty benefits
- Initiation of annual orientation sessions for lecturer faculty by the College, the departments, and the programs, where members receive relevant information enabling them to do their work and protect their rights
- Determination of appropriate public recognitions to honor members of the lecturer faculty for their contributions
We believe that the establishment of this culture of lecturer inclusivity will enable WCAS’s continuing lecturers to attain their proper status as faculty members of the University. Moreover, such a culture will promote the integration of lecturer and tenure-track faculty within the intellectual and social environment of the University. The time is far overdue for there to exist one diverse faculty who can achieve the overall mission of Weinberg College and Northwestern University.
Appendix: Task Force Data

Survey Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Response N</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Chairs and Program Directors</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Chairs and Program Directors</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer Faculty</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track Faculty</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>637</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>15%**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Includes one anonymous response; **Total response rate based on N= 97 as it does not include former chairs and program directors.
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