

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

2019-2020 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) had four meetings during the Academic Year 2019-2020 (one at UCOP and three by videoconference) to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 135, which are to consider general policy on academic personnel, including salary scales, appointments and promotions, and related matters. The issues that UCAP considered this year are described briefly as follows:

CAP EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY IN THE HEALTH SCIENCES

This year, UCAP dedicated time during each meeting to discuss CAP evaluations of Senate health sciences faculty. A number of health sciences faculty who had served on CAP joined the committee to discuss what is working well or not for these faculty in the personnel review process, transparency about the criteria used for evaluation, and expectations related to service. UCAP learned that every campus has a different mechanism for handling the evaluations of these faculty, including UCLA's use of a dedicated Clinical CAP subcommittee. A common theme to emerge is that CAPs may find it challenging to understand the guidelines and expectations for faculty in the health sciences. CAPs also have difficulty identifying what constitutes creative activity and it can be hard to quantify service and teaching in the medical schools.

Based on these discussions, UCAP concluded that having clear criteria enables CAPs to evaluate faculty in the health sciences but that it is not the role of UCAP or CAPs to dictate a set of homogenized expectations. Instead, UCAP will signal that more communication and understanding between CAPs and medical centers is needed. A small team of UCAP members will prepare a memo describing these discussions and providing examples of where more communication and clarity would be helpful. The memo, to be sent to vice chancellors of personnel for distribution to departments, will include the recommendation that each medical center, unit, school, or campus delineate its expectations and the criteria for advancement.

TEACHING EVALUATIONS TASK FORCE

UCAP Chair Gilbert represented the committee on Council's [2019-2020 Teaching Evaluation Task Force](#). Last year, the Council chair asked UCAP, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), the Committee on Educational Policy, the Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity and the Committee on Faculty Welfare to consider issues related to bias and inappropriate comments in student course evaluations. The final charge of the task force was broadened to encompass issues surrounding the evaluation of teaching overall. The task force was able to capitalize on in-depth work by UC Centers for Teaching and Learning and separate divisional Senate efforts which recommended a variety of best practices. The [task force's report](#) to Council was endorsed in July and subsequently transmitted to divisional Senate's for consideration. UCAP will continue to monitor campus efforts to improve their approaches to evaluating teaching.

STUDENT MENTORING

UCAP met with the chair of the CCGA, Ramesh Balasubramaniam, in March to discuss recognition for mentoring students, a conversation which began last year. Mentoring is an important part of what faculty do, however many faculty who mentor students and junior faculty do not receive any credit for this activity. This is a problem that is more pronounced in social sciences because faculty in the Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics fields typically report their work with graduate students, and women and faculty from underrepresented groups do significant mentoring without any credit. Mentoring is mentioned in APM 210.1.d but CCGA's goal is to make it more prominent. Although UCAP did not support making mentoring its own category for review and is concerned that an emphasis on mentoring could privilege some disciplines over others, there was consensus that mentoring should be documented in concrete and visible ways. The committee concluded that renaming the Teaching category in the

Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Appraisal section to “Teaching and Mentoring” would be the best way to ensure that mentoring is recognized. UCAP and CCGA will transmit a recommendation to Academic Council in the fall.

OPEN ACCESS PUBLICATIONS AND CAP EVALUATIONS

In May, UCAP was joined by the chair of the Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC), Gregg Camfield, Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost of UC Merced, to discuss issues related to open access and personnel evaluations. Various publishers have cost UC significant amounts of money with increasingly higher priced journals even as faculty provided free content and services. The University’s desire for open access is at odds with the traditional perception that some journals have prestige in their own right, and it also conflicts with junior faculty in some disciplines being advised that publishing in certain journals is necessary to attain tenure. SLASIAC approached UCAP to discuss how to reinforce that the focus of personnel reviews is the quality of the faculty members’ work. The committee readily agreed to collaborate with SLASIAC to identify and implement promotion, tenure, and advancement practices that can be used to support UC’s fundamental values of scholarly information exchange. An immediate concern for UCAP is how UC will ensure that access for funds to publish in open access journals is equitable for faculty across all disciplines, especially those in disciplines with little grant funding. The committee plans to consider this complex issue in the year ahead.

OTHER ISSUES AND ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

In response to requests for formal comments from the Academic Council, UCAP submitted views on proposed revisions to APM - 120, Emerita/Emeritus Titles.

CAMPUS REPORTS

UCAP devoted part of each regular meeting to a discussion of issues facing local committees including extraordinary service compensating for deficiencies in scholarship; Diversity, Equity and Inclusion statements; and potential impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on faculty and how the consequences of the pandemic on faculty productivity will be calibrated in personnel reviews.

UCAP REPRESENTATION

UCAP Chair Gilbert represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council and the Assembly of the Academic Senate, and served on the Provost’s Academic Planning Council.

COMMITTEE CONSULTATIONS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

UCAP benefited from regular consultation and reports from Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel; Pamela Peterson, Executive Director and Deputy to the Vice Provost, Academic Personnel and Programs; and Kimberly Grant, Director, Academic Policy & Compensation, Academic Personnel and Programs. UCAP occasionally consulted the Academic Senate Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani and Vice Chair Mary Gauvain about issues facing the Senate and UC.

Respectfully submitted,

John Gilbert, Chair (SB)

Susan Tapert, Vice Chair (SD)

John Kuriyan (B)

Lisa Tell (D)

Valerie Jenness (I)

Diane Papzian (LA)

Ali Behdad (LA - alternate)

Nella Van Dyke (M)

Howard Judelson (R)

Guillermo Algaze (SD)

Mallory Johnson (SF- fall)

Margaret Wallhagen (SF – winter/spring)

Francis Dunn (SB)

Marilyn Westerkamp (SC)

Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (SB))

Mary Gauvain (Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (I))

Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst