

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

## VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2020

**Attending:** John Gilbert, Chair (UCSB), Susan Tapert, Vice Chair (UCSF), John Kuriyan (UCB), Lisa Tell (UCD), Valerie Jenness (UCI), Ali Behdad (UCLA), Howard Judelson (UCR), Guillermo Algaze (UCSD), Meg Wallhagen (UCSF), Francis Dunn (UCSB), Marilyn Westerkamp (UCSC), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel), Kimberly Grant (Director, Academic Policy & Compensation, Academic Personnel), Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Chair, Academic Senate), Mary Gauvain (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

**I. Updates**

Chair Gilbert had a good conversation with the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) about mentoring and CCGA's chair will join UCAP in March. CCGA would like mentoring to be emphasized in the personnel review but Chair Gilbert argued that the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) should not be overly prescriptive. One idea is to change the name of the category to "teaching and mentoring." The Academic Planning Council has established a task force on salary scales to examine the scales and the structure of the system. Chair Gilbert will chair the task force, Vice Provost Carlson will serve as vice chair, and the Senate Chair and Vice Chair will also participate.

**II. Consent calendar**

**Action:** The October minutes were approved.

**III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

- *Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Mary Gauvain, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

The search for the new president is underway and Chair Bhavnani has set up the Senate's Academic Advisory Committee (AAC) per Regents' policy. The AAC will assist the search firm with the screening of candidates. The Regents are having listening tours at UCLA and UCB on January 16<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup>. Chair Bhavnani explained that the Academic Assembly will reconsider a component of the policy on Area D that deals with science requirements for high school students. A draft report from the Standardized Testing Task Force, set up last year to examine the use of standardized tests for UC admissions, was discussed by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools on Friday. The report will be on the Council's January 29<sup>th</sup> agenda and then sent out for a 45 day systemwide review by the Senate. The president will receive the report in April and placed on the Regents' May agenda.

**IV. Consultation with Health Sciences Faculty**

- *Christine Cocanour, Professor of Surgery, Surgical Critical Care Fellowship Program; Director, Surgery - Trauma, Acute Care Surgery and Surgical Critical Care, Surgery - Surgical Critical Care, UCD*
- *Stephen Hayden, Professor of Clinical, Emergency Medical Services, UCSD*
- *Lonnie K. Zeltzer, Distinguished Research Professor of Pediatrics, Anesthesiology, Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Science Director, UCLA Pediatric Pain Research Program, David Geffen School of Medicine, UCLA*
- *Sanford J. Shattil, Distinguished Professor, Department of Medicine, Interim Chief, Hematology Oncology Division, UCSD*

Chair Gilbert explained that UCAP is joined by faculty from the medical campuses to get a better understanding of the issues for CAPs. Today the discussion will focus on what each School of Medicine finds is working well or not for CAPs in terms of efficiency, transparency and fairness.

UCLA's CAP has struggled with reviews of faculty in the clinical series. When there is clear evidence of creative activities these faculty can be moved to the health sciences series. Personal statements can be helpful. Difficult files will go back and forth between the ClinCAP and the CAP, particularly for faculty moving from assistant or associate to professor. These faculty can be wonderful role models but the CAP may find it hard to see evidence of creative activity. Department chairs and deans will have different perspectives and this is difficult for the ClinCAP to resolve. UCD's CAP finds that there are varying expectations for the amount of time Clinical X faculty spend on clinical work and it impacts the time they have for service. A question is whether faculty in the Health Science Clinical Professors series (HSCP) should be added to the Senate. At UCLA, HSCP files go to ClinCAP and only to CAP when there is a disagreement. UCD has different categories for what is considered creative activity for the HSCP faculty.

The UCSF CAP reviews HSCP and there is a broad list of creative activities. How creative activity is defined needs to be clear and HSCP faculty should be educated about articulating these activities to make sure it is obvious to CAP. It is helpful to provide examples of things that would qualify as creative activity beyond journals, such as abstracts and book chapters. At UCSD, a distinction for ClinX faculty is that their work should be disseminated beyond the department and campus to a regional, national or international level. Each department articulates for themselves what creative activity is and this is shared with CAP. The guests agreed it would be valuable for every department to list the criteria for advancement and that itemizing what is different across the disciplines is key.

**Discussion:** Chair Gilbert remarked that education of the UCSB CAP by chairs and deans has been valuable although carried out inconsistently. UCD's CAP does not look at HSCP faculty and it can be difficult for non-medical faculty CAP members to review medical faculty. It would be a positive change for CAPs to be more transparent. Any effort to identify criteria should be balanced between specificity and being open ended but sharing criteria among the campuses would be helpful. Clear criteria will help candidates understand what is expected while also providing a format for their statements. A particular journal may not look prestigious but for some disciplines it disseminates information to the relevant communities.

Having the criteria also helps people voting in their department to understand what they are voting on and how to vote. Departments do not know about the different series and the criteria gives guidelines for what is expected. Rather than at the department level, it may be worthwhile to have overarching criteria at the campus level. This could be a core body of expectations to which departments then add what would be unique. Members could ask their CAPs about the idea of campus level criteria. A member suggested that comprehensive letters from chairs might be more useful than codifying the criteria.

## **V. Consultation with the Office of the President**

- *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel*
- *Kimberly Grant, Director, Academic Policy & Compensation*

Academic Personnel has been focusing on issues related to faculty diversity and a recent meeting of the campus recipients of grants from UCOP to enhance diversity was successful and the programs are going well. Academic Personnel will hold a symposium on May 22<sup>nd</sup> for and about faculty equity advisors. The January 23<sup>rd</sup> Regents meeting will include a presentation on equity and diversity with data and an overview of processes at campuses to improve the academic environment and the climate.

Vice Provost Carlson indicated that the data provided to the salary scales task force can be shared with UCAP and other campus Senate committees, but is not for further distribution. One issue the Task Force should discuss is the relationship between salary scales, the step system and actual salaries. There are cases where salaries do not correlate to the step a person is being hired into. The task force would like information about how campuses set salaries and which CAPs look at salaries. At present, it is unclear where this discussion will lead but task force members have agreed that having salary scales is valuable.

Director Grant reported that a proposed technical revision to APM 025 will be issued this month. Several policies are currently out for review which UCAP will discuss today. A number of substantive revisions are proposed to address key aspects of APM 120. Some of the revisions are prompted by changes to Regents policy.

The analyst shared highlights from the December 19<sup>th</sup> meeting of the task force on teaching evaluations which involved a review of the report from the Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTL) on these evaluations. The task force will focus on the Centers for Teaching and Learning report and separate reports from several campuses. It was noted that Immediate Past Chair May asked committees to discuss inappropriate comments on student course evaluations. Chair Gilbert indicated that the second form of evaluation is something he would like UCAP to discuss, and how the APM requirement for two forms of evaluation is met is a question for the committee. Vice Provost Carlson recommends looking at the new APM policy for Teaching Professors for ideas about how teaching might be documented.

## **VI. Systemwide Review Items**

UCAP has the opportunity to comment on two systemwide review items, proposed revisions to APM 120 and proposed revisions to APMs 240 and 246.

1. Proposed revisions to APM - 120, Emerita/Emeritus Titles. The deadline for comments is February 14, 2020.

**Discussion:** Members agreed that granting emeritus status will have minimal impact on UC resources. Emeritus status seems to simply grant membership to the UC community. How emeritus status is revoked and the appeal process for individuals not in the Senate should be explained. UCAP will submit a memo recommending that the policy is as inclusive as possible.

**Action:** The UCI representative agreed to draft a memo and send it to Chair Gilbert.

2. Proposed revisions to APM - 240, Deans, and APM - 246, Faculty Administrators (100% Time). The deadline for comments is February 19, 2020.

**Action:** The committee agreed to not opine on this matter.

## **VII. Mentoring**

The Chair's update addressed this item.

## **VIII. Campus Reports/Member Items**

There were no Campus Reports.

## **IX. New Business**

### **Teaching Evaluation Task Force**

Chair Gilbert explained that he and the chairs of the Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP), CCGA, the Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity (UCAADE), and the Committee on Faculty Welfare are the task force members. The Task Force started last year with the chairs of UCAADE, UCAP and UCEP discussing the inequities found in student course evaluations for diverse groups. The initial plan was to recommend a research project before the task force learned that there were various campus projects on teaching evaluations underway and about the CTL's work on this issue. Two things which came up in the December meeting include a need to demystify the personnel review process and utilizing a second form of evaluation. The CTLs recommended triangulating between different forms of evaluation and feedback rather than depending upon one tool.

**Discussion:** Student course evaluations should not be the sole form of assessment and the evaluation should include peer observation and a personal statement. A question is what can be done to make other forms of evaluation more robust. The April and July memos and the CTL report can be shared with CAPs. Chair Gilbert would like CAPs to discuss how to make second forms of evaluation more robust.

A decision about whether UCAP will meet in person or by videoconference in March will be made by the end of January.

## **X. Executive Session**

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1 PM  
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams  
Attest: John Gilbert