

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

## VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2019

**Attending:** Dan Farber, Chair (UCB), John Gilbert, Vice Chair (UCSB), Sharon Block (UCI), Susan Tapert (UCSD), Marilyn Westerkamp (UCSC), Sherryl Vint (UCR), David Saloner (UCSF), Ignacio Lopez-Calvo (UCM), John Kuriyan (UCB), Jon Snyder (UCSB), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel), Kimberly Grant (Director, Academic Policy & Compensation), Robert May (Chair, Academic Senate), Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

**I. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** The minutes were approved with a correction.

**II. Updates and Announcements**

Chair Farber reported that UC's negotiations with Elsevier continue and it is not clear if an agreement about open access will be reached. Vice Chair Gilbert participated in Academic Council's discussion about the proposal from the Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity (UCAADE) to require a statement on contributions to diversity for academic merit reviews. The vice chair asked Council to postpone acting on the proposal until UCAP and the Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) could discuss the matter.

**III. Consultation with the Office of the President**

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

Provost Brown has appointed Senate Chair May and UCSC Chancellor Blumenthal to co-chair a small working group tasked with creating policies to protect non-academic appointees. Academic Personnel's symposium on salary equity studies was held the last day of October. While the studies identified differences between disciplines, an outstanding question is whether more needs to be done to identify differences based on ethnicity and gender. Director Grant explained that legal technical changes are proposed to the leave policies in the Academic Personnel Manual. The Office of General Counsel recommended changes to comply with laws and for clarity and consistency with existing policies. These policies have not undergone a significant legal revision in several years and this summer the 700 series will be opened for substantive changes to leave concepts.

**Discussion:** UCR will affiliate the LSOEs with a department which will allow the normal review process to be followed. There are open questions about how to adapt the current standards to the work LSOEs do and it is not clear what guidance from UCAP would be helpful to CAPs. Academic Personnel created a tool kit but it does not address specific issues that CAPs will have to consider in light of the new criteria and salary scales. UCAP is encouraged to share any guidelines it decides upon with Academic Personnel. UCM's CAP is discussing the number of courses LSOEs should teach. Vice Provost Carlson thinks the policies on teaching for the professorial series are out of date and that UCAP might want to ask for them to be updated.

**IV. CAPs and Title IX**

Chair Farber invited members to suggest edits to the draft memo related to the personnel process and Title IX procedures.

**Discussion:** Members agreed that the memo reflects UCAP's concerns about the need for guidelines regarding the type of information about the resolution of Title IX cases that is included in personnel files sent to CAPs.

**Action:** The memo was approved.

## **V. Evaluation of Teaching by Faculty in SSGDPs**

Members have gathered information about how their CAPs evaluate the teaching of faculty members in Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs (SSGDPs). The concern is how to count the teaching and whether it should be included in the evaluation for merits. UCB's CAP considers teaching in SSGDPs to be outside activity, which suggests that the teaching in these programs may not be counted at all.

**Discussion:** UCSF's CAP evaluates the teaching of SSGDP faculty as equivalent and these faculty members receive qualitative evaluations which are included in the file. Chair Farber remarked that if the teaching requires a significant amount of time, it should be considered. A concern has been that teaching in SSGDPs will result in less teaching of in-residence students. A member noted that this may be part of a bigger problem related to a lack of guidance about teaching. UCR considers teaching in SSGDPs to be a part of the regular teaching load. UCB does not give credit for teaching in these programs. UCSD treats it the same as any other teaching.

Chair Farber would like members to continue to gather information from their campuses. UCAP may ultimately make a recommendation about how this issue should be handled. Vice Chair Gilbert suggested that the preparation of merit files should include information about the sources of compensation.

## **VI. Course Evaluations – Offensive Comments and Discrimination Issues**

Senate Chair May asked UCAP to discuss the issue of offensive comments in student course evaluations and determine if a policy is needed.

**Discussion:** A member proposed using the term "inappropriate" rather than "offensive" since the evaluations may not include overtly offensive words or comments. UCR's CAP discusses about whether comments are inappropriate or not. Action should be taken when comments are deemed to be problematic. It is not clear if there is a process for having these comments removed from a file but members agree that it would be good to not include them in the permanent, historical record. UCI is piloting a new student course evaluation. UCAP might suggest that units should establish a procedure to allow inappropriate comments from the file. At the graduate level, because the classes are small there is less anonymity and the student who wrote the evaluation can be identified.

**Action:** Members will continue to collect information about whether the course evaluation is the same across a campus or if departments use different sets of questions.

## **VII. Management Review - Proposed Technical Revisions to APMs 710, 715, 730 and 760**

UCAP has the opportunity to weigh in on the proposed technical revisions to the leave policies in the APM, sections 710, 175, 730 and 760.

**Discussion:** A member pointed out that there is no consistency included in files about the information about leaves or modified duties. Including some information about the reason for the modified duties can help CAPs better understand the file. At UCSB the files include a notation about modified duties. The files that included a notation that the duties were modified may have been treated differently from files without a notation.

**Action:** UCAP will ask if the requirement to maintain the family and medical leave records precludes having some acknowledgement that there were modified duties.

### **VIII. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

- Robert May, Chair, Academic Senate
- Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Vice Chair, Academic Senate

Chair May reported negotiations with Elsevier are underway and the University Librarians are setting up contingency plans to ensure that UC faculty will have access to Elsevier's journals in the future. In response to a request from President Napolitano, Council has established a task force to study the role of standardized tests in UC admissions. The task force will be chaired by the former chair of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools, Henry Sanchez and Chair May's charge to the group will be broad. Chair May will encourage the task force to take plenty of time to fully consider the issues.

In September, Council recommended establishing a workgroup to devise policy for non-academic appointments that provides protections related to academic freedom. The issue is complicated as it relates to the academic freedom protections for faculty as codified in APM 010. The federal government has withdrawn funding for a UCSF research project involving modified fetal tissue. Academic Council has received a letter from UCSF about this incident and will discuss issuing a statement in support of researchers. It is hoped that the Council statement prompts President Napolitano to back UC faculty researchers. The federal government is also pressuring UC to end intellectual relations with China. Chair May reported that an increase for faculty salaries is included in UC's budget proposal for 2019-2020.

### **IX. Contribution to Diversity Statements**

Following the most recent Council meeting, Chair Farber has participated on calls with the chairs of UCAADE and UCFW. UCAP should weigh in on the proposal for the statements on contributions to diversity should be required for merit reviews.

**Discussion:** The statements at hire are not controversial. It is not clear that these statements meet the goal of increasing diversity as described in APM 210.1.d. A concern is that the statements will create more work for CAPs. Faculty are confused about what diversity means or who is an under-represented minority. Last year, the UCM CAP supported requiring the statements but there was significant push back from department chairs who noted that the requirement is not in the APM. UCSF's CAP does not penalize faculty who do not include a statement but a compelling statement on diversity is taken into account, particularly when the case is on the borderline. The UCM and UCSC CAPs take an approach similar to UCSF. UCSC is concerned about differential fairness in evaluating diversity statements and that diversity means different things in different disciplines or departments. In some areas, diversity is part of the job. There is a question about the education needed to make the statements useful and effective. The statement should delineate the substantive work faculty member has done to support and further diversity.

UCSB's CAP feels that the statement should not be required but faculty should be encouraged to provide it. UCSD's CAP is opposed to requiring the statements for personnel actions. Members indicated that UCAP should provide guidance about what should be included in the statements. Chair Farber noted that

it should be clear that CAPs are not attempting to make contributions to diversity a fourth category for evaluation for advancement. CAPs will need guidance regarding how to evaluate the statement. One idea is to find a way to incorporate information about contributions to diversity in an existing part of the file. A concern is that faculty will not provide meaningful information. One member proposed that requiring the statement will force faculty to think about contributions to diversity throughout the review period. If a meaningful change in UC's culture is wanted, the statement should be required. UCSF has a line item that allows faculty to report contributions to diversity. CAPs could meet with new faculty to discuss the meaning of diversity and the importance of writing a statement especially since departments may not provide any guidance. Efforts to educate younger faculty are especially important.

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

UCM: The CAP has discussed issues related to multiple authors on an article. The candidate's name is somewhere in the middle and there is no information about his or her contribution so the files are returned to the department. Members suggested that department chairs should be educated about what CAPs need to see in the case of a faculty member who is not the first or second author.

UCR: The new software the CAP is required to use is causing delays in the processing of files and information has also been missing from files.

#### **XI. New Business**

Chair Farber will make a decision by early February about meeting in person or by videoconference on March 13th.

#### **XII. Executive Session**

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 2:35 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Dan Farber