

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

## MEETING MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2019

**Attending:** John Gilbert, Chair (UCSB), Susan Tapert, Vice Chair (UCSF) (videoconference), John Kuriyan (UCB), Lisa Tell (UCD), Valerie Jenness (UCI), Diane Papazian (UCLA) (videoconference), Nella Van Dyke (UCM) (videoconference), Howard Judelson (UCR), Guillermo Algaze (UCSD) (videoconference), Mallory Johnson (UCSF), Francis Dunn (UCSB), Marilyn Westerkamp (UCSC) (videoconference), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel), Pamela Peterson (Executive Director & Deputy to the Vice Provost, Academic Personnel & Programs), Mary Gauvain (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

Chair Gilbert welcomed members to the committee, expressing thanks for their service on divisional CAPs and UCAP. Following introductions, the committee's charge and the day's agenda were reviewed. A portion of each meeting this year will be allocated to consulting with medical campus faculty about the academic personnel process. Now that the Teaching Professor series has been incorporated into the Academic Personnel Manual, UCAP may discuss the implications for CAPs. If the January 8<sup>th</sup> meeting is needed, UCAP will convene by videoconference and Chair Gilbert would like the committee to meet in person again in March. The analyst offered a reminder about confidentiality.

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

- *Mary Gauvain, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Vice Chair Gauvain explained that Chair Bhavnani would usually provide updates to the committee but is out of town today. The vice chair shared that the Regents have been discussing employee and employer contributions to the retirement plan. The Regents have established a search committee to identify a new president and the Senate will create an advisory committee to offer input related to academic issues.

**III. Consultation about CAP Evaluations of Faculty in the Health Sciences**

- *Donald Forthal, Division Chief – Infectious Diseases; Professor of Medicine – Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, UCI*
- *Ping H. Wang, Professor of Medicine, Physiology and Biophysics, and Experimental Pathology, Director, UC Irvine Diabetes Center Chief, Division of Endocrinology, Diabetes and Metabolism, UCI*
- *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 welcomed the health science (HS) faculty who have joined UCAP to discuss issues related to CAP evaluations. The goal is for UCAP to gain a better understanding of the issues for faculty at the medical centers and the committee may identify best practices for how CAPs address these issues. The committee's UCD, UCSF, USD and UCLA representatives will also provide their insights as HS faculty.

**Discussion:** UCLA has a Clinical CAP (a subcommittee of CAP), which finds that the dossiers vary widely particularly at the big steps and it may be difficult to tease out creative activity. Personal

statements help especially when the candidate describes the creative activity. The CAP at UCSD's School of Medicine (SOM) sends files to the full CAP for promotion, and input from associate deans for academic reviews helps CAP identify strengths and weakness in the files. The files for Clinical X are not aligned with the other academic files the SOM CAP sees and there are inconsistent requirements for student evaluations. UCI does not have a SOM CAP and the CAP reviews dossiers only for Senate faculty members including Clinical X. The challenge for CAP is related to the files for non-Senate health science faculty where the criteria for promotion may not be rigorously specified.

It was clarified that across the campuses, faculty in the Clinical X and In Residence series are Senate members while faculty in the Health Science Clinical (HSC) series are not.

UCLA uses the same criteria to evaluate both the In Residence and regular line faculty and Clinical X faculty are often master educators with national reputations in clinical education, whose creative activity includes mentoring residents who then publish clinical research papers, or producing novel educational models used on a national level. UCSF's campuswide CAP sees files from the SOM and Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy schools for all academic series (adjunct, in residence, ladder rank, Clinical X and HSC). The challenges include distinguishing the expectations for HSC from those for the Clinical X faculty and the CAP looks for significant dissemination of work to help make this distinction. For Clinical X, the creative activity could be in their teaching but faculty in all series engaged in creative activity may not document this work for CAP. A range of examples for HSC faculty has been shared with chairs and department heads but this information has not reached the affiliated sites where faculty do not have many opportunities for research or creative work. This CAP also tries to weigh service for HSC faculty.

UCD's CAP typically includes a faculty member from the School of Veterinary Medicine (SOVM) and two from the SOM who evaluate and present the dossiers. Challenges for the SOVM include that all faculty have clinical appointments between 50 to 90%. The CAP does not evaluate HSC faculty who are Federation but a creative activity component has been added to the HS Professor series. The department voting template is designed by series and evaluative criteria, and the summary dossier form notes the percentage of clinical appointment. For the SOM, figuring out the percent of clinical appointment in the Professor of Clinical X series, which can range from 25 to 70%, making it difficult to evaluate creative activities. The CAP struggles with the professional competence criteria which may be a fourth category for evaluation of the HSC and Professor of Clinical X series. The Executive Dean has a document outlining the criteria for advancement for each different series which provides examples of creative activities that could be included. Candidates are advised to write their statements based on the criteria. Dossiers are separated by criteria for evaluation to clarify expectations.

A member commented that CAP evaluation of the non-Senate medical campus faculty is unusual and non-Senate faculty in other disciplines are not evaluated. The point was raised that CAPs may give deference to the judgement of CAP members in the health sciences due to lack of knowledge. Unlike most faculty whose salaries are covered by the state, many clinical faculty raise funds through their practices so one question is why CAPs evaluate them but, given their substantive contributions to the campuses, it is important to include them in the established faculty review process. The academic appointments are important to faculty at the medical campuses, who are interested in advancing knowledge and want to be evaluated on the same criteria as regular faculty. Clinicians willing to engage in research and teaching should be recognized. It is important to distinguish between health sciences clinical faculty and faculty whose entire focus is clinical activity. For campuses with only one CAP, it would be helpful to know how much of their time is spent on health sciences faculty who have a very small percentage of creative activity. Having clear criteria enables CAPs to evaluate faculty in the health sciences or other disciplines such as the arts.

At UCSD and UCI, people in the HSC series are expected to do some teaching. UCI's CAP has benefitted from having a clear explanation about what is involved in the educational contribution of HSC faculty. Heterogeneity makes it difficult for UCSD's CAP to evaluate the files, not just for faculty not in the health sciences but even for an M.D.'s evaluation of another M.D. or a M.D.-Ph.D., and it was suggested that UC Health might look at the heterogeneity and criteria for advancement from a systemwide perspective. Vice Provost Carlson might be asked about this later today.

Chair Gilbert indicated that the priority topics for the next three discussions at UCAP should be identified and asked members to consider what type of report should be produced at the end of the year. Vice Chair Tapert suggested the next discussion should focus on what each School of Medicine finds is working well or not in terms of efficiency, transparency and fairness. Another topic is guidelines for what constitutes creative activity, especially for faculty who spend a lot of time in the clinics, and how clinical activity is recognized. It will be beneficial for candidates to know that a CAP uses consistent criteria for evaluation. Chair Gilbert agrees that CAPs can be systematically surveyed about what does and does not work and about the portion of time CAPs spend on these files relative to other files.

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

- *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel & Programs*
- *Pamela Peterson, Executive Director & Deputy to the Vice Provost, Academic Personnel & Programs*

State funds to improve faculty diversity were granted to schools or departments ready to address diversity in recruitment, motivating units to identify new strategies. President Napolitano allocated an additional \$3M annually to this program and Academic Personnel (AP) decided to focus on retention and climate. A request for proposals (RFP) was issued and 16 proposals from eight campuses were received, 14 of which were funded. AP is planning a fall convening for the grant recipients and will issue a new RFP next year.

Academic Personnel is preparing to issue APM 011, the new policy on Academic Freedom, Protection of Professional Standards, and Responsibilities of Non-Faculty Academic Appointees. The policy on Visiting Appointments, APM 230, is undergoing systemwide review. This year AP will work on APM 120, the policy for the emerita/emeritus titles which includes changes based on what the Regents have approved and it will soon undergo systemwide review. The office is reviewing the APM 700 series on leaves to determine if policies need to be added or revised. It was noted that family leave frequently comes up in negotiations with represented bargaining groups. The provost has asked AP to look at the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP), APM policies 670 and 671, to evaluate how well it is serving participating faculty by their area. Studies on morale point to compensation as an issue for faculty in the HSCP and a large task force will take up a multiyear study on this matter.

A complete report on the retention and exit survey administered at seven campuses over the past three years will be available this year and the findings will be discussed with UCAP at a future meeting. The findings indicate that compensation is a key factor in both retention and separation. At the request of the Senate, the provost will establish a task force, which will include a UCAP member, to study the use of Research Information Management Systems. AP is also involved with efforts to resolve problems with UC Path. AP is pleased that the Senate is discussing the evaluation of teaching.

**Discussion:** UCI's CAP has handled cases for post-tenured faculty and has found the policies related to leave can be vague. For various reasons, there are faculty who have not opted to take a medical leave, instead making informal arrangements, and their modified leave agreements may not be fully explained for CAP. Vice Chair Gauvain reported that Dr. Carrie Byington, who will replace Dr. Jack Stobo as the executive vice president of UC Health, met with the Senate's Health Care Task Force and UCAP might want to meet with her in the future as well.

## V. Debrief on Consultations

The committee members were invited to share their thoughts about the various consultations today.

**Discussion:** Members discussed issues that arose during the discussion about the evaluations of faculty in the health sciences. UCR's representative suggested documenting what is good and what is negative about the current CAP processes. Questions include whether some ways the process is structured are better or more effective than others and how CAP members' familiarity with the issues impacts the evaluation of HS faculty. UCSF expects growth as a result of acquiring affiliates and is considering whether the individuals at the sites should be given academic appointments. UCLA's health enterprise has expanded in the community and deans would prefer to give practitioners a title such as Clinical Associate instead of academic titles.

An important issue for some campuses may be the relative ambiguity of evaluating faculty in the health sciences compared to their counterparts in other disciplines which Chair Gilbert believes is a good reason for UCAP to share best practices. A member suggested that specific examples of how creative activity is defined would be helpful, and it was noted that the individual schools have the best information about what qualifies. Another question may be how service is defined. CAPs can provide guidance to candidates about what is expected. UCAP might develop a survey specifically about CAP practices at campuses with medical centers. The criteria traditionally used by CAPs do not necessarily map to the review of HS faculty.

## VI. Task Force on Teaching Evaluations

Chair Gilbert explained that UCAP, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) and the committees on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity; Educational Policy; and Faculty Welfare proposed a task force to examine student course evaluations last year. The charge was to look specifically at student course evaluations but this has been broadened to teaching evaluations overall.

**Discussion:** UCSB has a task force looking at teaching evaluations and UCSC has been working on these evaluations for the past three years. Reportedly, the state of Oregon recently mandated an intensive and costly system for evaluation of teachers. Vice Chair Gauvain noted that mentoring of newer faculty by more experienced faculty is valuable but not a widespread practice. Members are asked to share any recent campus reports on teaching evaluations. The campus Centers for Teaching and Learning are involved with this issue and the task force will discuss their report.

## VII. Dean Delegated Files

The committee has been asked to discuss how many types of personnel actions and the number of files can be dean-delegated before it is too many.

**Discussion:** At UCSF, the CAP is involved with reviewing administrators' files. UCSB uses the phrase "dean's authority" and administrators are reviewed by higher level administrators. The UCSB CAP conducts a post-audit which can serve as training for new CAP members. UCD's CAP does a post-audit when there is not agreement between the Faculty Personnel Committee and the dean. This CAP was instructed to consult with UCAP about the handling of endowed chairs, department chairs and emeriti status requests. UCSB, UCI and UCR review all endowed chairs.

Members agreed that there may be deans to whom a CAP would not want to delegate authority. The UCSC CAP sees salary recommendations and the committee takes equity into consideration and dean delegated appointments are reported to CAP every quarter. UCB and UCSB CAPs look at salaries and it

would be interesting to explore how the differences between CAPs that do and do not look at salary show up in data.

### **VIII. Different CAP Practices**

This matter was not discussed.

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

UCSC: The CAP is discussing the extent to which extraordinary service can make up for deficiencies in scholarship. At most campuses, extraordinary service, in lieu of research, would not be enough for promotion to Full Professor.

UCI: The member asked how many letters are requested. The number ranges from six to eight and CAPs may request letters from other UCs or from independent people at senior levels at comparable institutions.

### **X. New Business**

Chair Gilbert asked if it is appropriate to think about the role of Teaching Professors (formerly Lecturers with Security of Employment) on CAPs now that the Teaching Professor title has been formalized. The CAP practices survey now includes questions about Teaching Professors participation on CAP. Members are asked to report in January about the role or potential role of Teaching Professors on CAPs.

The chair reported that he will meet with CCGA in November to discuss adding an emphasis on mentoring to APM 210, a topic UCAP briefly discussed last year.

### **XI. Executive Session**

The committee did not hold Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:25 PM  
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams  
Attest: John Gilbert