

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2020

Attending: John Gilbert, Chair (UCSB), Susan Tapert, Vice Chair (UCSD), John Kuriyan (UCB), Lisa Tell (UCD), Valerie Jenness (UCI), Ali Behdad (UCLA), Nella Van Dyke (UCM), 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. Open Access Publications and CAP

This topic will be discussed in May.

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

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

Chair Bhavnani reported that most campuses have moved to remote instruction due to COVID-19 and President Napolitano will determine when campuses will reopen. The Regents will receive a briefing from Provost Brown on the use of standardized tests at UC. The graduate student strike at UCSC has prompted sympathy strikes at other campuses and both UC and the graduate students' union have filed unfair labor practice suits. The presidential search is proceeding and the Regents plan to announce the new president in May. The search for the UCM chancellor continues.

III. Consultation with Health Sciences Faculty

- *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 welcomed the Health Science faculty consultants to the videoconference and suggested discussing expectations related to service.

Discussion: Junior faculty should not be given so much committee work that it becomes overwhelming. For junior faculty, committee work for department, campus or system takes away time for creative activity, and CAPs will note the need to show more creative work. Department service may be sufficient at assistant professor. With career reviews at step VI, CAPs often see significant divisional or department service and a lack of service to the larger campus or Senate. CAPs may take the perspective that serving on a Senate committee is not required as long as there is service to the greater community. CAPs will take location into consideration when assessing service, especially for faculty at affiliated sites.

Faculty in the Clinical X series have major clinical duties that can make any significant service difficult. It can be challenging to hold faculty with 50% clinical appointments to high standards for Senate service. Another issue is that faculty may not be selected when they apply to serve on committees, and this should

be mentioned on the candidate statements. Disparities in service between women and men may be seen at more junior levels. Women are disproportionately asked to serve on committees that want broader representation and this may impact their ability to focus on creative and scholarly activity. Faculty in the Health Sciences should participate in shared governance and contribute to campus.

Discussion: Two members of UCI's CAP present the Health Science cases and the other members rely upon their understanding of how much work something entails. UCAP could issue a statement about evaluating service and recommend that candidates explain the amount of work involved and the frequency of meetings. The department chair and candidate should spell out what service entailed so CAPs can evaluate it in a meaningful way. It can be hard to quantify service and teaching in the medical schools, so CAPs should ask candidates to offer detailed explanations. Over the course of a year on CAP, members will gain a better understanding of service for Health Science faculty.

UCLA's Clinical CAP (ClinCAP), a subcommittee of the main CAP, only reviews Health Science faculty and recognizes the different norms for committee work and expectations for creative work compared to ladder rank faculty. This CAP has concerns about how much service and clinical work junior faculty are responsible for and how little time is available for creative academic work. The workload and the number and different types of files is a challenge for CAPs. It is helpful for CAPs to have members familiar with what is needed for promotion in different series from an academic standpoint.

Chair Gilbert asked the consultants if teaching evaluations are hard to conduct for Health Science faculty and whether it differs from evaluating the teaching of ladder rank faculty. UCLA's ClinCAP uses ratings for different types of work and considers comments from students and trainees. CAPs may need to change their expectations related to teaching and files may not include any teaching evaluations for the Health Science faculty. UCD's School of Veterinary Medicine uses quantitative evaluations for all clinicians with standardized categories that include mentorship and teaching. The evaluations provide objective data to the CAP and candidates do not determine what data is included in files. Faculty based in hospitals may have limited opportunities to interact with students and residents.

The student evaluations UCLA's ClinCAP reviews consistently rate teaching as excellent and the lack of variance makes it hard to know what the teaching is really like. It can be helpful to monitor what happens to doctoral students and how well their research proceeds. UCD's CAP looks for evidence of teaching and the step plus program is used to recognize outstanding teaching, service, or research. CAP pays attention to a pattern of poor evaluations that suggests a problem and it is obvious when students and residents have taken time to write comments, positive or negative. The feedback can paint a clear picture but often only a few students provide evaluations, especially in small residency programs, making it hard to draw any firm conclusions. Chair Gilbert thanked the consultants for their time and noted that teaching evaluations are under discussion by different groups at UC.

IV. Consent Calendar

Action: The January 8, 2020 videoconference minutes were approved.

V. Consultation with the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs regarding Student Mentoring

- *Ramesh Balasubramaniam, Chair, Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)*

Chair Gilbert introduced CCGA Chair Balasubramaniam, reminding UCAP that the two committees discussed mentoring last year and CCGA proposed new language for APM 210. Chair Balasubramaniam remarked that 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 Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics fields typically report their work with graduate students. In some fields, the faculty cannot give co-authorship to their mentees. Women and faculty from underrepresented minority groups do significant mentoring without any credit. Advising of graduate students also goes unrecognized. Faculty may try to include mentoring in the teaching category but it does not always fit. The language from CCGA considered by UCAP last year may have been overly prescriptive. Mentoring is in APM 210 but UCAP is asked to think about how to make it more prominent.

Discussion: UCSB's CAP is not in favor of making mentoring its own category for review. Members agree that there are different degrees and types of mentoring and there is variation by discipline. An emphasis on mentoring could privilege some disciplines over others. UCSC's CAP is concerned that advising is invisible labor and sees a connection to diversity, so mentoring should be documented in a more concrete and visible way. The committee agreed that the category could be called "teaching and mentoring" and CCGA's chair believes this would be sufficient.

The Call for UCLA includes a reference to mentoring students of color and women in the section on diversity and this work is valued by CAP. Since The Call was issued, faculty of color and faculty who advise students of color mention report their mentoring work. Evaluating mentoring of undergraduate students can be problematic if it seems the students are only working in a faculty member's lab. Undergraduates may not see faculty very often and their letters of recommendation are written by graduate students. Faculty should provide evidence of their involvement with undergraduates to help CAPs evaluate the quality of the mentoring. Adding mentoring to the category title will ensure that this work is recognized. To change the APM, UCAP and CCGA will make a recommendation to Academic Council. If Council endorses the recommendation, Academic Personnel will be notified and the proposed revision will be sent out for a systemwide review.

Action: A motion to add "mentoring" to the name of the "teaching" category in APM 210 was seconded and approved unanimously.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

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

Vice Provost Carlton reported that, in light of COVID-19, Academic Personnel and Human Resources are reviewing leave policies to make sure they will meet the needs of faculty who get sick, are quarantined, or are caring for family members. The UC Washington, D.C. Center has suspended its spring quarter program and the semester program will be completed remotely. The Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC) has discussed the quality of research and how open access is changing the way faculty are evaluated, an issue SLASIAC's chair would like to discuss with UCAP. Vice Provost Carlson is interested in the discussion about highlighting mentoring in the APM.

Director Grant reported that the systemwide review of APM 120 has been completed and Academic Personnel is looking at the comments. Proposed revisions to APMs 240 and 246 are out for review now and Academic Personnel anticipates conducting management reviews of proposals to remove gendered language throughout the APM. Recommended changes to the APM 700 series will also be sent out for management consultation in June to be followed by a full systemwide review in the fall. Human Resources at UCOP set up a systemwide task force on paid family leave for staff and it may evaluate policies for faculty as well. Options being discussed include joining state disability insurance program or a private program. The task force is expected to make a recommendation in May which will require Regents' approval. A proposed presidential policy on copyright ownership will touch on research and

original intellectual property. This policy will be a major change for how UC thinks about copyright ownership and it will offer additional rights for authors.

Academic Personnel is focusing on issues related to academic labor contracts. Teaching Assistants have a union contract but they are unhappy and asking for changes. The contract for Unit 18 Lecturers expired at the end of January and there will be three negotiating sessions this month but it is unclear when these talks will end. Academic Personnel is responsible for representing the academic viewpoint on behalf of the Senate and academic administration in such negotiations. Academic Personnel is managing the president's program on diversity and the state-funded Advancing Faculty Diversity projects on retention. Vice Provost Carlson and Provost Brown are slated to give a presentation to the Regents next week on recruitment, retention and diversity. Academic Personnel is hearing concerns about how Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) statements are being used by some units or for particular projects. The office also wants to explore other ways to use the DEI statements. UC continues to be criticized by the state and students for not doing enough to diversify faculty.

Discussion: Chair Gilbert shared that UCAP voted earlier today to recommend changing the APM 210 category title to "teaching and mentoring." Unit 18 Lecturers seem to want a larger role in shared governance and to be treated the same as Teaching Professors. Lecturers have teaching responsibilities but also want formal recognition for service, although service is not required of them. They also want recognition for engaging in research but their current contract prevents this. Departments are not required to use DEI statements at the hiring stage but they are being utilized by units participating in the Advancing Faculty Diversity project. Rubrics for assessing the DEI statements appear to work best when adjusted for particular disciplines. A central question is how policy on contributions to diversity intersects with expectations for research and creative activity.

VII. Updates and Announcements

Academic Council's February meeting included a presentation on a proposed policy on Openness in Academic Research which pertains to the types of restrictions funding agencies can place on who participates in research. Chair Bhavnani recommended that UCAP review the proposed policy and its potential impact on different disciplines. Regent Estolano visited with Council and discussed the need for UC to be more diverse and to increase student enrollment. The use of DEI statements at hiring and in personnel reviews will be discussed at a future Council meeting.

Discussion: UCSF is requiring DEI statements for hiring and UCLA asks candidates to comment on their contributions to diversity in the sections about teaching and research. The Senate considered requiring the statements last year but there was concern about the risk of making diversity another area of review. Some administrators have been heavy handed in their approach to the use of the DEI statements and the Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) has brought this concern to Council. Currently, the statements are not required for merit and promotion cases at any campus. UCD received a grant from the state to increase diversity and initially used the rubric to screen candidates but language in a memo from the administration suggests that the statements are required. Chair Gilbert has heard specific concerns about using scoring on a rubric to eliminate candidates before the rest of the application was reviewed.

VIII. APM 285 ~ Teaching Professors (formerly LSOEs)

UCFW has informally asked UCAP to discuss differential teaching loads for Teaching Professors. UCFW asked Provost Brown to provide guidance on this question and is still awaiting a response.

Discussion: It is reasonable for Teaching Professors to have lower teaching loads than Unit 18 Lecturers, and it is noted that teaching loads are not specified in the APM. The UCFW memo to the provost asks for specific information about teaching load to be included in APM 285.

IX. Proposed Openness in Academic Research Policy

The agenda packet includes the presentation given to Council on the proposed Openness in Academic Research policy. The proposed policy would impact certain types of research. The restrictions UC is willing to accept on research funding is an important topic in general. UC does not accept some restrictions such as limitations on publication and UC typically does not accept funding for classified research. The proposed policy is partly a response to citizenship restrictions some federal agencies are requiring for research assistants or project members. There is tension between accepting restrictions in order to fund important research that cannot be otherwise funded and allowing everyone at UC to participate in the research enterprise. Some UC faculty are supported almost exclusively by Department of Energy funding but the Department is adding restrictions that UC would not be able to accept. UCAP should think about the impact of this policy on merit reviews.

Discussion: Faculty may be willing to accept some restriction on the basis of national security but not on who can be awarded a grant or on who faculty could hire to work on their project. Restrictions on who can work on a project may prevent faculty from getting a grant. The argument for accepting restrictions is based on the idea that UC is preeminent in certain important areas of research and not working in these areas would for the greater good would be a concern. In some units, promotion depends strongly on a faculty member's ability to secure grants. Restrictions on citizenship seem to go against UC's values. Members agree that UC contributes to important national needs in many areas. The proposed policy would have a detrimental impact on graduate student involvement in research.

X. Campus Reports/Member Items

UCI: The representative asked which CAPs are meeting online due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The UCM, UCSF, UCSC and UCLA and UCI committees are considering online meetings.

UCLA: The CAP has been considering where faculty are publishing. For faculty in some disciplines, publishing in certain journals is essential. It was noted that important conferences are being canceled due to COVID-19 and this will have implications for personnel reviews.

XI. New Business

UCAP's fourth and final meeting for the year will be on May 13th by videoconference.

XII. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1:25 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: John Gilbert