UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 2020

Attending: John Gilbert, Chair (UCSB), Susan Tapert, Vice Chair (UCSD), John Kuriyan (UCB), Lisa Tell (UCD), Valerie Jenness (UCI), Diane Papazian (UCLA), Ali Behdad (UCLA Alternate), Nella Van Dyke (UCM), Howard Judelson (UCR), Guillermo Algaze (UCSD), Meg Wallhagen (UCSF), Francis Dunn (UCSB), Marilyn Westerkamp (UCSC), Gregg Camfield (Chair, SLASIAC and Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost, UCM), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel), Pamela Peterson (Executive Director & Deputy to the Vice Provost, Academic Personnel & Programs), Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Chair, Academic Senate), Mary Gauvain (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I.   **Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**
- *Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Mary Gauvain, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Bhavnani thanked UCAP for its work this year and budget concerns based on the anticipated shortfalls due to CoViD-19. UC's budget for 2020-2021 may be flat but in July the state will know what the tax revenue will be. The campuses have been asked by UCOP to provide budget projections. Campuses differ in the amount of reserve funds they have and Council may recommend that there should be more consistency. Principles are being developed about the importance of shared governance and the need to maintain educational quality. Campuses are concerned about decreasing non-resident enrollment and about how many California students will enroll in the fall.

Discussion: Campuses differ greatly in the amount of funds they have in reserve and there are different opinions about whether campuses should socialize the fiscal pain. One question is how UC can stay together as a system under these conditions. It was noted that when students return to campuses may depend on local public health rulings, which will vary.

II.   **Open Access Publications and CAP**
- *Gregg Camfield, Chair, SLASIAC & Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost, UCM*

The chair of the Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC) joined UCAP to discuss the related issues 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, review service, and editorial support. UC's desire for open access is at odds with the traditional perception that some journals have prestige in their own right. It also conflicts with junior faculty in some disciplines being advised that publishing in certain journals is necessary to attain tenure.

SLASIAC decided to engage UCAP in a discussion about how to reinforce that the focus of personnel reviews is the quality of the faculty members' work. Chair Camfield posited that promotion, tenure, and advancement practices can be used to support UC's fundamental values of scholarly information exchange. The COVID-19 pandemic underscores how critical it is to disseminate research quickly and not doing so is a failure for UC to meet its obligation as a land grant university. One idea is that UCAP could issue a statement that helps departments understand that there are many paths to tenure and that CAPs take the quality of the work as well as the prestige of journals into account.

Discussion: A member thanked Chair Camfield for SLASIAC's work and thinks it is appropriate for UCAP to write the proposed statement. It is important that departments advise junior faculty about the

quality of journals. One issue that bears discussion is journals that publish work that has not undergone rigorous peer review. Mentoring of junior faculty is a way to ensure that the importance of rigor is understood. As more and more university presses go out of business because libraries cannot afford books, faculty have to start thinking more flexibly about how research is disseminated to the public. CAPs have so much information in files to parse through, so chairs and deans can—and should--help CAPs understand the new terrain to reduce reliance on journal rankings. Chair Camfield believes the crisis in scholarly publishing provides an opportunity to push back on bad practices with respect to how faculty are evaluated. UCAP can help change the culture by prioritizing a focus on quality. This idea, in turn, raised questions about the many markers CAPs use to judge quality.

A member asked if SLASIAC has addressed issues of costs for publishing in open access journals, as faculty are finding it more difficult to cover these costs. Chair Camfield indicated that the goal is for open access to be cost neutral. However, some faculty are having a difficult time covering the cost to publish in open access journals, especially those in disciplines with little grant funding. The money UC libraries are now spending on subscriptions will instead be used to subsidize publication and UC is already having some success with some publishers. It would be preferable to pay to publish rather than paying to read. UCAP will discuss next steps later in the meeting.

III.   Updates and Announcements

Chair Gilbert and Vice Provost Carlson are co-chairing a task force on faculty salary scales that reports to Provost Brown and includes people on the Academic Planning Council. The provost asked the task force to look at the salary scales and provide a theory about what the scales should look like and how they should be updated, but is not charged with providing specific recommendations regarding numbers. A 2007 plan to fix the scales over four years ended in the second year because of the last recession and it is interesting to look at the scales when UC's budget is again in trouble. The current goal is for the task force to report to the provost in the fall.

The task force on the evaluation of teaching that began last year with UCAP and the Committee on Diversity, Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity (UCAADE) has continued this year. Its main contribution has been to surface the useful work that has been done by campus Centers for Teaching and Learning. Another task force is looking at research information management systems (RIMS), commercial databases discussed by UCAP last year in the context of the company Academic Analytics. Most members of this task force are UC Librarians who are looking at the databases large publishers are trying to turn into a revenue source. Chair Gilbert emphasized that this type of data should not be part of the academic review process.

Discussion: Members discussed how CAPs are thinking about the longer impacts of the pandemic on faculty and how the consequences of Covid-19 for faculty productivity will be calibrated in personnel reviews. It is possible that some faculty may have surge of productivity during this period while others will not. The pandemic will continue to have significant impacts on UC and the faculty, and as faculty performance is appraised it will be important for deans and departments to keep in mind the disparate burdens caused by COVID-19. The administration at some campuses have requested a brief statement about why the extra year is needed. The APM has language about adjusting expectations and it will be interesting to put these guidelines into practice. A member reports hearing that candidate statements should indicate the extent to which the pandemic impacted their productivity. The statements are being required because some faculty may feel shy about reporting the impact of the crisis.

IV.   Consent Calendar

Action: UCAP's March 11, 2020 videoconference minutes were approved.

V.   Summary of Discussions with Health Sciences Faculty

Chair Gilbert invited members to suggest how this year's discussions with Health Science faculty should be summarized and to whom the summary should be sent. UCAP has learned a good deal, including that every campus has a different mechanism for handling the evaluations of these faculty. It is not UCAP's place to promulgate a set of homogenized expectations for Health Science faculty. CAPs may find it challenging to understand the guidelines and expectations for these particular Senate faculty. UCAP could recommend that each medical center, unit, school, or campus delineate its expectations. It is important for this information to be generated and distributed by medical units, not by CAPs. UCAP could discuss this issue next year.

Discussion: The analyst explained that Immediate Past Senate Chair May prompted UCAP's focus on Health Sciences faculty, and clarified that a formal report is not required. The Health Science faculty with whom UCAP consulted can be given a summary and UCAP members should share the information with their CAPs. The UCI and UCD representatives will verify that documents their CAPs have found helpful can be broadly shared with campuses. It should be clear that UCAP's only message is that more communication and understanding between CAPs and medical centers is needed. The letter can include a description of this year's discussions and examples of where more communication and clarity would be helpful. Members agreed to send the memo to vice chancellors of personnel who can distribute it to departments. The UCI and UCD representatives agreed to work with Vice Chair Tapert on the memo.

VI.   Contribution to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Statements

A year ago, UCAADE's recommendations to Council about the use of DEI statements were endorsed and transmitted to Provost Brown. However, a recommendation about using the statements for recruitment was interpreted by the administration in a way that was not anticipated. There was controversy on some campuses where it was perceived that the administration was directing faculty searches. Last year, UCD had a recruitment for a state grant-funded pilot to look at diversity as major component for recruiting faculty. All components of the candidate's packet were looked at in holistic manner. However, some search committees used the statements for an initial screening before looking at the rest of the packet. This was a source of concern. During the June Council meeting, divisional chairs will describe the campus discussions about the DEI statements and Chair Gilbert can share UCAP's perspective.

Discussion: A recent opinion piece about the DEI statements by Dan Walters at CalMatters, filled with inaccurate information and poor analysis, alarmed UCSC faculty who became concerned about the UCSC rubric. The UCSC CAP chair spent time over the summer correcting the facts about the statements and rubric. The statement from the provost implied that UCAP agreed with UCAADE's recommendations, though UCAP had not endorsed them. Some of the faculty search committees at UCD utilized a rubric developed by UCB. At UCSC, the Senate was not consulted about a call for proposals for grants to work on diversity that was issued in the summer or about the decisions about the proposals. UCAP and CAPs do not want to thwart diversity but do have concerns about diversity becoming a fourth criterion for evaluation. For CAPs, diversity can be a plus but lack of a DEI statement will not be held against faculty.

UCAADE's recommendation clarified that the statements should not be about what people do in their jobs that is baked in (for example, teach URM students who are enrolled in their courses). During the last Council meeting, Chair Gilbert took the position that Council should revisit the original UCAADE recommendation and consult with divisional Senates and relevant standing committees, but Council decided against this. UCAP should have been asked about the use of the DEI statements in recruiting last year but the question is what UCAP can do about this now. Chair Gilbert will share this feedback with Council and recommend that the Senate needs to have a better understanding of the statements overall.

VII. Campus Reports/Member Items

There were no Campus Reports.

VIII. Consultation with the Office of the President
- *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel*
- *Pamela Peterson, Executive Director & Deputy to the Vice Provost, Academic Personnel & Programs*

Vice Provost Carlson thanked the committee for its memo on COVID-19 and personnel reviews, noting it is already having a real impact. Academic Personnel is trying to make it easier for faculty to have a third year off the tenure clock and faculty will simply check a box to indicate they are requesting a delay because of the pandemic. It will be clear that the requests are not considered exceptional given the current situation. Academic Personnel is working on technical changes to leave policies that were necessitated by changes in the law. UCAP should receive the proposed changes for management review in June. Input is needed about adding or expanding the reasons for leave. UC has good policies for leave for personal health reasons but a family leave policy may be needed.

The unit is also preparing to review proposals for the Advancing Faculty Diversity program, now in its fourth year. These grants support 14 campus pilots programs in recruiting and retention but substantial funding is available for additional projects. Campuses are working on proposals to be reviewed by a committee that includes Senate members. Representatives of the current projects met by videoconference in April to discuss the status of projects, any changes that have been made due to the pandemic, and plans to delay projects to fall. Academic Personnel is finalizing UC's contract with Harvard's Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education, which has administered retention and exit surveys at the campuses. The survey report has been used by Academic Personnel to advocate for faculty salaries and for support to retain faculty. The faculty retention and exit surveys have not yet been condensed into an executive summary that can be shared with campuses.

Discussion: A member asked if Academic Personnel can collect data on the different types of impacts resulting from the pandemic, but others recognized that this work would be a burden. Some faculty are concerned that needing extra time will be seen as a weakness in their work. There is currently no easy way to record when someone takes time off the clock and UC Path will not have a place to document this. Vice Provost Carlson clarified that the requests for a third year will be approved by UCOP as stipulated in policy, including Regents policy. At present, Academic Personnel believes that the academic merit review process will continue. This process is central to maintaining the quality of UC.

IX. New Business

UCAP considered the next steps related to the SLASIAC discussion earlier today. A member supports open access but how funds to support faculty will be equitably allocated should be determined. It is not clear if every faculty member would receive the same amount and what will happen to faculty in departments where the focus is on books. Faculty in the Humanities do not have access to funding to publish in open access. Departments should be educated about open access and the importance of the quality of articles versus the reputation of the journal. It would be helpful to have data showing whether faculty have bought into the open access model in terms of where they are publishing since the Elsevier boycott started.

International support for open access is clear but it is unclear how long UC faculty will continue to boycott. The question for CAPs is how to assess quality and impact separately from the journal. The CAP

workload increases when they spend time tracking down the information required to do more in-depth assessments of the files. With open access, a new way of figuring out the impact that does not rely on letters alone is needed. Sometimes the journal is a factor in determining if work is highly meritorious. The UCAP memo to SLASIAC can indicate that the committee endorses the general principles and it should mention concerns about inequitable subsidies. Members agreed that UCAP should take time next year to consider this complex issue. The chair will draft a short memo to SLASIAC.

X.   Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1:15 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: John Gilbert