

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2019

Attending: Dan Farber, Chair (UCB), John Gilbert, Vice Chair (UCSB), Sharon Block (UCI), Susan Tapert (UCSD), Marilyn Westerkamp (UCSC), Sherryl Vint (UCR), Reza Ahmadi (UCLA), David Saloner (UCSF), John Kuriyan (UCB), Jon Snyder (UCSB), Charles Langley (UCD), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel and Programs), Robert May (Chair, Academic Senate), Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Consent Calendar

Action: The March 13, 2019 minutes were approved with one correction.

Action: Today's agenda was approved.

II. Consultation with the Senate Office

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

The May revise of the state budget will be released tomorrow and Chair May noted that revenues to the state are higher than projected in January. The new governor may be more generous toward UC than the previous one. During next week's Regents meeting, non-resident tuition will again be discussed and a revised proposal has a plan for \$3M to be used for return to aid. Elsevier has indicated that access to its publications will end unless UC re-engages in negotiations. A proposed policy for represented non-faculty academic appointees is undergoing systemwide review and will be discussed by UCAP today.

In June, Council will vote on a memorial asking UC to divest from fossil fuel. A new committee established to examine health care plans includes Chair May, Vice Chair Bhavnani, and former Senate Chair Bob Anderson. It is discussing potential changes to Medicare and UC retirees are sharing their concerns about this. Vice Chair Bhavnani reported that campuses are being asked to review their Transfer Pathways and Transfer Admission Guarantee agreements and notify the Senate if there are any changes. Council has approved the transfer guarantee proposal from BOARS following a systemwide review.

Chair May described the proposed affiliation between UCSF and Dignity Health. Although this situation is not directly relevant to UCAP, Chair May believes it is critical for all UC faculty to be aware of this proposal, and members are encouraged to express any concerns to Senate leadership about how it conflicts with UC's values. UC will be faced with extensive litigation if this partnership is approved.

Discussion: Reportedly, some of UCSF's Senate leadership are in support of the affiliation because it is a good business deal. A member noted that UC and UCAP are invested in diversity and this affiliation would undermine this value. The business argument is not compelling and the medical school may not benefit from the partnership. It was noted that, as a secular institution, UC is able to openly discuss issues related to reproductive health whereas this would not be permitted at organizations such as Dignity. Members may want to discuss this matter with their divisional committees and colleagues.

III. Updates and Announcements

Chair Farber shared that the task force on student course evaluations is being established and members are invited to send him any materials they might have on this issue.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel*

When Vice Provost Carlson visited the campuses to discuss efforts to enhance faculty diversity, a consistent theme was concern about the invisible service burden placed on women and under-represented minorities (URMs). Different language about service and ways to compensate for this service might be explored. The graduate deans may propose APM changes to more explicitly highlight mentoring. Academic Personnel is preparing a call for proposals for the funding to increase diversity. The funding may be provided to support faculty research in this area, “data leadership projects” to help identify and track climate issues, and targeted interventions to improve climate. Faculty in the Researcher and Project Specialist series are examining how to unionize. The types of research vary depending on the title, and unionizing would require changes to the APM and adjustments to the salary scales.

Discussion: The UCD CAP has discussed the pressure on URM faculty to be mentors and Academic Personnel should consider asking administrators to do more to address this problem. The criteria for evaluation and compensation might be two issues for UCAP to discuss. It was noted that the process for evaluation of Unit 18 lecturers involves CAPs but the labor agreements restrict what is assessed. At UCSC, the divisions have their own CAPs to evaluate Unit 18 lecturers. Many Unit 18 lecturers are moving to the Teaching Professor series. Academic Personnel can be a resource for the task force on student course evaluations and is willing to provide feedback on what the task force eventually proposes.

V. Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual Policy 210

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) has shared possible new language on mentoring in APM 210.

Discussion: There is agreement that some mentoring is under the radar and should be clearly highlighted. Some CAPs already weigh mentoring activities. Mentoring in departments without many graduate students is on a different scale. The language from CCGA seems to be written from the perspective of faculty in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math and mentoring in the Humanities takes a different form. The language should focus on faculty members’ activities rather than on students’ circumstances. The suggested language also does not mention mentoring of other faculty but it will be important to address it separately from the mentoring of students.

Qualitative assessments in the way of statements from the mentees about how the mentors impacted them would be valuable. In the medical and veterinary fields, participation in evaluation is a critical professional activity required of students from the start and students always write evaluations. Requests from faculty members for students’ input may be viewed as manipulative by CAPs and not weighed as heavily. At UCSB, faculty are not allowed to solicit letters. It is valuable to include the opinions of students in the evaluation process but some CAPs are wary of students being coerced. The committee will prepare a response to CCGA.

VI. Proposed New APM 011 ~ Academic Freedom, Protection of Professional Standards, and Responsibilities of Non-Faculty Academic Appointees

Chair Farber invited members to share their feedback about the proposed policy for academic freedom protections for non-faculty academic appointees. The policy indicates that professional standards apply.

Discussion: UCR’s CAP is concerned that administrators would be adjudicating cases, preferring that a Senate committee should handle this work. The expansion of UCSF to include remote campuses was

recently discussed by the CAP and it is not clear how the decision is made about whether the clinicians at these campuses are Senate members or not. Members did not identify specific concerns about this policy.

Action: The committee will not opine.

VII. Statements on Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

Members are asked to report campus responses to or discussions about the statements on contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI).

Discussion: The UCR CAP is awaiting Senate guidance on how to implement the statements. At UCLA, the CAP's position is that diversity statements can be helpful but not hurt a candidate and contributions to DEI are not a fourth leg. The members of UCSC's CAP require significant evidence to support assertions about contributions to diversity and faculty have asked for examples or definitions. UCSB is engaged in discussions about the statements and there is pressure from the administration to not require statements for certain hires. The UCSB CAP is opposed to requiring statements for merit cases. UCI has had multiple discussions about this and the CAP is pushing back by stating that diversity should be integrated into the three components for evaluation.

In many cases, the mentoring of URM students is often invisible and the CAP has discussed how to bring this to light. When substantial work is being done, having documentation from someone who does not report to the faculty member would be ideal. Faculty meet with students informally or after hours and this work is not captured. At UCSF, faculty document service to different communities. Clear definitions of diversity, equity and inclusion are needed.

VIII. CAP Practices Survey

The CAP Practices Survey does not include data from UCB, UCSB and UCSC. Chair Farber noted the variation in terms of what is delegated and that the use of fractional steps are different.

Discussion: UCR's CAP is discussing delegation and members are currently divided. UCI's CAP sees files when there is disagreement. The CAP was conducting post-hire reviews of assistant professors but there was nothing substantive for the committee to do. A member suggested conducting a comparative analysis of CAP practices and that a short synopsis of the variation in practices could be used to educate new CAP members. A portal with the survey results might be made available. The analyst suggested that Vice Provost Carlson's office may have the resources to analyze and turn the survey into a document to guide CAPs.

IX. Medical Center Faculty Issues

Chair Farber would like UCAP to dedicate time to considering academic reviews of faculty in the health sciences and the topic may be prioritized for next year.

Discussion: At UCLA, the medical school's CAP is different from the rest of the school. It uses electronic voting, the cases may not be closely reviewed, and the recommendation letters are frequently from friends and collaborators rather than people at arms' length. At UCSD, there is variation across the departments for how voting is conducted. UCSF's representative indicated that the metrics used are different from those used at other campuses in part because there are fewer opportunities to teach. Some clinicians do not prioritize promotion. There is an academic mission and a medical mission and faculty in different specialties look at the academic mission in disparate ways. Faculty fall into different tracks and there are fewer ladder rank faculty since UCSF has a smaller number of students than other campuses.

Professional competence is a fourth category of review at UCSF and health sciences clinical faculty are expected to excel in this area. Faculty in the Clinical Professor X title are expected to publish more than clinicians with a grant funding portfolio.

The UCD representative commented that when the health sciences series was revised, the Clinical Professor X category was added and there was a discussion about highlighting research. The evaluation of their scholarly work and teaching has to be done by CAPs. At UCD, mini-CAPs in each college were created and there are certain categories of people evaluated by these committees and only a few cases would be seen by the campus-wide CAP. At UCSF, the CAP requires evidence of creative activity and knowledge dissemination, usually because faculty do not know how to represent it correctly. Some health sciences faculty would like to be more involved in the Senate and next year a non-Senate member will chair UCSF's CAP. The CAP's workload is significant so UCSF is considering creating a second CAP although it will be challenging to find people to serve on it.

X. Interfolio Software

Chair Farber was asked to do a tenure review of faculty member at another university using Interfolio which was not user friendly.

Discussion: UCLA is using Interfolio and has experienced glitches. The system provides a summary of the cases CAP will see in the coming week. UCSB's system has evolved over the years and is configured to meet the needs of CAP as they are identified. UCR started using a new system at the beginning of this year and the representative recommends against using a third-party program to avoid the delays that result when working with a vendor. Interfolio appears to be designed specifically for administrators to track faculty. There are concerns about what is being outsourced and the materials being uploaded. UCSC's Information Technology unit developed the system used by the CAP but there is dependence on the people who create the files. Electronic files are preferred over hardcopies.

UCD has a local system that easily allows dossiers to be reviewed online. It appears that administrators have been using Interfolio for quite some time. Another concern is that the outside companies have confidential information they could sell without anyone knowing. A consequence of the documentation being available to people external to UC is that people may be much less forthcoming. At UCD, confidential letters are not in the system but provided to the CAP when the case is reviewed. UCSD created its own electronic system which works well.

XI. Online Attacks on Faculty

Chair Farber explained that there are concerns among faculty, especially junior faculty, that they could be negatively impacted if information about them is found on a website such as Canary Mission.

Discussion: UCD's representative remarked that when the dossiers were only available in hardcopy form, the CAP could only consider what is in the dossier. The question is what information outside of the dossier can be examined, so CAPs may be unaware of negative posts on an anonymous website. Generally, faculty members or administrators do not have the opportunity to comment on any information that is not included in the file. UCSB's CAP has a policy against looking for additional information about a candidate. On the other hand, when something in the file is unclear, it is helpful to be able to look it up. UCR's CAP members will look up an unfamiliar award. Information posted on the Canary Mission website may not impact CAP but might influence an administrator. It is important to know if organizations grant awards if the faculty member has paid a fee. It is not clear where the line about gathering more information about the contents of a file should be drawn.

There is not a clear objective measure in terms of creativity so there is an ongoing effort to learn what this means. The standing policy is that the decision has to be limited to the information provided by the faculty member. If someone on CAP is aware of something not in the file, the faculty member will be asked to update it. The online attacks have been brought to UCAP's attention to primarily make sure faculty aware of this situation.

XII. Campus Reports/Member Items

UCLA: It is difficult to recruit members to serve on CAP even though it is compensated. This is an ongoing issue and sometimes former members of CAP have to be asked to serve again. Other campuses have the same challenge. Tapping individuals who have served on smaller divisional Senate committees to serve on CAP has been a successful strategy at UCD. The resources are not necessarily available to increase the compensation for service. The CAP has questions about how the distribution of the COLA will be decided and Chair Farber indicated that the president will make this decision. Whether the money is given to the campus to address equity issues or used for range adjustments is a question.

XIII. New Business

There was no New Business.

XIV. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 2:30 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Dan Farber