



## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

### Minutes of Meeting

October 16, 2024

**In attendance:** Sean Malloy, Chair; Nael Abu-Ghazaleh, Vice Chair (UCR); Michael Lucey, UCB; Angela Gelli, UCD; Virginia Jackson, UCI; Reza Ahmadi, UCLA; Miriam Barlow, UCM; Veronica Shubayev, UCSD; Cathy Lomen-Hoerth, UCSF; Mark Meadow, UCSB; Susan Gillman, UCSC

#### I. Welcome and Introductions

*Sean Malloy, UCAP Chair*

#### II. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

*Steve Cheung, Academic Council Chair*

- **Academic Affairs Restructuring:** The Provost has split the unit formerly known as Academic Personnel and Programs in two- Faculty Affairs and Academic Programs, which is being led by interim Vice Provost Doug Haynes, and Systemwide Academic Personnel, which is being led by Deputy Provost Amy Lee. The impetus for the change was the recent changes to the academic labor landscape.
- **Academic Planning Council:** 1) A workgroup to investigate the pros and cons of adopting a single systemwide academic calendar for undergraduate students based on the semester system will be co-chaired by Council Vice Chair Palazoglu. Advocates note enhanced cross-campus enrollment, segmental alignment, expanded summer opportunities, and fewer administrative cycles as pros. Cons include opportunity costs and disruption costs. Learning outcomes and research opportunities are cited by both. It is expected that the Senate will have the opportunity to review the findings through the normal systemwide review process. 2) A workgroup to review Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Sections 015 and 016 (Faculty Code of Conduct and Discipline, respectively) is being formed in response to legislative requirements for a review of policies regarding expressive activities for the former and following a failed revision of the latter regarding simultaneous review and disciplinary actions. The first part (APM 015) is due in December, and the group will shift to APM 016 in 2025. Council Chair Cheung is co-chair.
- **Presidential Search:** Per policy, the Regents have formed a special committee being Chaired by Regent Chu. Council Chair Cheung will lead an Academic Advisory Committee (AAC). Selection of a search firm is underway. The academic requirements developed by the AAC will be presented to the Regents in November.

### **III. Chair's Announcements**

*Sean Malloy, UCAP Chair*

- Senate By-Law 55 (Departmental Voting Rights): The previous UCAP recommended revisions to SBL 55 that would allow Professors of Teaching full voting rights in departments. The pros were equity-based. The proposal was rejected, however, by the Academic Assembly, with opponents noting research differences and unfamiliarity with the position. Chair Malloy suggested the current UCAP gather data and coordinate with the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE) before resubmitting a proposal.
- Academic Council of September 25: 1) Regarding the APM workgroups: A) As noted, the APM 015 review was required in a budget bill rider. Campus enforcement and faculty policies are both under scrutiny. Given the activist nature of many leaders, direct intervention in the APM could jeopardize faculty rights. B) The proposed revisions to APM 016 were rejected as they indicated an assumption of guilt and perhaps an ulterior motive. C) The contentiousness of the proposal caused the charge to evolve into a study and the timeline to be extended. Efficiency-related motives were also not well received.

### **IV. University Professor**

*Sean Malloy, UCAP Chair*

Per policy, whenever a professor is nominated by their campus to become a University Professor, UCAP has the role of reviewing the nomination, assisting to establish a review panel, and certify their recommendation. A slate of nominees for the review panel has been submitted, and UCAP is asked to approve the slate, perhaps in rank order, and perhaps to add names to ensure broad representation. SWAP can further clarify the process, if needed.

Volunteers will be sought to review the slate more carefully offline.

### **V. Campus Updates**

Santa Cruz: 1) The campus is working to incorporate community engaged work in reviews. Guidelines from two years ago are being monitored closely. Many have noted the overlaps with EDI concerns. 2) During annual visits to departments, the SBL 55 proposal is being discussed further in the hopes highlighting the parallels with tenure track positions. 3) Campus budget concerns and the structural deficit are raising concern about program consolidation and staff reductions.

Santa Barbara: 1) Several changes to academic reviews have been made recently: professional activities are now combined with research or service; quarter steps have been eliminated as were "special steps". The goal is to emphasize flexibility and holistic review of candidates. 2) An online bio-bib system is being adopted. 3) How to consider student evaluations in reviews remains a topic of discussion. 4) Recognition of public-facing scholarship is under discussion. 5) Implementing the mentoring component of reviews is complicated post-COVID and post-strike. Comparing undergraduate and graduate and peer mentoring is a challenge. 6) A new twist in the "publish or perish" paradigm involves book disciplines versus book scholars. Consistent guidelines are needed systemwide since this is practice, not a policy.

San Francisco: 1) A Senate retreat will be held in February. 2) Some have suggested allowing an optional advocacy category on CVs.

San Diego: 1) The campus supported the SBL 55 revisions, but discussion will continue to ensure support going forward. 2) The School of Medicine has precedence in evaluating mentoring, so perhaps guidelines could be modified. 3) Book or article publication requirements/recommendations tend to vary by discipline and department.

Merced: 1) Community engaged scholarship evaluations are also under consideration here. 2) Metrics for evaluating Teaching Professors are being revised. 3) More standardization of the acceleration process on the campus is needed. The overall relationship to the University, not just individual productivity, is implicated. 4) Submission of Letters of Recommendation to fill documentary gaps in review packets is under discussion.

Los Angeles: 1) The high local CAP workload is making it difficult to recruit members. 2) Guidelines for reviewing community-based scholarship have been posted online. 3) Requirements to pass the Step VI barrier are unclear to some and should be clarified. 4) Requests to confirm research independence seem to overlap with mentoring expectations. 5) Clarifications to the diversity segment of reviews should specify what one studies and does are under scrutiny, not oneself, and that it should be additive. 6) The campus only has 14-15 Professors of Teaching, and none has been granted provisional voting rights under the current SBL 55 option. 7) The local CAP does not opine on salary. 8) Many remain concerned about faculty participation in demonstrations and variable enforcement of policies and laws. 9) Most consider online programs would put academic quality in jeopardy, despite popular calls for expansion. 10) Some are concerned that medical center revenue goals and growth plans may risk the quality of care.

Irvine: 1) Many regular merit cases are going directly to deans due to CAP workload concerns. This change is significant, and its impacts are still unknown. 2) A work in progress category has been added for book disciplines. 3) Protest activity is not a consideration in reviews. 4) P6 Letters of Recommendation are welcome, but not all deans are supportive. 5) Budget cuts are impacting the humanities, especially post-contract admission cuts.

Davis: 1) CAP meets weekly, reviewing about a dozen cases each time. An optional statement on public and global impact is new; it is similar to the community engagement issues discussed above. So far, they have been well received.

Berkeley: 1) CAP meets weekly in the fall and twice weekly in the spring due to workload considerations. 2) CAP reviews have prevented inequities that would have resulted from decanal preferences regarding accelerations, especially in STEM book-based fields. 3) The campus opposed the APM 016 proposal last year. Greater clarity on bullying would help that section, too.

Riverside: 1) CAP meets weekly and is still closing cases from the last academic year. 2) The Vice Provost for Academic Personnel stewards the local APM, and proposed revisions need to be evaluated carefully. Expanding usage of book chapter provision is under consideration. 3) Conflation of the timing of acceleration and placement promotion is occurring. 4) Inclusion of expressive and non-academic work in review files is under discussion. 5) Community engaged work evaluation is ongoing. Sister campuses' policies are being surveyed.

## **VI. Consultation with the Office of the President – Systemwide Academic Personnel**

*Amy Lee, Deputy Provost*

*Kelly Anders, Executive Director*

#### A. Legislative Update

- Last session, proposed Assembly Constitutional Amendments (ACA) 6 and 14 were defeated, but similar proposals are likely in the future. UC's strategy to frame efforts in terms of the state's best interest. Compromises will be needed.
- Assembly Bill 1905 goes into effect January 1, 2025, and SWAP is developing guidelines for its two main areas of impact: a) Before an employee can be given a letter of reference, the University must confirm that they are not a respondent in a sexual violence/sexual harassment (SVSH) case. This restriction does not apply to academic reviews, and whether it applies to graduate students is unclear as of yet. b) Informal settlements of SVSH cases filed by students is prohibited, and any sexual violence case cannot be settled informally. Formal settlements would require chancellorial (non-delegable) approval and notification to the Regents.
- Also in conformance with new state laws going into effect January 1, 2025, all employees must have enumerated sick leave accruals, so a faculty "leave" bank is being developed; medical center employees are included. Six days of flexible sick leave should allow attendance to medical appointments or assist family members, for example; but the bank is "use it or lose it"- balances do not carry forward to the next calendar year. Guidelines and communications are being developed.
- Other state legislation expands background check requirements, specifically for SVSH violations, and they also will be implemented effective January 1, 2025: a) State Senate Bill 791 requires new hires to submit a disclosure statement regarding any final administrative or judicial decisions determining that the applicant committed sexual harassment within the last 7 years and went into effect January 1, 2024. b) Assembly Bill 810 changed the definition of what must be disclosed to include misconduct. AB 810 also requires the University to obtain a release form that authorizes the release of information by the applicant's previous employer(s) and use that release form to make a reasonable attempt to obtain information from the previous employer concerning any allegations of misconduct for all hires in tenure-track/tenure positions, as well as all positions in athletics. AB 810 goes into effect January 1, 2025. The University is implementing changes in response to SB 791 and AB 810 effective January 1, 2025.

#### B. APM Reviews

- APM 205 (Recall for Academic Appointees): As a technical edit, Savings Choice participants must be added.
- APM 235 (Acting Appointments): Language is being clarified to specify a permanent right to work, not a right to permanent residency.
- APMs 710 (Leave of Absence/Sick Leave/Medical Leave) and 758 (Leaves of Absence/Other Leaves with Pay): In accordance with AB2499, the victim or a family member of certain crimes can take family leave, so these additions will be made.

#### C. Academic Labor

Note: This item occurred in Executive Session and no notes were taken.

**VII. Elevating Senate Service**

*Analyst Feer*

In an effort to elevate the Senate's profile and the value of Senate service, the systemwide Senate office has developed a strategic plan that includes greater media engagement, more consistent on-boarding and pre-hire documents and practices, and consideration of relevant APM verbiage. Service expectations vary by rank, department, and campus. Members noted that the Senate provides service "opportunities", and that higher service usually gets better administration support and often a lighter workload. Unfamiliarity on local CAPs with systemwide service parameters needs to be addressed. Over-tapped faculty from underrepresented groups is a concern, and that some seem to eventually eschew service in favor of research is also a concern.

**VIII. New Business and Further Discussion**

None.

Adjournment: 2:25 pm

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Sean Malloy, UCAP Chair

The committee adjourned at TIME.

Minutes prepared by NAME, TITLE

Attest: NAME, COMMITTEE Chair