May 28, 2015

SUSAN CARLSON, VICE PROVOST
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Re: Final Review: Proposed revisions to APM 210-1-d, Review and Appraisal Committees

Dear Susan,

At your request, I circulated for a final systemwide Senate review the revisions to Academic Personnel Manual Section 210-1-d proposed by an Academic Council working group and unanimously endorsed by the Academic Council in February.

Six Academic Senate divisions (UCLA, UCM, UCSB, UCSC, UCSD, and UCSF) and one systemwide committee (UCROP) submitted comments, which are appended to this letter. The feedback from Senate reviewers was overwhelming positive; however, Council would like to suggest one small additional change to the wording circulated for final review. Our suggestion is to change “due credit” to “due recognition” in the last sentence of the passage, to ensure consistency with the wording of the second sentence. Council believes that a parallel pattern of word usage within the passage will help avoid implying a change in standards or criteria, when no such change is intended.

Academic Council’s final proposed language is the following:

…

The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. Teaching, research, professional and public service contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of the candidate’s qualifications. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms, including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of California’s diverse population, or research in a scholar’s area of expertise that highlights inequalities. Mentoring and advising of students and of new faculty members, particularly from underrepresented and underserved populations, should be given due recognition are to be encouraged and given recognition in the teaching or service categories of the academic personnel process academic personnel actions.
Thank you for supporting the extended process of revision and review of this important piece of the APM.

Sincerely,

Mary Gilly, Chair
Academic Council

Encl.

Cc:  Academic Council
     Executive Director Baxter
     Policy Manager Lockwood
     Senate Executive Directors
May 15, 2015

Mary Gilly
Chair, UC Academic Council

Re: Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Policy Section 210-1-d (APM - 210-1-d), Review and Appraisal Committees (Final Review)

Dear Mary,

The Executive Board of the UCLA Academic Senate discussed the proposed revisions to APM 210-1-d), Review and Appraisal Committees, at its meeting on May 15, 2015. The individual responses from our various committees are available online.

The Board is in agreement with the proposed changes with one exception. The Council on Academic Personnel recommends, and the Executive Board supports, replacing the word “all” with the word “any” in the second sentence on page 1. Under 210-1.d, beginning “Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement...” should read “Contributions in any area of faculty achievement...” to underscore the fact that contributions in even one area (e.g., teaching or research) are valued.

Please feel free to contact me if you should have any questions.

Sincerely,

Joel D. Aberbach
Chair, Academic Senate

cc: Dan Hare, Vice Chair, Academic Council
Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
Michael LaBriola, Principal Policy Analyst, Systemwide Academic Senate
Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, UCLA Academic Senate
May 21, 2015

To: Mary Gilly, Chair, Systemwide Academic Senate

From: Jian-Qiao Sun, Chair, Merced Division Council

Re: Final Review of Proposed Revisions to AP Policy 210-1-d

The Merced Division of the Academic Senate endorses the proposed revisions to APM 210-1-d. CAP, COR, and FWDAF comments are appended to this memo.

We appreciate the opportunity to opine.

Sincerely,

Jian-Qiao Sun, Chair
Division Council

CC: Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
Division Council
CAP
COR
FWDAF
Senate Office
May 1, 2015

To: Jian-Qiao Sun, Chair, Division Council

From: Raymond Gibbs, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)

Re: Proposed Revisions to APM 210-D

At the request of Division Council, CAP reviewed the proposed revisions to APM 210-D. CAP endorses the proposed revisions as they provide useful clarification on the impact of the contributions to diversity in the academic review process.

CAP appreciates the opportunity to opine.

cc: Division Council Members
    Senate Office
May 11, 2015

To: Jian-Qiao Sun, Chair, Division Council

From: David C. Noelle, Chair, Committee on Research (COR)

Re: Proposed Revisions to APM 210-D Contributions to Diversity

COR reviewed the proposed revisions to APM 210-D concerning contributions to diversity in the academic review process. Although the committee sees further opportunities for improvement to the proposed language, the committee endorses the revisions.

COR appreciates the opportunity to opine.

cc: COR members
Division Council members
Senate Office
May 11, 2015

To: Jian-Qiao Sun, Chair, Division Council

From: Rudy Ortiz, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom (FWDAF)

Re: Final Review of Proposed Revisions to APM 210-D

FWDAF reviewed and discussed the proposed revisions to APM 210-D pertaining to contributions to diversity in the academic review process. The committee endorses the proposed changes as they will enhance faculty welfare and diversity.

FWDAF appreciates the opportunity to opine.

cc: FWDAF members
Division Council members
Senate office
May 14, 2015

Mary Gilly, Chair
Academic Council

Re: Final Review of Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Policy Section 210-1-d, Review and Appraisal Committees

Dear Mary,

The UC Santa Cruz Division has reviewed and discussed the proposed revised Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 210-1-d. Our committees on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD), Academic Personnel (CAP), Faculty Welfare (CFW), Privilege and Tenure (P&T), and Academic Freedom (CAF) provided comments. The Santa Cruz Division supports the proposed revisions and finds the latest revision preferable to previous versions as it clarifies the view that contributions to equal opportunity and diversity in all areas of faculty achievement should be recognized in the academic personnel review process without creating a fourth category of evaluation.

The Santa Cruz Division recognizes that faculty contributions in this regard in research, teaching, and service are important to the University’s core mission to form an educated democratic citizenry and are therefore worthy of recognition and reward. Further, in order to encourage research promoting equal opportunity and diversity, the Division encourages the Office of the President to consider providing additional research funding in this area.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Don Brenneis, Chair
Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

cc: Ingrid Parker, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
Carolyn Dean, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel
James Zachos, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
Paul Roth, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure
Ron Glass, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom
May 14, 2015

Professor Mary Gilly
Chair, Academic Senate
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

Subject: Final Review of Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 210-1-d

Dear Mary,

The final draft of the revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 210-1-d was circulated to the San Diego Divisional Senate committees on March 29, 2015, and was discussed at the May 11, 2015 meeting of the Divisional Senate Council. None of the committees had comments and Senate Council supported the revisions.

Sincerely,

Gerry Boss, Chair
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

cc: Divisional Vice Chair Continetti
Divisional Director Rodriguez
Executive Director Baxter
Systemwide Chair Gilly
May 19, 2015

Mary Gilly, Chair
Academic Senate

RE: APM 210-1-d, Review and Appraisal Committees, Final Review

Dear Mary,

The following groups opined on the final version of APM 210: Council on Faculty Issues and Awards (CFIA), the Committee on Equity and Diversity (CDE), and the Faculty Executive Committees from the College of Letters and Science (L&S FEC) and the College of Creative Studies (CCS FEC). All reviewing groups supported this final set of revisions although CFIA had some questions about campus implementation.

CFIA, while noting it found the language to be an improvement over previous versions, questioned how diversity work would be specifically documented and credited during the personnel/merit review process. They also urged that the policy be applied in an even manner throughout the campus to maintain consistent treatment across all disciplines.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair
UCSB Division
May 21, 2015

Mary Gilly, PhD, Chair
Academic Council
Systemwide Academic Senate
University of California Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-52000

Re: APM 210-1.d

Dear Chair Gilly:

The San Francisco Division of the University of California Academic Senate has reviewed the proposed wording for APM 210-1.d., and would like to make the following suggestion:

**APM 210-1** Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on Actions Concerning Appointees in the Professor and Corresponding Series: d. Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Appraisal:

...Mentoring and advising of students and faculty members, particularly including those from underrepresented and underserved populations, should be given due credit recognized in the teaching or service categories of the academic personnel process.

As it was previously worded, this section may communicate the message to faculty that it is particularly advantageous in the academic personnel process to select students and faculty to mentor from underrepresented and underserved populations. As a result, other students or faculty who do not fit such criteria may be excluded from such valuable mentoring relationships. In making this suggestion, the San Francisco Division believes that the revised APM 210-1.d continues to support the intended principle of encouraging the contributions towards diversity by individual faculty members.

Thank you for the opportunity to opine on this important APM revision. Please feel free to contact Executive Senate Director Todd Giedt (415.476.1307; todd.giedt@ucsf.edu), or myself with any additional inquiries.

Sincerely,

Farid Chehab, PhD, 2013-15 Chair
UCSF Academic Senate
Professor, Department of Laboratory Medicine

Encl.: 2
April 30, 2015

Farid Chehab, PhD
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
500 Parnassus Ave, MUE-253
San Francisco, CA 94143

Re: UCSF Committee on Academic Personnel Position on Proposed Revisions to APM 210-1-d

Dear Chair Chehab:

At the April 29, 2015 meeting of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), members discussed the new revisions proposed by UC Systemwide Academic Senate for APM 210-1-d. Overall, committee members appreciated their increased clarity in comparison to revisions reviewed last academic year, and understood the intention of including diversity as among criteria considered for advancement and promotion of faculty at the UC Campuses.

UCSF CAP had two proposed revisions to the final sentence in the revision, and includes them here for your consideration:

Sentence as currently proposed reads:

APM 210-1 Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on Actions Concerning Appointees in the Professor and Corresponding Series

   d. Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Appraisal

   ...Mentoring and advising of students and faculty members, particularly from underrepresented and underserved populations, should be given due credit in the teaching or service categories of the academic personnel process.

Sentence proposed by UCSF CAP

APM 210-1 Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on Actions Concerning Appointees in the Professor and Corresponding Series

   d. Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Appraisal

   ...Mentoring and advising of students and faculty members, including those from underrepresented and underserved populations, should be recognized in the teaching or service categories of the academic personnel process.

UCSF CAP is proposing these new revisions as mentoring of all students and faculty members should be recognized in the teaching or service categories of the academic personnel process.

As previously written, it suggested faculty might selectively pursue students and faculty from underrepresented and underserved populations in order to mentor them – in attempts to receive more credit in the academic personnel process. This may have the unintended consequence of potentially excluding other students or faculty from mentoring or advising who didn’t fit such criteria.
UCSF CAP does not believe that is what was intended by these revisions, and as such, has proposed minor corrections to amend any undue consequences.

Thank you for providing the campuses with the opportunity to discuss and review this APM.

Sincerely,

Committee on Academic Personnel

Judy Yee, MD, Chair
Jeffrey Lotz, PhD, Vice Chair
Linda Chafetz, RN, PhD
Kirsten Fleischmann, MD
Steven Kayser, PharmD

Jacqueline Leung, MD
Jacquelyn Maher, MD
Robert Nissenson, PhD
Octavia Plesh, DDS, MS
Robert Rushakoff, MD, MS (Guest)
COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY
Janice Tsoh, PhD

May 15, 2015

Farid Chehab, PhD, Chair
UCSF Academic Senate
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764
San Francisco, CA  94143

Re: System-wide Review of APM 210(d)

Dear Chair Chehab:

The Committee on Equal Opportunity (EQOP) reviewed the current amendment to APM 210(d). EQOP has no additional comment and supports of the revisions. The Committee noted that the wording related to diversity was revised from “encouraged” to “recognized,” which continues to align with the intended principle of encouraging faculty's diversity contributions. EQOP’s previous statement dated December 4th, 2014 regarding this policy is also appended.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this important policy. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Janice Tsoh, PhD, Chair
UCSF Committee on Equal Opportunity
COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY
Janice Tsoh, PhD, Chair

December 4, 2014

Farid Chehab, PhD, Chair
UCSF Academic Senate
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764
San Francisco, CA 94143

Re: System-wide Review of APM 210(d)

Dear Chair Chehab:

The Committee on Equal Opportunity (EQOP) has been active in crafting and amending APM 210 to include a diversity component since 2005. The current iteration has included routine input from UCSF EQOP to the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD). UCAAD and UCAP (University Committee on Academic Personnel) have worked closely to draft a policy that is amenable to all parties.

While EQOP has endorsed the current draft, the Committee has the following comments and concerns:

1. EQOP’s guiding principle is to encourage diversity.

2. There should be an explicit statement that research and other academic activities directed toward diversity and equal opportunity are given equal weight and academic merit in promotion as any other research teaching or service. Currently, the following has been redacted: “or research in a scholar’s area of expertise that highlights inequalities.” EQOP believes that diversity contributions in one or more of the four categories should be valued and credited within in each of the categories where the contributions are made.

3. EQOP recognizes the challenges for other campuses where basic scientists and non-clinical faculty feel they may not have the same diversity opportunities. However, given UCSF’s unique position as the only graduate medical science campus, EQOP recommends that activities that further diversity and inclusion be evaluated and given appropriate merit in their Academic Personnel Packet Review.

4. Lastly, EQOP strongly advocates that each campus be given the prerogative to interpret and operationalize the amendments to suit the needs of their respective campuses.

The Committee on Equal Opportunity welcomes questions or further discussion on this issue.

Sincerely,

Janice Tsoh, PhD, Chair
UCSF Committee on Equal Opportunity
May 11, 2015

MARY GILLY, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: Final Revisions to Proposed Revisions of APM 210-1-d

Dear Mary,

The University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) has met and discussed the final revisions to proposed revisions of APM 210-1-d. UCORP members agreed that the revised language was clearer than the language in the version reviewed in December and were supportive of the revisions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

Sincerely,

Liane Brouillette, Chair
UCORP

cc: UCORP
Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate