



DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE  
ONE SHIELDS AVENUE  
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616-8502  
(530) 752-2220  
academicsenate.ucdavis.edu

June 21, 2017

**Jim Chalfant**

Chair, Academic Council

**RE:** Proposed Revisions to APM 285, 210-3, 133, and 740

Dear Jim:

The proposed revisions to APM 285, 210-3, 133, and 740 were forwarded to all standing committees of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate. Seven committees responded: Academic Personnel Oversight (CAP), Faculty Welfare, and the Faculty Executive Committees (FEC) of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES), the College of Biological Sciences (CBS), the College of Engineering (COE), the College of Letters and Science (L&S), and the Graduate School of Management (GSM).

Overall, committees' evaluations of the proposed changes are mixed and, in some aspects, conflicting. While some feel that broader expectations in the proposed Teaching Professor series provide beneficial flexibility, others argue that the review criteria are too vague and could lead to unintended inequities in the merit and promotion process.

The FEC of CAES strongly supports the emphasis on teaching excellence and innovation in the Teaching Professor series, as well as the flexibility offered in the "Professional and Scholarly" review category. Its assessment is that the proposed changes will improve the review process, in direct opposition to the assessments made by Faculty Welfare and the FEC of L&S, reported below.

The FECs of CBS and GSM broadly support the proposed revisions but also have concerns. Notably, these FECs disagree on the role of teaching/program innovation and scholarly work. CBS states that the "emphasis on teaching innovation is not appropriate. Teaching excellence certainly does not preclude innovation, but we don't feel that requiring innovation in teaching is necessary. Instead, we suggest using the term 'Scholarly' rather than requiring work that is specifically innovative." In contrast, GSM would prefer that the series focus on "program innovation, development, and execution rather than writing/creating scholarly works."

Faculty Welfare and the FEC of L&S expressed concerns over the review criteria for merits and promotions. While supportive of the shift from L(P)SOE to a more recognizable title, and supportive of the greater flexibility provided for achievement under APM 210-3, Faculty Welfare considers the lack of specificity and clarity in review criteria "potentially problematic with respect to fair and equitable review." It is particularly concerned because "review committees for Teaching Professors will be comprised largely of those in the professor series." Similarly, L&S points out that the proposed changes "still leave it ambiguous as to whether scholarly activity is or is not required for advancement in the LPSOE series," as

the language in APM 210-3 switches between “and,” “or,” and “and/or” language in various spots. L&S argues that “it needs to be decided—and clearly articulated—whether scholarly activity (including externally recognized scholarly activity in the form of publications) is or is not a requirement of merits and promotions,” and also notes that, as written, the policy is vague as to what constitutes “scholarly” activity.

CAP is opposed to all proposed changes. It is primarily concerned about the evaluation criteria for the “Teaching Professor” series as well as the title itself. CAP notes that it had already expressed its concerns through its UCAP representative, but the proposed APM changes “provide no indication that this prior input was taken into account.” CAP expressed similar concerns when the Davis campus considered using the working title “Professor of Teaching \_\_\_” in 2016, which was ultimately not implemented; those concerns are enclosed. CAP thinks the evaluation criteria are vague and, in contrast to Faculty Welfare, thinks the proposed “Teaching Professor” title, as with “Professor of Teaching \_\_\_” when proposed at Davis, is “potentially misleading in that it implies that other Professors do not teach or that teaching is less important among ladder-rank faculty.” This impression, CAP argues, is “incorrect and is a terrible message to send at a time when many individuals in state government and the public already think that faculty do not teach enough.”

Finally, consistent with CAP, Faculty Welfare expressed concern that the proposed revisions to the APM, when examined as a whole, are “part of a larger trend in favoring teaching over research....UC must hold steady to promote the pedagogical value of instruction-by-researcher, and it should not be abandoned for the sake of budgetary pressure or efficiency.” The FEC of COE concurs, noting its concern “about growing a group of faculty whose primary purpose is something other than research, considering UC Davis’ reputation as a premier research institution.”

The Davis Division appreciates the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,



Rachael E. Goodhue  
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate  
Professor and Chair, Agricultural and Resource Economics

Enclosed: Davis Division Committee Responses

c: Edwin M. Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate  
Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate  
Michael LaBriola, Principal Policy Analyst, Systemwide Academic Senate