



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
ONE SHIELDS AVENUE
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616-8502
TELEPHONE: (530) 752-2231

December 1, 2014

MARY GILLY, CHAIR

UC Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

RE: UC-Wide Review – Proposed Amendment of APM 133, 210, 220 and 760

The proposal to amend APM 133, 210, 220 and 760 was forwarded to all Davis Division of the Academic Senate standing committees and school/college Faculty Executive Committees last spring and review was extended into fall quarter 2014. Responses were received from the Committees on Affirmative Action and Diversity, Committee on Academic Personnel – Oversight Subcommittee (CAP), and Faculty Welfare as well as the Faculty Executive Committee of the College of Letters and Science and Biological Science.

The proposed amendments of APM 133, 220 and 760 were supported. It was noted that on page 5 of the draft of APM 133. In the last sentence on the page, it should read "his or her research activities". The "or her" is missing.

The proposed amendment of APM 210 was not supported by a majority of respondents. The proposed wording of APM 210-1-d was found ambiguous. CAP's response summarizes the issue:

"APM 210-1-d contains wording that we find ambiguous. The third sentence is unclear. It appears to suggest that a fourth category of evaluation is to be initiated "*They should be given the same weight in the evaluation . . . as any other contribution in these areas*". But this is clearly not what is meant, as the rest of the paragraph makes clear. "These areas" (above) must refer to teaching, research and service, and the sentence must intend to say that diversity contributions *within* each of teaching, research and service are to be given the same weight as other components. But the point is still not clear. The same weight as what, exactly? As, perhaps, high scores in teaching evaluations, or as developing new courses, or as serving on a time-consuming committee, or as publishing in a top journal or with a top press? How can anything be given the "same weight" as anything else, in some a priori way, given that all contributions may not be equally important, that the weights ascribed to criteria vary according to a candidate's appointment title (s), and that the personnel process requires CAP's judgment about the relative "weight" of everything, both within each category and between them? Attempting to prescribe in the abstract how much something is to be weighted pre-empts the judgment CAP is supposed to be making.

Since this sentence only adds confusion, we recommend deleting it completely. The rest of the paragraph adequately covers the issue.

In the final sentence, the word “diverse” is ambiguous and unnecessary. The point is surely that mentoring of all faculty and students is to be encouraged and recognized. By definition this will include e.g. underrepresented minority (URM) faculty and students. The deletion we suggest avoids the (surely unintended) impression that only mentoring of URM faculty and students is to be recognized.”

The Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity supported amendment of APM 210 as submitted.

The Davis Division of the Academic Senate supports the proposed amendments to APM 133, 220 and 760 after correction of the type noted in the APM 133 draft. The Davis Division of the Academic does not support the proposed amendment to APM 210 as written.

Sincerely,



André Knoesen, Chair
Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Professor: Electrical and Computer Engineering