



# **Davis Division Academic Senate**

## **Request for Consultation Responses**

### **ADVANCE Policy & Practices Initiative Recommendations**

**May 15, 2014**

The co-Chairs of the ADVANCE Policy and Practices Initiative Committee have submitted draft recommendations that will impact campus academic recruitment if adopted. The co-Chairs request review of recommendation assignments to Academic Senate committees. Committees responses should provide comments as well as indicate if there is interest in implementation participation as written, interest if the recommendation is modified or not at all. Following further review and refinement the recommendations will return to the Academic Senate for full review next year.

# **Affirmative Action & Diversity**

**May 12, 2014 9:41 AM**

The Affirmative Action & Diversity Committee found recommendation 3 to be most problematic. What exactly is meant by "demographic parity"? Is this meant to mean demographic "homogeneity" or "equality"? We feel the idea is to maintain diversity metrics throughout the search process, but neither the language as written is sufficiently clear, nor is the intended approach. In general, the plan to review existing structure and policies is thorough and will be useful. Some of this work may need to be delegated to more specialized sub-committees - ideally with members versed in the key areas of theory or practice to be implemented.

# **CAP Oversight Committee**

**May 22, 2014 5:08 PM**

*Response continued on next page.*

May 21, 2014

## **ADVANCE Policy & Practices Initiative Recommendations**

CAP was asked to comment on recommendations 1, 7, 13, 14.

Recommendation 1: Modify UCAPM 210-1 section c4, perhaps as follows:

760. It is our policy that the overall record of productivity and scholarly attainment form the basis of evaluation. Time since appointment is not a consideration in review of the candidate's record of accomplishment.

CAP's comment: A clarification of the policy regarding productivity and time to tenure is welcomed. The general direction of the suggested modification is good, but the precise wording needs to be more specific about what the intended goal is. CAP understands that the central goal of the modified policy statement is to remove any stigma or bias that comes from a faculty member taking a parental leave, or a medical leave, and hence the time taken in such leaves is not considered time in service. However, as worded, the statement seems too broad. When reviewing a faculty candidate for tenure, their trajectory is a factor that does require consideration of the time in service to produce the overall record. Unlike other merit steps, tenure is not a reward for past accomplishments, irrespective of how long those have taken, but is an investment in the future productivity of the candidate. Indeed, the word "productivity" implies an element of time. CAP suggests the consideration of the following version:

760. It is our policy that the overall record of productivity and scholarly attainment form the basis of evaluation. Consideration of the time taken to achieve the record since appointment should only include time in service.

Although CAP makes the above suggestion, it also comments that CAP's view is not privileged, and any change should reflect the will of the Academic Senate as a whole.

Recommendation 7: Create a new targeted program “Faculty Targets of Transformation” that could serve to recruit faculty at all ranks with the potential to strongly enhance efforts to build an inclusive campus environment.

CAP comments that the accompanying discussion is somewhat outdated, as it states that Target of Excellence currently are expected to be senior faculty members. That is no longer the expectation. It is also outdated in stating that only TOE and POP positions are granted search waivers. Other programs are also currently granted search waivers.

CAP voted six opposed, and none in favor of adopting this recommendation, primarily because the criteria for a Target of Transformation do not match the merit and promotion system. CAP has significant concerns for the implementation details of recommendation 7. CAP will need clear guidance on what criteria to use, and how to balance “solid” research with potential for transformative impact.

Recommendation 13: Review campus policies and procedures with respect to search waivers.

CAP agrees that additional clarification is needed, particularly for requested search waivers for Presidential and Chancellor's Fellows, and for POP appointments. CAP is concerned that currently the standards for POP appointments are low.

CAP also is not convinced that the impact of the current system of search waivers limits the hiring of underrepresented minorities. Recommendations for modification of procedures for search waivers should only be made after a full determination of the impact of the current system.

Recommendation 14: Reward mentorship activity in merit actions.

Although CAP understands and supports the intent of this recommendation, and agrees that mentorship should be considered in educational and service activities, it is concerned about some aspects of the recommendation and its discussion in the draft. The draft recommends that CAP develop clearer metrics for evaluation of mentorship activities. However, CAP does not agree that it is within CAP's purview to suggest such metrics, or indeed that there even be an attempt to establish metrics (as opposed to criteria). In any event,

establishment of criteria to assess mentorship activity is the role of the Academic Senate as a whole. Further, there is concern that whatever criteria are established, faculty mentoring efforts will primarily be self-reported or purely numerical. CAP is concerned about placing too high a reward on vague and poorly measured activities. An alternative suggestion is to have a peer review of mentorship activities, and to encourage candidates to discuss mentoring in their candidate statements, and to encourage faculty comments and considerations on mentorship when voting on a candidate's record.

CAP is also concerned about the discussion in the draft of letters from past mentees. The implicit suggestion of requesting and using such letters raises concerns for protecting the privacy of the letter writer, and the power differential of the mentor and mentee. This is in contrast to letters from peers which are drawn from a much larger pool, where privacy is easier to maintain, and typically the letter writer is more senior than the candidate.

# **Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (ENGINEERING)**

**May 13, 2014 2:20 PM**

The College of Engineering Executive Committee believes that the proposed changes are appropriate,

as long as female faculty members whose tenure clock is extended are given the option to receive an early tenure review.

## **Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (LS: SOC SCI)**

**May 7, 2014 11:15 PM**

The L&S Executive Committee reviewed the recommendations listed in the ADVANCE proposal. We think that Chairs and/or Deans should initiate a verbal description of family leave policies in all recruitments, regardless of gender of the applicant. The description of the family friendly (work/life balance) policies of UC Davis could be appropriately included in a discussion of other UC Davis benefits, thus eliminating entirely the need for the applicant to initiate such a discussion. --Phil Shaver, Chair

# Faculty Welfare

**May 22, 2014 10:20 AM**

The FWC is willing to assist in the evaluation of the proposed mentorship programs, the recommendations on appropriate childcare resources, and the review of the POP program. Based on the initial reading of the draft recommendations, the committee had the following comments :

(1) The mentorship program should contain many avenues both in the department and senate-wide, with the most qualified and seasoned mentors. Similarly for other non-research activities (such as teaching and service), ensuring that faculty are sufficiently rewarded for their mentoring efforts will be vital for the success of these programs.

(2) The "Target of Transformation" should have exceptionally high standards to ensure the fulfillment of promise on campus of the candidate. The process of evaluating and hiring TOTs (and TOEs for that matter) should be rigorous and transparent to the department, campus, and candidate, including all promised resources. As stated above, a campus culture that highly values teaching and mentoring will be vital to the success of this program.

(3) As part of the review of department climate, the University should thoroughly review all of its available on-campus resources and trained personnel available for problem resolution (such as poor climate, discrimination, harassment etc) to ensure that they are sufficient and qualified to handle these issues in a variety of departmental cultures and with a variety of personality types.

# **Graduate Council**

**May 16, 2014 12:32 PM**

*Response continued on next page.*

May 16, 2014

**RFC: ADVANCE Policy & Practices Review Initiative Committee Draft  
Report on Recruitment**

The Graduate Council accepted the recommendations of the Academic Planning and Development (APD) Committee in consideration of the above-mentioned Academic Senate Request for Consultation (AS RFC).

The Graduate Council accepted the recommendations, as follows, from the APD Committee.

The Academic Planning and Development (APD) Committee met on May 6, 2014 and considered the recommendations in the Draft Report on Recruitment put forward by the ADVANCE Policy & Practices Review Initiative (PPRI) Committee. Specifically, APD focused on Recommendations 7 and 9, which the PPRI Committee identified for implementation by Graduate Council. APD also briefly discussed Recommendations 14 and 18, which were also viewed as pertinent to graduate education.

APD commends the comprehensive and thorough draft report and recommendations put forward by the ADVANCE PPRI Committee to enhance the diversity of faculty appointments on campus.

Regarding Recommendation 7, which suggests the creation of a new targeted program “Faculty Targets of Transformation (TOT)” allowing the “targeted hiring of faculty with solid research programs but that also have even stronger records in teaching and mentoring”, APD raised several questions and concerns, although it supported the general concept of hiring faculty with exceptional records of teaching and mentoring a diverse population of students. It was not clear how many TOTs would be hired, how they would be expected to enhance teaching and mentoring on campus, and how they could be evaluated for merits and promotions differently than regular faculty. APD favored hiring faculty with strong teaching and mentoring records within existing titles and programs, e.g. regular faculty, lecturers with permanent appointments, or faculty within the Targets of Excellence program, in place of developing a separate TOT program and faculty title. This sends a stronger message concerning the campus’s commitment to teaching and mentoring the diverse student population, than the creation of a separate program and/or titles. Further, since the word “teaching” is often associated with undergraduate teaching, APD requests that graduate teaching and mentorship be explicitly included in the recommendations.

Regarding Recommendation 9, which recommends evaluation of current pipeline programs, in particular, the hard 5-year maximal limit on postdoctoral positions and the policy for reduction from 100% postdoctoral appointments, APD had concerns. It was viewed that changes could lead to employment abuses similar

to those that had occurred in the past, such as indefinite temporary postdoctoral employment (potentially at multiple institutions) and postdoctoral fellows being paid less (as officially part time employees) but still being required to work as hard as a postdoc with a 100% appointment. Further, the UAW, the union representing postdoctoral fellows, is unlikely to support the suggested changes, given the employment abuses of the past. Regarding applications to extend postdoctoral positions beyond the 5-year limit for family and caregiver responsibilities, these are readily granted by Graduate Studies thus APD did not feel this was an unfair process.

APD also considered Recommendations 14 and 18, which potentially affect graduate students. Recommendation 14 suggests rewarding mentorship activity in faculty advancement. APD commented that mentoring and the mentoring metrics need to be more clearly defined. Successful graduates could potentially be invited to write statements evaluating their mentorship by a faculty member during graduate school. Recommendation 18 suggests review of department climates and development of development of best practices for creating inclusive department climates. APD suggests that Graduate Council, in addition to Undergraduate Council, should be involved in this recommendation and should consider and propose mechanisms for climate assessment, including but not limited to, within the protocol of the periodic review of graduate programs.

The Graduate Council submits the APD committee's comments, as accepted by consensus, at our May 16, 2014 meeting, as the Council's assessment of the "ADVANCE Policy & Practices Review Initiative (PPRI) Committee Draft Report on Recruitment" RFC.

Sincerely,



Rachael E. Goodhue, Chair  
Graduate Council

/vm

C: Gina Anderson, Academic Senate Executive Director

# **Planning & Budget**

**May 15, 2014 9:00 AM**

CPB reviewed the ADVANCE Policy & Practices Initiative Recommendations. On the basis of what has been proposed, CPB sees no red flags, but much will depend on the final implementation details. CPB would hope that each of the items has faculty buy-in and that the items are not just being proposed to meet NSF requirements. We understand that the initiative is just starting to get its legs, but some of the CPB members indicated support for the CAMPOS initiative and felt it could have better visibility than has been evident thus far. CPB is concerned that many faculty members do not know about the CAMPOS component of the ADVANCE program. Many faculty members agree that the CAMPOS web site is not helpful and therefore, CPB recommends that additional details be provided regarding this component of the program.

# Undergraduate Council

May 20, 2014 9:01 AM

## **ADVANCE Policy & Practices Initiative Recommendations**

UGC does not wish to become involved in hiring decisions carried out via the TOT program. Additionally, while UGC supports the idea of program climate evaluation, UGC does not currently have the necessary expertise to carry out such evaluations. The UGC would encourage departments and programs, colleges, the faculty welfare committee, and other interested parties, to identify validated instruments or other valid climate evaluation methods. UGC would additionally encourage programs to use such methods to monitor and, if necessary, address climate issues.