Davis Division Academic Senate

Request for Consultation Responses

ADVANCE PPRI Revised Recruitment Recommendations -

February 13, 2015

The ADVANCE Policy & Practices Review Initiative has provided a revised set of recruitment recommendations for formal Academic Senate review. The review document provided contains a cover letter requesting review of specific recommendations by specific standing committees. However, comment from all interested Academic Senate standing committees is desired.

Affirmative Action & Diversity

January 30, 2015 8:10 AM

Affirmative Action & Diversity Committee Response: ADVANCE PPRI Revised Recruitment Recommendations

As a result of a fruitful discussion with Linda Bisson about the ADVANCE PPRI Revised Recruitment Recommendations, the AA&D committee would like to make a few recommendations to the AS Executive Council that will strengthen ADVANCE's efforts.

1. To bolster ADVANCE's recommendations, we believe more coordination is necessary among the various endeavors to increase and improve diversity, equity, and inclusion. The ADVANCE team, STEAD, AA&D, Vice-Provost Stanton's office, the Strategic Initiative on Diversity & Inclusion, the Office of Community Relations, and the committee revising the Principles of Community all are working towards the same ends along occasionally parallel, occasionally converging and overlapping paths. We fear there will be too much duplication of work. Therefore, we ask the Executive Council to find a way of establishing more coordination among the working groups.

2. A concern was raised within the AA&D committee about the centralization of search committees and the departments' migration to "Recruit." Undoubtedly, Recruit will play an important role in collecting the data necessary to determine how successful efforts to improve diversity and equity are. However, some departments do not participate in Recruit and prefer to use their discipline's national centralized system for submitting job applications. As one member of the committee commented, "If we were to switch to a separate system, we could lose out on a lot of applicants." We hope account will be taken of this in the implementation of Recruit.

3. We recommend that ADVANCE deploy UCD's Principles of Community (currently under revision) on their website as a statement of our university's commitment and values. At least a link to the POC should be placed on the ADVANCE website.

4. STEAD training should be for faculty, staff, and non-tenure-track search committees. Apparently, non-tenure-track searches do not require STEAD training of its committee members. In other words, all campus search committee members ought to undergo STEAD training.

5. Similar to STEAD training, which reaches directly into departments, so, too, deans and chairs must undergo training and develop a coherent vision as to how they will improve diversity, equity and inclusion in their units. The commitment to diversity must neither be imposed top-down nor must it stall on the level above the department faculty, as committee members have observed it happening.

CAP Oversight Committee

January 22, 2015 10:11 AM

Response continued on next page.

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has reviewed the Advance Policy and Practice Review Initiative Revised Recruitment Recommendations of November 2014. The committee offers two general comments, as well as specific comments on recommendations 1-4, 6-11, and 17.

*** Indicates Recommendations with specific requests for CAP involvement in recommendation implementation.

First, CAP members thought that it would be helpful for the Revised Recruitment Recommendations to include comments on the preferred manner of integrating the recommendations with the currently used matrix of decision making considerations in recruitment. CAP members noted that the current academic recruitment criteria (APM 500) clearly emphasize inclusions and diversity considerations. The APM 500 criteria are commonly used in as much balance as possible with APM 220-10 appointment criteria to guide recruitment and searches. The latter involve considering candidates' potential or realized excellence in research/scholarship, teaching, professional competence, and University and public service. It was not clear if the Revised Recruitment Recommendations were intended to explicitly or implicitly direct the faculty to create a balance or hierarchy of considerations in recruitment and appointment process. CAP recognizes that this is a difficult and complex issue to address. Nevertheless, clear guidance on this issue may be necessary to a full appraisal of the recommendations, let alone their effective implementation.

Second, CAP members noted that recommendations for enhancing the recruitment of women were emphasized as much as or more than the need for enhancement of the recruitment for URMs. This surprised many CAP members who noted that shifts in graduate-education gender demographics across disciplines suggest that recruitment of women may now be less of a concern than recruitment of URMs. Examination of the Office of Academic Affairs' report of the Ladder Faculty Hiring Analysis by Division from 11/01/2009 through 10/31/2014 supports this perception. In addition many CAP members commented that the portrayal of the stereotype of an ideal scientist on the basis of gender characteristics in Recommendation 9 may be dated, and was not clearly the best approach in a text intended to reduce gender bias in recruitment pools and appointment evaluations. CAP members noted that, in general, use of stereotypes abets the further use of stereotypes. These comments were reiterated with specific application to Recommendation number 9.

Comments on Specific Recommendations

1. ***We do not see a specific role for CAP in evaluating this recommendation. However, concern was expressed that the administrative complexities involved in this recommendation may slow down the hiring process in a manner that creates a system-wide disadvantage for the University.

2. ***We do not recognize a specific role for CAP in evaluating this recommendation. CAP members did suggest that evidence for the utility of such workshops be presented to faculty to improve engagement.

3. ***CAP members unanimously stated that they did not believe this type of review fell within the purview of CAP. Moreover, many members noted that the change to the Step Merit system has already had an impact on the speed of weekly case reviews. To add a new category of review at this time would jeopardize the timeliness of CAP reviews.

4. ***The members of CAP did not recognize a specific role for CAP in evaluating this recommendation. Nevertheless, appraisal sites at http://jobs.universityofcalifornia.edu lead CAP members to agree that the UC job site should be redesigned to be more similar to UCB and UC Merced job sites.

6. *** CAP recognizes the need for someone to review the use of search waivers, which are supposed to come to CAP as individual requests (and have mostly done so). In recent history this is an issue that has come up most often with respect to appointments for President's post-doc fellows. CAP agrees that a review of the context and use of search waivers over the past 5 years would be a most important step in generating new guidance and, as necessary, setting clear conditions for the use of search waivers. CAP would be interested in seeing the results of such a survey, presumably to be carried out by the office of the VPAA.

7. ***CAP did not see a specific role for CAP in evaluating this recommendation. However, many CAP members suggested that a diversity statement should be a voluntary rather than compulsory component of applications for faculty positions.

8. ***CAP did not recognize a specific role for CAP in evaluating this recommendation. CAP members did suggest that evidence for the utility of the training methods developed for effectively increasing recognition of implicit bias and schema abatement be presented to faculty to improve attendance and buy-in. CAP notes that substantial training is already built into the VP's meetings with search committees and chairs.

9. ***See General Comment # 2 at the beginning of this text.

10. ***CAP did not recognize a specific role for CAP in evaluating this recommendation. However, CAP members noted that academic pedigree or educational opportunities, at times, may truly influence excellence or potential in research/scholarship, teaching, professional competence, and University and public service. Disentangling the effects of academic pedigree from appraisal of the potential of candidates has been a longstanding challenge for search committee members. Improved awareness of pedigree bias may help this challenge. Use of an NSF-style tick box may be useful here.

11. ***CAP members thought that this was potentially useful but difficult to appraise with any precision; perhaps a primary mandate for the Mentorship Council might be to devise a method for evaluating the qualitative as well as quantitative elements of mentoring activities. CAP notes the possible advantages of a centralized mentoring project (to eliminate anecdotal and idiosyncratic advice).

14. CAP was not asked to comment on this recommendation. Nevertheless, several members noted that enhancing childcare and caregiver support program was one of the most important, needed and concrete suggestions in this set of recommendations.

17. ***CAP did not recognize a specific role for CAP in evaluating this recommendation. Nevertheless, many CAP members noted that the differences in the impact and implementation between a dual career program and the current POP program were not completely clear from the text of this recommendation. Some members also find the negative (anecdotal?) evaluation of the POP program to be dubious at best. CAP has seen numbers of cases in which both appointments have been strong, and thus doubly a benefit to the university. Where they are not so, CAP has the means to make judgments, and has done so. CAP finds nothing derogatory in the term POP, but has no objection to DCP.

Committee on Committees

January 30, 2015 2:07 PM

Committee on Committees responding specifically to Recommendation #12:

As has already been pointed out in the document's discussion, uniformity of treatment may be difficult depending on the size of the department. However, with regards to junior (untenured) faculty volunteering for Senate Committees, these have typically been less than 8% of all volunteers, and generally for the less time consuming committees such as Grade Changes or Undergraduate Scholarships. Since many of these faculty are very interested in the charge of the committees for which they volunteer, we would not want to discourage them from applying as Section 12 suggests.

Tenured junior faculty are expected to provide increasing levels of committee service, even at the campus level, as they become less junior, while untenured faculty could reasonably be expected to actively refrain from committee service unless it concerns a particular passion. In this regard, the report could be improved by making the tenured/untenured distinction for junior faculty and indicating a general expectation of very low committee service load for untenured faculty regardless of the impact on senior colleagues.

Furthermore, not only a simple reduction in course load and service expectations can affect junior faculty research, also the size and types of courses required to be taught, with varying degrees of preparation and time commitment, support from the department, etc. Not all courses are created equal in this regard, as are all senate committee time commitments.

Perhaps a survey illustrating school/college junior faculty workloads versus promotion success rates over time would be instructive.

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (AGRICULTURE)

February 16, 2015 9:54 PM

The CAES Faculty Executive Committee reviewed/discussed the ADVANCE Policy and Practices Review at our bimonthly meeting on 2/6/15.

In general the faculty were strongly supportive of the overall goal and recommendations provided in this ADVANCE review.

Two general items of concern were noted. One concern was if this plan, when implemented, would add new duties and requirements to already overburdened faculty and staff.   One suggestion for the administration was to try to adopt a system whereby new burdens on faculty/staff are compensated by reduction in burdens elsewhere.   A concern is that faculty are "suffering death by a thousand cuts at this point from every new requirement". In general, the impact on faculty/staff time these ADVANCE recommendations entail should be taken into consideration.

A second concern related to the idea of broadening searches. The suggestion is made, for example, that searches should be broadened so that a larger pool of candidates can be attracted, the implication being that a department may then choose a candidate who clearly addresses the broad ADVANCE goals but who may not be the 'ideal' candidate to meet explicit departmental teaching or research priorities. In this circumstance the department would have no incentive to choose the URM candidate even if she were clearly the best qualified 'scientist and teacher' since that hiring would perpetuate gaps in the departments teaching and research needs. In this example there is clearly a role that the College or University could play in negotiating split appointments or additional FTE or lecturer allocations so that the dual goal of increased URM women in the STEM fields is met while not disadvantaging departments who have taken this admirable goal seriously. The ADVANCE initiative needs to be truly collaborative at all levels. The current recommendation is strong on education and facilitation but short on incentives and, as such, it may not have the full impact this initiative deserves.

The Committee was supportive of all of the recommendations specifically identified for comment by FECs.   Many thought the expansion of the STEAD workshop to all faculty was a great idea as long as it was not relegated to an online course.   Several members expressed how beneficial the "live" version of that workshop was but thought that conversion to an online version would reduce its impact.

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (ENGINEERING)

February 13, 2015 4:34 PM

Response continued on next page.

Thursday, February 12, 2015

To: Andre Knoesen, Chair
     Davis Division of the Academic Senate

From: College of Engineering Faculty Executive Committee

SUBJECT: ADVANCE Policy and Practices Review Initiative-Revised Recruitment
                                              Recommendations November 2014

The Executive Committee, representing the faculty of the College, is as concerned about equitable opportunities for all as anyone else is on campus, and we believe that it is both wise and proper to eliminate any bias based on professionally irrelevant characteristics of individuals, thereby promoting diversity of opinions and experiences that reflect our society as a whole.

The ADVANCE document under review seems to concur with our views. However, we would favor a more positive and less bureaucratic approach as the issues are complex and not easily addressed by the heavy-handed emphases advocated for in the recommendations.

There seems to be an underlying assumption in the report that there is widespread lack of support for diversity on campus. The suggestion that all faculty should be required to attend workshops to correct this perceived problem is counterproductive and inefficient use of resources; certainly if directed at entities that may not have problems. A more surgical approach might have a better outcome. If there are identifiable problems in specific units, then these should be specifically addressed.

In most engineering fields the percentage of women faculty across the nation has not changed since about 1980. Over this time an enormous amount of effort and funds have been invested, with minimal result. With respect to women faculty our College is ranked 4 out of the top 50 universities nationwide (2002 report); we are doing well but can still do more. There is also space for additional improvement for other underrepresented groups, including hispanics and african americans. Thus, there is a well-recognized problem with the recruitment of various under-represented groups. In many cases this has to do with the very small pools of candidates rooted in long-term societal issues starting at the earliest stage. However, when considerable effort is put into the recruitment of top candidates in these very small pools, we are typically not successful due to the intense competition from other top institutions, and experience has shown that UC Davis has not succeeded with competitive offers. No mandatory faculty workshops to further instill the value of diversity will solve this problem. Higher success rate in recruitment of excellent candidates identified by the faculty requires more competitive offers by the campus.

There is widespread use of the term "unconscious bias". It is a likely fact that humans have biases based on culture and experiences, and it is clear that we should avoid having those biases influence our professional decisions to the detriment of others or the wellbeing of the institution. However, it is concerning to build an agenda upon a concept that is inherently difficult for individuals to identify. We run the risk of charging others with bias that is (or may be) unsubstantiated and this can easily lead to innuendo, which in turn is damaging for welfare, diversity, and inclusiveness.

College of Engineering Faculty Executive Committee

The top-down legislation proposed in the document is likely to be as detrimental as it will be beneficial. We agree that the facts and concerns regarding this issue must be shared. We also agree that there is work to do. But the negative, even caustic, tone of the document is unproductive. In fact, the document has a flavor of stirring up emotions, which we find counter to the stated objectives. An example is the unfortunate sign of prejudice about successful faculty and scholars:

``*The concept of the ideal STEM scholar is often imbued with traits such as excelling at self-promotion, aggressively competitive, stingy with both time and credit given to others, a tough negotiator and dedicated to career as evidenced by a lack of worklife balance.*"

Regardless of the origin, we are concerned with such naive and derogatory caricature of the faculty, who spend much of their time generously interacting with our diverse student body, graduate as well as undergraduate, and conducting significant service to the campus and beyond. Further, successful faculty members operate in a scientific world in which significant time must be devoted to the profession in order to be leaders in their fields, thereby advancing the stature of UC Davis and be successful in receiving extramural grants that supports the mission of the university, including the direct support of graduate students. We are concerned with the seemingly irrelevant statement that successful faculty, who are securing academic excellence at UC Davis, must have a lack of work-life balance. We appreciate the focus on work-life balance, but faculty members make (and should continue to make) their own priorities regarding their personal lives as they please, and these personal choices should not be the subject of superfluous judgement in a campus report. The above mentioned example seems inappropriate and not consistent with the stated objectives of the proposal. We suggest that the document be revised to avoid such unnecessary prejudice and generalizations.

On recommendations suggested in the report, we find several of them advancing a bureaucracy of reporting, training, and the development of best practices that may already have evolved at other institutions. We agree with Recommendation 6 that it can be useful to review the present use of search waivers in order to determine if these are applied consistent with campus and UC policy. We also concur with the proposed STEAD training, mentioned in Recommendation 8, if this is offered smoothly online and if it is handled by an independent, off-campus entity. Recommendation 9, which seemingly attempts to redesign how a faculty profile should look, is not only troublesome in its premise (noted above), but also in its suggested actions. It seems illogical that a defined group of campus members should ``redefine the ideal STEM faculty profile". This is hardly a spirit of diversity of ideas and inclusiveness. Recommendation 10 highlights the potential problems of excessive importance of pedigree. It seems sensible to address this for as long as it can be done without new bureaucratic burdens. Recommendation 11 suggests rewards for mentorship in merit and promotion actions. We believe that this is already included in the present format, where mentoring and service of value to the university is rewarded. We do not think that a departure from present flexible reporting to a more detailed (and therefore restrictive) set of named items is useful for the advancement process. A new mentoring council may also here point to more bureaucracy. We concur with the spirit of Recommendation 12, which addresses early career workload balances. We likewise concur with Recommendations 13-16 with 14 perhaps in need of a survey to determine the actual need. Recommendation 17 suggests mitigating the perceived ``stigma" of a POP hire by renaming the program to Dual Career. This is a sensible action, which should be explored, but it is not clear how the recommendation addresses other, more fundamental roots of problems with this type of hiring. We concur with Recommendation 18.

College of Engineering Faculty Executive Committee

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (LS: MATH/PHY SCI)

February 9, 2015 3:12 PM

The Letters & Science Executive Council had an extensive discussion of this proposal at our February 2 meeting. We were generally sympathetic with the recommendations, which address a very real and very serious problem. We did, however, have a few particular questions and reservations, which I will describe in more detail.

In my description, I will try to make clear which points were shared widely by the committee ("we"), which were raised by one or a few members, and which involved disagreement among committee members. Note that these concerns should not be interpreted as diminishing our general support.

1. We were concerned that the recommendations focused almost exclusively on gender, and not race or ethnicity. While this may have been the remit of the committee, we are very uneasy with recommendations that focus on policies for recruitment of women and not also underrepresented minorities.

2. The proposal contains a long list of recommendations, some which would require a significant commitment of resources (e.g., the childcare programs) and others which would not.
 Some members were concerned that the campus will agree to the proposal, implement the cheap recommendations, and declare victory. Several members noted that a related report on UCD underrepresented STEM students showed a pattern of programs receiving seed money and then drastically shrinking when that money dried up and was not replaced by internal funding. We would like assurance that any commitment to these steps by the campus comes with a reliable source of funding.

(There was some disagreement over the question of whether the final report should set priorities among its proposals.)

3. A number of the recommendations involve confronting implicit bias. Several members of the committee with expert knowledge in this area pointed out that to approach this problem, one needs awareness of implicit bias (addressed in the proposal), but also time and motivation to consciously work to overcome it. We do not have a systematic proposal for addressing this issue, but we would suggest, as one step, looking at UC Berkeley's policy on "equity advisors" (see more below).

4. We felt that item 9, on gendered traits, was very poorly worded, in a manner that seemed guaranteed to maximize opposition from STEM faculty.   The statement that

> "The concept of the ideal STEM scholar is often imbued with traits such as excelling at self-promotion, aggressively competitive, stingy with both time and credit given to others, a tough negotiator and dedicated to career as evidenced by a lack of worklife balance"

was considered at best "strange" and at worst a caricature. Onemember stated, "The report is describing the concept of an ideal STEM scholar as someone who none of us would want as a colleague." There is a real issue of gendered traits in STEM, but the committee felt that the issue was discussed very poorly in this report.

5. A committee member raised the question of enforcement, especially for item 8 (STEAD training).

What steps would be taken if search committee members simply refused such training? This is a rather delicate question, since it intersects with issues of academic freedom.

6. Members of the committee brought up several examples of practices elsewhere that we could learn from. One, mentioned briefly, above was Berkeley's use of "equity advisors" in all searches. These are faculty members who either serve on a search committee or who act as outside consultants; in the latter case, the search committee must appoint an official liaison.   The equity advisor ensures that the position is advertised widely enough to catch the attention of a diverse pool, that the job description is written broadly enough that a diverse pool of candidates apply, etc., and is charged with discussing with the search committee research on selection bias, proactive search procedures, and applicable affirmative action laws. A member who is familiar with the system at Berkeley reported that it had been extremely successful in increasing faculty diversity. Information is available at http://ofew.berkeley.edu/resources/Senate_search_guide2.pdf.

Another member pointed out that at UC San Diego, job candidates are required to write a diversity statement. This has helped to make both future faculty and search committee members think about these issues.

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (MANAGEMENT)

February 5, 2015 5:07 PM

Rather than comment in detail on the recommendations, we offer some general principles that might help in thinking about how to implement the recommendations.

We would generally encourage an approach that establishes a community that values diversity in hiring but affords flexibility in how to achieve that goal. Regulating or centralizing the process might actually be counterproductive in many situations.

The GSM has had tremendous success in hiring women and in recent years been noted as the business school with the highest proportion of women faculty in the world. There are two factors that have played on this success. First, we have been allowed to recruit at other than the assistant professor level, which allowed us to pursue women with tenured offers. Second, success begets success. A faculty with many women in leadership roles is an attractive destination for women beginning an academic career or looking to move.

Faculty Welfare

January 14, 2015 11:16 AM

While there are many useful recommendations in the ADVANCE document (including developing and disseminating a core set of best practices, monitoring hiring practices, creating a common, transparent UCD job website, and, importantly, reviewing search waiver practices), the Faculty Welfare Committee did not favor a required "diversity statement" as part of the application process. Even an optional requirement would compel applicants to complete such a statement for fear others might, placing an undue and likely unclear, as far as content, burden on the applicants. How to best formulate and evaluate diversity statements as part of the current merit/promotion system for faculty is still a work-in-progress, so it seems premature to include it in the hiring process, where there exist other more pressing issues.

Grade Changes

December 12, 2014 2:44 PM

The Committee on Grade Changes would like to express its support for this change, although the Committee would like to suggest three revisions to the proposed language:

1. The amended language states, "The Registrar shall change the NG notation to an F grade…" The Committee would suggest changing this to "The Registrar shall change the NG notation to an F grade, or equivalent,…" This would explicitly acknowledge that not all failing grades are F's (e.g. NP and U grades). This is a small but important distinction.

2. The amended language states, "during end-of-term processing in the immediate term following the assignment of the NG grade…" The Committee would suggest changing this to read, "during end-of-term processing in the immediate *regular* term following the assignment of the NG *notation*…" This way, the Office of the University Registrar will not be required to roll NG notations in summer terms. Also, the NG notation is not a grade, it is a notation, and should not be called a grade in Senate language – doing so could create a lot of problems with grading policy.

3. The amended language states, "the Registrar shall notify all affected students each term, after the end-of-term processing has identified them." It is the Committee's view that this gets too specific about the process. The Committee suggests ending the sentence at the comma so it reads, "the Registrar shall notify all affected students each term."

Thus, the Committee's suggested language for A540(G) would look like this (changes in ***bold italics***):

The Registrar shall change the NG notation to an F grade, ***or equivalent,*** **during the end-of-term processing in the immediate** *regular* **term following the assignment of the NG** ~~*not*~~ ***notation***, if the NG has not been removed under the provisions of (1) or (2)., ~~unless the instructor in charge indicates otherwise to the Registrar.~~ To ensure that the student is aware that an NG must be removed, the Registrar **shall notify all affected students each term**. ~~provide the following written notification to all affected students: "NG must be removed within one term or the NG will be changed to a grade of F. If this course appeared on your midterm course check list, see your instructor immediately; if it did not appear, see the Registrar."~~

Graduate Council

February 12, 2015 2:29 PM

Response continued on next page.

February 12, 2015

RFC: ADVANCE PPRI Recruitment Recommendations

Graduate Council met on February 6, 2015, and considered the ADVANCE PPRI Revised
Recruitment Recommendations.

Graduate Council was specifically asked to discuss Recommendation 11 concerning improving
the assessment of mentoring, in part to support greater rewards for quality mentoring activities.
GC supports the general concept of improving mentorship, rewarding effective mentorship, and
"defining the breadth and scope of mentorship." However, GC noted that the wide range of
mentoring styles appropriate to the diverse academic programs at UCD would make it difficult for
a single centralized council to craft an appropriate, successful set of recommendations. GC
believes the fostering of effective mentorship, and its due recognition within review processes, is
more effectively done at the college, department, and graduate group levels. Furthermore, the
reference to "council" in the ADVANCE document implies the establishment of a permanent body.
However, a temporary working group could address the primary needs of Recommendation 11,
which include the furthering of campus commitments to promoting and rewarding mentorship.
The membership of any such working group should include GC members, post-doctoral
associates, Academic Federation researchers, and graduate students. GC members deemed the
establishment of a permanent (or quasi-permanent) mentorship council to be unnecessary and
potentially problematic.

GC commends the goals of the ADVANCE revised recruitment recommendations, noting that
diversifying the faculty will help in providing effective mentors and role models for graduate
students and post-doctoral associates. GC in addition finds many of the recommendations for
faculty recruitment have analogs in graduate student and post-doctoral recruitment. Therefore, it
would be beneficial to coordinate campus initiatives to implement the ADVANCE faculty hiring
recommendations with GC activities for diversifying graduate student and postdoc communities.

Sincerely,

Kyaw Tha Paw U, Chair
Graduate Council

/vm

C: Gina Anderson, Academic Senate Executive Director

Planning & Budget

February 18, 2015 12:02 PM

CPB reviewed and discussed the ADVANCE PPRI Recruitment Recommendations and is providing specific comments regarding the recommendations that pertain to planning and budget.

Recommendation #3: Evaluate and enhance college/school level review of position descriptions and search plans.

CPB does not want to review search plans, but agrees that search plans could be improved and modernized. CPB recommends that the ADVANCE group come up with a best practices document and work with the Assistant and Associate Deans in each college and school.

Recommendation #6: Review current practices with respect to search waivers.

With one exception, CPB agrees that granting search waivers for Presidential Postdoctoral Fellows is acceptable. The minority opinion of CPB is that search waivers should not be granted for the Presidential Postdoctoral Fellow program and is in violation of APM 500. CPB reviews TOEs and POPs and agrees that it would be useful for POP requests to explain how the candidate will fit into a department's academic plan and discussion of how the department will ensure the success of the candidate.

Recommendation #13: Align University and federal family friendly policies via lobbying of federal granting agencies to institute cost-extensions for parental leave.

CPB endorses the need for an alignment plan and encourages the ADVANCE group to come up with a plan that will align the policies; CPB will be happy to review the plan.

Recommendation #17: Create a dual career program.

This recommendation would essentially transform the Partner Opportunity Program into a dual career program. CPB members strongly endorse this recommendation. CPB agrees that this would help to address the differences in start-up costs and salaries currently experienced between UC Davis and other universities.

Research

February 18, 2015 12:43 PM

COR reviewed and discussed the ADVANCE PPRI Recruitment Recommendations. The committee agrees that the recommendations address important issues and concerns, but also sees the prospect for nebulous responses, redundancy in action, and good intentions but difficulty following through. In addition, the proposed actions cannot be a sweeping act but a list of items and topics that the campus can use to help us to do better regarding recruitment in the coming years. Some of the action items and comments apply more directly to COR missions, so the committee focused mainly on those. Minor comments related to other recommendations are:

- **Recommendation #2**: The committee is not sure if a whole workshop for deans & chairs is warranted, it seems like a lot of work and time, and could possibly be done more efficiently;
- **Recommendation #4**: The committee is not sure that our website is so much different than other universities and needs more than minor editing;
- **Recommendation #5**: Again it seems like minor editing required for calls we already produce;
- **Recommendation #9**: The committee agrees that the proposed Joint Senate/Administration Committee to review gendered traits in pool evaluations is not necessary.

For the recommendations that affect COR directly:

- **Recommendation #11**: This recommendation is to reward mentorship but most of the discussion relates to assessing mentorship. COR believes that assessing quantity of mentorship is straightforward: how many undergrads, grads, others, peers etc. Could we adapt MIV to capture this information better? COR would agree that assessing quality is difficult, because of subjectivity in interpreting responses, fear that disgruntled mentees would not be honest in their responses, etc. For faculty engaged in mentoring junior faculty, COR believes it is appropriate for an overall group within the dept., school, or unit to assess the mentor's effectiveness and for people in such a position to attend mentoring training. There is already quite a lot of opportunity for mentoring training on campus so the majority of COR is actually not in favor of creating a whole mentorship council. In any case subjectivity in assessments is a reality in everything we do. The next unaddressed question is how to reward this. COR assumes it has to be included in packet assessments somehow for merits and promotions.
- **Recommendation #12**: This doesn't seem realistic. If someone comes in with strong funding and ongoing research, they start at a different place that someone who is brand new. It will vary greatly by discipline, and honestly by how attractive a candidate is. Should all units be constrained to the exact same perks being offered to a candidate that has very different strengths and experience in teaching, research, opportunities for future high-end funding etc.?

- **Recommendation #16**: COR completely agrees that Faculty Career Advisers and Privilege and Academic Personnel Advisers are a great idea. They should be advertised so faculty are aware of the service they provide.

Undergraduate Council

February 9, 2015 11:51 AM

No response at this time.