SUSAN CARLSON, VICE PROVOST ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Re: Proposed revision of APM 210

Dear Susan:

As I believe you are aware, ambiguities in the language of APM 210-1d contains have raised concerns in Senate committees about inconsistent implementation and potential misunderstanding. Accordingly, over the past year, the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) and the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) have worked together to develop proposed revisions that they believe would more precisely state the University’s commitment to faculty diversity while also avoiding the misperception that research in some fields will be valued more highly than research in others without regard to its academic quality.

I write now to transmit a memo from UCAP and UCAAD chairs Harry Green and Emily Roxworthy providing background context for the proposed change. Please note that the language of APM 210-1d was first proposed by the Senate.

As always, please feel free to contact me or Professors Green or Roxworthy if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Bill Jacob

Encl. (1)

Cc: Academic Council
   Executive Director Winnacker
   Policy Manager Lockwood
   Senate Analysts
January 2, 2014

BILL JACOB, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: APM210-1.d Historical Context and Need for Revision

Dear Bill,

Historical Context

In the fall of 2002, President Atkinson convened a Strategic Review Panel that recommended incorporating educational outreach (which helps disadvantaged and underrepresented populations) into the teaching and research mission of the UC faculty. The Panel’s final report in Spring, 2003, also recommended involving faculty more directly in efforts to serve the community. One of the University’s responsibilities as a land-grant institution is to provide broad and equitable education for all eligible California residents, including those in disadvantaged and underrepresented groups. As a consequence, faculty contributions to diversity and equal opportunity are to be highly valued by the University. Accordingly, the Panel asked the Academic Senate to develop means by which faculty members could be properly recognized and rewarded for their participation in these forms of educational outreach.

In 2003-04, the Senate’s University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) worked with several other Senate committees to propose language for the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) that would instruct campus reviewers to evaluate contributions to diversity and equal opportunity in all three categories of the academic appointment, review, and promotion process (teaching, research, and service). Revisions of three sections of the APM were proposed to guide Deans (APM 240), Department Chairs (APM 245) and the Academic Merit and Promotion process (APM 210) in promoting diversity and equity. The first two revisions were approved with little discussion but the proposed revisions to APM 210 met with considerable controversy. In particular, the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) commented that “By singling out a specific area of work for special treatment, it seems to imply that the subject matter itself is more important than and substitutes for scholarly rigor, objectivity and originality” and “It is also unclear how to distinguish between diversity efforts that should count as “research and creative work” rather than as “University and public service.” In 2004-05, following further discussion and system-wide review, the Academic Council unanimously approved creation of a new paragraph of APM 210 (section 210-1.d) [Attached]. The Administration concurred and charged each campus with devising local strategies to implement the new policy.
Need for Revision

Since 2005, each campus has approached APM 210-1.d autonomously, and its implementation has been uneven and inconsistent across the system, primarily due to confusions and/or disagreements concerning the original two concerns of UCORP. Finally, in 2011/12, after extensive and animated discussions, the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) concluded that the current wording of APM 210-1.d was unworkable because its language is ambiguous; it can be read to say that research into diversity and equity holds a privileged position above other academic disciplines. This conclusion was reached while UCAP was reviewing the report of a Faculty Diversity Working Group convened by President Yudof in early 2011 as part of the Campus Climate Council. One of the Working Group’s key recommendations was that the Senate devise strategies for fully implementing APM 210-1.d as soon as possible. As a consequence of the Working Group’s recommendation and UCAP’s conclusion of unworkability of the current wording, in Fall 2012, the Senate Chair tasked UCAAD and UCAP with revising the language of APM 210-1.d to make it unambiguous to ensure that the policy would be fully and consistently implemented on every campus.

Proposed New Language

During the 2012-13 academic year, UCAAD and UCAP worked together to modify the language of APM 210-1.d to clarify: (i) that all academic disciplines have equal standing in the merit/promotion process; (ii) that contributions to diversity and equity by faculty members for whom diversity and equity are not primary research fields are also to be encouraged as an aspect of their teaching and/or service; (iii) that mentoring of diverse students and faculty in any discipline is important and can require considerable time and effort, for which faculty should be rewarded appropriately. The proposed revisions include explicit language stating that research, teaching, and service related to diversity and equal opportunity comprise a valid disciplinary area that is to be judged on its own merits—at the same level of recognition as any other academic discipline recognized by the University of California. At the same time, contributions toward diversity, equity and inclusion in teaching and/or service are to be highly valued in the merit/promotion process of faculty in any discipline. Mentoring of diverse students and faculty is specifically to be given “due recognition” in the merit/promotion system. That is, such mentoring is to be addressed on a “sliding scale”, thereby giving appropriate recognition depending on the level of involvement of the faculty member. In Spring, 2013, the Academic Council approved with a large majority the revised wording for APM 210-1.d [attached] that is now to be distributed for discussion and approval by the full Senate.

Finally, both UCAAD and UCAP recommend that every campus provide dedicated sections on the biobibliography or elsewhere in the review file where faculty can, if they wish, document their contributions to diversity and include narrative that details the efforts and impacts of these activities. Such presentation will allow reviewers at all levels to evaluate these voluntary contributions to teaching and service in the context that they are valued highly by the University.

Sincerely,

Harry Green, Chair
UCAP

Emily Roxworthy, Ph.D., Chair
UCAAD