June 14, 2013

Carole Goldberg
Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

RE: Proposed Revisions to Appendix XII of The CALL

Dear Carole,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposed revisions to The Call, Appendix XII. Upon receipt of the proposal, I asked all Faculty Executive Committees, the Council on Academic Personnel, and the Faculty Welfare Committee to evaluate the proposal. Their responses are attached. The Executive Board, which speaks for the Senate on such matters, reviewed the responses as well as the proposed revisions. After discussion, the Board voted in favor of the proposal (8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

The Board did want to share the following concerns, which were raised by reviewing committees:

1. Some members were concerned that a revision of The CALL should not be (or appear to be) rushed, and more review time is recommended. To revise The CALL this late in the academic year, with such a short review period, will raise concerns about the changes that may be unwarranted.

2. Some Board members who were familiar with 5 year reviews found them to have been helpful. Others were concerned however, that the 4th possible outcome “No advancement, performance unsatisfactory for an extended period of time,” seemed overly punitive and wondered what was added that had not already been covered in outcome 3, “No advancement, performance unsatisfactory.”

Sincerely,

Linda Sarna
Chair, Academic Senate

CC: Jaime Balboa, Academic Senate CAO
CAP response to the proposed revision of Appendix 12 of the UCLA CALL, Five-year Reviews.  June 8, 2013

On behalf of the Council on Academic Personnel, I would like to assure the leadership of the Senate, and the executive board in particular, that CAP discussed the proposed changes with Vice-Chancellor Carole Goldberg over a several month period. Our observation is that V.C. Goldberg was interested in revising this appendix in order to ensure more fairness and equitable application of the provisions of the appendix across campus. Some faculty had simply been refusing to submit materials for the five-year review and thus avoiding it, while others dutifully went through the process. We agreed that a more consistent enactment of the appendix would be fairer to the faculty as a whole.

We had a number of suggestions during our many discussions, and we feel that VC Goldberg was very responsive to them. We began by asking how many faculty might be affected by the new outcomes and were assured that it would be very few indeed. We suggested that the point of this review should be to help faculty get back on track, and if they had been performing well but not advancing past a barrier step, that that performance should be rewarded (salary increase, for example). Carole agreed with these suggestions. We also wanted to be clear that teaching should not be seen as a punishment in this process. (E.g., if you don’t do enough research, we will punish you by assigning more teaching…) We could envision several possible ways to contribute positively to the department and to the university (e.g., administrative work, mentoring, curricular development, senate service…). Carole also agreed with this sentiment and modified her proposal accordingly.

In a time when we are understaffed in terms of ladder faculty and overwhelmed with additional students, it is crucial to have all faculty actively participating in their positions at UCLA. Most of us do so with great dedication. Those that are struggling should receive help. Those who are strongly contributing should be rewarded. Those few who are not, should realize that there may be repercussions. They need to be given help in developing a plan and time to realize it. We think that this is the sentiment of the revisions.

Please let me know if I can provide any more information that might be of help.

Sincerely,
Kathleen L. Komar,
Chair of CAP
June 6, 2013

Professor Linda Sarna
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Senate Item for Review: Modifications to The CALL Appendix 12 Five-Year Reviews

Dear Professor Sarna,

The Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) reviewed the Modifications to The CALL Appendix 12 Five-Year Reviews.

The Committee endorses the proposed modification.

We appreciate the opportunity to review the charter. If you have additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact me (x42681; kominski@ucla.edu) or Maya Moore (x53851 mmoore@senate.ucla.edu).

Sincerely,

Gerald Kominski
Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee

cc: Maya Moore, Faculty Welfare Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
    Members of the Faculty Welfare Committee
    Jaime Balboa, Academic Senate CAO
    Steven Troung, MSO
To: Linda Sarna, Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
Fr: Michael Meranze, Chair, College Faculty Executive Committee
Date: June 6, 2013
Re: College FEC response to the proposed changes to Appendix 12 of the UCLA Call (Five Year Review)

The College FEC appreciates the opportunity to review and opine on the proposed changes to Appendix 12 of the UCLA Call (Five Year Reviews). Our discussion at the FEC’s May 31, 2013 meeting was aided by Vice Chancellor Goldberg, who joined us for a frank and fruitful conversation about the changes, the reasons for their being proposed, and possible ways to clarify or improve them. The committee is pleased that she took the time to meet with us.

The FEC is electing not to take a specific position in favor or in opposition to the proposed changes. Instead, we question the rationale for why the revised policy needs to be put into place by July 1 and urge more dialogue about the proposed revised policy to identify where ambiguities should be addressed and clarified prior to implementation of changes to existing policy. Acknowledging there remains aspects of ambiguity in the proposal, I recount here a brief summary of the points that were made during our discussion:

1. The FEC appreciates the proposed formalization of the Five Year Review process. Insisting that departments create reviewable dossiers and curtailing the too-often ad hoc nature of reviews strikes us as a positive step. Moreover, we think that providing more direction to departments about the purpose of the Five Year Review, the decision options available, and the obligations of departments and Deans in the reviews will be equally productive. Indeed, one member commented that their last Five Year Review would have been far more useful had there been greater guidance provided to both the department and the faculty member.

2. The FEC also supports the Vice Chancellor’s desire to require departments and Deans (in cooperation with the individual faculty member) to construct action plans as part of the Five Year Review process. As presented to us, these action plans are intended to aid individual faculty members with advancement, or to address barriers preventing their contributions to scholarship and the university’s mission. So long as these plans are designed carefully to enable faculty to move forward in his or her teaching, research, and service, we think ‘action plans’ are an important addition to the process. In this context, the committee would like to draw attention to one specific point. Sometimes—due to changing intellectual visions, transformations in funding sources, research discoveries or other facts—the trajectory of departmental and individual interests may diverge. Given this possibility, the committee urges that mechanisms be included to ensure both that faculty participation in IDPs is given full acknowledgment and that the Five Year Review process ensures that faculty not suffer because of a divergence of research agendas among colleagues.
3. Despite Vice Chancellor Goldberg’s intent to redeploy the Five Year Review process as a tool for aiding faculty members to increase their creative contributions to university life, we think that the proposal does not convey that intent adequately. The notion of an ‘action plan’ remains vague and those points that are precisely laid out lend themselves too readily to punitive or negative interpretations. As a practical matter, the review process is concerned primarily with research productivity and the committee worries that the proposed language may not recognize the diverse and sometime new ways that we can re-conceive scholarship beyond the traditional publication venues. Faculty should not be discouraged from experimentation for fear that a five year review may end up penalizing them.

4. The FEC remains skeptical about the necessity of adding outcome 4. The university already has procedures for addressing issues relating to faculty who have repeatedly and consistently failed to meet their responsibilities. Given the small number of Five Year Reviews that take place annually, and the likelihood that many occur at barrier steps, the committee feels that the addition of outcome 4 dramatically increases the punitive implications of the proposed changes. While we do not believe it is Vice Chancellor Goldberg’s intention to create a disciplinary policy, outcome 4 gives at least the appearance of an attempt to make the review process more stringent and more punitive.

In light of these concerns we would urge the Senate to advocate for a later implementation date and to encourage the drafting of a stronger proposal that lays out more clearly the purposes and intent of the changes, highlighting the Vice Chancellor’s hope that the reviews can be deployed so as to create the conditions of renewed creativity for individual faculty, and to clarify the expectations on departments and Deans regarding their roles in this process and the importance that Five Year Reviews serve as incentives and not simply as penalties for teaching, scholarship, and service.

Finally, during her visit with us, Vice Chancellor Goldberg engaged with members in a wide-ranging conversation about the purposes of the academic personnel review process. Given the increasing challenges facing the university, and the diverse, and sometimes novel, ways that faculty are now being called upon to engage in scholarship both within their disciplines and in relation to the public and to teaching, we think that a serious discussion about ways to allow faculty to pursue multiple interests (either contemporaneously or sequentially) is overdue. We recognize that decisions about the structure of review and promotion are set at the system-wide level, but campuses do have flexibility in how those rules are interpreted. It is time for UCLA to take a leadership role in encouraging a reconsideration of how faculty can construct and develop careers that enables their fullest creative contributions.

As always, our membership appreciates the consultative process and welcomes the opportunity to opine on important matters like this. You are welcome to contact me at meranze@history.ucla.edu with questions. Kyle Stewart McJunkin, Academic Administrator, is also available to assist you and he can be reached at (310) 825-3223 or kmcjunkin@college.ucla.edu.

Cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
   Lucy Blackmar, Interim Associate College Dean, College of Letters and Science
June 6, 2013

Linda Sarna Chair, Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

RE: Revision of Appendix 12 of the CALL: 5 year reviews

Dear Linda,

Thank you for the opportunity to opine upon the recommended revisions to Appendix 12 of the CALL—5 year reviews. I have shared the proposal with the School of Nursing Faculty Executive Committee and the Faculty. The School of Nursing has a number of concerns about the recommendations suggested including:

1. We feel there has been insufficient time for faculty to adequately discuss the consequences of the proposed changes.

2. There is great concern about what would constitute the specific criteria to determine three of the outcomes: no advancement performance satisfactory, no advancement performance unsatisfactory and no advancement performance unsatisfactory for an extended period of time. Currently there are no explicit written criteria for determination of productivity and so how would this be handled? Some of these concerns related to diversity across units. How will the great variety of what is considered scholarly/research activities between units be handled?

3. There are questions about appeals process and how a faculty member would appeal a decision on a five-year review.

4. There are also questions about roles and responsibilities of faculty and units in conducting the reviews.

We are not necessarily unsupportive of the recommendations, but we do believe that a change such as this requires additional time for discussion. Thank you again for the opportunity to review and opine on this matter. Please contact me if clarification or elaboration is required.

Sincerely,

Barbara Bates-Jensen
Faculty Executive Chair, School of Nursing
MEMO

Date       June 4, 2013
From      Rodney McMillian, Vice-Chair, Faculty Executive Committee

School of the Arts and Architecture

To      UCLA Academic Senate Jaime Balboa, CAO

RE Modifications to The Call, Appendix 12: Five-Year Review

The Faculty Executive Committee of the School of the Arts and Architecture reviewed the Proposed revision to The CALL, Appendix 12: Five-Year Reviews. At our May 10th meeting we agreed there are aspects of the modifications which could provide streamlining benefits, however others fostered questions and concerns.

Many agreed that the revisions seem reasonable if the normal channels of approval are taken. However, there are questions about the motivations for the changes. Are the revisions driven by the current budget crisis? What safeguards are there for a faculty member who has been kept down due to intradepartmental bias as opposed to “cutting dead wood?”

A suggestion was made that there should be some kind of contingency for cases in which a professor may have received negative evaluations from students, or been the target of department dysfunction, i.e. departmental discontent towards a colleague’s unorthodox research and/or teaching. Perhaps the review could then go to an ad hoc evaluation outside of the faculty member’s home department?

Faculty in the SOAA produce research in a range of artistic and aesthetic media, which may be difficult for those outside the creative disciplines to evaluate. Thus, we are concerned that these revisions position the Vice Chancellor as the final arbiter of SOAA Five-Year Review processes. In other words, would this revision in fact be detrimental to the autonomy that the University of California promises its faculty?

The concern was expressed that these revisions are taking “carrots” away and leaving only sticks that are bigger than in the previous version. The SOAA believes there should be more positive and proactive wording in the revisions.

Finally, another issue of concern was in regards to professors of advanced age. With no retirement requirement at UC, as a professor ages, should they be
expected to be as productive as younger professors? Can veteran faculty be enlisted to help craft appropriate criteria emphasizing teaching and service?
To Linda Sarna, Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

From Mark A. Peterson, Faculty Chair, Luskin School of Public Affairs

Concerning the Proposed Revision of Appendix 12 (Five-Year Reviews) in The UCLA CALL

May 30, 2013

To gain an informed perspective on Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel Carole Goldberg’s proposed revision of Appendix 12 in the UCLA CALL, pertaining to five-year reviews for academic personnel, we acquired data on the number of faculty members subject to such reviews in the Luskin School over the past ten years, solicited the views of the current and recent former chairs of the School’s three departments, and I discussed the issue with Dean Frank Gilliam. Based on that information, the Luskin SPA FEC offers the following general reactions to the proposed revision:

1. The revised version of Appendix 12 in and of itself would be reasonable and noncontroversial from our perspective, generally a positive contribution that clarifies and standardizes the process.

2. The way the issue arose and the proposed changes in Appendix 12, however, fail to address a number of underlying issues:

   ● The proposed revision, effectively a replacement of the existing language of the Appendix, was presented and distributed without any explanation. We have the “what” but not the “why.” It would be helpful to know what prompted the suggested revision and what kinds of issues or experiences motivated the drafting of the particular form of replacement text.

   ● The objectives of the five-year review remain ill-defined beyond the broad notion of having some kind of mechanism for conducting oversight of faculty performance (simple monitoring). What, exactly, is the five-year review supposed to accomplish—is it a means to judge contributions and make commensurate salary adjustments for those who are temporarily or permanently off the scholarly research and publishing track (due process), a device to provide an incentive for a return to scholarly productivity, a form of shaming or even punishment for having failed to meet the standards of a top research university, or a procedure that could ultimately lead to a forced change in a faculty member’s status or even separation from the university?

   ● The proposed revision does not clarify whether the purpose of the five-year review is to prompt a faculty member’s return to the productive ranks of scholarship or to accept the shift away from research and publication but nurture a rebalancing of duties—to more teaching responsibilities or enhanced service obligations—so that the university’s expectations about time
commitments and cognitive investments remain roughly in balance across the entire faculty (equity).

● If the new version is intended to alter a faculty member’s behavior, reigniting a commitment to scholarship (setting guidelines for improvement), the underlying model of behavioral change is not clear, nor is the way the application of the five-year review should be adaptive to the varied reasons for a sufficiently severe decline in scholarly productivity to keep a faculty member from progressing through the standard steps—from major disruptions in the external environment, such as cutbacks in federal funding, to temporary but sufficiently long and intense personal crises that derail research (and other) activity to individual decisions to stop engaging in research and publishing—or the varied contexts across units on campus.

● The revision indicates that a five-year review could lead to a “change in series,” but it does not specify what would warrant such a change or what a change in series could actually entail. For example, might a faculty member be shifted from the ladder series to an “in-residence” position, requiring the individual to obtain outside funding to pay his or her salary?

    Sorting out these issues could be of real importance to get the five-year review process “right” and to establish a consistent set of procedures, expectations, outcomes across the campus. Consider two empirical observations from the Luskin SPA experience. First, there are a handful of active (non-retired) faculty at the School who have gone through five-year reviews over the last decade, but none of them in the last five years and they are currently engaged and productive with respect to research and publication. Second, as one former chair noted, on occasion a Professor, Step V, chooses to go through a five-year review in order to build a more robust portfolio in preparation for the Step VI review. These experiences underscore that the five-year review should accommodate, without stigma or grave concern, faculty who have not left the scholarly track.
TO: Linda Sarna, Chair  
Academic Senate

Cc: Jaime Balboa, CAO  
Academic Senate

FROM: Alan J. Laub, Professor  
Chair, HSSEAS Faculty Executive Committee

DATE: June 4, 2013

RE: THE CALL APPENDIX 12 - FIVE YEAR REVIEWS

The HSSEAS FEC supports The Call Appendix 12: Five Year Reviews. This is not a major issue in HSSEAS. We have no additional comments.