November 24, 2014

Professor Joel Aberbach  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity’s Response to the System wide Review of Proposed Revised APM Sections 133, 210, 220, and 760

Dear Professor Aberbach,

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity thanks you for the opportunity to respond to the proposed amendments to sections 133, 760, 210, and 220 of the APM. We wholeheartedly support adding language to expand the range of reasons for which a faculty member may choose to stop the tenure clock. We applaud efforts to concretize these procedures since too often, as the revisions’ authors well know, such accommodations are left to a chair’s or dean’s sometimes capricious discretion.

We also strongly support added language ensuring that contributions toward diversity, equity and inclusion in teaching and/or service are to be highly valued in the merit and promotion process of faculty in any discipline. We would like, however, to include the stipulation that research conducted by minority faculty members on their own respective cultures be considered just as valuable as research conducted by faculty conducting research on cultures other than their own. Former members of CAP who currently serve on The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity (CODEO) report several instances in which the research of Anglo faculty on non-Anglo communities was considered more impressive than that of minority faculty even when all objective metrics remained equal. CODEO believes that strong language prohibiting such bias will equalize evaluation in future cases.

In sum, The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity supports the revised sections of the APM with the following suggestions: include language in APM 210 and 220 that diversity efforts by minority and non-minority faculty be considered equally. You are welcome to contact me at mklopez@humnet.ucla.edu with questions. Annie Speights, Policy Analyst, is also available to assist you and she can be reached at (310) 825-3853 or aspeights@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Marissa Lopez,  
Chair, Committee on Diversity and Equality Opportunity

cc: Members of the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity  
Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate  
Serge Chenkerian, MSO/Executive Assistant, Academic Senate  
Annie Speights, Policy Analyst, Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity
November 04, 2014

To: Joel Aberbach, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Council on Academic Personnel

RE: Proposed changes to APM 210

CAP is very supportive of efforts to clarify the language in APM 210 on contributions to diversity in merit and promotion reviews. However, some parts of the new language still remain confusing to us. Specifically we think it is important to further distinguish between diversity-related activities (e.g., in teaching, mentoring, and service) and diversity as an area of one's scholarship. We would like more clarifying language, with examples, on the meaning of diversity as an academic discipline "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". We were also unclear about what it means to address contributions to mentoring of diverse students and faculty on a "sliding scale". Does the mean that it should be possible to quantify (e.g., how much does it count?) contributions to diversity through mentoring? If yes, why is this quantification limited to mentoring rather than including teaching and service as well? If the goal of the "sliding scale" analogy is to quantify how much of an individual's total teaching, mentoring, and service is comprised of diversity-related activities, then that goal should be more specifically stated and clarified.
December 02, 2014

To: Joel Aberbach, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Council on Academic Personnel

RE: Comments on “APM 133-17 Eight Year Limitation on Service

CAP is sensitive to the issues motivating a revision of criteria for stopping one’s tenure clock for reasons other than childbirth or adoption. The demands of caring for an elderly parent can certainly be as great as the demands of caring for a newborn. Both can take their toll on productivity. However, CAP was concerned that the conditions for requesting time off the clock for non child care related reasons were vague, underdeveloped, and therefore vulnerable to misuse. Until the conditions for requesting time off the clock are better articulated, any such requests should be handled by the Vice Chancellor of Academic Personnel on a case by case basis.
November 6, 2014

Professor Joel Aberbach
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Committee on Faculty Welfare’s Response to the System wide Review of Proposed Revised APM Sections 133, 210, 220, and 760

Dear Professor Aberbach,

On behalf of the 2014-2015 Committee on Faculty Welfare, I am writing to provide you with the membership’s feedback concerning the recent system wide review of proposed revised APM sections 133, 210, 220 and 760. On the issue of “Stopping the Clock for the Care of a Child”: The Committee on Faculty Welfare has no objections to the extension of stopping the clock privileges to the various additional situations as proposed here. One member did think that these extensions are so extensive that they dilute the original purpose of APM 133, and that it might be wiser to add these additional situations as separate sections of the APM instead of including them in 133, if only for the optics.

On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Welfare, we thank you for the opportunity to comment on the system wide review of proposed revised APM Sections 133, 210, 220, and 760. You are welcome to contact me at dlopez@soc.ucla.edu with questions. Annie Speights, Policy Analyst, is also available to assist you and she can be reached at (310) 825-3853 or aspeights@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

David Lopez
Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare

cc: Members of the Committee on Faculty Welfare
    Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate
    Serge Chenkerian, MSO/Executive Assistant, Academic Senate
    Annie Speights, Policy Analyst, Committee on Faculty Welfare
November 20, 2014

Prof. Joel Aberbach  
Chair, UCLA Senate  
3125 Murphy Hall  
Mailcode: 140801

Re: Proposed Revised APM - 133-17-g-j; APM - 210-1-c & -d; APM - 220-18-b; and APM - 760-30-a

Dear Prof. Aberbach,

The Privileges & Tenure Committee considered the referenced Academic Personnel Manual revisions and have no comments or additional suggestions.

Regards,

Kristina Bostrom, Chair  
Privileges & Tenure Committee

cc:  
Serge Chenkerian, MSO/Executive Assistant, UCLA Academic Senate  
Linda Mohr, CAO, UCLA Academic Senate
TO: Professor Joel Aberbach  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

FROM: Earl Freymiller  
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee  
School of Dentistry

RE: APM 133, 210, 220, 760

The Faculty Executive Committee of the School of Dentistry met to discuss the proposed revisions to APM 133, 210, 220 and 760. Three of the revisions (133, 220, 760) pertain to extending the eight year limitation on service toward tenure for certain conditions other than childbirth. Proposed revisions to APM 210 address how diversity contributions are evaluated in merit and promotion reviews.

The Dentistry FEC feels that extending the eight-year time limit due to some circumstances other than childbirth is most appropriate. However, concern was expressed that this change could lend itself to abuse. The requirement for Chancellor’s approval, on a case-by-case basis, should help prevent this possibility, assuming that each case is indeed considered with due diligence.

The Dentistry FEC favors the proposed revisions to APM 210. No concerns were expressed.
October 29, 2014

Joel D. Aberbach, Ph.D.
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

RE: Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Sections 133-17-g-j, 210-1-c & -d, 220-18-b and 760-30-a

Dear Professor Aberbach,

The David Geffen School of Medicine Faculty Executive Committee (DGSOM FEC) reviewed and discussed the proposed revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) (Sections 133-17-g-j, 210-1-c & -d, 220-18-b and 760-30-a) at its meeting of October 1, 2014.

The Committee expressed support of these proposed revisions but has some concern that the Chancellor is the only one to determine that the activity undertaken during the course of the leave is substantially unrelated to the individual’s academic career. While we agree with the proposal, we would still want the Chancellor to do this in consultation with the academic senate and are opposed to leaving the Academic Senate out of the process.

Sincerely,

Jonathan S. Jahr, M.D.
Chair of the Faculty (DGSOM Faculty Executive Committee)
Professor of Clinical Anesthesiology, Step VI
David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA
Ronald Reagan UCLA Medical Center
757 Westwood Plaza, Suite 3325
Los Angeles, California 90095
310.267.8678 f 310.267.3899
jsjahr@mednet.ucla.edu

cc: Serge Chenkerian, MSO Executive Assistant
Hey

Linda,
The Faculty of Executive Committee of Fielding School of Public Health reviewed the following APMs at our November 4th meeting.
We recommended to approve changes proposed by the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) on APM 133-17-g-j, which deals with the issue of stopping the tenure clock for care of a child or children. It has been proposed to expand the permissible reasons to “exceptional personal circumstances beyond the faculty member’s control which may impede timely progress”.
The purpose of APM 080-9-19-14 is to address issues of medical separation when faculty or academic appointees cannot no longer meet their conditions of appointment due to illness or disability. The APM is not new and is simply being edited to bring it up to date so that it is consistent with current employment law and current university practices. The modifications spell out an already reasonable and considerate approach to handling medical incapacity. Appropriate steps are included to adapt to the likely idiosyncratic situations that will arise and need guidance from APM 080-9-19-14.
We also support APM 760-30-a on enhanced family accommodation for childbearing and childrearing.

Weng Kee Wong
Professor and FEC Chair
Fielding School of Public Health
At its meeting on October 16, 2014, the GSE&IS FEC considered proposed revisions to four sections of the Academic Personnel Manual, as requested by Senate Chair Aberbach. The Committee had no comments on proposed changes to sections 133-17-g-j (Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles), 210-1-c (Review and Appraisal Committees), and 220-18-b (Professor Series).

Regarding the proposed changes to APM 201-1-d (also from Review and Appraisal Committees), several Committee members expressed a preference for the section's previous language, and their concern that the proposed revision "waters down" what they saw to be the earlier, stronger statement that faculty members should demonstrate, or at least reflect on, their efforts to promote diversity and equity in their research, teaching, professional activities, and service. Some criticized the explanations/justifications for the change provided in two letters dated January 2, 2014, from statewide Academic Senate Assembly Chair Bill Jacob, and Harry Green (Chair of the statewide University Committee on Academic Personnel) and Emily Roxworthy (Chair of the statewide University Committee on Affirmative Action & Diversity), respectively, which accompanied the proposed changes. These members contended that the suggestion that the previous language was "ambiguous" or could be read as implying that "research into diversity and equity holds a privileged position among academic disciplines," and thus confer an advantage in the personnel/promotion cases of faculty pursuing such research, was "disingenuous" and that any such presumption about diversity/equity research is essentially a straw man. Also, although the new language of 210-1-d states that diversity/equity contributions in research, teaching, professional activity, and service "are to be encouraged," some FEC members wondered whether such contributions are to be required of all faculty, or just expected. Others raised additional questions concerning the assessment of multidisciplinary work with respect to contributions to the promotion of diversity/equity.

Regarding APM 760-30-a, the FEC's main suggestion is that the section (and indeed, the entire APM 760 title) is overly focused on children, child care, and parenting, when similar accommodations (stopping the clock, in the case of 760-30-a) could just as well be invoked for other important family matters requiring accommodations for faculty,
including elder care, family illness or bereavement, and so on. Members suggested that the title of APM 760 itself should be amended to reflect this broader concern with family matters, removing the terms "childbearing and childrearing" (i.e., truncating the title to "Family Accommodations") and amending the whole text of APM 760 accordingly.

On behalf of the GSE&IS FEC, I hope these remarks are helpful as deliberations move forward.