July 18, 2023

Susan Cochran, Chair, Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

RE: Proposed Revisions to APM - 210, Review and Appraisal Committees

Dear Susan,

The Riverside Executive Council included the subject proposed policy on their June 26, 2023 agenda. There was overall a broad base of support for the revised APM-210.

I attach the comments from responding tasked committees and call your attention to the concern regarding measurement and evidence of effective mentoring (Committee on Academic Personnel, Committee on Faculty Welfare, College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences faculty executive committee), placement of mentoring in teaching versus service section (Committee on Academic Personnel, Graduate Council), and concern for additional workload to update the UCR online academic review management system eFilePlus accordingly (Committee on Faculty Welfare). Concerns were also expressed regarding the intersection of mentoring and DEI efforts and the disproportionate demand and impact of mentorship on under-represented faculty, with a call for a clearer set of guidelines (College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences faculty executive committee).

Sincerely yours,

Sang-Hee Lee
Professor of Anthropology and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Monica Lin, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of UCR Academic Senate Office
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

June 12, 2023

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
    Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Jang-Ting Guo, Chair
      Committee on Academic Personnel


In its May 31, 2023 meeting, CAP discussed the proposed revisions to APM-210 with the removal of section 210-5 and Appendix B. The committee is in general agreement with the substantive changes to sections 210-1, 210-2, 210-3, 210-4 and 210-6. Below are our comments and suggestions:

- Several CAP members asked how mentoring effectiveness will be measured and how the associated evidence will be evaluated. Others opined that a broad and open-ended approach to what can be considered mentoring would likely be the most useful.

- Several CAP members expressed concerns about designating some mentoring activities as service rather than as teaching, and wondered whether it would be more efficient to keep all mentoring activities in one place, under teaching.
June 15, 2023

TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair  
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

FROM: John Kim, Chair  
CHASS Executive Committee


The CHASS Executive Committee has reviewed the proposed policy revisions to the APM Section 210 and would like to provide the following comments:

1. We support the endorsement made by the Council of University Librarians (CoUL) on the addition of contributions to diversity, equity, inclusion, and equal opportunity in the academic personnel process for the Librarian series (210-4).

2. P. 13, 210.2.2b: The language regarding overenthusiasm and cliches may be well intended but it introduces subjective criteria and should be struck.

3. Regarding policy changes to:

210-1 Instructions to Review Committees That Advise on Actions Concerning Appointees in the Professor and Corresponding Series  
and  
210-3 Instructions to Review Committees That Advise on Actions Concerning the Lecturer with Security of Employment Series

- The change in language from “equal opportunity and diversity” to “diversity, equity, inclusion, and equal opportunity” continues to place the burden of “DEI interventions” on faculty and faculty-student relationships. It does so while failing to address broader structural issues pertaining to administrative and campus accountability in perpetuating inequity.
While we commend the incorporation of the proposed mentoring recommendations in both series to acknowledge the multifaceted nature of mentorship as evidence of “superior intellectual attainment,” we also express the following concerns:

-- On page 50 (page 6 in tracked draft), under **Mentoring Effectiveness** it states that “The committee should pay due attention to the variety of demands placed on instructors by the types of teaching and mentoring called for in various disciplines and at various levels, and should judge the total performance of the candidate with proper reference to assigned teaching and mentoring responsibilities.”

We acknowledge that the “variety of demands” placed on instructors vary in their intensity and impact, just as the rewards for mentoring and other extracurricular work are often attributed unevenly among faculty across different stages of their careers. It is crucial to recognize that teaching and mentorship demands disproportionately affect women and nonbinary faculty, particularly women and nonbinary faculty of color. This is, in part, because of the substantial mentorship needs of underrepresented students we have on campus at UC Riverside, in addition to the community service work that underrepresented faculty often undertake.

Given the extra burden and the difficulty that documenting what are often—and must often be—informal and ongoing forms of mentorship that are commonly performed by underrepresented faculty, as opposed to formal service on Senate committees or in College-level DEI roles, for example, reviewers at all levels, from departments to Academic Personnel Committees should be mandated to pay particular attention to narrative accounts of DEI service in the candidate’s self-statement, a document too often overlooked or disregarded.

Preferably, however, contributions to DEI should be added to all reviews as a distinct category alongside Research, Teaching and Service. Given that it is a required qualification for all hires, contributions to DEI in the service of the ongoing desegregation of the university should continue to be reviewed at all stages of advancement, rather than being regarded as merely a threshold requirement.

-- On page 50 (page 6 in tracked draft), **Evidence of Teaching and Mentoring Effectiveness**, there is a lack of clarity regarding how evidence of teaching and mentoring effectiveness will be collected. It is critical to establish a clear set of guidelines that outline a proposed process for gathering additional evidence, such as feedback from current students/mentees. This is particularly important considering that faculty of color, as well as women and nonbinary faculty, often receive lower or more critical student and potentially discriminatory student evaluations.
May 18, 2023

TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Ph.D., Chair, Academic Senate, UCR Division

FROM: Bahram Mobasher, Ph.D., Chair, Faculty Executive Committee, College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences


Dear Sang-Hee,

The CNAS Faculty Executive Committee reviewed the Proposed Presidential Policy at May 16, 2023, meeting and has no suggestions for changes or additional comments.

Sincerely,

Bahram Mobasher, Ph.D
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Katherine Stavropoulos, Chair
Committee on Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion


The DEI committee reviewed the proposed Revisions to APM – 210 for Review and Appraisal Committees and was in overall support. The Committee commented on the importance of mentorship and that it be recognized formally, in addition to explicit mention of DEI.

The Committee noted a possible suggestion regarding teaching effectiveness in APM 210-3: Lecturer with Security of Employment Series. The Committee recommends the addition of the following language that is noted in the Professor and Corresponding Series which is important for both Series and the promotion of DEI:

(viii) engagement in professional development for teaching, or involvement in specific departmental or campuswide educational equity or student success initiatives.
FACULTY WELFARE

June 20, 2023

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
   Riverside Division

From: Yawen Jiao, Chair
       Committee on Faculty Welfare


At our June 13, 2023 meeting, the Committee on Faculty Welfare (FW) discussed the proposed revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM): APM - 210, Review and Appraisal Committees. FW appreciates the opportunity to evaluate this systemwide review item and is in general agreement with the addition of mentoring as an aspect of the teaching mission. However, we do make mention of the following:

• There is a need to clearly identify specific, tangible metrics that will be used to judge the quality and quantity of mentoring. For example, are there specific learning/student outcomes that can and/or will be used to measure the effectiveness of mentoring?

• Some members expressed concern that “the achievement of student learning outcomes” depends on more than the effectiveness of the teaching and mentoring of the faculty member, as it also involves the quality of the students.

• There is a concern that the proposed changes will create additional work and yet another burden for faculty members, department chairs, and staff members, as all parties will have to spend considerably more time ensuring that e-file submissions for academic actions contain meaningful statements, accompanied by evidence, of a candidate’s mentoring effectiveness at lower-division, upper-division, and graduate levels of instruction.
GRADUATE COUNCIL

June 9, 2023

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
    Riverside Division

From: Christiane Weirauch, Chair
    Graduate Council


Graduate Council reviewed the proposed revisions to APM 210 at their June 8, 2023 meeting. The Council was supportive of the revisions but questioned why mentoring is being linked to service if the trainee is not affiliated with UC ("Certain mentoring activities should be documented as service if included in an academic review file. This includes mentoring of individuals who are not UC-affiliated trainees, including faculty, international scholars, staff, and community members."). Why would co-advising a UC graduate student count as teaching, but co-advising a graduate student at a different university as service?
May 25, 2023

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
   Riverside Division

From: Susan Laxton, Chair
       Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication

Re: 22-23. SR. Proposed revisions to APM 210 Review and Appraisal Committees

The committee reviewed the proposed changes and had no comments but agreed that mentoring credit should be adjusted and had questions whether the teaching criteria would change as well.
June 21, 2023

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Division Chair of the UCR Division of the Academic Senate and Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of the UCR Academic Senate

From: Raquel M. Rall, Ph.D., Faculty Chair of the School of Education Executive Committee


The SOE Executive Committee reviewed the [Systemwide Review] Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM): Proposed Revisions to APM - 210, Review and Appraisal Committees. Comments/feedback were solicited at our executive committee meeting and via email.

The SOE Executive Committee found the revisions to be acceptable and appreciated the proposed additions. No additional comments were noted.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Sincerely,

Raquel M. Rall, Ph.D.
Faculty Executive Committee Chair 2022-2025
School of Education
University of California, Riverside
June 9, 2023

TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Ph.D., Chair, Academic Senate, UCR Division
FROM: Marcus Kaul, Ph.D., Chair, Faculty Executive Committee, UCR School of Medicine

Dear Sang-Hee,

The SOM Faculty Executive Committee has reviewed the Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM): Proposed Revisions to APM - 210, Review and Appraisal Committees.

The Committee suggested that the Academic Senate consider mechanisms to acquire feedback from mentees for mentoring. There should be options for mentees to officially comment on their mentors, even if it is something as simple as a Qualtrics survey.

Yours sincerely,

Marcus Kaul, Ph.D.
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee School of Medicine