

To: Jessica Cattelino, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Chon Noriega, Chair, Council on Academic Personnel

CC: Andrea M. Kasko, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
Shane White, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Lori Ishimaru, Senior Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
Members of the Council on Academic Personnel

Date: June 1, 2023

Re: (Systemwide Senate Review) Proposed Revisions to APM-210, Review and Appraisal Committees

At its meeting on May 23, 2023, the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) discussed proposed revisions to APM-210 (Review and Appraisal Committees). CAP already considers contributions to mentoring in their review of academic personnel actions and generally welcomed the formal inclusion of this concept in APM-210. However, members voiced the following concerns regarding the proposed revisions:

- As specified in 210-1.d.(1), “mentoring” can be classified as either “scholarly activity [that] can be reported under Teaching” or “non-scholarly support... as well as mentoring of faculty and others [that] can be reported separately under Service.” It is recommended that distinct terminology is used when describing “scholarly mentoring” and “non-scholarly mentoring,” to make these differences clear throughout the APM.
- It is unclear whether teaching criteria and mentoring criteria are to be equally weighted. Mentoring achievements may be more difficult to quantify in smaller departments or specialties.
- The inclusion of mentoring may result in an overemphasis of quantity, rather than quality. It is recommended that any evidence of mentoring effectiveness focuses on achievement and outcomes, rather than simple numbering.
- The proposed language utilizes “buzzwords,” such as “evidence-based teaching practices” and “learning outcomes.” Trendy topics should not be included in systemwide policy.
- Explicit inclusion of mentoring may impede faculty’s academic freedom to their approach towards teaching and scholarship.
- Cautioning against the inclusion of “outcomes” tracking, due to the increase of administrative burden to obtain and maintain.

Members supported the revisions to identify diversity, equity, inclusion, and equal opportunity contributions in APM-210 and ClinCAP’s comments on APM-210-6.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at cnoriega@ucla.edu or via the Council’s analyst, Lori Ishimaru, at lishimaru@senate.ucla.edu.