

To: Jessica Cattelino, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Sandra Graham, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure

CC: Andrea M. Kasko, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate  
Shane White, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate  
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate  
Marian M. Olivas, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate  
Members of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure

Date: May 29, 2023

**Re: Revisions to APM-210, "Review and Appraisal Committees"**

---

At its meeting on May 25, 2023, the Committee on Privilege & Tenure (P&T) discussed the systemwide proposal to revise APM-210. The principal revisions aim to add "mentoring" to the review criteria Teaching and Service. P&T considers the idea to be a generally positive step to get the word "mentoring" into the policy and a recognized part of the evaluation process, but finds that the revisions need refinement in order for them to be effective in guiding review and appraisal committees. P&T members offer the following comments and concerns:

- Several terms are too vague for meaningful criteria – evaluation on the basis of "standards of the discipline."
- At UCLA, CAP and many departments already recognize mentoring as part of teaching. Faculty already document this. Is it adding more burden to have to separately document mentoring? Will there be a penalty for not doing so? This should be clear in the policy that while faculty may include a section on mentoring, the burden for considering mentoring will fall on the review committee.
- There should be clarification that some positions do not offer opportunities for mentoring connected to teaching – at least as described in the document. Perhaps it should be expanded to define mentoring trainees in the research lab and in clinical or other performative work.
- The Committee members were concerned that separating "teaching" mentoring from "non-scholarly support" is an artificial divide. When faculty provide what the policy describes as "non-scholarly support," it is rarely separate from helping students achieve academically, especially for under-resourced students. If faculty are to be recognized for "an academic environment that is open and encouraging to all mentees," it is highly likely that creating that environment will involve "non-scholarly support."
- The policy previously described the bar for tenure as "clear documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role. In judging the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching, the

committee should consider such points as the following.” The revision proposes the bar for tenure as simply “success in teaching and supporting student learning.” P&T finds the use of the word “success” as problematic, especially as no definition of success is offered. There is a tension between the traditional definitions of “success” in teaching (numbers of Ph.D students advanced and how quickly, teaching evaluations, etc.) and other benchmarks for successful mentoring and equity efforts. For example, taking on students who may need additional support to complete their academic program often inherently means longer time to graduation and/or fewer “number” graduating.

- There should be a way to evaluate retention efforts as they relate to mentoring that goes beyond counting numbers graduated. Students, as well as faculty, may change mentor-mentee relationships for the wrong reasons.
- Some Committee members commented that the Clinical X and In Residence requirements for mentoring should be better differentiated from the Regular Professor series to account for the unique requirements of those series. Clinical X, in particular, is supposed to be a series for a master teacher.
- There seems to be little description of mentoring Teaching Assistants and Teaching fellows, despite the fact that the roles are always supposed to be apprenticeships under the authority of the Instructor of Record.
- The Committee recommends that the policy indicates that local procedures should be developed with a robust yet rigorous way of evaluating mentoring. Committee members suggest that a uniform and standardized method of assessment of effectiveness could be implemented through, for example, a committee established by each department that would assess the mentoring performance of all of its faculty and identify as well as assess special issues that arise from the background of each of the students involved. CalTech employs such a model.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at [graham@gseis.ucla.edu](mailto:graham@gseis.ucla.edu) or via the Committee’s analyst, Marian Olivas, at [molivas@senate.ucla.edu](mailto:molivas@senate.ucla.edu).