

Committee on Committees

February 24, 2014

To: José Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division

Fr: Mariam Lam, Chair
Committee on Committees

Re: Proposed Change to CAP Bylaws Concerning Inclusion of Associate Professors

Dear José:

Our committee has met and discussed at length the proposed revision to the CAP Bylaws regarding the inclusion/exclusion or disenfranchisement of Associate Professors. The following summarizes our suggestions and concerns.

Some suggestions and recommendations:

1. The proposal needs to specify the exact language change(s) and/or additions requested of the Bylaw phraseology. Perhaps this will be accomplished once the proposal is formally submitted in appropriate form with strike-outs, additions, etc. We feel that the proposal in its current breadth and length hurts more than helps the intended change proposed. For example, if the line in question, "All members shall hold the rank of full professor..." is the problematic statement, what specifically can it be changed to in order to avoid such appearance of intended disenfranchisement? The UCSD example may be instructive, or the author can look to the other compiled campus/division Bylaws for models.
2. According to each division's Bylaws, UCR is not the only division to include language that specifically excludes Associate Professors, as stated in the proposal. UCSF also enunciates that CAP members must be at full professor rank. The easiest argument to make in order to (at the very least) avoid the appearance of exclusion, then, is to insist upon a Bylaw wording change that renders our UCR Bylaws consistent with the other systemwide divisional Bylaws that do not over-state possible exclusions.
3. Aligning the current Bylaw language with the larger problem of too few senior women and minorities at UCR, which the CoC members acknowledge as a tangible problem, may not be as helpful to the immediate and specific language change request, as the latter is an endemic nationwide and larger institutional problem beyond the purview of this particular Bylaw. Because we are sympathetic to the material inequalities explored in the proposal- but anticipate that the change will be hindered by those who are not or those who do not recognize the inequalities as articulated in the document- we feel it may be to the author's advantage to disaggregate many of these larger national concerns from the specific request at hand. Indeed, two members of our committee appreciated the academically "elite" membership of CAP in selecting more advanced full Professors due precisely to the level of

experience and workload demands of CAP, while they did recognize that the composition of such “elite” membership has had huge disproportionate consequences for racial and gender equality. They felt that these inequalities and disenfranchisements are indicative of larger institutional and structural apparatuses that will need more comprehensive approaches to resolve.

Some concerns:

1. One question is whether Associate Professors have the necessary background to assess the careers of others at higher Professorial ranks. The estimate is that Associate Professors have normally served at least six years prior to being appointed to Associate Professor and have been involved in merit and promotion decisions within their own departments. Full Professors normally have at least twelve or thirteen years prior to appointment. Across the campus, relatively fewer departments currently allow Associate Professors to vote on full Professor merit and promotion cases; in these departments, then, the Associate Professors will not have had such experience. It was noted by several that even the full Professors at the lower steps have had difficulties with service workload and reviews of more senior and above-scale full professor files. With regard to having sufficient expertise to do this kind of evaluation in which criteria are quite different, sufficient lengths of tenure, sufficient time needed to do this work, etc., one CoC member suggested that rather than the current language excluding Associate Professors in the Bylaws, the author might instead introduce typical practice language along the lines of, “Typically, CAP members...,” which could help to solve this issue in the future.
2. The Committee on Committees was equally concerned with implementation, should Associate Professors be permitted to serve on CAP. To date as stated earlier, some departments do not allow Associate Professors to do voting for full Professor files. If such a change were to be implemented, what would be the next logical steps in trying to align all Departments with the “new” CAP practice? It would be odd to have different practices implemented campus wide and at the department levels. While we understand that Bylaw 55 and its annual departmental voting procedures may have to do with internal departmental administrative necessities and considerations, this procedure will nevertheless create an incompatible alignment with the CAP Bylaw change if Associate Professors are able to review Professor files for CAP without ever having any experience of doing so within their own departments. It would also be off-balance to allow a rank *carte blanche* in voting at the CAP level for files they are not allowed to vote on before becoming CAP members and after completion of CAP membership. What then are the potential ramifications of implementation?
3. With all due respect to associate (and even assistant) professors, two members stated that they respected the wisdom of our other sister campuses (and our own earlier members of the Senate) and their bylaws or expectation that only very senior full professors serve as members of the CAP. Typically at other systemwide campuses, full Professors at Step V or VI and above are appointed even though not necessarily stipulated. Step III has historically been the lowest rank appointed. While the Fall Quarters may not see as much review work, Winter and Spring Quarters carry very heavy loads and difficult discussions often overwhelming for even relatively recent full Professors. They felt that we needed to examine and implement more structures to promote more women and minorities into those higher ranks at UCR. It has been very difficult for CoC to appoint even eligible full professors to serve on CAP. Our own CoC has been flexible to every extent possible with the balance in composition between representation of colleges, gender and racial diversity, and other

requirements (occasionally prioritizing the latter considerations over the earlier), in order to create more equality in CAP membership during appointments. Even then, however, we are often turned down, and unable to populate a one third female CAP membership, for example.

4. There is some faulty logic in the document, particularly on pages 2 and 3, that appear to raise as many questions as they attempt to address. The suppositions of “elite gatekeeping” are in part, pragmatically-speaking, the charge of the CAP. While we understand that one often follows the other, an academic “elite” oriented toward professionalization needs to be differentiated from the larger racial and gendered elitism “undermining faculty morale” depicted in the proposal. In another example, the statements about the Committee on Committees procedures in appointment are a generalization of one committee composition’s work process onto the history of the whole, and not evident in the rules governing the workings of each CoC. Thirdly, the logic of compensation for committee chairs is to accommodate the time taken away from research and teaching required of these committee chairs. This intense amount of work is also why Associate Professors are not encouraged to take on such positions.
5. The specific statements about compensation for Committee Chairs is inaccurate. The Chairs of Planning and Budget, Graduate Council and Educational Policy also carry incentivization. Those three committees actually meet more frequently than the Committee on Committees, and require- as does CAP- inordinately larger amounts of homework in the form of review materials. Please see the Committee on Committees webpage for a breakdown of each Senate Committee’s annual meeting requirements.

Again, the Committee on Committees was very sympathetic to the concerns raised by this proposal, and the spirit of the proposal itself. One member suggested other mechanisms be put in place, such as: a) requiring a third of CAP members each year be comprised of women, b) departmentally-based rules for advancement that would facilitate and promote more women and minorities moving to the full Professor rank, and c) other possible mechanisms that might extend voice and participation to Associate Professors (giving them access to files, even if not expected to vote). However, these ideas and suggestions are beyond the scope of our charge, and within the authority of the Committee on Committees, we focused our discussion on how to assist the author in improving the proposed CAP Bylaw change.

Sincerely,



Mariam Lam, Chair
Committee on Committees