

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE



BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92521-0132

March 11, 2014

TO: José Wudka, Chair
Academic Senate

FROM: Erica Edwards, Chair
CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Request to Revise CAP Bylaw

In our February 26, 2014 meeting, the CHASS Executive Committee met to discuss Professor Karen Pyke's proposal to consider a revision to the CAP bylaw, a revision which would allow Associate Professors to serve on CAP.

The Executive Committee encourages a vigorous discussion of the CAP bylaw; we are persuaded by several of Professor Pyke's points. However, we are not convinced that the proposal's evidence is adequate to its claims. For example:

- 1) The proposal claims that the Irvine, Los Angeles, Davis, and San Diego campus allow associate professors to serve on CAP, but it only provides documentation about UC Berkeley's Budget Committee. (See Footnote 1, page 1.) Should the proposal include documentation regarding the other campuses?
- 2) There is no evidence to suggest that CAP's conservative personnel policies correlate to the senior status of its members. The proposal argues that "the elite status of CAP members might encourage greater conservatism regarding personnel policies" (p. 2). This claim is supported only by the speculation that CAP's support of the return-to-scale policy was an effect of its implicit conservatism and that, further, this conservatism was an effect of its race and gender makeup (which was an effect of its composition of full professors). This logic is speculative at best. While we, too, oppose the punitive return-to-scale policy, we believe that its implementation can only circumstantially be linked to the composition of CAP or the seniority of its members.
- 3) We are inclined to agree with Professor Pyke's argument that the CAP bylaw is discriminatory; however, we feel that such an argument would require further documentation about racial and

gender disparities on p. 1-2. While the proposal specifies, for example, the number of Academic Senate faculty members who are women, it claims that a “disproportionate number of these women faculty are at the associate and assistant ranks” and that “the majority of faculty members from historically marginalized racial groups in the U.S. are also at the associate and assistant levels” without similarly citing figures. We feel that greater specificity would make the proposal’s claims more convincing.

- 4) The proposal’s notes about the racial makeup of the current CAP (Footnote 2) are wholly based in speculation and unfounded conjecture.

It is precisely because we take the aim of this proposal seriously that we encourage greater clarity and precision with regard to its claims. We believe a robust discussion of the revision of the CAP bylaw—which, again, we encourage—will not be possible without clearer evidence supporting the claim that the bylaw is discriminatory.

Erica Edwards, Chair

UCR CHASS Executive Committee