**Committee on Academic Freedom**

**Melike Pekmezci, MD, Chair**

**November 29, 2021**

**1:00pm – 2:00pm**

**ZOOM**

PRESENT: Melike Pekmezci, Andrea Hasenstaub, Monica McLemore, Steven Altschuler

ABSENT: Terumi Kohwi-Shigematsu, Donald Taylor

**Draft Minutes**

1. **Consent Calendar --** Members voted to approve the[September Minutes](https://senateserviceportal.ucsf.edu/v3/meetings/2680/files/Draft_Minutes_CAF_9.23.21.docx)
2. **Chair’s Report**
   1. Executive Council Meeting – Chair Steven Cheung reported that UCAF had written a letter to Academic Council re: departments posting political statements of support online and whether such statements pose a potential threat to academic freedom for faculty. It was reported that there was overall supportive discussion in the Council who are likely to endorse the letter.
   2. Systemwide Reviews
      1. [Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 025/Section 671 Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members/ Health Science Compensation Plan Participants](https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/underreview/systemwide-senate-review-revisions-apm-025-and-671.pdf) – Comments Due January 11th
      2. [Proposed Presidential Policy on Abusive Conduct and Bullying](https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/underreview/bullying-policy.pdf) – Comments Due January 11th.
3. **DEI Statements and Academic Freedom**

As part of the discussion relating to political statements, some UCAF members have further drawn a parallel to DEI statement requirements for faculty promotion. Chair Pekmezci commented that those campuses who have expressed reservations re: DEI statement requirements will likely attempt to block any momentum froward on the issue in the near future and in her opinion, Academic Council is unlikely to recommend making it a requirement systemwide at this time. Whereas within UCSF, Monica noted that the Anti-Racism Task Force Recommendations and the Anti-Racism Initiative from the Chancellor have both recommended making DEI statements mandatory for merit/promotion. Members considered whether CAF, as a committee, might proactively release its own statement on the issue or alternatively wait to see if their opinion is sought either at the campus or systemwide level. Either action would likely necessitate CAF members coming to an agreement on the issue first. Monica suggested that if similar groups on campus are already formulating their stances on this issue, then CAF should work to make sure its voice is also being heard. Andrea shared that she doesn’t believe that faculty should be required to submit any sort of ideological statements for merit/promotion. Monica believes that a DEI statement requirement would likely function similar to existing teaching and/or research statements—which essentially ask faculty to explain the facts of what they are doing under a certain domain. To that point, Chair Pekmezci highlighted the importance of clarifying how such statements are to be evaluated/scored, especially considering that different faculty have different packet requirements depending on rank/series but this would seemingly be a universal requirement.

Analyst McRae shared that the EQOP Committee had been focused on this issue for the last several years and had expressed interested in meeting with other Senate committees to discuss if/how a DEI statement requirement affects their committee’s area of interest.

1. **Old Business**
2. Town Hall – Committee would like to move forward with planning a town hall/panel discussion on politicization of research. Suggested speakers include Keith Yamamoto, [Robert May, Eugene Volohk, Keith Wittingon for free speech issues], Lori Freedman (repro health/catholic affiliations), or perhaps someone from legal affairs who might be willing to do a review of the existing toolbox. Steven also suggested Dorian Abbot as a potential speaker

Monica advised that she will be co-hosting a 1-2 day symposium in the spring that will feature discussions on the intersection of AI/research/academic freedom. Members suggested planning the town hall for after the symposium, perhaps during the first two weeks of May.