

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
MINUTES OF MEETING
TUESDAY, MAY 10, 2011**

Attending: Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair (UCD), Katja Lindenberg, Vice Chair (UCSD), Kyaw Tha Paw U (UCD), Henry Pontell (UCI), Kathleen Komar (UCLA), Julia Bailey Serres (UCR) (telephone), Patricia Cohen (UCSB) (telephone), Dana Takagi (UCSC), Richard Arneson (UCSD), Paul Garcia (UCSF), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel), Janet Lockwood (Manager-Academic Policy and Compensation, Academic Personnel), Francis Lu (Chair, UCAAD, Member of the Sub-committee of the President's Council on Climate and Inclusion), Jorge Mariscal (Professor (UCSD, Member of the Sub-committee of the President's Council on Climate and Inclusion), Dan Simmons (Academic Senate Chair), Bob Anderson (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Welcome and Announcements

This is the committee's last meeting but there will be business to handle over email in the next few months. Management reviews of several APMs will be conducted, including APM 668 which UCAP has already begun commenting on. Language about good standing and the source of funding that UCAP will need to discuss. The other APM item is 205 which pertains to recall for academic appointees and changes that would need to be made for this to occur.

Council has met a few times since UCAP's last meeting and the budget has been a major issue. A five-year budget plan is being developed by OP and it assumes there will be 8% fee increase along with an 8% increase in funds from the state. Discussions have focused on rebenching. Guidelines for dealing with the undergraduate fees and tuition are being identified. The UC online project has been discussed at Council and there is funding from the Gates Foundation and a loan from UCOP. It is unclear how the loan will be repaid and there are a variety of questions about the courses.

The Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) developed guidelines on self supporting programs and had concerns about how the programs were reviewed. Council continues to discuss the report from the Task Force on Senate Membership and is trying to determine how to move forward. The issues may not be solved by admitting everyone into the Senate. An issue is the disenfranchised faculty on some of the campuses including medical school faculty who do not have a voice and are concerned about being short changed in terms of advancement. The task force on salary includes several EVCs, Chair Simmons, Vice Chair Anderson, the Merced Division Chair and Chair Palazoglu, and there is a discussion about the best way of distributing 3% per year for the next five years to the faculty. The questions include whether the money should go to the scales and how the off scale will be handled. The EVCs are worried about the funding source.

Discussion: The Chair reported that the increase in the salary scales should be uniform, not just to certain faculty. The scale focuses on faculty accomplishments to date and is meaningful. A member commented that UC is competing with private universities, not publics.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel*
- *Janet Lockwood, Manager-Academic Policy and Compensation, Academic Personnel*
- *Francis Lu, Chair, UCAAD, Member of the Sub-committee of the President's Council on Climate and Inclusion*

- *Jorge Mariscal, UCSD Professor, Member of the Sub-committee of the President's Council on Climate and Inclusion*

There is a work group looking at faculty diversity that is a sub-committee of the President's Council on Climate and Inclusion. The work previously done has been assembled and the effort is to understand why there is stagnation with respect to hiring minorities and women. Diversity is defined to include gender representation, underrepresented minorities and LGBT faculty. An issue being explored is whether work impacting diversity is being valued. Vice Provost Carlson provided data on the demographic makeup of the campus CAPs and budget committees which includes ethnicity over five years. The data includes an analysis of where the representation might be expected to be and based on this the CAPs fall short. Data on gender will be shared with UCAP via email.

The group is looking at diversity as part of campus climate. Research has shown that faculty diversity has a positive impact on climate for everyone. The group has looked at diversity from hiring to retention. An interim report will be submitted to the president in June and a final report will be submitted in October. It is perceived that APM 210 is not being implemented in a consistent way. It is difficult to understand how contributions to diversity are defined in personnel reviews. A template for understanding what kind of activities should be counted will be developed so that faculty will understand the information to include in the biobib form. Campuses will also develop templates which will help CAPs understand the information that can be included and what may count. According to UCAAD Chair Lu, diversity should be included in all areas of faculty performance. It will be important for UCAP and UCAAD to continue discussing this issue, and CAPs and campus affirmative action diversity committees should discuss how APM 210 can be incorporated in the CAP process. Implementation will occur at the CAP level, the department chair level, and at the faculty level so they understand what is important to report.

The provost asked his staff to draft white papers on issues that will help UC move forward and Vice Provost Carlson drafted a white paper on faculty profiles. The paper is an attempt to determine ways to deal with the budget issue and maintain the best faculty at UC. Across the country it is well known that UC is a leader with respect to defining faculty roles. The Vice Provost asked UCAP members for feedback on the paper, specifically on the discussion section.

Discussion: In the data, there is ambiguity in some of the categories that confuses international faculty with domestic Latino faculty. A member commented that putting information about diversity activities in each section is a good idea so they are not seen as somehow different from faculty's regular work. All faculty members who vote on hiring decisions need to be aware of federal affirmative action rules on employment. Having a separate narrative box for the diversity activities ensures they are not folded into service and provide a place for a summary of them. UCAP may want to consider the idea of putting an asterisk on the CV which signifies activities related to APM 210 diversity language.

UCAP was asked what best practices it could endorse. A one-time half step for diversity is given at some campuses for exceptional or outstanding diversity work. Other campuses advance faculty with accelerations in time which is another way diversity activities could be rewarded. One question is how frequently and when faculty who conduct ongoing diversity activities should be rewarded. A mechanism for tracking when a faculty member is given a reward for diversity activities would be needed. It may need to be up to the campuses to decide how diversity activities are captured on the biobib, what counts as a contribution to diversity, and how faculty are rewarded. It might be best for faculty to decide what counts as a contribution.

The committee discussed whether research on diversity should be counted. The same standards applied to research in other disciplines should be applied to research on diversity issues. A substantial one-time cash reward could be considered. UCAP can support giving rewards but the specifics may need to be

left to the campuses. The idea of sharing a case that illustrates diversity activities may have negative consequences. Faculty need to understand that they will not be disadvantaged if they do not put something in the biobib about diversity activities. Training for faculty and department chairs would help them understand activities that contribute to diversity. One campus is preparing a list of key items to be included in personnel cases which will be sent from the EVC and chairs of CAP and diversity committees to all faculty. A member suggested sharing the data on race and ethnicity with the campus committees on committees. It would be useful to look at the composition of the committees on committees, although Vice Provost Carlson indicated that collecting data on the CAPs and budget committees was a significant amount of work.

A member remarked that UC faculty have less flexibility than is described in the white paper and more is demanded of them. It will be difficult to change this since there will probably always be people who are willing to meet the increased demands. A clear plan is needed for meeting the teaching need. Some faculty with grants can buy out of teaching while faculty in other disciplines have increased teaching loads. A member noted that policies are not well advertised and need to be implemented. Steps need to be taken to ensure there are not fewer tenured underrepresented groups. An analysis was conducted in 2002 on how the family friendly policies impact faculty. Findings included that married men with children do the best whereas single mothers do the worst. A member reported that women in the social sciences at one campus have salaries 20% lower than men, largely because women do not seek outside offers. It was suggested that, given the disparity in salaries, perhaps the files of the women in these disciplines should be examined with an eye to the question of equity or appropriate reward - maybe these women's salaries need to be adjusted. UCAP members will provide feedback on the white paper via email.

IV. LPSOE/LSOE and ClinX Titles

The chair would like the members to discuss whether the LPSOE and LSOE titles are being used appropriately and, if not, put forth recommendations to Council on what needs to be changed.

Discussion: Reducing the research requirement for ClinX is not problematic. UCLA, UCI, UCD, UCSD and UCSF CAPs review ClinX faculty. There is an expectation of a different type of scholarship for ClinX faculty and UCD provides flexibility in the types of creative activity conducted. At the medical schools an issue is that health sciences faculty are involved in activities that do not make them eligible for membership in the Senate. At UCSF, nearly 50% of faculty are in the health sciences are clinical track or adjuncts. It would be good for members of the health sciences at this campus to sit on CAP since their promotion is dependent on review by CAP. UCSF could make a local change without requiring new APM language be created and one suggestion is to establish a ClinX advisory committee. One campus has a school of medicine CAP. There is great variability in how campuses use the LSOE series and a task force has been formed at UCSD to examine this. How to appropriately reward LSOEs needs to be determined.

V. Intercampus Transfers (APM 510)

UCFW requested that UCAP look at the policy on intercampus transfer because of concerns that faculty who transfer are not getting a good deal. Two versions of modifications to APM 510 have been proposed by UCFW. One addresses the pay increase and the other addresses the step limit. The members are asked to identify which modification would be better.

Discussion: The issue is whether faculty should be restricted to an increase in only one step or how much of an increase in salary can be offered. Members indicated that the steps are used differently across the campuses, and merit and achievement are not equivalent. The step could be limited and the off scale increment will be decided by the administration which preserves the sense that the steps are meaningful. Counter offers from the EVCs may not go through CAPs. Faculty at some campuses are

told not to come back for counter offers for a certain number of years although exceptions can be made. A vote was taken on UCFW's two proposals and one member abstained. Five members voted in favor of the proposal decoupling the salary from the step and four opposed making any change. There is unanimity against changing the one-step limit.

Action: The analyst will draft a memo to UCFW with UCAP's decision.

VI. Flexibility in Merit Reviews

The issue of flexibility in merit reviews is related to rewarding activities in different ways. All CAPs have the flexibility in how cases are weighed. Research expectations can vary at different points in a faculty member's career. Exceptional work in service or teaching could compensate for a decrease in research. One question is how teaching and service are recognized.

Discussion: At one campus, service on certain committees is rewarded with a one year acceleration in time. UCB, UCSC and UCSD strongly discourage faculty from coming up for an acceleration early. One campus sees all one year accelerations in time. There would be no reward if teaching is poor. If there is excellent performance in one area, there should be at least nominal or adequate performance in the other two areas. Different aspects could be emphasized but no areas should be dispensed with. Faculty should not be allowed to buy out as much classroom teaching as possible. A CAP will send the administration a note if the teaching is minimal. Exceptional service may be rewarded as long as the research was adequate. Faculty need to be educated that excellent Senate service can be rewarded with an acceleration. Administrative service, excluding chairs, is not rewarded since it is compensated and the APM addresses the mechanisms for rewarding chairs.

VII. CSHE Report on Peer Review in Academic Promotion and Publishing

The History Chairs statement came from the Divisional Chair at UCSC. UCAP also received a report from the Center for Studies of Higher Education on peer review in academic promotion and publishing.

Discussion: In the Humanities it takes longer than five or six years to get a book published, thus the years at the Associate I-III may not be realistic. The History Chairs statement is a first step in proposing alternatives to the standard monograph expectation. Some campuses have never accepted a series of articles in lieu of a monograph. Faculty in the Associate rank feel that a book is needed and are not getting the message that high quality articles or a manuscript and contract for a book may be acceptable. One campus wants to see what will actually be published. Departments need to be aware of what is acceptable. Some book fields are evolving and guidelines from disciplines are needed by CAPs. CAPs have been very conservative in peer reviews and the approach traditionally used will have to change. In certain disciplines, it is difficult to evaluate the quality so CAPs rely on experts at their campuses in addition to the external measures. Publishers' decisions about peer reviews should not be seen by UC as a decision. UCAP could acknowledge major shifts for book disciplines especially for junior faculty and encourage CAPs to take these changes seriously. It was noted that changes are occurring in all disciplines. The committee agreed to draft a statement.

VIII. Replacing "Above Scale" with "Distinguished Professor"

The Chair has discussed changing "above scale" to "distinguished professor" with Vice Provost Carlson.

Discussion: Some campuses have a policy that if a faculty member is above scale, the title distinguished professor can be used. Members agreed that this should apply to all faculty titles. The APM language describes distinguished scholarship. Faculty who have to publish a book languish at the barrier steps. The committee agreed that the change should be formally made. Distinguished professors would be above full professors in the catalog. The memo should be addressed to Chair Simmons. It

either will be sent out for systemwide review or given to the administration.

Action: The analyst will draft a memo with UCAP's recommendation.

IX. Campus-wide Online Teaching Evaluation System

A concern came from UCB about a new online teaching evaluation system used in the faculty review process. Most campuses are moving towards online systems and some already have them. The question is how effective the online systems are. A concern is that the data is inadequate because there are very few student evaluations which makes it difficult to determine the quality of teaching. Another concern is that the results will be skewed because most feedback will come from students unhappy with the instructor.

Discussion: A member reported that the online system at the UCSF SOM assures rater anonymity and a high response rate as grades will not be released until the evaluation is completed. At UCSD the evaluation system is entirely student run so faculty have no control and there is no centralized peer review of teaching. There are sites on the internet where students can rate professors that are relied on by students. UCD is investigating going online and has some concerns. Issues include whether the faculty member is present when the evaluation is handed out and that departments use different terminology in the questions. Some schools at UCI use an online system whereas others still use paper forms. The CAP reviews the comments to find trends and does not focus on response rates. UCSC does not have an online system although it is being tested in the graduate school. UCSF uses an online system and uses the data to tell rate faculty teaching performance (to the extent of providing percentile ranks in some departments). UCSB primarily uses the paper forms and one or two departments use an online system. UCR has used an online system for a number of years with the same form for all departments except the biomedical department. After initially low response rates, the campus offered early release of grades as soon as the evaluation was completed. At UCB, departments use paper forms. The campus adopted UCR's system and there were complaints at UCB because data was entered incorrectly and could not be corrected. UCAP may want to produce a list of best practices such as how to increase response rates. UCLA is piloting an online system to identify what does not work. Students should not be allowed to do the evaluation more than once.

Action: The Chair will draft a letter to CAPs, reaffirming evaluation guidelines and highlighting best practices.

X. Annual CAP Survey

Members were asked if anything stood out in the responses to the annual CAP survey.

Discussion: A member remarked the wide range of stipends to members. The Chair proposed selecting a few questions and analyzing changes over a five year period. Changes in the rate of agreement between the CAP and the administration could be analyzed for example. UCLA and UCSB survey results will be incorporated into the survey and circulated to the committee.

XI. Campus Reports/Additional Member Items

This item was not discussed.

XII. New Business

The committee thanked the chair for his work this year and applauded him. The committee also thanked the analyst.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:25 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Ahmet Palazoglu