TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Personnel met four times in Academic Year 2007-2008 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 135. The issues that UCAP considered this year are described briefly as follows:

Implementation of the New Faculty Salary Scales
UCAP received regular updates from UCOP administrators about plans and progress for implementation of the first phase of the four-year systemwide faculty salary scale plan. UCAP members, in turn, reported on campus plans for moving forward and conveyed issues and concerns that arose during implementation.

In general, UCAP supported the adjustments as a welcome effort to help restore the competitiveness of the UC salary scale system and bring the majority of faculty back on-scale. In most cases, complaints were minimal; however, there were some concerns about the effect of the market adjustments on absorption of merit-based off-scale differentials, which led a number of off-scale faculty to feel unfairly penalized. The committee also discussed the possible impact of state budget cuts on the next stages of the salary scales plan and viewed data comparing the percentage of faculty with on and off-scale status before and after implementation of the new scales, which indicated that the percentage of off-scale faculty decreased markedly after implementation.

Report on “Non-Progressing” and “Disengaged” Faculty
The Senate chair and vice chair asked UCAP to discuss a concern, expressed by others, that the recent adjustments to the UC salary scales may reward some faculty who are not actively engaged in their research or teaching duties. UCAP was asked to collect and analyze data that would accurately estimate the scale of the concern and to report its findings back to Academic Council.

To estimate the number of potentially “disengaged” faculty, UCAP requested and received from UCOP a list of associate and full professors who have remained at the same rank and step for at least the past six years, which would normally represent two consecutive “no action” decisions in a personnel review. Assistant professors, faculty at the Associate Professor Step V, Professor Step V, or Professor Step IX barriers, and those who held administrative positions at any point during the six-year period, were excluded. Each UCAP representative reviewed the individual files of the faculty from his or her campus identified by this definition as “non-progressing” to discover the individual circumstances in each case causing the lack of advancement.

UCAP determined that the number of faculty who the committee would term “disengaged” was 1% or less of faculty systemwide. The Committee found that the academic personnel systems at the individual campuses are working effectively – rewarding engaged faculty, delaying the advancement of faculty whose research and teaching do not yet rise to the next level, and implementing policies and procedures for assisting those few faculty significantly disengaged from their careers. Finally, UCAP found that the dismissal procedures within the Academic Personnel Manual are sufficient to encourage faculty to either re-engage in the academic enterprise or leave the University. Academic Council received the report and forwarded it to the President.
Law Faculty Salary Scales
UCAP discussed the incongruity of the UC law faculty scales in relation to the other professorial scales. In January, the Committee recommended to Academic Council that UC initiate a systemwide review of the law scales in order to align them more closely with other professorial scales, so that law faculty share a similar basis and timeline for academic personnel reviews. On Council’s recommendation, Vice Provost Jewell took steps to form a joint faculty-administration Law Faculty Salary Scales Work Group that will be working in fall 2008.

UCAP’s Recommended Modifications to APM 220-18b (4)
UCAP originally proposed modifications to APM 220-18b (4) in 2005, and worked with Council on revised proposals in 2006 and 2007. The original intent was to clarify the distinction between the criteria for advancement to Professor Step VI and Professor Above Scale, and to align policy with actual practice. Council endorsed a final proposal in March 2007, but administrators later raised their own concerns during an informal review initiated by UCOP. UCAP Chair Hunt, Vice Provost Jewell, and Director Slocum worked together to craft a revised document addressing those concerns, which Council adopted and forwarded to Provost Hume. The administration sought feedback on several additional changes before releasing the proposal for a final systemwide review at the end of 2007-08. UCAP supported these efforts.

Cross-Campus Comparison of Off-Scale Amounts and Advancement Rates
There was a request for UCAP to compare campus practices to determine the relative “harshness” or “generousness” of the CAPs. UCAP viewed preliminary data generated by the UCSC representative from systemwide compilations. The rate of progress in rank and step across campuses was similar at all campuses. Faculty at UCB tended to have a higher initial step at appointment than other campuses. On the other hand, there is a large divergence in salary equity across the system – with UCLA and UCB at the top – which cannot be explained by rate of advancement, because on average, the differences are seen at every rank and step. UCAP in 2008-2009 will revisit these trends in coordination with the Faculty Welfare Committee.

The Use of “Collegiality” in Personnel Reviews
At the request of the University Committee on Academic Freedom, Council asked UCAP to consider the use of “collegiality” as a criterion in the faculty merit/promotion review process. UCAP responded that CAPs review all files based on criteria outlined in APM 210, and it could not recall a case where a CAP recommended denial of a merit or a promotion based solely on “collegiality.” The Committee noted that it was sympathetic to UCAF’s concerns about threats or potential threats to academic freedom stemming from a hostile or unsupportive work environment, but emphasized that the work of the CAPs is not affected by outside pressures or considerations unrelated to professional competence. Finally, it noted that there is no basis for UCAF’s request that CAPs “suspend the use of collegiality” in the evaluation of candidates since there is no consideration of collegiality in personnel reviews.

Other Issues and Additional Business
University Professor: In December 2006, in accordance with APM 260, UCAP nominated an ad hoc faculty review committee to review an appointment to the University Professor title proposed by a campus. In October 2007, UCAP members reviewed the ad hoc committee’s recommendation and all case materials and forwarded a memo of strong support for the University Professor appointment to Provost Hume.

Recharge of Faculty Salaries to Grants: UCAP expressed concern about an accounting practice on at least one campus involving recharging a portion of faculty salaries to extramural grants and splitting payroll titles for faculty who have a portion of their salary covered by extramural sources. There was also a larger concern about the need to ensure accurate, transparent, auditable compliance with federal effort reporting guidelines.

Step 10: UCAP considered a suggestion that the Senate add Step X to the salary scales. After reviewing the history of the step system and discussing the issue with their local committees, the Committee decided not to pursue the issue further.

Investigation of Local “Calls”: UCAP was asked to investigate campus procedures for writing and implementing local academic personnel policies supplementary to the systemwide APM – commonly known as “the Call.” There was concern that these interpretations appear to have the force of policy, but require no review by UCOP, and some could conflict with the APM. UCAP’s annual update of campus practices is a critical means of maintaining consistency in the application of the Academic Personnel Manual.

In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, UCAP also submitted views to Council on the following:

- Proposed Transitional Leave Policy for Members of the Senior Management Group with Concurrent Faculty and Administrative Titles
- Regents Diversity Study Group Report on Faculty Diversity
- Systemwide Senate Review of Proposed Regulations Governing the Code of Conduct for Health Sciences
- Proposed Revisions to APMs 220-85b, Professor Series; 335-10-a, Cooperative Extension Advisor Series; and 740-11-c, Leaves of Absences/Sabbatical Leave; and Proposed Rescission of APM 350, Postgraduate Research

Campus Reports
UCAP devoted part of each regular meeting to reports about issues facing local committees and comparison of individual campus practices. In these discussions, UCAP members touched briefly on policies and procedures for search waivers; the role of teaching evaluations; strategies for improving efficiencies in the personnel process; credit for electronic-only publications compared to print publications; the role of “service” in merit and promotion criteria and CAP reviews; local implementation of diversity modifications to APM 210; the compensation of CAP members; reporting protocols; problems securing a sufficient number of external letters; cases where there is an appearance of conflict of interest in external and internal letters; recusal policies; special accelerations for retention or other reasons; average case turn-around time; and whether grants can be considered as a criterion in the merit and promotion process.
The committee also discussed issues specific to UC Merced, including best practices for the evaluation of young founding faculty there, who have added service obligations and a less well developed infrastructure. A UC Merced policy of encouraging semester-long sabbatical leaves for assistant professors was viewed as a helpful approach for carving out opportunities for research and creative activity.

**Survey of CAP Practices:** UCAP updated its annual survey of local campus CAP practices and experiences. The survey covers a wide range of topics, including the type and number of files reviewed by CAPs; CAP support, resources and member compensation; final review authority; CAP’s involvement in the review of salary and off-scale increments at the time of hiring or in retention cases; and the use of ad hocs. UCAP considers the survey to be an important resource that helps the committee identify areas in which campus practices might be brought into closer congruence.

**UCAP Representation**

UCAP Chair James Hunt represented the Committee at meetings of the Academic Council, the Assembly of the Academic Senate, and the President’s Work Group on the Faculty Salary Scales. UCAP member Katja Lindenberg was a member of the Academic Council Presidential Search Advisory Committee.

**Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements**

UCAP benefited from regular consultation and reports from Vice Provost for Academic Advancement Nicolas Jewell and Director of Academic Personnel Jill Slocum, who presented updates on the implementation of the salary scale plan, systemwide APM policies under review or being prepared for review, including possible policy changes to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, and elements of the Mercer Consulting Policy Review Project, including proposed changes to policies for members of the Senior Management Group.

UCAP occasionally consulted the Academic Senate chair and vice-chair about issues facing the Senate and the Senate executive director about Senate office procedures and committee business.
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