

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (UCAP) 2006-2007 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

In Academic Year 2006-2007, the University Committee on Academic Personnel met four times 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:

UCAP's Recommendations for Improving the UC Faculty Compensation System

UCAP reviewed feedback received from systemwide Senate committees and divisions to UCAP's June 2006 report, [*Synopsis of the Present Status of the UC Merit and Promotion System and Principles of and Policy Recommendations for UC Faculty Compensation*](#), in which the Committee made recommendations for improving the fairness and transparency of the published salary scales. In March, Council forwarded UCAP's report, along with all of the feedback, to Provost Hume and the President's Work Group on Faculty Salary Scales to help inform its deliberations and recommendations. UCAP Chair Croughan, along with the chairs of UCFW and UCPB, served as members of the President's Work Group, which was convened in November by President Dynes.

Recommended Modifications to APM 620 and the Faculty Salary Scales

In May, UCAP reviewed and endorsed an initial set of recommendations from the President's Work Group for amending policy language in APM 620 governing the use of off-scale salaries. In its memo to Council, UCAP noted that the modifications would help bring about the larger goals of improving the fairness, relevance, and transparency of the published salary scales and of returning the majority of faculty to on-scale status. UCAP also felt the modifications would help align off-scale policy to actual practice and recognize that off-scale salaries are a normal part of compensation practice necessary to meet market conditions. In addition, UCAP endorsed a draft proposal for implementing market adjustments to the salary scales. The Committee noted that raising the scales would help improve equity and morale problems across ranks and disciplines, and would have a particularly beneficial impact on salary inversion and disproportionately low salaries in the assistant, associate, and early full professor ranks, and for women and ethnic minorities who have less frequently utilized external job offers to negotiate higher salaries. UCAP felt that local implementation of the new scales would sometimes have to proceed on a case-by-case basis; would require significant input from various campus entities, including the Senate and campus CAPs; and that campuses should consider empowering all CAPs to review and/or set salary.

UCAP's Recommended Modifications to APM 220-18b (4)

UCAP reviewed comments from systemwide committees and divisions to UCAP's proposed modifications to APM policy 220-18b (4), articulating the criteria for advancement to Professor Step VI and Above Scale. Council recommended endorsing UCAP's proposal with a few minor modifications, and forwarded its final recommendation to Provost Hume, who initiated a systemwide review at the end of the 2006-07 academic year.

The Role of Collaboration in Evaluating Research and Scholarship Achievements:

Chair Croughan established a UCAP subcommittee to consider the need for new APM language that would provide clearer guidance to CAPs in their evaluations of “independence” and “collaboration” in research and creative work. The subcommittee was chaired by Margaret Walsh (UCSF) and met once by conference call. Its recommendation to UCAP was for deletion of the word “independent” from the Professional Research Series policy (APM 310-4(a)), in order to make the language more consistent with language in other APM series and with current CAP practice. UCAP endorsed the recommendation. UCAP decided that proposing the small change also presented an opportunity to promote broader consideration of independence and collaboration in research and guidance for the evaluation of independence in the context of collaborative work. The Committee thought this could be accomplished through an accompanying White Paper, appropriate for the Call.

Evaluating Service in Academic Personnel Reviews

UCAP discussed concerns about the role of “service” in merit and promotion criteria and in CAP reviews, including whether the APM should place more emphasis on Senate service; whether Senate service should be made an explicit criterion of career reviews; and whether the academic personnel system disincentivizes administrative service. UCAP decided not to pursue any changes to the APM. The Committee also reviewed the draft Berkeley Budget Committee’s *Campus Service Guidelines*, an educational document outlining the role of service in the faculty reward system. Chair Croughan suggested that UCAP ask Council to endorse a statement about the importance of service and circulate the Berkeley *Guidelines* as a recommended model to be incorporated into the Call on each campus.

Diversity Issues Academic Senate Analysis of Inclusiveness and Proposition 209

UCAP discussed an Academic Council request for committee input into a comprehensive study about the effect of Proposition 209 on diversity at UC. UCAP submitted comments to Council about issues and barriers having an impact on the hiring, promotion, and retention of a diverse faculty and possible steps to improve the situation. UCAP also discussed the local implementation progress of diversity modifications to APM 210, 240 and 245.

The Use of “Collegiality” in Personnel Reviews

UCAP considered a request from the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) for information about the use of “collegiality” as a factor in promotion and merit decisions. The UCAF chair also asked UCAP to conduct a ten-year audit of divisional CAP records to determine how many CAP decisions were overturned by the administration. UCAP responded that it does not conduct such audits; that CAPs review all files based on criteria outlined in APM 210; and that UCAP members could not recall a case where a CAP recommended denial of a merit or a promotion based solely on “collegiality.”

Other Issues and Additional Business

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

- **A Joint UCEP and CCGA Proposal on the Role of Graduate Student in University Instruction**
- **A Proposed Senate Bylaw 16 – Executive Director**

- **A Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 181 – Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy Committee**
- **A practice at UC Davis of recharging faculty salaries to extramural grants**

UCAP also reviewed a set of budget recommendations from the University Committee on Planning and Budget; a set of draft Guiding Principles for Policy Setting and Compensation Governance; a proposed UC Open Access Policy that would grant to the Regents a license to make published faculty scholarly work available in an open-access online repository; and, in accordance with [APM 260](#), a list of ad hoc committee nominees for review of a University Professor title.

Campus Reports

UCAP devoted part of each regular meeting to reports from its members about issues facing local committees and comparison of individual campus practices. In these discussions, UCAP touched briefly on procedures for campus Ad Hoc Review Committees; local efforts to define – and re-engage – “disengaged” faculty; the need to make teaching evaluations more consistent across campuses and to communicate more clearly to students the purpose of evaluations; rampant decoupling and the use of “shadow” salary scales; procedures for reviewing endowed chairs; improving efficiencies in the personnel process; credit for electronic-only publications compared to print publications; five-year stewardship reviews of deans, chairs, or unit heads; and finally, how to evaluate the role/commitment for named Investigators, Co-Principal Investigators and the Principal Investigator on grants, especially for multi-component program projects and multi-million funding awards.

UCAP updated its annual survey of local campus CAP practices and experiences. The survey covered 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; the use of ad hocs; and recusal policy. UCAP considers the survey to be an important resource that helps UCAP identify areas in which campus practices might be brought into closer congruence.

UCAP discussed the role of CAPs in determining or reviewing salary and off-scale offers that had either a merit or a market component, and for those CAPs that review salaries, how to determine the appropriateness of a given proposal. Significant concern was expressed about the lack of CAP involvement in salary and off-scale decisions at some campuses. Some CAPs were satisfied with their current position—not commenting on salary—while others saw their involvement in salary matters as a vital part of shared governance. There was a suggestion that UCAP make a statement recommending that CAPs as a minimum should be entitled to see salary and off-scale information, if they so request it.

UCAP Representation

UCAP Chair Mary Croughan represented the Committee at meetings of the Academic Council and the Assembly of the Academic Senate. Professor Croughan was unable to attend one Academic Council meeting and one Assembly meeting; vice Chair James Hunt attended both meetings in her place.

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements

UCAP benefited from regular consultation and reports from Acting Assistant Vice President for Academic Advancement Sheila O'Rourke and Director of Academic Personnel Jill Slocum, who presented regular updates on systemwide APM policies under review, benefit and compensation plans, the Mercer Consulting study, proposed changes to policies covering compensation, outside activities, and leaves for the Senior Management Group, the Policy Framework project, policy revisions covering sick leave, reasonable accommodation medical separation, and presumptive resignation, and a UC Retirement Plan inactive COLA policy.

UCFW Chair Susan French joined a UCAP meeting (by telephone) to discuss areas of interest shared by her committee and UCAP, including the work of the work group and Mercer Consulting's studies on UC compensation and the potential impacts of various proposed changes to UC health and retirement benefits.

At the first UCAP meeting, Academic Senate Vice-Chair Michael Brown updated the committee on issues facing the Academic Council and Senate, and the Academic Senate executive director spoke to UCAP about Senate office procedures and committee business.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Croughan, Chair (UCSF)
James Hunt, Vice Chair (UCB)
Barry Bowman (UCSC)
Chris Calvert, (UCD)
Paul Micevych (UCLA)
Steven Plaxe (UCSD)
Carl Shapiro (UCB)
Ambuj Singh (UCSB)
Richard Sutch (UCR)

Alladi Venkatesh (UCI)
Margaret Walsh (UCSF)
John Edmond (alternate-UCLA)
Patrick Fox, (alternate-UCSF)
John Oakley, Academic Senate Chair
(UCD)
Michael Brown, Academic Senate Vice-Chair (UCSB)
Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst