

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (UCAP)  
ANNUAL REPORT, 2000-2001**

**TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:**

Under the Bylaws of the Academic Senate, the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) is responsible for advising the President and the Divisional CAPs on issues concerning academic personnel; reviewing any matter pertaining to the latter topic referred to it by the Assembly, a Division, or another University Committee; and initiating recommendations on such matters.

During 2000-2001 UCAP held five formal meetings, supplemented by e-mail consultations. The following summary of the committee's work focuses on those matters that resulted in actions or generated substantive discussion. The topics are listed in alphabetical order.

**APM-015, THE FACULTY CODE OF CONDUCT: REVIEW OF DRAFT REVISIONS.** The Office of the President wishes to place this item before the Regents at its January 2002 meeting. In order to do so, these proposed changes will be placed on the October agenda of the Assembly of the Academic Senate. In June UCAP members were encouraged to distribute the draft revisions and begin discussions at Divisional CAPs.

**APM-025, CONFLICT OF COMMITMENT AND OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES OF FACULTY MEMBERS, PROPOSED CHANGES.** UCAP carefully reviewed the proposed revisions to APM-025, APM-662 appendix B-1, and APM-740-19, and generally found the revised APM-025 to be an improvement over the existing language of APM-025. The following comments were made by different committee members and conveyed to the Academic Council. A minimum threshold for detailed reporting needs to be clearly defined. A coherent position on health sciences faculty and the existing Health Sciences Clinical Compensation Plan needs to be taken. The section involving graduate students in outside professional activity needs further thought; indeed, discussion of the student/faculty relationship seems out of place in the APM. Some members suggested that definition of a "day" is vague and ambiguous in APM-025; others felt that "normal and reasonable" was a sufficient definition. APM-025's distinction between "executive" or "managerial" positions was felt by some members to be unclear and other members felt the same way about the distinction between professional practice and consulting. In response to the question of how extensive outside activities are perceived by CAP, some UCAP members remarked that although circumstances vary widely, such activities often can help the academic file by leading to an increase in publication.

UCAP members concluded that the two most important CAP issues concern a minimum threshold for reporting and the involvement of graduate students in outside professional activity.

**BUSINESS SCHOOL SALARY SCALE, REVISED.** The 2000-2001 UCAP was asked to consider a revised proposal by the Deans of UC's Business Schools to go to a different salary scale. (The 1999-2000 UCAP and Academic Council had not supported an earlier proposal.) After a series of discussions, including a presentation to UCAP in January by UCB Business School Dean Laura Tyson, a majority of UCAP members continued to oppose the revised scale. Although UCAP was sympathetic to the difficulties faced by the business school deans in attracting and retaining their best faculty, it passed the following resolution (by a divided vote of five in favor, two opposed, and three abstentions):

*UCAP believes that the integrity of the merit system is at the core of the quality of the University of California. The existing merit system reflects UC's persona; it serves to define the University and should not be lightly cast aside. While the issues underlying the*

*revised proposed business school Salary Scale are both serious and undeniable, those issues can continue to be addressed by the business schools' current practice of meeting market demands through off-scale salaries. Further, the issue of funding negotiated differentials is a budgetary rather than a personnel matter and falls under the purview of campus Planning and Budget Committees.*

Among the many concerns that were conveyed to the Academic Council and then to the administration, a major one was that the deans' recommendation of a large, systemwide increase in the business schools' salary scales would reward business faculty across the board without Senate review of their individual merits. The morale of general-campus faculty could potentially be harmed by the perception of such a large salary increase as a windfall for some business school faculty members. Another concern was that the use of state funds to augment the business schools' salary scales would be perceived as a reduction of support for other equally deserving campus units. Furthermore, the proposal has at least the potential to harm faculty salaries outside the business schools because of UC's use of the comparison-eight method. However, UCAP recognized the deans' reasons for wanting to raise salaries in this competitive market for business faculty. If business schools had their own funding sources or if fees for professional schools could be increased, for instance, then possibly an appropriate salary increase could be achieved without raising concerns about either bypassing Senate merit reviews or draining state funds away from other campus units.

**BYLAW 195 AND PROPOSAL TO REPLACE BYLAW 335 WITH FOUR BYLAWS: 334, 335, 336, and 337 (UCP&T PROPOSED CHANGES).** All Senate Divisions and Universitywide standing committees were asked to provide any comments regarding proposed changes; the bylaw changes were unanimously approved at the May 2001 Assembly.

**BYLAW 135—UCAP.** UCAP members agreed that SB 135 should be amended so that the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Council should be *ex officio* members of UCAP and that the Council Chair should no longer be a voting member of UCAP.

**CAMPUS CAREER REVIEWS.** In support of President Atkinson's desire for all campuses to look into career equity reviews, UCAP will serve as the repository for documents that come forward from the divisional CAPs explaining their procedures for special career reviews. In the future the committee can then function as a forum for discussion of policy questions about these reviews.

Divisional CAPs' experiences with campus career reviews are reflected in the following comments. On most campuses, processes similar to the Riverside career review are part of the routine CAP review. Career reviews are seen as a way of reevaluating careers that don't quite make the bar for acceleration. Career reviews are seen as recalibration arguments on some campuses, and the CAP automatically will do (an informal) career review at the time of any advancement in rank. On a few campuses career reviews are seldom done, though technically possible. On one campus a task force has been working for the past two years in order to address a procedural question involving career reviews: should career reviews go through CAP or a permanent ad hoc career equity review committee?

**CLINICAL X SERIES, PROPOSED EXPANSION.** In response to Vice President of Health Affairs Michael Drake's proposal to expand the Clinical X series, letter of 11/27/00 concerning expanding the Clinical X series, UCAP members unanimously approved the concept of extending the "ceiling" on Clinical X series to 50% of Academic Senate members of clinical departments. Members also suggested that expansion of the series should be done gradually and with careful deliberation at each campus, in recognition of the crucial role that these faculty play. It was recommended that campuses utilize such appointments primarily for associate level or full professor level appointments because residencies and

even fellowships may not provide sufficient data to make an appointment with confidence in this series at an assistant professor level.

**CPEC SALARY METHODOLOGY; COLA.** Early in the 2000-01 academic year an anticipated 3.9% to 4% increase in faculty salaries was projected for 2001-02. By June 2001, however, the state's budget situation had worsened to the point where it was reported that UC faculty might receive at most only a .5% COLA plus merits. In the absence of a final state budget and with the expectation of no significant COLA, UCAP was not asked to decide how to distribute the adjustments across the ranks.

**EAP SERVICE.** UCAP was asked to discuss how CAPs handle EAP service. There does not seem to be a Universitywide policy on how administrative EAP service should be counted during academic personnel reviews. UCAP members suggested the following points. Highly effective administrative leadership needs to be valued. Without such acknowledgement there is little incentive for the most talented faculty to involve themselves in administrative work. Some CAPs expect less research or creative activity from department chairs, and the APM has an explicit exception that department chairs' service is considered as academic work. However, to treat EAP directors in the same manner as department chairs would go beyond what is explicitly stated in the APM. The sense of the committee was that CAPs should be allowed flexibility. Rather than codifying how EAP service should be treated, cases of EAP service should be considered individually.

**GLOBAL FILM SCHOOL, UCLA.** At its November meeting UCAP discussed the proposal for a Global Film School (GFS) by UCLA's School of Theater, Film, and Art (TFT). Because of the complexity of the issues involved, UCAP did not take a vote on the proposal as a whole. The sense of the committee was that UCLA should proceed, but with caution, paying attention especially to the ways in which a "for profit" venture might conflict with the personnel process and lead to difficulties for the campus CAP.

UCAP appreciated the positive aspects of the proposal, which involves high quality programs that already have international visibility, but the committee nevertheless had reservations about some aspects of this arrangement. Some members were concerned about the extent to which a "for profit" unit goes beyond one that is "self-supporting." The beneficiaries of a "for profit" program like the GFS will be not only the university and the faculty, but a group of shareholders as well. UCAP would want assurance that the rights and privileges of the faculty involved in the GFS would be protected, and that there would be no negative impact on the merit actions of faculty who do not wish to participate in the GFS. In thinking through the ways that merit reviews work in practice, some committee members felt that a "for profit" arrangement raises potential issues of both conflict of commitment and conflict of interests. UCAP urged that attention be paid to the extent to which FTE allocation and recruitment is affected by the creation of the GFS and it also suggested that legal counsel should assess the status of the faculty members' intellectual property. As a cautionary measure, a university-wide policy, similar to that guiding UC Extension, should perhaps be developed for the creation and overview of joint "for profit" ventures.

**FACULTY HIRING PRACTICES, STATE AUDIT.** During the 2000-01 academic year, an audit regarding UC's hiring practices for women faculty was carried out by the state. At UCAP's June 2001 meeting, AVP Ellen Switkes distributed a draft of UC's preliminary response to the Bureau of State Audit's report. UCAP members then discussed, in great detail, both the audit's recommendations and UC's draft response with her and provided specific recommendations.

**FACULTY SALARY SCALE COMMITTEE.** Professor Barbara Doshier, Vice Chair of UCAP, attended the Faculty Salary Scale Committee meetings, along with representatives from UCFW, UCPB, the Academic Council, senior administrators from several UC campuses, and AVP Ellen Switkes. Vice Chair Doshier reported regularly on the issues that were being considered, and UCAP members gave their

views on a variety of possible changes in the personnel process. However, no report was forthcoming by the end of the 2000-01 academic year, so presumably any proposals will be considered by the 2001-02 UCAP.

**PART-TIME LECTURERS WITH SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT (SOE); LECTURERS WITH POTENTIAL SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT (PSOE).** With a vote of 8 for and 2 abstentions, UCAP members agreed with the principle that Senate membership should be extended to both part-time Lecturers SOE and Lecturers PSOE. Full-time lecturers SOE already are members of the Academic Senate. Throughout the UC system there currently are approximately 22 part-time Lecturers SOE and all campuses, except Irvine, already consider these appointees to be Senate members. In terms of both recruitment and the administration of personnel policy, campuses prefer that part-time Lecturers SOE and Lecturers PSOE be appointed as Senate members. This would help make the Lecturer SOE series a more coherent whole.

**UCAAD SUPPORT FOR MOVE TO RESCIND SP-1 AND SP-2. A majority of UCAP members, with some dissent about particular phrases, agreed with and supported the position reflected in UCAAD's letter to the Regents.**

UCAP MEMBERS' ITEMS. UCAP members bring before the committee issues and questions that have come up in their own CAPs. These discussions are for information, which the representatives then take back to their local committees. The following topics were discussed this year.

*Endowed Chairs: Policy and Practices.* One campus representative had the following questions about how other campus CAPS dealt with endowed chairs. How should the recipient of an endowed chair be selected? What determines the eligibility for holding an endowed chair? Should the endowed chair always be for an indefinite period of time, or should it be time limited?

*Market Pressures.* UC seems to be experiencing serious difficulties in its attempts to meet market pressures in disciplines such as economics, finances, public policy, or computer engineering. How can market values for faculty be assigned in these disciplines?

*UC Davis Final Report: Special Committee to Review the Academic Personnel Process.* UCAP reviewed in considerable detail the principles set out in a special report on the effects of the personnel process at the Davis campus, taking exception to some and refining others.

*CAP members on cases from their own departments.* As a result of interest in how CAP members on different campuses participate in the consideration of members of their own departments, some variants of the following questions will be included in the annual UCAP survey.

- (1) What is the participation of CAP members in files from their own department?
- (2) What procedure is followed when it is alleged in a file that a member of CAP lacks objectivity regarding that file?
- (3) Are there general guidelines regarding conflict of interest and non-participation of CAP members in certain files?

*UC Annuitants and the 2-4% COLA Gap.* UCAP supported the UCLA CAP's suggestion that the Academic Senate work with the systemwide administration to close the 2-4% COLA gap, and sent UCFW a request to take another look at this issue.

**Respectfully submitted:**

David Hoy (SC), Chair

Barbara Doshier (I), Vice Chair

David Bogy (B)

Robert Rucker (D)

Amihai Glazer (I)

Alistair Cochran (LA)

Steven Brint (R) (fall)

Tom Bellows (R) (winter/spring)

Joel Dimsdale (SD)

Brian Aldredge (SF)

Katharina Schreiber (SB)

Ira Pohl (SC) (fall)

Leta Miller (SC) (winter/spring)

Harold Drake (SD) UC Merced CAP

*Ex Officio*: Michael Cowan, Academic Council Chair