

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL ANNUAL REPORT, 2001-2002

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During the 2001-2002 academic year, the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) held seven 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. These topics appear in alphabetical order.

Ad Hoc Faculty Review Committee for University Professor

At several meetings, UCAP reviewed confidential lists of committee nominees for University Professor nominations, subsequently providing Assistant Vice President Switkes with additional nominees.

APM 270: In Residence Series

By campus request UCAP considered the following issues: Are a faculty member's rank and step automatically transferred in the transition from the In Residence to Professor Series? Should the language of APM 270 be revised in order to address this issue? UCAP concluded that, as specified in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM 270), the criteria for evaluation in the In Residence title are equivalent to those for the Professor title. An individual in an In Residence appointment may be considered for an appointment in the Professor series only following documentation of a full competitive search. A Professor appointment is a new appointment, even when following on a period of In Residence appointment. As with any new appointment, the divisional CAP should evaluate the qualifications of the new appointment for rank and step. Evaluation by divisional CAPs of proposed step or rank advancement consider the cumulative level of achievement both in initial appointment and in subsequent advancement. In theory, the equivalence of the criteria between the In Residence title and the professorial title imply an equivalence of appropriate step and rank. In practice, divisional CAPs may or may not have participated fully in prior evaluations of individuals in the In Residence series. Therefore, UCAP strongly recommends that divisional CAPs strive to practice the equivalence of criteria for advancement in the In Residence and Professor series specified by APM-270.

APM 310: Professional Research Series

The Academic Council asked UCAP to look into the question of whether Professional Research Series personnel are considered faculty, and to clarify criteria that are utilized in their appointment and promotion. UCAP was specifically asked to consider the extent to which these criteria match those used in the Professor Series. The following UCAP position was sent to Council Chair Viswanathan: Research series appointments fall under the category of "other academic appointees" and are defined as non-faculty appointments. Nominally, the research components between the Professional Research Series and the Professor Series are equivalent, although in practice research appointments may be carrying out research within the context of a project or laboratory directed by a Professor. The equivalence in the research component, even when achieved, does not necessarily reflect full equivalence with the Professor ranks, however, because there are components of performance within the Professorial ranks that are not normally a component of the Research title.

APM 311 (proposed new) – Project Series

At its June 18, 2002 meeting, UCAP conducted a preliminary review of the proposed Project (Scientist) series. Although UCAP understood the motivation for a bifurcation of the Researcher title by addition of a Project Scientist title, UCAP found the description for the Project Scientist title to be problematic, especially at the senior levels. A letter setting out UCAP comments and suggestions was sent to Assistant Vice President Switkes. The Professional Researcher is developed in parallel to the full Professor, with an equivalence of research component. It is illogical to develop the Project Scientist along the same lines, on track, because their research accomplishments are not expected to be equivalent to ladder rank faculty, as is the case with Professional Researchers. Perhaps an explicit statement could be added to the APM: that although the individual might meet the parallel, there is no presumption of lateral equivalency or transportability of rank and step. The majority of UCAP members were concerned that there might be a proliferation of series.

APM 740 (informal review of proposed revisions to): Sabbatical Leave

Formal systemwide review will begin as soon as the suggestions from UCAP, UCFW, Academic Vice Chancellors, and DANR have been received. The proposed revisions to APM 740 and SOR 103.4 will then be sent to the Academic Council and all relevant Senate committees. UCAP members recommended that APM 740-18-a-3 should apply to a five (not six) year period.

Career Progress – Request for Implementation of Systemwide Tracking.

At its May 21, 2002 meeting UCAP approved a motion that the Office of the President be requested to implement a system for tracking the career progress of faculty at the University of California.

A UC-wide career path database that tracks progress of the faculty through the ranks is currently unavailable. Lack of relevant information has consistently impeded attempts by UCAP to evaluate issues of equity and cross-campus comparability in application of standards. Although this information is implicitly contained in the archival academic personnel records, this form of information is generally inaccessible, and is not useful for the construction of system-wide aggregates. UCAP recommends that a consistently formatted database be developed that would contain sufficient information that the full career trajectory could be tracked. This database should include (at least): the dates and titles of appointment, the dates of changes of series, dates of leaves of absence, and the dates and nature of advancements of both step and rank, and of special adjustments in salary, the age of the faculty member, and the date of the highest degree. The database should also include base salary information. It should be a uniform system applied across the entire UC. Such a database would make it possible to directly apply standard salary methodologies, such as the salary methodology of the Association of American Universities that evaluates the normative salary as a function of such factors as age and years of experience since the Ph.D. (or other highest degree). This methodology has been used or is being used on a subset of campuses. The AAU methodology would need to be extended or adapted to consider step and rank. UCAP has recently reviewed the statistical patterns of advancement in the full professor rank as a function of age and disciplinary category.

The *UCAP Statement on Tracking Progress through Ranks and Career: Statistics and Information Gathering*, along with data that suggest issues of gender inequity, was distributed to the Academic Council. It is in context of these data that UCAP recommends that a systemwide tracking database be implemented to provide information necessary to a full understanding of faculty advancement practices.

Career Review

The University needs to ensure that all ladder-rank faculty are appointed at the appropriate rank and step consistent with their academic accomplishments as a matter of fairness and good employment practice. UCAP wrote to those Divisional CAPs not already engaged in or considering merit equity review with the recommendation that those campuses develop appropriate mechanisms for such a review. The Riverside model was offered as an example, and campuses were urged to reconsider this issue and to develop procedures, on an on-going basis, for merit equity review. Though current academic personnel policy authorizes merit reviews at normal intervals, President Atkinson believes that guidelines similar to UC Riverside's equity "career review" guidelines should be developed and implemented by all campuses.

Distinguished Professor: Proposal to Change "above-scale" Professor to Distinguished Professor

After reviewing the UC Davis administrative proposal to use the title Distinguished Professor for all above-scale faculty at UC Davis, UCAP members unanimously supported the position that the Distinguished Professor title is an honorary working title that currently is and should continue to be used only sparingly. The proposed Davis action for a blanket use of the Distinguished Professor title would create great difficulties for other UC campuses, raising issues of comparability for above-scale professors on other campuses. Its blanket use might ultimately lead to a diminished value for Distinguished Professor titles in the UC that would limit the effectiveness of this mechanism for recruitment and retention. In a letter to Davis administration, UCAP strongly encouraged that the proposal to grant the title of Distinguished Professor to all above-scale faculty be reconsidered.

Divisional CAP Procedures, Request for Review

One campus's Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure asked for a UCAP review of CAP procedures. UCAP concluded that CAP can accommodate most procedural irregularities by taking into account new information. This accommodation may be eased because a change in the CAP constituency normally would have occurred by the time new information is considered. However, UCAP also believes that it would be possible for the CAP Chair and the Executive Vice Chancellor (or appropriate administrator) jointly to decide that a shadow CAP might be used in certain cases.

eScholarship Advisory Subcommittee

The Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee asked that a UCAP member represent the Academic Senate on the eScholarship Advisory Subcommittee. UCAP was unable to designate a representative to the eScholarship Advisory Subcommittee from either current UCAP membership or from Divisional CAPs. As necessary, this request will return for consideration by the 2002-03 UCAP.

Laboratory Professorship Program

UCAP reviewed a new initiative, announced by the Provost and Senior Vice president of Academic Affairs, to establish a Laboratory Professorship program at Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos National Laboratories. The purpose of the program is to forge stronger ties between the laboratory and a campus in a strategic area of mutual interest. Academic Council members raised concerns that the process outlined in the proposal might fundamentally undermine the academic personnel process for hiring UC faculty. Though the overarching concept of increased lab-campus collaboration was strongly supported by UCAP, members pointed out that lab-campus collaboration

currently exists. UCAP also was concerned with the principle of outside participation in the allocation of faculty FTE or the selection of faculty newly recruited to the UC. The motion to decline UCAP support for the Laboratory Professorship Program was approved by a vote of 8-2-1. UCAP concerns and recommendations about the proposed program and UC's academic personnel process were detailed in a letter to Council Chair Viswanathan.

UCAF concern: can student evaluations negatively impact the academic freedom of faculty?

UCAP considered this issue, at the request of Council Chair Viswanathan, and concluded that appropriate mechanisms for the evaluation of teaching already exist in the APM. Departments are encouraged to utilize multiple alternative methods in addition to student evaluations to evaluate teaching effectiveness. If the department believes that issues academic freedom is compromised by student evaluations, they should provide this information as appropriate context as part of the faculty review file.

UCAAD Report on Recruiting a Diverse Faculty within the Context of Tidal Wave II

UCAP extensively discussed the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) *Report on Recruiting a Diverse faculty within the Context of Tidal Wave II*, sought comment from the Divisional CAPs, and consulted with representatives of the Office of the President regarding diversity policies of the University of California. UCAP members strongly support principles of excellence, equity, and diversity in faculty hiring and promotion. The specific methods and suggestions described in the UCAAD report were extensively discussed, and, while not in agreement with a number of specific recommendations raised in the UCAAD report, UCAP members were broadly supportive of the goals of the report. In a letter to Council Chair Viswanathan, UCAP offered a series of comments and suggestions regarding the UCAAD report.

UC Merced: Initial Bylaws of the Committee on Academic Personnel; Initial UCM Academic Appointments. UCAP reviewed and commented on the UC Merced CAP initial bylaws.

UC Standing Committee on Copyright Draft Documents. UCAP considered three draft policy documents: (1) policy on ownership and use of course materials; (2) policy on recording of [academic][instructional] presentations; and (3) policy on reservations of rights. UCAP agreed that the Standing Committee on Copyright has done a judicious job of representing the rights of the individual faculty member to his or her own intellectual developments. There were, however, two minor points that UCAP would like to recommend for further consideration: (a) The "policy on reservation of rights" is vague and requires clarification. (b) Does the reference to a "course materials policy committee" mean that a new, additional committee must be established at each campus, or would extant Committees on Courses adequately be able to meet the responsibilities described? These concerns were conveyed by letter to the Academic Council Chair.

Unit 18 Lecturers Negotiations. UCAP was regularly informed by the UCOP Office of Academic Advancement about the University's ongoing negotiations for Unit 18 Lecturers. In an executive session with AVP Switkes and Director Okada, UCAP members discussed confidential bargaining documents.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Doshier, Chair (I)

Michelle Yeh, Vice Chair (D)

Robert Holub (B)

Robert Rucker (D)

Richard L. Regosin (I)

Jaime R. Villablanca (LA)

Subir Ghosh (R)

Ramon Gutierrez (SD)

Sandra Weiss (SF)

Tom Gerig (SB)

Peter Kenez (SC)

Sarah Gray (UCM Rep)