

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (UCAP)  
ANNUAL REPORT 2002-2003**

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

The University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) held six meetings during Academic Year 2002-03 and additionally conducted business by E-mail. UCAP considered and submitted reports on 21 items and discussed 6 additional items. UCAP members also served on various committees as representatives of the Committee. A summary of issues considered by UCAP this year is outlined in the following.

**1. Faculty Service Legislative Report, Item 6440-001-0001 of the Supplemental Report, "Tenure and Promotion Decisions."** Responses from all campus Committees on Academic Personnel (CAPs) were compiled and forwarded to the Academic Council on 17 December 2002. UCAP members were unanimous in their view that service is a significant area of evaluation in the UC personnel review process. UCAP's response was forwarded to Assistant Vice President Ellen Switkes and Director Myron Okada, who had requested that UCAP review and comment, in preparation for their completion of a report to the Legislature on this issue.

**2. Unit 18 Lecturers Negotiations**—UCAP was kept apprised of developments related to ongoing negotiations and bargaining between UC and the Union representing Unit 18 Lecturers by updates from Assistant Vice President Switkes and Director Okada. UCAP discussed and commented on the issues but did not offer any official response.

**3. Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Policy APM 715—Family and Medical Leave.** UCAP accepted and approved the proposed revision without further comment. A letter was sent to Academic Council on 16 December 2002.

**4. Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Policy APM 740—Sabbatical Leave. On 16 December 2002 UCAP forwarded its comments to Council.** UCAP was in favor of substituting significant University service for teaching requirement for a sabbatical spent in residence, as an exception to policy. UCAP approved in general a revision to allow recipients of a sabbatical leave at less than full salary to receive additional compensation for research from other universities. In addition, members favored an additional recommendation that faculty be allowed to also teach elsewhere during sabbatical leave. The justification for this is that this would cost the University nothing, and faculty teaching at another institution could bring visibility and stature to the University. UCAP recommended that the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) look at retirement issues such as retirement credit resulting from service credit during

sabbatical. The Committee did not reach consensus on the revision that allows a faculty member who holds a full-time administrative position for five years or more to take a sabbatical immediately after that service, based on the pay rate of the administrative position. Members concluded that not all administrators should qualify automatically for this and felt that a better definition was needed for who would be eligible for the sabbatical at an administrative pay rate.

**5. New Academic Personnel Policy for Formal Review APM 390—Postdoctoral Scholars.** In its letter to Council on 16 December 2002 UCAP agreed that the policy would be beneficial to postdoctoral scholars, recommended clarification and expansion of the title codes, and expressed concern about potential negative impact on postdocs in humanities and social sciences, who already find it difficult to secure positions and funding. If campuses cannot provide the additional funding necessary to meet the requirements, they might hire fewer postdocs in these fields.

**6. Scholarly Communications Proposal/ E-scholarship in personnel review.** Overall, UCAP endorsed the Office of Systemwide Library Planning's Proposal for Discussion and forwarded its approval and comments to the Academic Council on 12 December 2002. UCAP considered the establishment of repositories for depositing and accessing scholarly works as a positive step for the system and noted that e-scholarly communities in highly specialized fields have been evolving since the 1990s; a top-down approach to monitoring the impact of technology on culture and behavior in academia may not be necessary. UCAP believes there are important issues for the personnel review process, however. CAPs need to evaluate on-line publications by looking at the editorial board and review process of each journal to determine its quality and impact. In addition, it would be very helpful if faculty, department chairs, and deans could provide candidate-specific information and criteria for on-line publications.

**7. Teaching Evaluation—Assessment of teaching and dependency of departments on student evaluations.** Criteria for evaluating teaching in personnel review. These issues were discussed as a UCAP initiative, and will continue to be discussed. UCAP is interested in UC's accountability with respect to this topic and would benefit from consultation with guest speakers who work on developing student evaluations. UCAP did not forward any formal response on this topic.

**8. Appointment to University Professor—Ad Hoc Nominating Committee.** Pursuant to APM 260, UCAP engaged in this confidential personnel action by providing nominations of faculty to serve on two ad hoc faculty review committees to consider two recommended appointments of University Professor.

**9. Equivalent Rank Status for Specialists in Cooperative Extension.** UCAP was asked to review a recommendation proposed by UC Davis Chancellor Vanderhoef in his letter to President Atkinson in March 2002 that Cooperative Extension Specialists be granted “equivalent” status, similar to agronomists in the Professor series. UCAP reported in the 9 April 2003 letter to Council its vote of six members opposed and three members in favor of supporting the recommendation. Members who opposed the recommendation expressed concerns that campuses might be negatively impacted during current budgetary pressures, that other series (e.g., in-residence and clinical professor series) might raise equity concerns, and that CE specialists are not a homogenous group in which every member can meet the research criteria for the professorial rank. A recommendation was made that career review of every CE Specialist could address this concern. UCAP also recommended that two titles could be developed within the series, should there be different standards for research and publication within the group.

**10. The Step System/Step VI Barrier Step.** UCAP remains interested in review of the Step System and anticipates receiving and commenting on a report from the Academic Council Task Force charged with reviewing the Step System and in particular the Step VI barrier step.

**11. Amendment to APM 015—the Faculty Code of Conduct (Faculty-Student Relations/Sexual Liaison Policy).** UCAP reviewed the proposed amendment and also policies on faculty-student relationships from other institutions of higher education and other related documents, including a Resolution on Faculty-Student Relations adopted by the Assembly of the Academic Senate on November 30, 1983. UCAP responded to the Academic Council on 12 February 2003 that members were in favor generally of adopting a faculty-student sexual liaison policy, but took no formal vote or action because of concerns that there should be further discussion and clarification of policy to apply to administrators who may or may not be instructors. A recommendation for revising language related to “types of unacceptable conduct” was later dealt with by the Academic Council, to UCAP’s satisfaction.

**12. Racial Privacy Initiative (RPI)/Classification by Race, Ethnicity, Color and National Origin (CRECNO).** In a letter to Academic Council on 18 March 2003 UCAP reported its unanimous vote to oppose RPI/CRECNO as an initiative that has strong potential to cut off lines of scholarly inquiry and knowledge. UCAP also called on the Academic Council to request that the Regents defend the University’s interests and oppose it also. UCAP Chair participated in Council discussion that resulted in the Council opposing the Initiative and calling on the Regents to oppose it.

**13. Division CAP Activity Survey Compilation.** Division CAPs were asked to update the information on CAP Activity Survey. The updated survey will be distributed at the first UCAP meeting of academic year 2003-04.

**14. Request for formal review of proposed revisions to APM 310; New draft policy APM 311; Technical changes to APM 620-14.** As reported in its 22 May 2003 letter to Council, UCAP voted on the three APM proposals collectively. UCAP accepted the proposed revisions with eight members in favor, one opposed, and no abstention. Two members were absent. One member who opposed would submit a minority view.

**15. Report from UCORP Subcommittee on the Labs.** UCAP reported in its letter to Council on 15 April 2003 that members were supportive of the UCORP Subcommittee Interim Report and cited its “sensible recommendations and very reasonable steps.”

**16. Report from the President’s Summit on Faculty Gender Equity. UCAP supports gender equity in the UC system.** Its members concurred with recommendations on advancement in the Faculty Gender Equity Report and recommended that faculty not be asked to engage in excessive or disproportionate service early in their careers. UCAP expressed its and CAPs’ sensitivity to this problem and also suggested a minor revision in its letter to Council on 17 April 2003.

**17. Request for review of proposed revisions to APM 010 - Academic Freedom and revised proposed revisions to APM 010.** UCAP reviewed and discussed the original proposed revised amendment to APM 010 at its April meeting, forwarded recommendations that were effected in a subsequent revision, and reviewed a second proposed revised amendment at its June meeting. In its 19 May 2003 letter to Academic Council, UCAP expressed its unanimous support of the proposed amendment and also forwarded comments and a recommendation. In its 17 July 2003 letter to Council, UCAP endorsed the UCAF-amended revision of APM 010 by consensus, but did not take a formal vote. In addition, the Committee forwarded two suggestions for the Council and Assembly to consider.

**18. Formal review of proposed new APM 278, 279, 210 and a proposed revision to APM 133-0.** A vote was taken on the proposals collectively. UCAP reported to Council in its 16 July 2003 letter that members approved unanimously the proposed revisions. Additionally, the Committee forwarded three concerns for consideration. 1) the term “voluntary” was deemed to be demeaning and should be eliminated and replaced with the former term, “Without Salary” (WOS). 2) The “Voluntary Clinical Professor” series includes a statement in policy that the group will receive 30-day advance notice in a termination letter;

however, this is not part of the salaried “Clinical Professor” policy, which UCAP considers an oversight. 3) Professional competence and teaching are the two primary criteria for personnel review in the “Clinical Professor” series. It has always been stated that research and creative activity and service are desirable and encouraged, but not required. University service will be required in the new provision. Also, under professional competence, a new component, creative activity has been added as a requirement. UCAP expressed the concern that consideration of creative activity within two different criteria for personnel review could cause confusion.

**19. Proposed Senate Bylaw revisions.** As reported to Council in a 2 May 2003 letter, UCAP voted on a proposed addition to UCAP membership of the Chair of the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD). Seven members were opposed, none were in favor, and two members abstained. In a separate vote, UCAP voted on a motion to urge that the Chair of UCAAD be a member of the Academic Council. Nine members were in favor, none opposed, and there were no abstentions. UCAP members supported membership of Chairs of all Senate standing Committees on Council; however, the Committee made no further recommendation or action on this because of current fiscal and logistical concerns.

**20. Interaction between UCAP and University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD).** UCAP Chair Michelle Yeh and UCAAD Chair Deborah Nolan met by telephone. On 10 July 2003 UCAP conveyed to Council that it shares UCAAD’s view that affirmative action and diversity are integral to the mission of the University and continues to support the UCAAD request that the UCAAD Chair become a regular member of the Academic Council. To facilitate better communication between the two committees, beginning in academic year 2003-04 UCAP will invite the Chair of UCAAD to approximately two regular meetings. The Vice Chairs of both Committees were unable to participate in the telephone meeting and were informed of this agreement.

**21. University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR) analysis and response to UC Health Sciences Task Force Retirement Compensation Plan.** UCAP responded to Council on 17 July 2003 that the documents were difficult to understand and assess, since they apply to a specific group of faculty. UCAP did not vote on the proposals or choose an option. Most of the issues raised were seen as not directly related to UCAP.

**23. Possible Incorporation of Monterey Institute of International Studies (MIIS) into the University of California.** UCAP responded to Council on 17 July 2003 that it would like to be apprised of future development of any proposal

arising from these preliminary discussions, especially with regard to the review process involving faculty transfers.

**Additional business:**

**1. UCPB Report, “Increasing Access and Sustaining Excellence: A Budget Proposal from UCPB May 2002.”** UCAP received the document but did not submit comments.

**2. California Master Plan for Education.** UCAP reviewed and discussed but did not submit an official response.

**3. California State Auditor’s Report/Audit of UC’s Partnership Agreement: Faculty Workload Issues.** UCAP discussed the issues but did not forward an official response.

**4. UC Merced: Initial Appointment UCM Academic Appointments.** UCAP regularly consulted with the UC Merced CAP representative, offered advice, and discussed new appointments. UCAP did not forward an official response.

**5. Half-time FTE.** UCAP discussed and offered advice to a member who introduced this topic as a campus CAP concern. No official response was forwarded.

**6. Member items.** Members occasionally brought items from campus CAPs for committee discussion. Members frequently shared information on individual CAP practices.

**UCAP representation:**

UCAP was represented on additional Committees, Task Forces and Work Groups this year, including: Academic Council, Assembly of the Academic Senate, Academic Planning Council, UC Merced Task Force, Faculty Step System Task Force, and Faculty Workload Task Force.

**Acknowledgments:**

UCAP benefited from the regular consultation and reports from Assistant Vice President Ellen Switkes and Director Myron Okada of University of California Office of the President, Office of Academic Advancement, and from Academic Council Chair Gayle Binion. UCAP also thanks Professors Mayfair Yang and Jenny Cook-Gumperz, who served as alternates for the appointed UCSB Divisional representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Yeh (D), Chair

Ramon A. Gutierrez, Vice Chair (SD), Vice Chair

Pamela Samuelson (B)

Robert Rucker (D)  
Alan Barbour (I)  
Emily Klenin (LA)  
Geoffrey Mason, ex officio, Merced CAP Representative (SC)  
John M. Ganim (R)  
Gerry Boss, Edward Yu (SD alternates)  
Sandra Weiss (SF)  
John T.C. Gerig (SB)  
Alan Richards (SC)  
Gayle Binion, (Member, *ex officio*, as Chair of Academic Council)

Louisa Tapley-Van Pelt, Committee Analyst