

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
2008-2009 ANNUAL REPORT**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) met four times in Academic Year 2008-2009 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 135 to consider general policy on academic personnel, including salary scales, appointments and promotions, and related matters. The issues that UCAP considered this year are described briefly as follows:

Implementation of the New Faculty Salary Scales

UCAP monitored implementation of the four-year systemwide faculty salary scale plan. Year one of the four-year faculty salary plan in 2007-2008 brought UC salaries closer to the comparison institutions and brought more UC faculty on scale. Year 2 of the plan will not be implemented due to the current budget situation, but UCAP will continue to track the salary comparisons. Even though there is no funding for the faculty salary plan, it is important to continue working on the salary scales in order to know how UC salaries compare to comparison institutions. UCAP will receive data on an ongoing basis showing the comparison of UC to comparison eight. There are questions about which institutions should comprise the comparator group and how UC should be compared to them. UCAP would like to follow this data on an ongoing basis and determine progress.

Cross-Campus Comparison of Off-Scale Amounts and Advancement Rates

UCAP reviewed faculty salary reports generated by UCSC and UCD. The data indicate that there is significant variation in faculty salaries across the system. Different methodologies were used for the existing reports as a way of addressing questions of particular interest to those campuses. A standard methodology that provides one useful and relevant way of looking at the data is required and a uniform set of data analyzed in a uniform way is necessary. UCAP believes it is important to have the ability to look at salaries by discipline in a consistent way across the campuses. The committee will look at this data on an ongoing basis to monitor whether progress has been made. Standardized and centralized ways to track recruitment and retention are also needed to demonstrate how UC is doing. The impact of next year's furloughs on faculty funded by grants has not been analyzed yet but the cost of furloughs will be evaluated by UCAP. In 2009-2010 UCAP will revisit the data with assistance from the Institutional Research and Academic Personnel units at OP.

Health Sciences Compensation Plan

UCAP's Chair participated in a small working group that reviewed proposed revisions to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP), APM 670, to determine what revisions should be made. Issues under consideration include clarifying eligibility for the HSCP and which job titles should be included or excluded. The revision of APM 670 should contain a framework for split appointments where faculty are subject to the rules of two plans and can select the best benefits from the plans. One problem identified is that the HSCP continues to pay the additional compensation to faculty

suspended from practice who cannot bring in the clinical revenue to cover their high salaries. In the past this has been left to the discretion of the department chairs, and decision-making can be subjective and will not be uniform across departments, if not coordinated. To address this issue, UCAP agreed that the policy should describe good standing criteria, who will decide if the criteria have been breached, and an appeal process to protect the faculty member.

Consultation with the Administration

Janet Lockwood, Associate Director, Academic Personnel, Patricia Price Interim Director, Academic Advancement, and Jim Litrownik, Coordinator, Data Management, Academic Advancement served as consultants to UCAP. The committee was provided with regular updates about UC's budget and was kept abreast as plans to address the financial crisis were developed. A key concern for UCAP was the potential impact that any plans would have on merit reviews and promotion decisions, although OP ultimately implemented strategies that did not put these at risk. UCAP members also discussed the importance of maintaining the cohesiveness of UC as a system by ensuring that all the campuses adhere to one set of budget principles.

APM 240 - Deans

At UC, a Dean has a unique role as the academic leader of a Division, College, School, or other similar academic unit, with senior-level administrative responsibility for the operations of the academic enterprise. APM 240 attempts to achieve balance in matters of accountability, performance standards, compensation, and benefits for those who serve in this dual role. UCAP provided feedback to Academic Personnel on the question of whether the primary duties of a Dean are those of a senior faculty member appointed to an administrative role, or primarily those of an administrator with an underlying faculty appointment. The committee recognized that individual cases may require unique consideration. Several UCAP members participated in a discussion with Academic Personnel about general principles to guide the local CAPs.

Other Issues and Additional Business

University Professor: In October 2008, 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 May 2009, 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 Pitts.

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

- The UC Accountability Framework
- Policy on Re-employment of UC Retirees
- Proposed revisions to APMs 230-17, Visiting Appointments Terms of Service; 230-18, Visiting Appointment Salary; and 279-20, Clinical Professor, Volunteer Series
- The UC Education Abroad Program's Business Plan

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 the status of searches; responses to outside offers; requirements related to publications/creative work in review packages; 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; whether grants can be considered as a criterion in the merit and promotion process; and how CAPs consider contributions to diversity and equal opportunities.

Survey of CAP Practices

UCAP updated its annual survey of local 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. This year the committee agreed that the results of the survey could be shared with people at the campuses including EVCs and CAPs.

UCAP Representation

UCAP Chair Steve Plaxe represented the Committee at meetings of the Academic Council and the Assembly of the Academic Senate.

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements

UCAP benefited from regular consultation and reports from Janet Lockwood, Associate Director, Academic Personnel and Patricia Price Interim Director, Academic Advancement, who presented updates on the implementation of the salary scale plan and systemwide APM policies under review or being prepared for review, including possible policy changes to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan. Jim Litrownik, Coordinator, Data Management, Academic Advancement provided the committee with data analysis critical to UCAP's discussion about faculty salaries.

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Plaxe, Chair (SD)
Allison Butler, Vice Chair (SB)
Carol Aneshensel (LA)
Maureen Callanan (SC)
Mary Gilly (I)
Harry Green (R)

David Lieberman (B)
Katja Lindenberg (SD)
Ahmet Palazoglu (D)
David Seibold (SB)
Roland Winston (M)

Mary Croughan ((SF); Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Harry Powell ((SD); Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Brenda Abrams, Senior Policy Analyst