

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (UCAP)
ANNUAL REPORT, 1999-2000**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Under the Bylaws of the Academic Senate, the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) has the following responsibilities. It is to advise the President on issues concerning academic personnel; to review any matter pertaining to the latter topic referred to it by the Assembly, a Division, or another University Committee; and to initiate recommendations on such matters. During 1999-2000, the Committee held six formal meetings, supplemented by e-mail consultations. The following is a summary of the Committee's work. It focuses on those matters that resulted in actions or generated substantive discussion. The topics appear in alphabetical order.

APM Language on Step V for Assistant Professors. For Assistant Professors who are hired at Step III there is a problem because they are advanced to Step IV within two years, but then are held there for an indefinite period because Step V is defined as an "exceptional" Step. A survey of UCAP members revealed that the policy on the use of overlapping Steps varied significantly from campus to campus. There was an extensive discussion about the disjunction between campus policy and the APM language, and whether the APM should be changed to reflect actual practices. Many UCAP members thought that the word "exceptional" should be deleted from the APM, but the Santa Barbara representative pointed out that the word "exceptional" does capture what is going on when overlapping steps are used. It is exceptional in the sense that the evaluations for promotion are postponed but still allows people to move ahead, at least in salary. The language that the Santa Barbara CAP uses when it applies special Steps helped to clarify the issue. From that perspective, members agreed that the current APM language seemed to work for each campus individually. It was decided that no action was needed on the issue of overlapping steps, and if Divisional CAPs wanted more specificity on special steps they could refer to the Santa Barbara language.

CAP Involvement in Administrative Appointments: Although faculty do participate in high-level administrative searches, the appointment usually precedes the case coming before the Divisional CAPs. In an effort to minimize this practice and to strengthen shared governance, UCAP asked the Academic Council Chair to distribute a letter from UCAP, to the appropriate Divisional administrators, that addressed the sequence of the appointment procedure. The letter states that UCAP endorses the practice of a preliminary screening, by CAP, of short-listed candidates for administrators who will also be faculty members, with respect to appointability at or above a certain rank and step.

COLA Increases: UCAP discussed removing the COLA increases from people who have unsatisfactory Five-Year Reviews. Although there was a mixed reaction from the Divisional CAPs on this issue, the majority were against using the COLA as a tool to encourage satisfactory performance.

Faculty Fellows: UCAP was asked to advise on the Faculty Fellows Proposal. The Faculty Fellow would be a teaching post doc and the program would target those in the Humanities and Social Sciences. In considering the proposal, UCAP made the following recommendations. The program should include an annual review of their teaching. The UC campus limitation should be removed and allow the scope of the search for suitable candidates to be determined locally. There should be a strictly stated two-year time limit on the appointment. The Committee also said that the program should be open to professional Doctorates or terminal degrees in fields other than the Humanities and Social Sciences.

Five-Year Mandatory Reviews: A survey of Divisional practices revealed that there is no uniformity on how the mandatory fifth year reviews are conducted or how the end result is reported. Some campuses have three possible outcomes, and others have only two. UCAP was concerned that the exercise of an "unsatisfactory" outcome option on some campuses, but not on others might create inequity across the system. Currently UC Davis is the only campus that has an explicit policy on Five-Year Reviews. There was a consensus among members that it would be desirable for those CAPs that do not currently have an "unsatisfactory" option to consider including it. UCAP sent a letter to the Academic Vice Chancellors that called attention to this lack of uniformity and presented UCAP's recommendation. A copy of the UC Davis policy was attached since it contained the explicit language that UCAP endorses.

Librarian Salary Scales: Because of the rapidly changing technology and the difficulty campuses are having attracting people with the needed specialized skills, UCAP supported a proposal that would restructure the librarian salary scale.

Master Plan for Education – Kindergarten through University: The Academic Council Chair asked UCAP to advise on a request from Senator Alpert for recommendations on an array of issues that have an impact on California’s educational system. Although the Department of Planning and Analysis would respond to many of the specific issues, UCAP recommended that the following information be included in the report: a) an informative narrative about the university’s merit and promotion procedures, specifically noting that UC faculty are under continual review until retirement; b) some language expressing the university’s concern about increasing student and faculty diversity; and c) that institutional resources contribute to professional development.

Proposal to Increase Law School Faculty Salary Scale: UCAP was asked to advise on a new salary scale for Law School Professors. The Deans of the Law School at Berkeley and UCLA argued that they are paying high salaries due to market pressures and that the proposal would align the current off-scale salaries into a regular scale. It would not eliminate the decoupled or off-scale salaries that now exist, but it would reduce them in the future. However, at the Davis Law School, implementing the proposal would create a significant cost issue because off-scale salaries are rare. UCAP members had a number of concerns with the proposal and did not support it in its present form. They felt that the proposed new scale was too aggressive, that the case was not made that high salaries deter raiding, and that it would result in a windfall for the Davis Law School faculty and for faculty not being paid off-scale at the Berkeley and UCLA Schools. In addition, the proposal did not specify how increasing the salaries would improve the Schools’ rankings.

Proposal of the Task Force on UC Business School Compensation: UCAP had discussions on a proposal, drafted by the Business Schools Deans, to increase the salary scales of the UC Business Schools. The proposal attempted to address the serious recruitment pressures at the Assistant Professor levels and the compaction problems and inequities that have occurred at the high end of the Full Professor level. At the May meeting during the initial round of consultation, UCAP recommended that rather than increasing the scales to the proposed magnitude, they should be increased to a lesser amount and the negotiated differential used to cover the differences. At the June meeting, two alternative proposals were brought to the Committee for consideration. The scales in the Alternative proposals did not increase as excessively as did those in the Business School Deans’ proposal, and they allowed for a differential component to make up the differences to meet the market pressures. A major objection to the proposals was that they all would result in a windfall for the whole of the Business School faculty. UCAP felt that there should be a more focused salary proposal that would specifically address the competitive areas of the Business Schools. However, members recognized that no proposal could likely avoid the problem of conferring windfalls because there are substantial differentials between specialties. In a straw vote, UCAP members unanimously rejected all three of the proposals. In seeking a more equitable solution, UCAP recommended that the Business Schools consider developing a plan based on the Health Sciences Compensation model. This might be an appropriate solution since the problems of market/salary differentials between specialties are similar to those found in the medical field.

UCAAD’s Proposed Changes to APM-210-1 Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Appraisal: A proposal from the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) to change the criteria for appointment, promotion and appraisal was brought to UCAP, for review and comment. The point of the proposed change was that when evaluating a candidate, the review committee would consider the extent to which the person contributed to the diversity and excellence of the academic community through his or her research, teaching, and/or service. The rationale was that by offering incentives and rewards, initiatives in achieving diversity would be integrated at the faculty level. It would encourage outreach in the sciences and engineering fields, and result in new ideas in teaching, research and service. While UCAP members were cautious about incorporating language in the Criteria that was overly specific or restrictive, they were open to considering new ways of evaluating a candidate’s service commitments. The members reviewed the proposal, page by page and returned it to UCAAD with their comments and recommended changes.

UCAP/UCFW Workgroup: Since many new faculty are appointed at Steps II, III, IV, or V and accelerations are more common than when the current salary system was put into place, and with the implementation of the new Step IX, the UCFW Chair proposed that UCAP and UCFW establish a Workgroup to explore possible revisions to the current salary scales. Issues of concern for UCFW included the impact of a “hurdle step” in the middle of the professorial series, and changes in the number and duration of steps. UCFW felt that the major career review at Step

VI comes too early in a career and that the review should be moved to Step VII to be closer to retirement age. UCAP voted 9 to 2 in favor of establishing a joint committee to look at the Step system from the perspective of how the system affects academic quality. The Workgroup met in January and again in February. The Chair, Professor Minkova, Vice Chair, Professor Hoy, and Professor Rickett (San Diego), represented UCAP. The Academic Council Chair participated in January's meeting. After extensive discussions, the Workgroup agreed on a proposal that would revise the professorial ladder step system. The proposal reduced the number of steps from the current nine to five steps. During the first four years, the increments would be automatic. At the end of the five-year period during review, there would be a balloon payment if merit were approved. This proposal was not well received by UCAP. The major objections were the prepaid salary in advance of merit aspect, and that it would have little, if any, impact on the too frequent use of accelerations and off-scales. In a straw vote, only three members voted in favor of continuing any further discussion on making changes in the current Step System.

UC Merced CAP: This past September the Academic Council established, as a special committee, a CAP for UC Merced. Its members, Chair, and Vice Chair were selected by the University Committee on Committees from each of the 9 campuses based on their Divisional CAP experience, and other Senate service experience. Appointed from UCLA was Professor Christopher Foote, who also agreed to serve as the UC Merced CAP representative on UCAP. He reported regularly to UCAP on UCM CAP related issues. The first meeting was held at UCLA at the end of January. The main task was to determine the operating procedures for the UCM CAP. It was decided that Divisional CAPs would be asked to form ad hocs, as needed, and that the UCM Task Force would assume the role of the Department. The Academic Council Chair subsequently sent an e-mail request to the Divisional Chairs and to the Vice Chancellors asking for their Divisional CAP's assistance in forming ad hocs for the Merced CAP. The candidate files will be vetted electronically. UC Merced is breaking new ground in this area, and there are a number of concerns vis-à-vis the CAP review process and electronic communications that will need to be addressed.

Workgroup on the Comparison-8 Methodology: The Workgroup on the Comparison-8 Methodology met in January. UCAP was represented by the Chair, Professor Minkova and by Professor Krener (UC Davis). Although no changes in the methodology are anticipated in the foreseeable future, the Workgroup felt that by identifying suitable substitutions from some of the current comparison institutions, it would be prepared to move those in, if there is pressure to change.

2000-2001 Faculty Salary Scales: At its June 2000 meeting, UCAP reviewed the proposed ladder rank faculty salaries for 2000-2001. Two distribution methods were presented. In one method a 3% increase would be applied across all ranks, and in the other the 3% increase would be weighted towards the Assistant Professor rank. In a straw vote, the majority of UCAP members voted in favor of the differential approach. The rationale was that allocating an increase at the lower end of the scale might help the university be more competitive in its hiring.

The members of UCAP wish to express their gratitude to Betty Marton, the Committee's Administrative Analyst, whose highly professional and timely assistance was indispensable for the successful completion of the Committee's tasks.

Respectfully submitted:

Donka Minkova (LA), Chair
David Hoy (SC), Vice Chair
Margaret Conkey (B)
Arthur Krener (D)
Amihai Glazer (I)
Thomas Harmon (LA)
Steven Axelrod (R)
Barnaby Rickett (SD)

Christopher Foote (UC Merced CAP)
Robert Newcomer (SF)
Denise Bielby (SB)
Leta Miller (SC) Fall/Winter
Sandra Chung (SC) Spring
Ex-Officio: Lawrence B. Coleman, Chair,
Academic Council

Betty J. Marton, Committee Analyst