

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

MINUTES OF TELECONFERENCE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2016

Attending: Michael Stenstrom, Chair (UCB), Christina Ravelo, Vice Chair, (UCSC), Virginia Richards (UCI), Barbara Spackman (UCB), Jacqueline Leung (UCSF), Peter Sturman (UCSB), Seana Coulson (UCSD), David Lloyd (UCR), Stuart Brown (UCLA), Andrew Ishida (UCD), Fanis Tsoulouhas (UCM), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel), Janet Lockwood (Manager-Academic Policy and Compensation, Academic Personnel), Jim Chalfant (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

I. Consent Calendar

Action: The November 18, 2015 minutes were approved.

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Jim Chalfant, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

The Senate Chair is on a work group looking at P&T procedures. There are issues with the way Chancellor Dirks characterized Senate procedures in the case of Professor Marcy at UCB. The Chair is attending a listening session at UCI today related to this. There may be a report that is reviewed by the Senate but the timeline for this is not clear. The summary of the year two report on the Negotiated Salary Plan was provided by Academic Personnel to the campuses and to the Senate Leadership. Vice Chair Chalfant indicated that there will be a Senate review of this Plan next year which is when UCAP will have an opportunity to comment.

The review of Health Sciences Clinical Professors is in the management review phase. The Retirement Options Task Force has finished meeting and the President received the report before the holiday break. The full report will be released this Friday and UCAP members should pay attention to competitiveness of the options and the attention paid to the defined contribution plan. The competitiveness of the options and the attention paid to the defined contribution plan will probably be the focus for most faculty. UCAP will have to act quickly in order to respond within the 30 day review period. Vice Chair Chalfant explained that the UCAAD is working on guidelines for search waivers. Chair Stenstrom may want to circulate this information to UCAP. In some years there have been issues with whether CAPs were consulted.

The Governor's budget for 2016-17 was announced and there are no surprises. The budget did not include funding for six hundred graduate students but otherwise, the budget continues the agreement from last year. Chair Hare is also serving on the Regents' work group drafting a Statement on Intolerance. The Regents want something specific and the goal is to submit a document for the May Regents meeting. Vice Chair Chalfant explained the Senate's work on the transfer pathways. The requirements have been streamlined, making it easier for students to understand what courses UC accepts. Related to this is a Course Identification project that may help with the articulation of courses from the community college system to UC. UC is looking into whether the C-ID numbers can be added to the transfer pathways.

Each campus has received its enrollment targets for its share of the five thousand students that UC must enroll. The Regents will have a presentation on admissions. UC is also addressing cybersecurity as a result of the UCLA data breach. There is an increase in monitoring web traffic systemwide. Some provisional monitoring of so-called bad actors associated with the UCLA breach was not announced to

faculty. There are definite concerns about academic freedom and privacy but the Vice Chair senses that there will be more monitoring in the future, not less. UC is being audited by the State and the focus is on non-resident students, executive compensation, and rebenching. The audit is asking how UC spends its non-resident student tuition. The auditor's report will be released in April, just weeks before the May budget revise should be announced. It is not clear if UCAP will be asked to weigh in on the Openness in Research policy. There are vice chancellors for research who claim that some faculty are interested in conducting classified research. Wendy Streitz from the UCOP Office of Research will present the matter to Council to get feedback.

Discussion: A member asked if the focus of the faculty discipline work group will be on failures of current policies or on changes to improve the process. A member indicated that the Statement on Intolerance is based on a spurious claim about anti-Semitism and has ignored the Islamophobia occurring at the campuses. The Regents are aware that many groups have concerns about intolerance. The more specific the statement, the less well received it is likely to be. The Senate should have an opportunity to comment.

III. Updates

- *Michael Stenstrom, Chair, UCAP*

Chair Stenstrom commented that the most common theme in the meetings he attends is the budget. UC does not keep the non-resident tuition in a separate pool of money and this is problematic for the State auditor.

The Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) work group met at UCI. The LSOE's job is to teach and research how one teaches or teaches better, as well as on new technologies for teaching. Campuses have very different approaches to the LSOE title. UCLA has fewer than ten and UCI has over a hundred. The title is an opportunity to give good teachers tenure. There is concern that there might be two cultures at UC if this moves forward.

Questions will be what privileges the LSOEs should have and whether UC should hire them or not. Should LSOE faculty be hired directly or should they be appointed from regular lecturers who are gifted and should continue to teach for UC. This goes beyond the rights that LSOEs have. They may aspire to be PIs on grants, have voting rights in departments and service on doctoral committees and such. UCI has a positive approach to LSOEs and UCAP will probably be a primary source for feedback on this matter. Chair Stenstrom will circulate the report as soon as it is available. Given the pressures to educate students, some may be thinking that it is more efficient for LSOEs to teach. Regular faculty have not adopted the "service" classes and it may be appropriate for LSOEs to teach them.

Discussion: A member indicated that UCAP should have the chance to discuss the issues related to LSOEs. All three ranks for LSOEs (LSOE, potential and senior) are under discussion. UCD's CAP is discussing the advantages and disadvantages of the LSOE title. The LPSOE was designed to see if someone really could make a difference.

IV. University Professor

The committee received a letter from the chair of the ad hoc review committee and will vote on the nomination today.

Discussion: Members commented that the file looks very good and agreed to approve the nomination for the University Professor title.

Action: The University Professor nomination was approved.

V. Campus Reports/Member Items

UCD: The CAP changed the period of time when people can submit dossiers and a change to the criteria allows for more credit be given for service and teaching. The CAP has found inaccurate information related to service on committees, participation in conferences, and the like and this has become a problem for the CAP. Now, there is an annual statement about how CAP will deal with these issues. The CAP has sent files back with stern messages.

A member suggested that there should be documentation about participation on a committee. In the past, there was a place where a faculty member could provide supplemental information. But the online system provides no space for this to be reported. Finding ways of asking colleagues to be more careful is one thing but how to respond when problems arise is another matter. Whether the service is trivial or significant is one question. However, it is a very different matter when multiple items in the file are inaccurate and include external letters. The effort to verify what is in the file would be a burden.

Members discussed how their CAPs handle determining the accuracy of what has been credited. It was suggested that the verification could come from the dean's office. UCSF faculty sign a statement about the accuracy of the contents of their files. CAPs should reserve the right to request more information from the candidate or independently research the candidate. The UCM CAP relies upon the campus Academic Personnel office to verify what is in the file. Chair Stenstrom proposed that he would write a memo about this matter.

UCSF: A faculty member was appointed at a higher step than the CAP thought was appropriate. Sometimes a faculty member has been at the campus already for a year before the appointment is reviewed by the CAP. The dean negotiates the rank and salary and then asks the CAP to approve it. Deans are supposed to make their agreements tentative and subject to CAP approval. The CAP review seems pro forma and the CAP has been reluctant to review files, especially with some new deans. Another campus CAP will send files back and the differences between the recommendations are usually resolved within the year. Another CAP has had a number of cases where it disagreed with the step but there would never be a dispute where the person is already on the faculty. UCSC does not approve appointments but just makes recommendations to the deciding authority. Members discussed what the CAPs recommend and how the administrators handle the recommendations.

UCM: The CAP does not review appointments to Assistant Professor titles. Several other CAPs, including UCB's, do review the appointments. A member asked if a list of different practices across could be compiled.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel, UCOP*
- *Janet Lockwood, Manager-Academic Policy & Compensation, Academic Personnel, UCOP*

Excellent progress is being made on the development of the exit survey for faculty leaving UC. UCAP saw some materials in November and since then the survey has been tested by a researcher in the field and changes have been made to it. The plan is to administer it beginning in February. Currently six campuses will participate in the pilot this year and will look back at the separations for the previous academic year. UCLA, UCSD, UCB, UCI, UCR, and UCSB are in the pilot. This is being done in partnership with COACHE at Harvard. Preliminary results may be available to review in the late spring and UC is looking at how it might compare itself to other institutions. A conference in late June at UCI is

being planned for this. The focus will only be on separations, not on retirements, during the pilot. A survey for retiring faculty is under initial discussions although this will not be as relevant to UCAP.

The report on the second year of the Negotiated Salary Trial Program has been released but UCAP has not received it yet. The Vice Provost would like to discuss the report with UCAP during the March meeting. In the fourth year of the NSTP, UC is on track to have a broader discussion and review of the program. Academic Personnel is in the early stages of trying to study faculty advancement in more detail. This is following up on the campus faculty salary equity studies that suggested that rates of advancement should be studied. One issue is whether there are differences in advancement based on race, ethnicity or gender that need to be addressed.

Several Presidential policies will come to UCAP for review. The Academic Planning Council has been involved with drafting the policy on International Activities which will be sent out for a management consultation soon. A policy on electronic security is in development and it will be distributed for management consultation in a month or so. Data on how the 2015-16 salary program played out and how campuses awarded the 1.5% salary will be submitted to the Provost by February 1st and shared with the Senate and the academic administrators on the campus. This has been very time-consuming at the campus level so Academic Personnel will look at the outcomes. This information will be important to provide to the President before decisions about salaries are made for next year.

Chair Stenstrom reported to Vice Provost Carlson that UCAP would be drafting a memo to the campuses indicating that the dossiers should be accurate. The Vice Provost asked if the online dossiers or hardcopy dossiers are more accurate, and the chair indicated that more problems seem to occur with the online dossiers. Vice Provost Carlson would like to see the UCAP memo and indicated that there has been an ongoing discussion about whether CAPs should utilize the databases, which are not necessarily reliable.

Academic Personnel continues to refine the UC Recruit system. The National Science Foundation award to study what is happening in the recruitment process is underway and UCAP will receive an update on this in the spring. UCAP may be interested in seeing how the information from candidates is screened. Vice Provost Carlson described an upcoming symposium, Gaming Metrics, and the details will be shared with the committee. This is a national meeting that will be at UCD, it is open to the public and there is no registration fee.

Discussion: There was a question about the use of Research Gate, and most members reported not using it.

VII. New Business

Members agreed that a meeting devoted to discussing CAP practices would be helpful.

VIII. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Teleconference adjourned at: 1: 20 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Michael Stenstrom