

**Attending:** Jeffrey Knapp, Chair (UCB), Christina Ravelo, Vice Chair, (UCSC), James Jones (UCD), David Redmiles (UCI), Jacqueline Leung (UCSF), Bradley Chmelka (UCSB), Myrl Hendershott (UCSD), Jang-Ting Guo (UCR), Eric Talley (UCB), Carolyn Dean (UCSC), Michael Stenstrom (UCLA), David Kelley (UCM), Mary Gilly (Academic Senate Chair), Dan Hare (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Fredye Harms (Principal Policy Analyst)

## I. Announcements

Chair Knapp welcomed everyone to the meeting. The President's Innovation Council Rewards and Recognition Workgroup has not met yet but Dr. Sastry was pleased with the information provided by UCAP members. She appeared to agree with the conclusion that patents were a relatively rare issue in reviews, that CAPs encountered no significant difficulties in reviewing patents, and that the review process would not be an especially fruitful path for encouraging more patents. Council has reviewed the feedback from the systemwide review of APM 210-1-d. The proposed revision was not seen as eliminating the concerns about extra credit for contributions to diversity. However, there was overwhelming consensus about the aims of the revision, so it is possible that a subcommittee of Council may work on a revision. Chair Knapp will ask Vice Provost Carlson about the administration's position on the policy.

## II. Consent Calendar

**Action:** The minutes were approved.

## III. Consultation with the Academic Senate

- *Mary Gilly, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Dan Hare, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Gilly described the governor's budget proposal. A systemwide cap on non-resident students is on the table. The initiatives proposed by the governor during the last Regents meeting will be discussed by the president and governor, and a report may be made during the March Regents' meeting. A faculty engagement plan is intended to make sure that faculty are well-informed about the long-range sustainability plan and to help faculty have a role in advocacy if they wish. During next week's Regents meeting there will be an update about the Commission on the Future recommendations.

The implementation of UC Path, the systemwide HR system, was planned for January 1<sup>st</sup> at UCOP and the president has asked for a new timeline and a budget for the project. The central team leadership for the project has changed. Two legislators have made a proposal that would strip UC of its autonomy. The community colleges are working on offering baccalaureate degrees at up to fifteen campuses and UC was given just one week to provide feedback about the majors. One proposed major would be for 24 students a year, suggesting a lot of resources are being spent on a limited number of students. None of the degrees overlap with UC's but the CSUs are concerned.

## IV. Total Remuneration/Faculty Salary Recommendations

UCAP should finalize the recommendation from UCAP to Chair Gilly about how to close the faculty salary gap. Recommendations will also be submitted by several other systemwide committees and by the campuses. Chair Knapp provided a summary of the feedback from members. UCM, UCR and UCSC and the majority of the UCD CAP are in support of an across the board salary increase. The UCD, UCI, UCLA and UCSF Four CAPs favor across the board increase and flexibility for retention and to address the loyalty tax. The UCB CAP and a minority of the UCD CAP favors complete flexibility for individual campuses. A minority of UCI CAP recommends increasing retirement benefits, UCSC recommends addressing the salary disparity among the campuses, and no CAP proposes eliminating or absorbing the off-scale increments. Several CAPs recommend limited fixes to the salary scales. UCLA thinks a second compensation initiative should be undertaken for health science faculty. Across the board increases or across the board increases with some funds reserved for flexibility are the two strategies with the most support. UCPB estimates that it would take an increase of 5.6% increase annually for five years to keep pace with the comparison eight institutions. The comparison eight institutions are expected to raise salaries by 3% every year.

**Discussion:** UCM wanted to keep the system of off-scales, keep some flexibility, and increase the amount for each step of the scales. The UCD CAP proposed applying the 3% to the base salary so that everyone would get something and not feel discriminated against. A member suggested dealing with equity later if there is more money. If the campuses were allowed to decide how to use the funds, there is a concern about who would be making these decisions and that the same people who created the inequity will be the decision-makers. Two CAPs, UCD and UCI, think it would not be feasible for CAPs to look at salaries. CAPs could give guidance that each individual campus could follow. The 3% will not help with the inequity issue. It would be untenable for the UCD CAP to make recommendations about the salary and this would be a big shift for UCI. The UCLA CAP would not look at individual cases but would probably recommend a philosophy to the vice chancellor about how the salary increases should be made.

UCD has data about who is making progress and not receiving outside offers but it does not have data about faculty who have an off-scale increment because they sought an outside offer. One CAP spent some time discussing the loyalty tax but it was difficult to determine who had suffered from the loyalty tax. In principle, there may be agreement with addressing the loyalty tax. Members agree with the idea of defining who should receive an increase. It is important to distinguish between people who have not sought an outside offer and the faculty who do not warrant receiving a salary increase because their teaching is lacking. UCLA has suggested that the 3% increase be awarded when the faculty member is up for a merit instead of giving an across the board increase all at once. One argument against a combined plan of using the 3% funds for a general increase and for flexibility is that splitting the 3% in half would be absurd.

If there were to be a blended approach, one question is how to determine the allocation that would go for the across the board increase and the allocation for flexibility. Chair Knapp asked members to consider what the balance would be. UCAP members did not support increasing the off-scale amount. If the across the board approach is used, the determination has to be made about who could receive the merit award. Some members felt that one-half percent should be allocated to flexibility and the rest to an across the board.

A member asked if there is a restriction about when this money must be distributed. Chair Knapp believes that the goal is to spend the money this year, which would make it tough to tie it to the merit increase. UCAP might suggest that campuses are given the funds now with the condition that they are

distributed at the point of merit. A member was informed that the 3% is not new money but is expected to come from the existing campus base budgets. This is a contradiction to what other members have heard. Another member proposed looking back to the last point of merit. It was noted that deans are in the best position to know who deserves an increase and who has not sought outside offers. There is agreement that a significant amount of time is being spent on a small amount of money and there is consensus on a one time across the board 3% increase on the on-scale portion.

The UCSC CAP, which considers salaries, is looking at increasing the salary dramatically at all of the steps requiring external letters in an effort to address the widening salary gap especially for those faculty who had not sought external offers. Individual campus CAPs may want to think about strategies for faculty at various thresholds. Some campuses are looking at initiatives that target health sciences faculty. The UCB policy for bringing faculty to market at tenure will be shared with the committee so other campuses can start to giving a special increment at different thresholds. Members agree that the funds should not be applied to the off-scale portion. Chair Knapp was surprised by how many faculty in the system are off-scale. The last effort to fix the salary scales was a disaster. The off scale increments are so large that members do not think it would be possible to fix them.

**Action:** The chair will draft a memo outlining UCAP's feedback.

## **V. Campus Reports /Member Items**

**Davis:** The CAP is using a new academic personnel system modeled in part after Berkeley's. People tried to advance through the system by accelerating in time for a merit review. Now the CAP uses a step plus system which allows the faculty to only go up in normative time. It has taken some time for the implementation of the voting system and this has created a large backlog of cases. The minimum step for UCD is one step. Chair Knapp commented that using half steps is a good way to raise salaries.

**Santa Cruz:** The CAP is now using a completely online system which works well. There is a problem with a very low student response rate and the campus is considering how to interpret the response rates. The response rates have varied by department from under 20% to 50%. The students that respond either really liked or disliked the class. UCSB has been considering this issue as well and hopes that UCSC shares its findings with UCAP. A subcommittee is looking into how the response rate could be approved. The response rates with the hardcopy surveys could be over 80%. The online system at UCD can be tailored by the faculty which makes it more user friendly. UCM students do not appear to be embracing the online voting system. The UCD system allows faculty to determine when the student evaluation will be and open that window up from anywhere, and the system sends reminders with a link to the system. CAPs may need to revisit how they assess teaching evaluations. Relying solely on the student responses can leave a lot of information out and more time could instead be spent observing lectures and evaluating syllabi which are probably better ways to evaluate teaching. UCSD asks for the written student comments as well as the numbers. Faculty have heard that the response rates to the student evaluation online are low so some are opting out of using the online systems.

## **VI. New Business**

The members received the first annual report on the Negotiated Salary Program just before the meeting. Chair Knapp explained that the negotiated salary component cannot exceed 30% of the scale plus off scale and the trial is limited to UCSD, UCI, and UCLA. The negotiated salary component must come from external sources but campuses are also using funds from self-supporting programs. The Senate was strongly against this program and UCAP had particular concerns about the faculty who would be

eligible. The Senate asked for annual reports and this is the first of three for the initial phase of the program.

**Discussion:** Members did not support making a blanket policy that prohibits the use of the funds for buy-outs. UCAP might recommend that deans prepare reports on the trial program participants for CAPs review. Chair Knapp invited members to provide feedback about the annual report which will also be discussed during the committee's March meeting. Many CAPs invite deans to a meeting at the beginning of the year to exchange information including how they would make decisions about program participation.

## **VII. Consultation with the Office of the President**

- *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel*

The consultation with Vice Provost Carlson was rescheduled.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:05  
minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams  
Attest: Jeff Knapp