

The Senate's meetings on the transfer pathways have been completed and participants are now working with their departments to finalize the agreements. Chair Hare is on a Regents work group on intolerance and spent a day at UCLA listening to public comment. The comments made it clear that this matter relates to more than one group of students. It is hoped that the Regents understand that it will be crucial that any policy on intolerance is inclusive and does not infringe on academic freedom.

Chair Hare provided an overview of the programmatic initiatives that resulted from the May budget revise. The Chair and Vice Chair are on the Retirement Options Task Force. Another budget initiative is to come up with a new 2016 retirement plan consistent with the PEPPRA Cap, which is the focus of this task force. Competing issues which are difficult include paying for the liability in the retirement plan, retaining competitive total remuneration, and finding some savings that will convince the legislature that UC is serious about changing its retirement plan. The Senate negotiated a full systemwide review of the task force's recommendations from January 15th to February before they are taken to the Regents for implementation in July. Chair Hare is on a work group looking at policies related to faculty discipline. Berkeley's Chancellor Dirks made a statement that the Senate's procedures tied his hands with respect to faculty discipline which inaccurately reflects the options available to the administration.

Discussion: The sexual violence policy will address harassment of faculty by students and the student adjudication processes would apply in these cases. Sections of the APM and some of the Regents orders explicitly address faculty discipline. A chancellor can set aside the finding of a Privilege and Tenure committee and impose the level of discipline that is preferred.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel*
- *Janet Lockwood, Manager-Academic Policy and Compensation, Academic Personnel*
- *Kiernan Matthews, Partner on the Faculty Exit Survey, Harvard COACHE*

Vice Provost Carlson thanked the committee for its time. The director of COACHE at Harvard also joined the teleconference to discuss the Faculty Exit Survey. UC is partnering with COACHE to develop and pilot a Faculty Exit Survey at several UC campuses for separating faculty. The survey was discussed with Faculty Welfare last week. Director Matthews walked the members through the survey development process and invited their feedback. In addition to the Vice Provost's office, an advisory group comprised of faculty from different UC campuses is helping providing information about UC's culture. Input has been sought from individuals at UCSC and UCSF who have conducted exit surveys at those campuses.

A literature review and study of practices at other research institutions were conducted. One goal is to create an instrument that might be shared by different institutions. The advisory group has helped identify which faculty population should be the target group for the survey. A final version of the survey should be ready in early January. There has been an effort to understand anything that will limit access to the faculty to be interviewed. The survey window will be open until April. Strategies for follow up are being planned for particular groups, especially faculty of color. The analysis and reporting is planned for April to June.

Director Matthews would like UCAP members to consider how the committee can be involved, particularly at the reporting phase. There is keen interest in research universities outside of California in participating in this project for the next academic year. Vice Provost Carlson commented that the decision to partner with COACHE was based on their access to data and their extensive experience with faculty surveys.

Manager Lockwood reported that a work group of senior administrators has reviewed the health sciences clinical series and a proposal has been submitted to Vice Provost Carlson. This has also been shared with

Chair Hare and Vice Chair Chalfant. It has been circulated informally for preliminary review and drafts will be prepared for management and systemwide reviews. Goals included clarifying the difference between the health science clinical series and the volunteers clinical professor series and to standardize practices across the campuses with respect to how they appoint and advance in the HS Clinical series. Academic Personnel offered to share the proposal to the UCAP members but it should not be distributed further.

Discussion: The UCM representative met Director Matthews over the summer at Harvard and was struck by the cost of departure. This member suggested identifying ways that this survey can be used proactively to prevent departures. A version of the survey will be designed to study faculty who have outside offers and decide to stay at UC. The cost of preemptive retentions has to be balanced with equity considerations. Some questions will not be added to the survey in an effort to keep the instrument brief. Eventually, there may be enough survey data to allow for an analysis of equity issues. Vice Provost noted that the survey will enable UC to collect data about why faculty leave on a more systematic basis and it will be centralized. The aim is to include 3 to 5 campuses in the pilot. UCAP will receive updates at the rest of this year's meetings. The LSOE work group will look at the entire series in this title including lecturers with potential security of employment and senior lecturers.

IV. Campus Reports

UCI: The CAP has been working on promotion to Step VI which is a barrier step and this campus recently stopped requiring letters for advancement to this step. There is an interest from outside CAP in removing this as a barrier. The CAP is interested in the history and continuity of Step VI. Chair Stenstrom reported that in 1977 Step V was the barrier step and then Step VI was made into a barrier step at some point in the 1980's. A work group then suggested that a candidate could have excellence in teaching or excellence in research to qualify for advancement. The UCD member recalls that this was a major change but it is not clear if this was adopted across the system since the campus practices vary.

The UCSC member suggested the emphasis was on research before the Pister report and the report recommended that teaching should receive greater recognition. Quantifying teaching can be difficult and it is suggested that UCAP discuss this. When a CAP receives a file from a medical school there are questions about the expectations for teaching and creative activity. There is variation at UCSF across departments. It is suggested that another category is needed for the faculty who work primarily as clinician teachers and do not have significant research output. More information about this that spells out the expectations would be helpful for CAPs. UCAP could review the APM sections and provide CAPs with guidance. A member asked about campus requirements for letters at Step VI. Requirements in the clinical series are different and UCLA has a subcommittee that looks at HS clinical files. At UCD evaluating the files at Step VI without letters has been difficult. At UCI, the policy states that letters can be requested at any step.

UCM: One question is about the timing for when publications are counted. A related question is whether a candidate can hold onto publications for the next review period. In the Humanities the UCLA CAP may give credit on a case by case basis. UCSF's CAP conducts a PubMed search so it would be hard to withhold a publication. If it is published by the end of the cycle the publication has to be included. At two campuses, the CAPs do not worry about work being held back. At UCSB the red binder specifically states that a reason for asking for a reconsideration may be that a publication was not included initially.

This has not been very relevant at UCLA and this is one of several CAPs that does not restrict when a career equity review can be requested. UCSD refers to these as recalibrations. At UCSF, the career equity review may be done by deans but faculty can only request one of these reviews in their career.

UCR: Although instructed to review only the materials in the file, members of the CAP may look online for additional information about the faculty member. At UCLA, in most cases the CAP specialist will review what is online at PubMed or Web of Science for example. A member has checked the grant status at NSF. Another CAP has a strict rule about not looking for information beyond what is in the file. Another CAP tries to verify what is provided in the file by looking online. The UCLA CAP is fairly strict about asking the candidate to carefully review their files.

Meeting adjourned at: 12:40 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Michael Stenstrom