

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

MINUTES OF TELECONFERENCE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2015

Attending: Jeffrey Knapp, Chair (UCB), Christina Ravelo, Vice Chair, (UCSC), David Redmiles (UCI), Jacqueline Leung (UCSF), Bradley Chmelka (UCSB), Myrl Hendershott (UCSD) (telephone), Jang-Ting Guo (UCR), James Jones (UCD), Michael Stenstrom (UCLA), David Kelley (UCM), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel), Janet Lockwood (Manager-Academic Policy and Compensation, Academic Personnel), Mary Gilly (Chair, Academic Senate), Dan Hare (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I. Announcements

The committee's final meeting, on May 13th, will be in-person in Oakland. The chair clarified that he does not participate on the Provost's Monthly Budget Call. UCAP's comments on the proposed open access policy for non-Senate UC authors were included in Council's feedback. Council also requested that the administration provide implementation funding for this policy and for the Senate's open access policy.

The Total Compensation Working Group is being chaired by Vice Provost Carlson and members included the chairs of UCAP, UCPB, UCFW, and UCAAD as well as three other administrators. All of the working group members agreed that its recommendation for 2015-2016 is for a 3% across the board increase. There are two options for the implementation: the 3% would be applied to the total salary or it would be applied to the scale salary (in which case it would be a 3.5% increase to the scale). A slight majority of the working group members favored applying the increase to the scale only and there was unanimous support for this option at Council as well. Since the working group could not reach a decision, both of these options will be forwarded to the president.

The main issue with this approach is what to do about above scale salary since it would be difficult to determine which portion of the salary is the scale portion. A strong majority of the working group favor a systemwide solution to this problem, and the strategy being discussed the most is to add a percentage of salary to the Step IX salary for every year a faculty member is above scale. What is still needed is a way to differentiate between merit increases that above faculty have received and any off scale increment that they carried into above scale or received as a result of a retention case while they were above scale. Neither group supported the increase going to meritorious faculty only, with members of Council shouting this option down according to Chair Knapp.

There is no agreement yet about the allocation of the 3% increases currently budgeted for the four out years following 2015-2016. The vice provosts lean toward campus flexibility and the Senate representatives lean toward systemwide across the board increases for this 3%. Chair Knapp has emphasized that the working group should not confuse the two different salary gaps it is being asked to address, one being an external gap in relation to UC's peers, the chief issue that got the working group convened in the first place. The other set of gaps are internal and related

to issues like the loyalty penalty, salary inversion, gender and racial inequities, and also to differences among the various campuses. The two types of gaps may require different approaches.

Two possible fund sources for salary increases have been identified. There is a promise of five years of 3% annual increases that have been budgeted, which is separate from the merit increase money, which is largely taken for granted. In addition, Chair Knapp reported that there is a reinvestment in quality fund that does not yet have a budget but is projected to be \$50M for the first year with significant increases for the four following years. There is a lot of skepticism about whether the reinvestment in quality fund will ever materialize and there are also a lot of people making claims for this money. Working group members have agreed that faculty salaries should be a high priority for how to spend the reinvestment in quality money. This might result in the five years being used to increase the scales in the way the group has recommend for 2015-2016 and then using the reinvestment in quality fund to address the internal salary gaps described above but this is just a hypothetical at present.

A sticky issue in the group is whether there will be absorption in future years of decoupled increments for faculty. Absorption means that for every dollar your scale salary increases your decoupled increment will decrease, so that the decoupled increment will slowly be absorbed into the scales. This is strongly favored by the Committee on Planning and Budget but not by others on the working group. Chair Knapp suggested that the complexity of the issues surrounding above scale salaries may torpedo the scale solution at the presidential level.

The Academic Planning Council discussed the policy on self-supporting degree programs. The Senate support the criterion that a case for a new self-supporting program must be “compelling.” Administrators view this criterion as setting too high a bar for such programs, but the Senate is now pressing that proposals to create a SSP must make “a compelling academic and budgetary case” for the program, and in addition, they must articulate how the program is not going to be detrimental to the unit’s state supported mission. The consensus on the APC seems to be moving in the direction the Senate has wanted to see it move. Chair Knapp indicated that there are some 50+ SSDPs now being considered for approval. The administration has agreed to establish a working group on SSDP policy made up of Senate and administrators. One further item: Nathan Brostrom from UCOP explained to the Academic Planning Council that Proposition 2, the “rainy day fund,” dedicates some money to paying off unfunded liabilities in the state and that the state has designated UCRP as an unfunded liability. This would be good news but for the fact that zero dollars have been allocated to this item. If UC received \$100M from the \$2B+ rainy day fund, tuition would not need to increase and the governor would not have to commit money from the general budget to the University.

Discussion: The committee discussed whether the faculty who are above scale should receive the 3% increase. A member commented that the working group’s recommendation is reasonable and that Chair Knapp has represented UCAP’s position well. The chair indicated that UCAP will have a more comprehensive discussion about the total compensation recommendations during its May meeting. One member questioned the justification for preserving the off scale component when UCAP hoped to somehow remove inequities like these.

Chair Knapp indicated that when this was tried in the past, there was significant unhappiness amongst faculty with off scale components who felt that their money was being taken away from them (which was incorrect) or that they were being excluded from the raises. It is a practical and political problem to make faculty unhappy who UC has done so much to try to retain. A member stated that these faculty are not the ones we should be worried about, and it seems like a small, vocal group that has been retained with an off scale component that is not representative of the broader constituency. Chair Knapp responded that the vast majority of UC faculty do have off scale components, something in the range of 60%-80% and some 60% of this group have an off scale that is less than 20% of their total salary. Planning and Budget's argument is that this latter group can be absorbed into the scales. One member suggested giving the faculty who are above scale the 3% increase to simplify things.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

III. Negotiated Salary Trial Program

UCAP members are invited to provide feedback on the first annual report of the Negotiated Salary Trial Program. The NSTP is at UCI, UCLA, and UCSD. Faculty can draw a negotiated salary component from external funds only such as grants, gifts, and internal degree programs. This component cannot exceed 30% of the scale plus off scale salary of the faculty member. During the trial program, there are to be annual reports. UCAP should decide if it has any comments on this first annual report.

Discussion: The report does not look at funding for graduate students and post-docs, such as stipends and travel funds. A member recommended that more data should be collected on whether the salaries for faculty in the trial program impacted the hiring of graduate and post-doctoral students. A piece of missing information is the role of CAPs in this program. CAPs are asked to report after the four year trial program is completed. UCAP could ask for more information about the CAP policies and to hear from the administrators about what the CAP input has been. CAPs would need data pre and post program to comment on, such as increasing or decreases in productivity or mentor more or fewer students.

Vice Provost Carlson indicated that the NSTP work group recommended that the CAPs would report after four years of the program. Work group members did not think that CAPs would have anything to report after just the first year of the program. Each campus has an implementation plan that specifies what the role of CAPs will be. Some campuses have templates or guidelines to help. The decision was made that CAPs that currently do not consider salary would not be asked to comment on salary for the NSTP participants. The UCI CAP has commented on good standing. UCAP would like the questionnaire for the administrators to include a question about the role of the CAPs. Even if the CAPs have a minor role, UCAP thinks that should be included in the report. Vice Provost Carlson indicated that the funding for graduate students comes from different sources so the campuses do not have information about reduction in funding. The Vice Provost accepted the verbal feedback from UCAP and indicated that a memo from the committee is not needed.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President

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

VP Carlson shared that UCD is hosting an event on April 10th about the rewards system and whether it meets current needs. Academic Personnel will soon have the results of the faculty salary equity studies. Reports have been submitted by all ten campuses and the complete report is at least four hundred pages. Academic Personnel is preparing summaries of the information from the campuses. The campuses took the studies very seriously. Some campuses did not find racial or gender disparities but found other issues such as the impact of taking leave. Three of the campuses have been studying equity issues for many years but will be revisiting the processes they use because of what they have learned as a result of the current exercise.

Academic Personnel is in the process of developing an exit survey for faculty. UCSC has a survey, UCSF contracts with a vendor and UCD is starting to work on this. This survey will provide UC with consistent information about why faculty leave UC. VP Carlson is working with the COACH program at Harvard, which will enable comparisons with peer institutions. Provost Dorr has provided funds for this work.

The seminars being conducted at the campuses on micro-aggression and bias are ongoing. The theater production has been tweaked to allow for audience participation. Proposed revisions to APM 080 on medical separation will be sent out for systemwide review. The goal is to support who want to be part-time and processes do exist at the campuses to handle these cases, although these are infrequently used. Academic Personnel wants to make the presentation better each time.

VP Carlson shared that there are several openings at systemwide programs. The director of the CDL will retire in the fall and directors are needed for the UC Sacramento Center and UCEAP.

Discussion: The UCD representative is providing information to the coordinator of the April 10th event. A member suggested that faculty should be surveyed about their reasons for staying at UC. VP Carlson indicated that it would be very expensive to conduct this survey along with the exit survey, and that the decision was made to focus on the exit survey since no data is collected about this right now.

V. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

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

Chair Gilly shared that the vice chair nominations are due in April. There has been news coverage about the committee of two and an update at the March Regents meeting. A study of AP courses found that 46% of African American students who would be eligible to take AP classes do not take them and this might be one way that UC can focus its diversity efforts. The governor has been focusing on three year degrees and the Senate is exploring ways that more

students could pursue these degrees. Chair Gilly reported on campus visits and a question that has come up is whether UC needs excellence. There is concern that the Senate has not been involved with some of the visits by the governor's staff. Some concerns expressed by legislators include that non-resident tuition is undoing the intention of rebenching and funding streams. There is some discussion about revisiting the formula used. Legislators have a number of faculty workload questions.

Regent Kieffer has been asking for a discussion at the Regents about the meaning of a UC degree. At next week's Regents meeting, there will be a presentation by the UCB Chancellor and the Senate division chair on the history of undergraduate education. The campuses go through similar exercises on a regular basis. With respect to the transfer initiative, there will be groups discussing what is needed for transfer into UC. A goal is to get everyone on the same page about the courses that comprise adequate preparation for a major. Some Senate members are concerned that the undergraduate deans are being consulted. Ten majors this year and eleven majors next year would cover about 80% of the transfer students. The AA degrees for transfer will be reviewed. These degrees are now the way that community college students think about transferring into UC and UC needs to think about any changes that should be made to the curriculum.

An assemblyman has proposed building an eleventh UC campus. Governor Abbot of Texas has reported a plan to invest in research universities in that state. A community college baccalaureate pilot is being planned. One requirement is that the degrees do not overlap with degrees offered by UC and the CSUs. The consequences for UC will be that the majors will require upper division general education requirements which would require articulation agreements. This issue is being addressed at the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates.

Discussion: The UCSB representative commented that three year degrees may not be viable. Students have summer internships for example. There should be a careful examination of where the demand is. Chair Gilly shared that demand for three year degrees is limited and that the student Regent has reported that students do not want these degrees.

VI. Campus Reports/Member Items

UCM: A tenure case came up and the CAP voted unanimously negative on it. An ad hoc was appointed and issued a report that has not been shared with CAP. The member stated that the CAP will be overruled by the provost. Members were asked if this happens at their campuses. At UCSB, this would be an unusual scenario and this CAP would initiate the ad hoc and factor its report into the CAP's decision. It would be unprecedented at UCD as well as UCB. At UCSF the vote of CAP is only advisory to the VPAA. The current VPAA is not using a lot of ad hoc committee and the final decision is being made by the VPAA. It is not clear that the UCSF CAP has any role in seeing the ad hoc committee report and the CAP does not get the ad hoc committee report or any feedback about the final decision. A member stated that the refusal to share a report violates the transparency of the review process.

The UCR CAP sees the ad hoc report before it votes. UCSB's CAP would have the report and make a recommendation. The UCM CAP previously received copies of report from other ad hoc

committees. In some cases the provost has gone with the ad hoc's recommendation but in those cases everyone saw the arguments made by everyone else. However, the CAP felt that this was a particularly extreme case with a unanimous vote, and that the transparency of the process is compromised by the administration's failure to share the ad hoc report. The provost has indicated that he will join CAP to explain his decision on this particular case and the representative is surmising that the CAP will be overruled. Regardless of the provost's decision in this case, this can be seen as a breach of procedure for the report not to be shared. Any previous precedent is not being followed now. The UCM representative will work with the chair of CAP on a memo to UCAP and this issue will be discussed during the May meeting. Currently six of the nine UCM CAP members, including the chair, are from other UC campuses. Chair Knapp and Vice Provost Carlson encouraged the CAP chair to meet with the provost and vice provost. The analyst will send the members a survey about whether their CAP sees the ad hoc committee's report.

UCSF: CAP is seeing frequent requests for multiple year accelerations, and sometimes the word retention is used. What kind of evidence do other CAPs want to see? In cases where the file was marginal, the CAP accepted the chairs' word as genuine and approved the acceleration. This is also referred to as preemptive retention according to Chair Knapp. The UCR CAP has a separate procedure for preemptive retention. The CAP reviews the file including the dollar amount recommended by the department and dean. It is separate from the regular merit and promotion process that considers multi-year acceleration. At UCD, the CAP does not deal with the monetary amount in terms of offering off scales, instead it strictly evaluates the productivity.

The UCSB CAP is engaged with salary considerations and is very reluctant to establish a direct precedent where preemptive retentions are encouraged. At UCI, the cases seemed to point to productivity that also established the acceleration, so the acceleration was not just being done for retention. Preemptive retention is a speculative mechanism. The UCB CAP in the past was very much opposed to preemptive retention as a serious criterion. Chair Knapp reminded the members that CAPS should focus on faculty members' achievements in the three categories, and preemptive retention is not an achievement, but rather a speculation that has no place in review. Deans who encourage preemptive retention should be encouraged to find money of their own, not through the review process.

The UCSF CAP has also been asked to review appointments one or two years after the faculty member have already been working at UC because of delays in paperwork or other reasons. Some CAPs use expedited reviews and the UCSF CAP may want to mark the appointment cases as expedited. The UCSF CAP reviews files for all faculty at the UC Fresno campus even though this campus is totally separate from UCSF. The representative agrees that the expedited review might be a useful tool for the many new appointments the CAP is seeing. It is important to reverse the current process where the CAP sees the appointments up to several years after the fact.

The UCSF representative will send Chair Knapp a memo about the evaluation of health sciences faculty and this matter will be added to the May agenda. This will touch on the reviews of faculty at the UCSF Fresno campus and the issue of measuring international recognition. The member would like to see examples from other campuses that have health science faculty and

have had problems. The UCI CAP relies heavily on its representative from the health science school to help the members sort out the different standards. This question will be on the agenda for UCAP's next meeting.

VII. Future Business

Letters at Step VI: Chair Knapp asked UCAP members to verify if the information collected by UCAF is accurate. The issue will be on the agenda for UCAP's May meeting. Specifically, UCAF's memo also argues that academic freedom can potentially be violated. Chair Gilly asked if Step VI is still a viable threshold option or if it should be treated like any other professorial step. One CAP has discussed this matter briefly and there is currently no consensus.

APM 210-1-d: A new proposed revision will soon be sent out by Academic Personnel for a sixty day systemwide review. The chair briefly explained the history of the proposed revision to this policy. One member pointed out that what has been proposed uses the phrases "due credit" and "due recognition." UCAP may comment on this asymmetry because the notion of "due credit" raises the possibility that faculty could get an extra boost with respect to mentoring and advising. Chair Knapp reported that substituting "due credit" for "due recognition" in the final sentence of the emended revision was a make or break issue for the working group, several of whom thought that the repetition of "due recognition" was redundant. UCAP may want to comment on this point.

APMs 360 and 210-4: UCAP members have been asked to provide comments on these proposed revisions. The Chair has asked members to send responses to these proposal by April 13th and it will be placed on the agenda for final comment.

VIII. New Business

Members did not suggest any new items.

Meeting adjourned at: 2:20 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Jeffrey Knapp