

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

MINUTES OF TELECONFERENCE

WEDNESDAY, May 18, 2016

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

I. Announcements

Chair Stenstrom reported that the State Audit of UC has been under discussion and the analyst will send the University's response to this report to UCAP. One or two people in the Legislature helped with UC's response. The analyst distributed an overview on the Health Science Compensation plan just as an information item. Chair Stenstrom reported that UCAP will need to review forthcoming information about the Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOE) now that the proposed wording changes have been finalized.

At the last UCAP call, the committee discussed sending a letter to the divisions about the service that is reported in the file. Chair Stenstrom will send a draft of the memo to the committee for input.

Discussion: A member asked if there will be an effort to move faculty in the tenure-track series to the LSOE series if their research productivity stalls. Chair Stenstrom indicated that the majority opinion is that the LSOE series should be reserved for faculty who are outstanding teachers. There was a discussion about clarifying and improving their voting rights and privileges. It would be a concern if the emphasis is on turning UC into a teaching university rather than a research university. Teaching Professor or Professor of Teaching is a title that has been used in job searches and the UCD CAP has concerns about the distinction between the regular professorial series vs the LSOE series. The UCD CAP would be in favor of something like Assistant Lecturer and the use of anything with the word "Professor" would be problematic.

The UCM representative asked if the APM indicates that ladder rank faculty can be moved to the LSOE series.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The January minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

- *Dan Hare, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Jim Chalfant, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

The Senate has been addressing the programmatic initiatives. The work on the transfer pathways has been completed and UC now has 21 systemwide majors that provide recommendations to students so they have the appropriate pre-major preparation to apply to all nine campuses in these particular majors. The next objective was to look at the articulation gaps to ensure that as many California Community Colleges as possible have the courses specified in the transfer pathways. Not all 113 CCCs are expected to provide all of the courses for all of the transfer pathways for the 21 majors. The Senate was asked to review the

College Level Exam Program as a way to provide an alternate way for some of UC's advanced students to achieve credit for courses without having to take those classes in subject areas where they have background. Chair Hare discussed the interaction with the College Board agency and how they led to our being unable to evaluate the CLEP exams.

The Academic Council learned about vendor changes to UC Care. The third party administrator will change from Blue Shield to Anthem Blue Cross January 2017. An update on cybersecurity included finding out which campuses plan to use FireEye as a threat detection system. Chair Hare described the report on the State Auditor of UC and how the University has challenged it. At last week's Regents meeting, there was further discussion about the State Audit. The president announced that she is making \$8M available for undocumented students and there will be support for injured scholarship athletes. There was a presentation on undergraduate student financial aid and a discussion about how to do more for middle class students and one question is how middle class is defined.

The Regents discussed how to diversify the student population and the president asked the Regents to come to future meetings with their specific ideas for doing this. There was a discussion about changes in the governance and bylaws of the Board. Instead of having most of the committee work done in the presence of the full board, the committees would act more independently during concurrent sessions and the report back to the full Board and most of the Regents favored the revision. The Regents discussed moving the governing documents from three categories to two. On individual basis, standing orders will either be elevated to a bylaw or downgraded to a policy. Most everything associated with the Academic Senate will be elevated to a bylaw which is more beneficial for the Senate than having things in standing orders.

Discussion: Chair Stenstrom noted being taken aback by some statements made in the State Auditor report. The Auditor recommended eliminating the compare favorable criterion which would mean UC has to identify another method of evaluating non-resident students. The president may ask the Senate to revisit the criterion. UCAP's chair suggested using the median scores from last year as the basis for comparing the incoming students. Looking at how students perform after their first year at UC is another approach.

The concern that ladder rank faculty who have stalled would be moved into the LSOE series was mentioned. A member remarked that a hidden consequence of hiring more adjuncts is the declining quality of research because of the burdens on service since adjuncts do not serve. Chair Hare responded that the conversion of ladder rank faculty to the LSOE classification is already happening. This may be a good solution for everyone when a faculty member who finds that they are less interested in research but are good at and interested in teaching. When you move ladder rank faculty into the LSOE series, the campus loses a faculty member who could bring in grant funding. However, for the Humanities faculty who do not bring in grants, this is not reassuring. Another profound effect is the decreasing number of tenure track positions available for graduate students. Chair Hare indicated that there is no formal advocacy for tenure track positions by the Senate but UCAP could bring these concerns forward.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President

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

Manager Lockwood reported that the policy workgroup is preparing a first draft of APM 285, the LSOE series and APM 210.3 the instructions to review committees that advise on this series. The drafts will be circulated informally, before management consultation, with the LSOE working group. The formal consultation will likely begin in the fall but meanwhile feedback is being sought from various groups to ensure that Academic Personnel remains on track conceptually. Chair Stenstrom as a member of the

workgroup will receive the draft in about three weeks and Manager Lockwood indicated that these drafts can be shared with UCAP members but not with the campus CAPs. Work will be done between now and September to create the best proposed policy.

Manager Lockwood was notified today that UCR is proposing a candidate, a Philosophy professor, for the University Professor title. Chair Stenstrom will receive a formal notice about the requirements for campus representation for the ad hoc review committee and UCAP members will be asked to nominate faculty for the ad hoc committee.

Vice Provost Carlson indicated that the systemwide Faculty Exit Survey was piloted at six campuses that volunteered to participate starting in April. The survey was for the academic year 2014-2015 and all ladder rank faculty who left the University were surveyed as were faculty identified by the campuses as retention cases which serves as a comparison group. The return rate was over 65% and the research team at Harvard is in the process of analyzing the results. A June 28th roundtable seminar at UCI will include a discussion about the partial results and about the general idea of conducting the surveys and how they can help with faculty retention and recruitment. Academic Personnel will join UCAP's fall meeting to review the results of the survey.

Year Three of the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP) has just been completed. Faculty are allowed to supplement their salary in certain circumstances and under the supervision of faculty groups at the campus. Academic Personnel is preparing to administer a survey to faculty in participating units to solicit their feedback on the program. A more comprehensive review of the first three years of the program will be conducted and good Senate representation for a task force is desired. A task force is needed to recommend to the provost whether the NSTP should be continued, extended to other campuses, continued on a temporary basis, or ended. When this program was put into effect, it was controversial so it will be important to have a broad review of the analysis.

The 2015-2016 Discretionary Salary Program was discussed. Each campus designed something different from what the president set out for the program. It worked fairly well for non-Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP) ladder rank faculty and discretionary funds were primarily used to address equity issues. The plan was less robust for HSCP faculty because the elements did not fit well for how salary and reviews occur for these personnel. In April the president sent a memo to the Chancellors for the 2016-2017 salary program. The two key parts are an adjustment to the scales and a discretionary program. This year the discretionary part is less restrictive. Last year it was clear that the president wanted the focus to be on equity but this year there is a broader conception of how campuses may want to implement the program. There should be active discussions at the campuses right now about how the program is implemented. The report for next year will not be as extensive as what was provided for 2015-2016. Vice Provost Carlson indicated that the 2015-2016 report can be shared with CAPs.

Discussion: Chair Stenstrom asked if the plan is for 3% increases for faculty salary will continue. Vice Provost Carlson indicated that the president has stated that there should be a standard 3% salary program every year, but this depends on what happens with the economy. This program does not address the gap between UC faculty and faculty at the eight comparator institutions and the president still considers this to still be an item on her agenda. The vice provost indicated that there will be an analysis of how many LSOEs there are. Currently there are fewer than three hundreds PLSOE and LSOEs at UC. It is still a fairly small group but the numbers are increasing. Chair Stenstrom remarked that there is variation at the campuses in terms of how many LSOEs there are and based on the discipline. Service loads are increasing as the proportion of faculty to LSOEs changes.

A concern related to the LSOEs for one member is the differential effect on Humanities as opposed to the Sciences. The increase in LSOEs is having unanticipated effects that are threatening the regular

promotion of tenure-track faculty. There are issues about the work burden and the relationship between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty. Service used to be shared across a much greater proportion of tenure track faculty. The more the burden of teaching is placed on non-Senate faculty, the more Senate faculty are taking up the service burden.

LSOEs tend to do a good deal of service at UCSB and UCI. The service may differ or substitute for the kind of service done by Senate faculty but they are still doing service. The full time LSOEs are Senate members and participate in service. There is a hope that this will be manageable although the issue of the humanities looms large for some members of the committee. The vice provost hopes to receive lots of input from UCAP.

V. Campus Reports/Member Items

UCSF: At a recent CAP meeting, a stewardship review committee chair and member met with them to discuss concerns about the process. They felt comfortable making decisions using the current process but are hoping that new processes could be considered. The representative would like information about practices at other campuses. This is the second stewardship review of the department chair. The faculty surveyed had a low response rate and those who responded thought highly of the chair. The department actually did well but the stewardship review committee concluded that the chair should not be continued which seems drastic. The CAP asked if there chair could be given one year to perform some remedial work to show improvement. The policy currently calls for the person to continue for five years, to continue for three years with remedial actions or discontinuing the stewardship. Another idea is to conduct a 360 review. This type of review is unusual. The review committee thought the low response rate was because the survey is not entirely anonymous.

UCD had a case like this and it depends on how the department is treated and the department's view about the how the chair is fulfilling his or her responsibilities. There were serious concerns about the effectiveness of the chair as a leader and members of CAP took a negative view of this. The anonymity of the survey was also a concern with the case this CAP looked at. Some members of CAP voted against renewing the individual as chair. Other colleagues talked about trying to address some of the problems. The low survey response rate is a question but if people are afraid to respond when given the opportunity to express an opinion, this is part of the picture.

Reportedly at UCLA, chairs in the Health Sciences are reviewed and it is normal that they continue longer than the five years. The reviews done by CAP were mostly positive and this is probably because within the medical schools reviews are going on so that problem cases were resolved before they reached CAP. One professor involved with many things at the medical school including setting the salaries and reviews for Health Sciences was Professor Michael Levine and the UCSF representative should contact him for a full picture of UCLA's process. Most chairs outside of Health Sciences have far less responsibility. Off-scale salaries are more common in the Health Sciences.

UCM: One issue for this CAP is how much weight is given for administrative responsibilities. Normally the CAP places more emphasis on research followed by teaching. New language has been added that said that administrative responsibilities when balanced with appropriate teaching and research are understood to be a type of academic activity. The campus has Bylaw 55 units since there are no departments at UCM yet and people are appointed for two years. At UCLA there are chairs who do not drop out of research and publications and in these cases, service as chair is seen positively and would contribute to an acceleration. The UCLA CAP has had extensive discussions about whether merit or promotion was deserved in these cases. It counts but it is rare that service as chair would create a promotion or merit increase on its own unless there was something very exceptional about the activity.

UCR: This CAP will be dealing with a 220 appeal from someone who served as a department chair and whose research declined during this period. How these things will be viewed depends on the particular composition and chemistry of the CAP. This case involves an associate professor who took on a burden of chair service well before this should have happened. It seems harsh to penalize someone for taking on work that no one else would do or was available to do. In the review leading to the appeal, insufficient credit was given to the service. The APM simply states that service should be considered, but there are no guidelines and it would be helpful to clarify this. Some colleagues are doing more service than is wise and the impact of this on progress through the ranks requires serious consideration.

The UCSC CAP has discussed the difference between disciplines. Service responsibilities have a greater impact on those disciplines where research is done in terms of sole publication where there is a single author versus a lab based discipline where faculty supervised graduate students and post docs and their work can be continued. The change in the latter case is less notable than if it involved a chair trying to write a book, for example. Service will have different impact depending on the requirements of their research. If someone is a chair of a department and an actor, he or she cannot travel to perform on stage that is not local because of the service required. If the service is compensated on an administrative level versus a research stipend or course release, this service does not count because it has been compensated.

UCD: The CAP is having similar discussions about service. There is a new way of looking at files in the personnel process which is basically a change in how often files are reviewed. There is a threshold or expectation for a normal amount of research, service and teaching. Strength in one component is not viewed as something that can offset weakness in another area. One question is whether the service has scaled up appropriately with rank. Another question is how service is viewed depending on whether it has been service at a campus or service elsewhere.

UCSB: At this campus, the issue of service is significant particularly. Service has to be proactive and not a consequence of what faculty do in their normal activities. The UCSD representative added service is required to keep advancing but the main reason for promotion is research. At more senior levels, CAP wants to see real service that does not have a connection to the faculty's research but rather service on CAP or a systemwide Senate committee. CAPs are happy with faculty engaged in community service especially when it helps with diversity. The people who serve on CAP value service. It is clear that some people are not cut out to do service. Members would like to keep these issues on the table for UCAP to discuss further and consider what kind of service CAPs find legible and can actually count toward promotion.

UCM: The CAP is discussing changing the tenure clock to make it more similar to the other campuses. A faculty member can go up in the sixth year and, if denied, cannot come back to be reviewed for a second time. At other universities, faculty who apply for tenure and are denied get a second chance. At UCLA, everyone gets a second chance as long as it is within the eight years. At UCSC candidates get a second round automatically. UCLA: tries to follow the 8 year clock.

Meeting adjourned at: 2 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Michael Stenstrom