

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

## MINUTES OF VIDEOCONFERENCE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2017

**Attending:** Fanis Tsoulouhas, Chair, (UCM), Peter Ditto (UCI), Catherine Waters (UCSF), Peter Sturman (UCSB), Seana Coulson (UCSD), David Lloyd (UCR), Stuart Brown (UCLA), Rida Farouki (UCD) (Alternate), Patricia Oteiza (UCD), Ignacio Lopez-Calvo (UCM), Kathy Foley (UCSC) (Alternate), Daniel Farber (UCB), Arthur Ellis (Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, UCOP), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel), Janet Lockwood (Manager-Academic Policy and Compensation, Academic Personnel), Jim Chalfant (Academic Senate Chair), Shane White (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Mona Hsieh (Office Manager, Academic Senate), Ken Feer (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

**I. Announcements**

Chair Tsoulouhas reported that the Academic Planning Council discussed new programs and schools, and whether there should be concerns about replication and if the processes are appropriate. The Academic Council discussed the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) process for program approval. The Health Sciences Clinical Professor series will be discussed by UCAP today and there is a need for a code of conduct for some faculty in this series. The Academic Council has proposed a 2.5% tuition increase and the Senate has argued that the proposed 20% cap on non-resident tuition does not make sense as it would have a big impact on the budget and there is no substitute for the lost revenue. UCB, UCLA and UCSD are already over the 20% cap. The resignation of UCR's provost was discussed and UCR faculty were dissatisfied with the level of respect for shared governance. Academic Council also considered alternative names for the Lecturers With Security Employment (LSOE) faculty such as Professor of Practice. Chair Tsoulouhas summarized the Academic Council's memo about the LSOE policy.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** The November minutes were approved with corrections.

**III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

- *Jim Chalfant, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Shane White, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Governor Brown announced his budget for UC yesterday and the budget framework agreement is still in place. The 4% adjustment to the base budget and \$18.5M for the additional undergraduate students to be admitted in fall 2017 are included. With the passage of Proposition 56, revenues will be generated for graduate medical education. UCOP is emphasizing working with the Legislature on funding for deferred maintenance and enrollment growth of graduate students. The Governor also proposed phasing out the State's middle class scholarship program starting in 2017-18 for a savings of \$115.8M by 2021, but this is money that will not go to UC students or substitute what they will pay in tuition. The elimination of this program will do significant harm. It is likely that there will be another attempt by UC to put funding for graduate student enrollment growth in the budget next year.

Chair Chalfant encouraged UCAP to discuss the LSOE series with Vice Provost Carlson today. There is still no clear sense of when to use the new LSOE titles and it may be a negotiation between a dean and department. UCAP prefers Teaching Professor but it is not clear what title will ultimately be chosen. The draft policy will be sent to UCAP for review again. The salaries for faculty in the LSOE series will not be

the same as the base salaries for ladder rank faculty, but the exact figures are still to be determined. The main proposal has simply been to have a step system for the LSOEs.

The proposed revisions to APMs 015 and 016 were to be on the Regents' March agenda for approval. The Senate had many comments about existing language that was not part of the proposed changes. The issue of leave without pay was a concern raised by UCAP but the Administration may not know how to handle this particular issue. The CCGA is concerned about presidential and chancellors post-doctoral fellows and Vice Provost Carlson has reported that the funding for the FTEs positions has been overspent. CCGA has recommended that more funding be made available for these subsidies, even if it means fewer subsidies are offered. UCAP may want to bring this matter up with the Vice Provost.

Two Academic Senate resolutions, one supporting the in-state tuition increase and the other opposing the limit on non-resident students, are gaining traction with the Regents according to Chair Chalfant. These issues will probably be discussed by the Regents in March. A long-range effort will be undertaken by UC to look at growth and support. Campuses are being asked to weigh in on their desired growth and the budget required to reach their goal. Chair Chalfant emphasized to the committee members that Senate involvement in these discussions is important. The number of faculty to be hired and how they will be hired are critical questions. The work on this effort is expected to end over the summer and result in a document that may help change the conversation with the State.

**Discussion:** One campus has been allowing LSOEs to use the title Teaching Professor as a working title and this has not caused any difficulties, and the deans have not appeared anxious to hire in this category. Having a different increment scale for the LSOEs has been confusing and it is not clear if there is an economic reason for the different scale. Chair Chalfant indicated there is no obvious reason not to move the LSOEs into the step system or for these individuals not to have the same base salaries. At UCD, the emphasis on doing research in pedagogy is impacting the expectation that the LSOEs' teaching load should be higher than that for regular professorial rank faculty. The campus is finding that in many cases the LSOEs are not doing more teaching than professorial faculty. One motivation for hiring the LSOEs is to relieve the teaching load on the professorial faculty, but the problem is with the implementation of these positions. The UCD CAP should have a discussion with the Divisional Chair about this matter.

#### **IV. Systemwide Reviews**

##### **1) Proposed Revisions to APM Sections 278 and 210-6**

UCAP has the opportunity to provide feedback on Proposed Revisions to APM Sections 278 & 210-6 which are related to the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series.

**Discussion:** Members agreed upon the following feedback and proposed new language that is in bold and underlined.

210-6.b paragraph 2: The first sentence should be revised to read "The Dean or Department Chair is responsible for documenting the faculty member's division of **time and** effort among the four areas of activity; this written recommendation letter shall be placed in the dossier and shall be shared with the faculty member." Members were in support of this change.

210-6.b paragraph 4: A motion was made, seconded and approved to support removing this sentence: "Clinical teaching, professional activity, and scholarly or creative activity may differ from standard professorial activities in the University, and may therefore be evaluated on the basis of professional competence, intellectual contribution, and originality." UCAP has concerns that this paragraph connotes

that standard professorial activities in the University are not evaluated on the basis of professional competence, intellectual contribution, and originality.

210-6(2) paragraph 2: The first sentence should be revised to read “In judging the effectiveness of a candidate’s teaching, the committee should consider such points as the following: the candidate’s command of the subject; continuous growth in the subject field; ability to organize material and to present it **effectively** with force and logic;...capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the **potential** relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; fostering of student independence and capability to reason; spirit and enthusiasm...”

One CAP is very concerned about the addition of this new requirement or expectation of creative scholarly activity being placed on faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, fearing it may have a deleterious effect.

210-6(3) paragraph 2: The overarching concern is that the statement about what would count as meeting the creative scholarly requirement is vague. This paragraph suggests that the criteria could be met by administrative activities. A motion was made, seconded and approved to revise the first sentence of this paragraph to read “In order to be appointed or promoted to the Associate Professor or Professor rank in this series, the individual’s record **is expected to** ~~must~~ demonstrate contributions to scholarly, creative, or administrative activities.” Members agreed that each campus, or even school, will interpret what the minimal expectation should be.

278-8: Members agreed to suggest that the criteria for appointment to Health Sciences Clinical Instructor or Professor be included in APM 210.

**Action:** The analyst and chair will draft a memo outlining UCAP’s concerns.

## **2) Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy Business & Finance Bulletin – G-28, Travel Regulations**

UCAP has the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed revisions to Presidential Policy Business & Finance Bulletin – G-28, Travel Regulations. Chair Tsoulouhas suggested that this policy may help with recruitment.

**Discussion:** Members agreed with Chair Tsoulouhas’ suggestion.

**Action:** The analyst and chair will draft a memo outlining UCAP’s concerns.

## **V. Consultation with the Office of the President ~ Research & Graduate Studies**

- *Arthur Ellis, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, UCOP*

Vice President Ellis explained that the document on collective excellence resulted from discussions with the Vice Chancellors for Research (VCRs). The VCRs felt it was important to emphasize a more expansive view of research given the dynamic nature of the research enterprise. This description is a clarification of information already in the APM. Providing concrete examples of cases may help sensitize processes whereby faculty are considered for promotion, merit increases and so on. The VCRs have endorsed the documents and the Vice President met with the Committee on Research Policy which suggested several edits.

**Discussion:** Chair Tsoulouhas mentioned that a concern is that there may be unintended consequences in fields where collaborative research is not as visible as it is in other fields. UCORP discussed collaborative

projects and ensuring that co-investigators receive credit from scholarly output resulting from the collaboration. The discussion with UCORP suggests that this works with varying degrees of success at the different campuses. A member commented that an issue with collaborative projects is how to measure the contribution of one individual. The individual's contribution has to be clarified and then how it will be quantified or measured needs to be determined. The aim of this document is to highlight that this is an area that should be given attention but it is not intended to be prescriptive. This information can help candidates understand what to expect. A member commented that all of the collective efforts are very positive. It would be helpful for CAP members if the candidate provided an explanation of his or her contribution, and this does occur at some campuses including at UCSC. At UCSD for promotion cases, it has been useful for the CAP to receive letters from collaborators that specifically describe the individual's contribution to the work.

Vice Provost Carlson asked if the document reflects things that are already in place at the campuses or if it represents changes to how individual faculty work is valued. At UCSC, it is expected that the department and the dean will make the arguments about how important the work is. If no one discusses the work's value, the CAP may not grasp the significance. The draft collective excellence document can be shared with CAPs and UCAP is invited to suggest edits. A member recommended that the positive impact that collaborative efforts have at the departmental level should be emphasized in the document. The Vice President Ellis discussed support for graduate students.

Vice Provost Carlson asked how the document can have the most impact on campus and whether it should be discussed at the department level. A member agreed that introducing it at the department level will encourage discussion and buy-in, and help faculty better understand what can count. For campuses using digital measures, these types of contributions can be easily highlighted. A CAP will recognize on a case by case basis how to evaluate an individual's contribution to a team, but if someone is contributing in minor ways and not leading the scientific agenda or providing input that could easily be supplied by someone else, this could be detrimental to a tenure case. If candidates do not highlight their contribution in their personal statement, it is asking a lot to expect others to find the evidence. The flexibility for CAPs is a key element.

A member remarked that this document sets a policy tone for how CAPs consider collective excellence and using this concept will help CAPs define what they mean by collective excellence and consequently how they can reward it. Looking at the collective effort and identifying ways to reward this will lead to more collective work. Vice President Ellis asked if UCAP's feedback can be considered an endorsement of the document, in principle, as it is further developed. Chair Tsoulouhas suggested the addition of a statement indicating that this is not meant to penalize people not engaged in collaborative research. Vice Provost Carlson indicated that this document, in its current form, would not be appropriate for the APM and proposing its inclusion would be a contentious subject. After it is finalized, Vice President Ellis stated it would be distributed at the grassroots level and other available channels. Members will ask their divisional CAPs for feedback. This may help UCOP understand the depth of concerns about unintended consequences. The Vice President and Vice Provost will prepare a cover letter that explains the type of input that would be helpful before UCAP members share the collective excellence document with their CAPs.

## **VI. Consultation with the Office of the President ~ Academic Personnel**

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

Last year, a pilot retention and exit survey was conducted at six of the campuses for faculty who left in 2014-2015. The survey was conducted in partnership with a Harvard group (COACHE). Currently, the six campus level reports are being finalized and the Vice Provost has asked the campuses to agree to

continue the survey for the next three years and will next solicit campus participation. UCOP will fund part of the cost as an incentive. There is a \$1500 per campus per year cost that UCOP will fund and the campuses will be responsible for the funds that would be based on the number of either retained or exiting faculty that receive the survey. Academic Council endorsed this survey, and the Vice Provost stressed that the survey is key to gathering the type of data UCOP currently does not have about faculty decisions about staying or leaving. This information will assist with decisions about salary, benefits and other policies and processes. The Vice Provost hopes to update UCAP on the campus participation in May.

Vice Provost Carlson reported on the task force looking at the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP), a five year pilot at three UC campuses intended to aid recruitment and retention. Faculty who can fund an additional salary increment can have that increment approved. This means that the faculty must have external, non-UC funds to enable them to have the salary increment. This is the fourth year of the trial program and a thorough review of the program was planned at this point to inform a decision about continuing, stopping, expanding or altering the program.

The task force has four academic administrators and five Senate members and is meeting monthly to gather information to make a set of recommendations to Provost Dorr. The report is due on June 1<sup>st</sup> and over the course of the next year, the report will be discussed in the Senate and by administrators at the campuses. The program continues to be controversial and it tends to be much more effective in certain disciplines than in others. Some people have concerns about the focus being diverted from more comprehensive salary programs and that the NSTP allows some faculty to deal with the salary issue while other people with salary issues are excluded. Even with the off-scale, UC salaries are not even close to the top of UC's peer institutions.

Academic Personnel is interested in discussing the proposed changes to APM Sections 278 & 210-6 with UCAP because the feedback received to date indicates that there is significant concern about what is proposed and the consequences. Vice Provost Carlson reported that currently there are about 250 faculty in the LSOE series across the system that play valuable roles at their campuses. The policy aims to make the series reflect the important roles these individuals have and to give them a more satisfying title. Vice Provost Carlson acknowledged that the most contentious issue is the proposed recalibration of the research output. Individuals in this series are almost always doing more teaching which means they have less time for research, and their focus might primarily be pedagogical research.

Vice Provost Carlson asked to discuss UCAP's feedback on the proposed revisions to APMs 015 and 016 including a concern about a provision for unpaid involuntary leave. Academic Personnel is in the process of reviewing the comments received from the Senate and campuses and will determine if additional review will be necessary. There are numerous comments about the issue of unpaid involuntary leave.

**Discussion:** Chair Tsoulouhas asked if the results of the survey would be used proactively, to adjust salaries for example. Vice Provost Carlson indicated that the President will make the decision about what would be appropriate in terms of a salary increase for faculty. While there are other factors, the results of the survey did show that salary is the most important factor for faculty both who stay or leave. This finding validates what was suspected. Based on data from one year and around one hundred completed surveys, it is hard to argue in favor of any decision. The benefits and retirement issues will change and the survey will be one way UCOP can track these changes.

Chair Tsoulouhas suggested administering a climate survey in conjunction with the exit survey and questioned whether UC can be proactive in terms of pre-empting faculty departures from UC. There is currently no plan to conduct a full climate survey with cost being the main factor but it may eventually become apparent that a climate survey is needed. The existing climate survey's questions were geared more towards students so it was not very helpful for Academic Personnel. The Vice Provost will have a

follow up discussion about cost-sharing with the Vice Provosts for Academic Personnel to support conducting the retention and exit survey at all ten campuses. UCSF, UCSD, and UCD already conduct their own surveys so they may not be interested in contributing to a systemwide survey.

The NSTP is a recruitment and retention device to deal with salary. UCSD is using the program the most, with about 10% of ladder rank faculty participating, and the campus has been able to recruit faculty due to the NSTP. There were 233 faculty participating in the NSTP across the system. The biggest sources of external funds have been NSF, NIH, the Department of Energy, contracts with private funders and some smaller fund sources. The program prohibits the use of state funding and it is seen as an incentive to encourage faculty to increase the amount of funding they bring into the institution. A member indicated that the NSTP has had a minimal impact on CAP. There is a question about whether base salaries could be increased in order to decrease the off-scale salaries. Vice Provost Carlson indicated that this effort would require millions of dollars and noted that last year's salary program included a component to add to the scale. There has not been a comprehensive effort to fix the scales in the six years the Vice Provost has been at UCOP.

Regarding APMs 278 and 210-6, Chair Tsoulouhas explained that faculty worry about compromising the research mission of the University. Faculty are evaluated constantly and the evaluators look at the number of people in a department and publication rates, and adding people who are not producing to a department will lower the publication rate per faculty member. Adding lecturers may be cost effective at first glance but they might eventually compromise the research rankings. The proposed policy also raises fears that faculty are being replaced by LSOEs.

Chair Tsoulouhas pointed out that lecturers who have been hired without the expectation of research in pedagogy will suddenly be notified that this research is expected. Furthermore, these faculty have the academic freedom to decide the type of research they wish to conduct. It should be clear that these lecturers are hired as teachers and if they would like to engage in research, their research will be rewarded whether it is in pedagogy or in their own discipline. Chair Tsoulouhas suggested that the policy should identify pedagogy as one example of research. UCAP's feedback in the management review included the suggestion that there should be a limit or percentage for LSOEs. The Chair explained that it would be undesirable to have a department comprised only of lecturers. By the same token there are some disciplines that rely heavily on lecturers, so decisions about the upper limit should be left to the campuses, divisional councils and departments. If a department has only lecturers who are not conducting any research, the research mission of the University is compromised and UCAP is very worried about this.

UCAP prefers the proposed "Teaching Professor" over "Professor of Teaching" in part because the latter title implies that ladder rank faculty are not engaged in teaching. Another concern is that "Professor of Teaching" suggests an emphasis on pedagogical research. Based on anecdotal evidence most universities would use the title "Teaching Professor." At Academic Council, the "Professor of Practice" was felt to be an option in certain disciplines. A member indicated that in November the committee did not unanimously support any name change. The title "Professor" carries some meaning and what exactly goes into the APM in terms of what is required is relevant to the new title chosen for LSOEs, so these issues are connected. That is, the name sets the expectations.

According to Chair Tsoulouhas, the feedback from the systemwide review indicates that people prefer keeping the word "Lecturer." UCAP members agreed that pedagogical research is fine but prioritizing or requiring it would be problematic. Manager Lockwood asked if using the phrase "research into pedagogy and/or the underlying discipline" would be acceptable and the Chair suggested naming the disciplinary research first. The next step is a systemwide review starting in spring, and Academic Personnel will propose an implementation process. An implementation period will be used to determine expectations for

individuals currently in this title and how campuses can be moved into the right title from their current title. Campuses will probably have up to a year for the transition.

Chair Tsoulouhas pointed out that salary is a major component of the LSOE discussion. LSOEs do extensive teaching, will have research expectations, and spend significant time working with students and need to be rewarded for all of this work. A question is if the base salary for the LPSOEs would be similar to the base salary for an assistant professor. The Vice Provost clarified that in the new policy the faculty will be moved onto the assistant, associate, and full ranks as well as the same number of steps UC has for regular rank professors. Academic Personnel has been studying the current salaries and figure out the most rational way to make this transition. Manager Lockwood described the analysis of data on current LSOEs and seeing how they might map to the professor scale and whether or not the salaries are comparable. Years at the step are factored into the mapping. Preliminary findings suggest that the salaries are roughly comparable and there are some off-scale lecturers. When hiring into the LSOEs some campuses look at the professor scale equivalency to determine if the salary being offered is fair. If this proposal and process moves forward, a more in depth review of each individual will be conducted at the campus to make sure that they are placed appropriately in the professor scale.

Vice Provost Carlson asked if CAPs would want to be involved with the campus implementation of this transition. In principal CAPs can make recommendations about salary, but some CAPs choose not to exercise this power. It is not likely that UCM's CAP would want to be involved in this process while the CAPs at UCB, UCI and at least one additional CAP probably would want to participate. Another option is that the administration makes its best judgement but if the candidate disagrees, the CAP could serve as an advisor to the administration. The UCSC CAP has not seen many LSOE cases and UCSF does not have anyone in these titles currently.

A member asked if the distinction between regular faculty and someone in the LSOE series would be the ratio of effort dedicated to teaching versus research. Vice Provost Carlson indicated it is widely agreed upon that, for individuals in this series, there will be more teaching in the future, and this is a defining difference between what LSOEs and ladder rank faculty do. The biggest question could be about the difference in the research of the "Teaching Professor." It might be the amount because they have less time, or the difference could be the kind of research. It is also safe to assume that there will be less research on the part of the LSOEs. The difference between being in the department of Medicine versus being in the Clinical X series might be analogous. Chair Tsoulouhas posed that if research is reduced to zero and teaching is increased to 100% why not simply hire Unit 18 Lecturers.

There is a question about the unintended consequences if UC starts to fill faculty ranks with "Teaching Professors" who are also working with existing faculty in departments. A senior faculty member might have enough influence to distort department priorities. If disciplinary research is part of the objective, the LSOEs may be working with senior faculty with enough influence to direct the FTEs a certain way. This would be opposed to launching an independent search for a regular faculty member who would launch their own independent scientific program, and the Vice Provost that this would indeed be an unintended consequence. At UCI, which has a large number of faculty in the LSOE series, there have been concerns about promotions in the medical schools and physical sciences of researcher series into the professor series where they are working for the more prominent researchers, so some kind of protection to deal with this should be in place.

For UCI's CAP it is both quality and quantity that differ when looking at regular faculty or someone in the LSOE series. The "Teaching Professors" are likely to prioritize teaching over research, so there will be less of the latter and less independent PI research. This CAP tries to maintain a lot of flexibility and it does not matter if the individual research is on pedagogy or based on their discipline. The CAP looks for the LSOEs' active leadership within their discipline and evidence of a presence beyond the University. At

UCSB the difference between the pedagogical and discipline based research is muted because the CAP focuses on the teaching. The research component is viewed as something that adds to the teaching. The Vice Provost appreciated UCAP's consideration of and feedback about the criteria for evaluating these positions.

Chair Tsoulouhas explained UCAP's concern about the provision for unpaid involuntary leave in APM 016. If someone is placed on an unpaid leave of absence before a final determination is made, there is a presumption of guilt. The Vice Provost pointed out that this can already be done under the current policy. Existing policy requires that the Regents must approve unpaid leave and the proposal is to transfer this authority to the President. One member would prefer to leave this authority with the Regents, as it suggests that this decision has to be made at the highest level and making it a group decision is more likely to result in a more deliberative process. Several members expressed agreement with this sentiment.

## **VII. Local CAP Practices Related to Diversity**

The CAP Practices Survey asks about contributions to diversity. The Chair asked members to report any problems CAPs have experienced with the diversity statement. Chair Tsoulouhas asked if CAPs reward contributions to diversity.

**Discussion:** A member indicated that his CAP receives cases where diversity is not addressed and a memo was sent to the Provost asking that the deans and department chairs that diversity needs to be addressed. About half of the cases this CAP receives do not address diversity. One member indicated that the CAP looks for the statement on diversity to always be included and contributions are supported. One member indicated that most of the files seen by his CAP do not include diversity statements, but contributions are rewarded. At least two CAPs agreed that faculty are not punished if there is no contribution. The biggest sticking point for UCSB's CAP is when research is embedded in issues of diversity or equity and whether this should get extra credit and the CAP members agreed that research alone by itself (e.g. studying diversity) would not qualify for extra above scale salary. The UCSB standard is that the contribution goes above and beyond. The diversity statement at UCSB is optional but making this a required part of the file is under debate.

The Chair asked if there should be a template for the diversity statement to help faculty figure out what constitutes a contribution to diversity. One member suggested that it might result in faculty just doing what is minimally required. Chair Tsoulouhas recommended that faculty should look at the UCSD webpage on diversity. Formalizing the statements on diversity may undermine the reasons faculty have for engaging in this work. A member stated that the paragraph in the APM on diversity is not well-written and it should be re-visited and made clear. UCAP could simply say that a diversity statement should be included somewhere in the file. It is good for faculty to be reminded that this is one of the things the University is working toward.

Chair Tsoulouhas asked how service is handled by CAPs, whether it is a substitute for teaching or research. The question is how should service be rewarded and this is of interest to administrators. At UCM and UCSB, assistant professors are engaged in too much service and it is hindering their ability to do research. UCSB's CAP expects to see service at the department level until they reach professor IV and at this point if service on Senate committees is not seen, the CAP brings it to the attention of the faculty member, and at some point faculty are penalized if there is a pattern of not being engaged in service. Some people may have the mistaken belief that serving on multiple committees is a substitute for research. At UCSC, service is not really expected of junior faculty so they can focus on research but by the time faculty have tenure it is hoped that they are embracing service and engaged in helping to solve the University's problems. Senior faculty who participate in service are reminded that they must simultaneously conduct research or encouraged to join the administration. There is a risk that faculty



engaged in service will do less teaching. A member asked how course relief for taking on extra duties should be judged since they are already being rewarded.

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

**UCM:** A full professor close to becoming Step VI reported hearing a rumor that it is necessary to chair a Senate committee before applying for Step VI. Chair Tsoulouhas responded that this rumor is false. A member commented that research is always the key to Step VI, and the candidate has to be good in teaching and engaged in service. One campus expects to see some service outside of the department and it does not need to be Senate service, and Step VI would never be approved on the basis of teaching alone. Not every campus requires external letters for Step VI. It is still a barrier step at one campus but the trend seems to be to making it more routine. At UCI this is still a barrier step and letters are no longer required as of last year, and this campus tends to look for international recognition. The fact that letters are no longer required has made this a more routine step.

**UCSB:** A question about compensation came up from newer members of this CAP. This CAP meets into July and some members questioned why there was no salary compensation for this. The members receive course release and stipends. How other CAPs handle this is of interest. The Chair pointed out that this question is in the CAP Practices Survey and that there are significant differences across the CAPs. UCM's CAP members do not receive course release. UCLA CAP members also serve through July but are given one month's summer salary and one course release. The cases of former CAP members are sent to shadow CAPs.

At UCSB members spend up to 30 or 40 hours a week on CAP in winter and spring quarters. Spending three years on CAP can be a serious detriment to conducting research. The course release and monetary compensation are nice, but only make it possible to do the CAP work. For three years of service on CAP at least one year of productivity is lost. Recruiting people to be on CAP at UCSB is very difficult. How one is compensated for the lost period of productivity is really the question. When the case of a former CAP member comes up at UCSB, it is viewed as an added component to their service and sometimes this translates into additional off-scale. At UCSC, CAP service is seen as exceptional service. Chair Tsoulouhas noted the CAP sizes are fairly similar even at the larger campuses. Members reported how many members are on their CAPs and whether the chairs present cases or vote. UCSF's CAP members do not receive any course release. At UCSC, the deans do a lot more of the work so this reduces the CAP caseload. Several members reported that the CAPs do not vote but reach consensus. At UCSB the goal is to finalize all of the cases by June. UCAP might want to compare the reports from each campus to really get a sense of the different practices. Chair Tsoulouhas reported that questions like this are handled through the survey so suggestions for adding questions to the survey should be sent to the UCAP analyst and chair.

**UCD:** Two years ago, the campus moved to the new step plus system which generated quite a change. There has been a learning process and it has changed the way dossiers are evaluated. The representative said that the Step Plus system makes a difference in the process. Many CAPs reported having half steps. Accelerations are used at a couple of campus and one CAP does not restrict the frequency or timing of accelerations.

The Chair mentioned that the CAP Practice survey could be expanded to include some of the questions raised today. Short forms are used at UCM, and at one campus the letters may be shorter but the process is the same. After the CAP makes recommendations, the chair and vice chair meet with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel once a week to give a heads up about upcoming cases where there is a substantial difference of opinion between the dean and the CAP. At several campuses, the CAP chair meets with the Vice Provost or Associate Vice Chancellor and at UCSF the chair meets with the Provost

as needed. At UCLA the chair and vice chair of CAP meet with the Vice Chancellor of AP to discuss all the cases reviewed by CAP earlier that day. Members discussed how often the CAP's recommendation is overruled.

**IX. New Business**

UCAP's next and final meeting this year will be on May 10<sup>th</sup> and it will also be a videoconference.

**X. Executive Session**

There was no Executive Session.

**Meeting adjourned at: 3:35**

**Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams**

**Attest: Fanis Tsoulouhas**