

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2021

**Attending:** Susan Tapert, Chair (UCSD), John Kuriyan, Vice Chair (UCB), Rhonda Righter (UCB), Lisa Tell (UCD), Lisa Naugle (UCI), Ali Behdad (UCLA), Ashlie Martini (UCM), Srikanth Krishnamurthy (UCR), Steve Briggs (UCSD), Meg Wallhagen (UCSF), Francis Dunn (UCSB), Junkto Ito (UCSC), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel), Kimberly Grant (Director, Academic Policy & Compensation, Academic Personnel & Programs), Ivy Anderson (Collection Development & Management Director/Associate Executive Director), Mary Gauvain (Chair, Academic Senate), Robert Horwitz (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

**I. Consultation with the Senate Office**

Chair Gauvain shared that the Regents' January meeting will include a discussion about the report from the Feasibility Study Work Group on the use of standardized tests for admissions. Human Resources at the Office of the President (UCOP) is being reorganized in response to problems identified by the Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) and its Health Care Task Force. UCFW and the Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity (UCAADE) have prepared a memo for President Drake outlining concerns about the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on faculty. The governor's budget was recently released and UCOP and the Senate will be examining the details over the next few weeks.

President Drake is planning to hold symposia on campus safety in February and March. Chair Gauvain and Vice Chair Horwitz have joined the meetings of a group at UCOP dealing with the pandemic and the vaccine rollout. The group is coordinating with the state and county public health departments, and the chancellors are working directly with this group to figure out what is best for each campus. Vice Chair Horwitz reported that Vice Provost Carlson sent a memo to Senate leadership about the proposal from UCAP and the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) to add "mentoring" to the teaching category in APM 210. The vice provost thinks that mentoring should be clearly defined in the APM. The Global Climate Leadership Council, which includes Senate leadership, is formulating policy requests about climate change and climate crisis for President Drake's consideration.

**Discussion:** Chair Tapert remarked that Vice Provost will be asked about her feedback regarding mentoring when she joins the committee later today. The committee discussed concerns related to the safety of returning to campus. Although students have been dissatisfied with remote instruction and are dealing with mental health and other challenges, their experiences do vary. Some courses are more amenable to being taught online while others are better suited for either a hybrid or an in-person format. Overseas students have appreciated being able to watch recorded lecturers at any time. One member commented that files coming to CAP are showing that faculty have managed to adapt remarkably well to delivering their courses remotely. Chair Gauvain suggested that CAPs should keep track of how the pandemic is negatively affecting caregivers in particular.

**II. Chair's Announcements**

Chair Tapert indicated that the Committee on Committees will soon begin the process of identifying a vice chair for UCAP so members should consider if they are interested in serving in this position. The analyst reported that most members agreed that the proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 336.F.8 were not under UCAP's purview but a short memo was transmitted to Senate Chair Gauvain.

**III. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** The October 14, 2020 UCAP videoconference minutes were approved.

#### IV. Open Access Publications and CAPs

- *Ivy Anderson, Collection Development & Management Director/Associate Executive Director, California Digital Library*

Associate Executive Director (AED) Anderson explained that Project Transform is a working group formed by the UC Libraries in partnership with the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) in 2018 to guide the UC Libraries' negotiations with publishers for open access. The Project uses the term "transformative agreements" to refer to the effort to transform UC's traditional subscription expenditures on journal licenses with publishers into open access agreements. This approach came about as a result of 2018 negotiations with publishers, including Elsevier. Also in 2018, Academic Council endorsed UCOLASC's Declaration of Rights and Principles to Transform Scholarly Communication and the Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee issued a call to action that argued for transforming these agreements to open access. These efforts united the UC Libraries (UCLs), faculty and administrators interested in and supportive of a transition to open access.

AED Anderson indicated that a large study that included several universities looked at the financial implications of transitioning to open access with major publishers using article-processing charges (APCs) as the basis. The study showed that library budgets alone cannot support open access, so UC is following a "multi-payer" model which blends library funds and grant funding. This approach gives UC authors autonomy over the funding stream, enabling them to make decisions about open access publishing that are more market grounded. The funding component is built into a publishers' workflow starting when a manuscript is accepted for publication, and the author decides whether or not to publish in open access. If open access is selected, the UCLs provide a baseline subvention for every article charge and authors are invited to contribute grant funds. If grant funds are unavailable, the UCLs pays that charge in full and the author never has to provide personal funds.

The UCLs negotiated the first transformative agreement with Cambridge. AED Anderson reported that Cambridge's APCs were \$3k in 2019 and the UCLs successfully negotiated to reduce the APC to \$2,100. The UCLs pay \$1k of this charge and the author pays the balance using grant funds. If the author indicates they have no funds, they are asked for a reason so the UCLs can track this information, and the UCLs cover the full APC. This model, in place with Cambridge since January 2020, is being carefully assessed by the UCLs. As of now, 30% of Cambridge authors have contributed to the APCs and the UCLs have covered the other 70%.

The UCLs use data from the Web of Science to look at the disciplinary breakdown and the types of articles published by UC authors. About 90% of the articles that are published at UC are in the science, technology, and medical fields and about 10% are in arts, humanities, and social sciences which are typically not well-funded through grants. The UCLs assume that authors who can contribute from their grants will do so, at least at modest levels initially, and this is what is occurring with the Cambridge agreement. Cambridge has a high percentage of humanities and social science content in their portfolio and 40% of UC articles with Cambridge are in the humanities and social sciences. The UCLs have established a small number of transformative agreements under the multipayer model with other publishers and most of the output is in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) fields. However, the aim is to have transformative agreements to involve a range of publishers including those not focused on STEM.

There is an effort to support early career researchers who publish in journals like PLOS One, for example, who might not have access to the grant funding that more established authors have. The UCLs want to expand the pool of publishers with transformative agreements and, if successful, the results of current negotiations would extend to a larger percentage of UC output. This month the UCLs reached an agreement with Springer Nature, the world's second largest publisher, which will be significant in terms of output. Based on feedback from the first week, the workflow is functioning well, and roughly 30% of

authors have contributed grant funds with the balance covered by UCLs. Some campuses have dedicated open access publication funds available for authors needing support with APCs. Information about the transformative agreements is available at the Office of Scholarly Communication website maintained by California Digital Library on behalf of the UCLs. The site also has a wealth of information about other publishing support and opportunities supported by the UCLs.

**Discussion:** Members expressed appreciation for the UCLs' efforts to support open access publishing. The UCLs are gathering information about the availability of grant funding in order to understand how the model will need to evolve and be sustainable. AED Anderson stated that the UCLs have the budget to support the transformative agreements made so far but will closely monitor the funding situation as more agreements are established. UC is not requiring that faculty publish in open access journals and a key principle for this project is to not infringe on academic freedom.

## **V. Recognition for International Activities**

Following UCAP's October meeting, members were asked to discuss with their divisional CAPs whether the personnel review process should include recognition for international activities. Based on the feedback, it is apparent that CAPs already take international activities into account and there is no interest in making these activities an additional component in the personnel review process or structure.

**Discussion:** International activities, such as participation in an international conference, are currently documented in the candidate's file. One reason the Committee on International Education (UCIE) may have asked UCAP to consider this issue is that the effort required to work internationally can be a burden for some faculty. Faculty should highlight their international activities and get credit for this work. There are concerns that Visa restrictions could make international work more challenging. A member pointed out that there may not be evaluations or concrete objective measures of international teaching, making it difficult to evaluate this work, unlike the information available about teaching on campus.

Chair Tapert proposed sending a memo to UCIE that affirms the value of international activities and the importance of this work in many disciplines, but states that the existing framework for file evaluation includes mechanisms to reward achievements in the international realm and these activities should not be a category of its own. The memo should also state that UCAP encourages faculty to articulate if there were unusual challenges particular to their discipline or the state of the world that impacted their ability to perform the work and should be factored into how their work is judged. Some thought should be given to how to support faculty whose international work has been made difficult by the pandemic.

**Action:** The analyst will prepare a memo explaining UCAP's position to UCIE.

## **VI. Recognition for Climate Crisis Activities**

In October, Chair Tapert also asked members to discuss recognition of climate crisis activities with their CAPs. The chair noted that involvement in these activities will be dependent on one's discipline but any work in this arena should be documented in the file. As with the issue of international activities, the CAPs do not support changing the review framework to include a specific focus on climate crisis activities.

**Discussion:** The committee agreed that the current review process is adequate to ensure that work on the climate crisis is acknowledged and changing the process would be difficult. Working within the existing system makes sense and recognizing a specific area of research would be inequitable.

## **VII. Use of Half-Step Offset**

UCB will provide a half-step offset as a one-time measure for faculty who experienced a significant loss of productivity due to COVID-19 and UCAP decided to explore if this would be a feasible approach at

the other campuses. Most of the campuses do not use a half-step and it would be hard to implement it easily within this academic year.

**Discussion:** UCD has half-steps but the administration has decided not to apply this approach to mitigate the impact of the pandemic. UCLA's administration has concluded that half-steps will not be used. UCSC's CAP determined that half-steps will not be adopted at this time but this campus does have a merit plus system. The UCB representative clarified that half-steps will not be given to everyone and indicated there will be multiple prerequisites before the half-step will be considered. UCR's CAP gives half-steps but faculty must provide a substantive statement about how their research was affected. Chair Tapert pointed out that half-steps will not be a global solution and that each campus needs to figure out how to address the impact of the pandemic with the tools already in place.

### **VIII. Merit Reviews at Full Professor**

During the committee's October meeting, the idea of changing the merit review cycle for full professor to four years instead of three was introduced. Reviewing these files every four years might be more efficient, however now might not be the best time to make this change given everything that is happening.

**Discussion:** The UCB representative does not think this proposal should be pursued because of how different the campuses are. UCB's Budget Committee (its CAP) looks at salaries, so moving to a four-year review cycle would help with the workload. A member suggested the UCB consider letting the Vice Chancellor for Personnel handle salaries, but Vice Chair Kuriyan indicated that this idea would be rejected. UCSB's CAP also looks at salaries and would be reluctant to delegate this authority to administrators.

### **IX. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic**

UCAP will develop guidance for CAPs about reviewing files that include the period of the pandemic. Chair Tapert commented that variability across the campuses limits what the committee can do in terms of policy and UCAP cannot dictate something that will not work at a given campus. The aim is to try to promote some uniformity and equity across campuses in the faculty reviews, given the various ways that the pandemic can impact research, teaching, and service. The committee has received a memo from UCFW and UCAADE with ideas about mitigating the impact of the pandemic on faculty.

**Discussion:** UCD's CAP will ask faculty to describe how they were operating before the pandemic and to describe how the pandemic has affected them without needing to disclose any personal information, and will also remind faculty about the extra year extension they can request. The CAP will point out the language in the APM about unusual circumstances causing an imbalance in the record. It may be challenging to figure out how to ensure that the CAP's approach is equitable as well as how to uphold excellence, especially for promotions. One question to think about is if there are alternatives to deferring that would provide concrete support to faculty. Another idea is to let departments decide whether or not people should come up for review within a certain time frame.

Chair Tapert asked if UCAP should suggest that additional statements or information be included in files. At UCI, some faculty are listing planned activities and striking through the ones that did not happen due to COVID-19 and this provides a helpful context for the CAP. At UCLA, faculty are asked to provide a statement on the impact of the pandemic, and they can request the salary advancement along with a delay of the case review. There are concerns that women or junior faculty may be reluctant about reporting the negative impact of the pandemic, so encouraging everyone to include a statement may help alleviate hesitancy. CAPs could simply assume that all faculty have been negatively affected by the pandemic since the statements add to a CAP's workload. However, the point was made that the pandemic's impact will be uneven and this needs to be made clear for CAPs.

The statements are not being required at any campus but they should be encouraged. UCR's CAP has requested that every department put together a statement offering an overview of the impact on the entire department, and on the sub-disciplines within the same department. The department letter could describe how standards for publications or teaching loads, for example, have been adjusted. Then, the candidate has an option to put together a personal statement about his or her individual circumstances and challenges. A member speculated that the true impact of the pandemic might not be evident until next year. Another idea is that the letters from department chairs can address difficulties due to the pandemic, but this is problematic since the chair's letter is often not written until after the vote. Members agreed that a candidate could provide a separate statement or incorporate the specific impacts into the research, teaching, and service sections to put them into context.

**Action:** Chair Tapert will draft a memo with help from the UCD and UCSB representatives.

## **X. Systemwide Review: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report**

UCAP has the opportunity to comment on the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report.

**Discussion:** The proposed strategy would increase the salary at each step, bringing UC salaries closer to those at other universities. While off-scale salaries are an important issue, the proposal will not prevent faculty from seeking outside offers. Off-scale salaries are a long-term problem in terms of inequities, but the committee noted that certain highly accomplished faculty are deserving of their off-scale salaries. There are also legitimate differences between disciplines that make a one-size-fits-all salary scale unviable and it may be more appropriate to take a campus-specific approach to raising salaries.

UCB's Budget Committee periodically uses a program called "targeted decoupled increments" which involves looking at everyone's salaries and making adjustments that help to mitigate inequities across genders and ethnicities. The program adds to the Committee's workload but it is an important tool for retention. The first recommendation states that the salary scales should be based on transparent and objective mechanisms but "objectivity" is not defined. Members believe that giving deans the authority to decide the amount of off-scale salary is not transparent and can instead contribute to inequities. While increasing the scales for all faculty is a positive objective, the committee also questions whether the effort required to recalibrate the scales annually to establish a new baseline is a worthwhile investment.

**Action:** The chair and analyst will draft the committee's response to the proposed plan.

## **XI. Campus Reports and Member Items**

There were no Campus Reports.

## **XII. New Business**

The analyst confirmed that UCAP's final meetings for the academic year are scheduled for March 10<sup>th</sup> and May 19<sup>th</sup>.

## **XIII. Executive Session**

There was no Executive Session.

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

- *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel*
- *Kimberly Grant, Director, Academic Policy & Compensation*

During the committee's consultation with Academic Personnel in October, UCAP asked if faculty can be given a second one-year extension to stop the tenure clock due to the pandemic. Vice Provost Carlson

reported that campuses have the authority to decide if a second year is appropriate, assuming this is done in one-year increments. Requests for a third year extension of the clock need to be approved by the president, and given how long the pandemic is going on, it is possible that someone might want to request multiple extensions. Vice Provost Carlson will consult with a Regents' workgroup looking at how UC encourages and rewards entrepreneurship and innovation transfer. The workgroup is comprised of Regents as well as experts outside of UC who work on this issue. Academic Personnel has been asked to consider if language could be added to APM 759 for situations when a faculty member wants to take a leave to pursue entrepreneurship as a way of showing that UC supports this type of activity. Should there be a formal request to modify APM 759, the proposed revision will undergo systemwide review.

Vice Provost Carlson sent a letter to Senate leadership about the proposal from UCAP and CCGA to change the title of the teaching category in APM 210 to "teaching and mentoring." Academic Personnel recommends that the goal of highlighting mentoring cannot be achieved just by changing the title. There should be more clarity about how mentoring is defined or described, and Academic Personnel pointed out that mentoring is referenced in other sections of APM 210 beyond the section on teaching.

**Discussion:** One question is how CAPs should handle a file that includes accomplishments during the six months of entrepreneurial leave and whether these accomplishments should be considered separately. Vice Provost Carlson is not sure if the current language related to leaves and outside professional activities will clarify how entrepreneurial activities should be factored into the personnel review. Chair Tapert indicated that the committee is willing to work on a more comprehensive integration of mentoring into all relevant sections of APM 210. UC has not previously determined how mentorship should be documented and evaluated, and Academic Personnel will research how this is handled at other universities to help inform UCAP's deliberations. When CAPs look at a file, it is not just a question of the number of people who were mentored but the effect of the candidate's mentoring on those people.

Certain federally funded researchers are required to document a mentoring plan for their trainees, but this information is usually not publicly available. Chair Tapert's department asks the candidate for a list of mentees and collects rating forms from the mentees that are included in the candidate's files. CAPs may be especially interested in the outcomes for students and junior faculty who have been mentored by faculty up for an above scale salary. The committee discussed how unsolicited letters from mentees should be handled and ways to ensure that information in letters is contextualized. Chair Tapert will work with CCGA to develop suggestions for departments and CAPs. The analyst mentioned that the committee's past discussions about mentoring have touched on the concern that mentoring by faculty of color and female faculty is invisible labor for which they do not get credit, and questioned if simply adding language to the APM will rectify this problem. UCAP might want to recommend that CAPs encourage departments to educate their faculty about documenting their mentoring activities.

Vice Provost Carlson shared that there are several research projects underway, funded by the UCOP's Advancing Faculty Diversity program, looking at how invisible labor tends to fall disproportionately on women and faculty of color. One of the goals of these projects is to ensure this labor is rewarded, and this is closely connected to this issue of mentoring. The projects are just getting started but the results can be shared with UCAP. Chair Tapert believes it would be helpful for department chairs to help disseminate information like this. UCSC has a website with resources about mentoring: <https://citl.ucsc.edu/teaching-resources/mentoring/>.

Videoconference adjourned at: 2 p.m.  
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams  
Attest: Susan Tapert