

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

MEETING MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2017

Attending: Michelle Yeh, Chair (UCD), Daniel Farber, Vice Chair (UCB) (videoconference), Georg Striedter (UCI), John Gilbert (UCSB) (videoconference), Ulrike Strasser (UCSD), Margaret Stuber (UCLA), Pablo Ortiz (UCD), Carla Freccero (UCSC), Ignacio Lopez-Calvo (UCM), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel) (videoconference), Pamela Peterson (Executive Director & Deputy to the Vice Provost, Academic Personnel & Programs), Shane White (Academic Senate Chair), Robert May (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Mona Hsieh (Office Manager, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Welcome and Introductions

Members were welcomed to the meeting by Chair Yeh and introduced themselves. Vice Chair Farber attended the September 27th meeting of the Academic Council on behalf of Chair Yeh and he described Council's discussion about changes to the Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOE) series.

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Shane White, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Robert May, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair White elaborated on the LSOE policy discussion, noting that the new title to be used for these faculty is still to be decided. A central issue is about the expectations related to scholarship and creative activity, which vary by campus. Chair White indicated that the LSOEs are distinctly different from the Unit 18 lecturers. It is hoped that UCAP can help resolve this issue. Chair White explained that UC's relationship with the State is problematic as evidenced by the budget for UC. There are also issues with retiree health. President Napolitano intends to establish a task force at the beginning of the year to work on retiree health benefits. UC's benefits lag behind the Comparison Eight institutions by 8 to 12%. There are differences in salary based on gender and discipline and this is a structural problem with the University. UCAP will work with the Committees on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), Planning and Budget (UCPB), and Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity (UCAADE). The President attended a meeting of UCAADE last year and understands that the penalty for loyalty significantly impacts women and faculty from underrepresented minority groups.

President Napolitano has taken the lead with respect to pushing back against the federal government on protections for students impacted by the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. The chair also indicated that the University must stand behind the First Amendment, noting that the Free Speech Week at UCB was uneventful. Chair White also indicated that UC needs a systemwide funding model. Issues related to undergraduate enrollment and enrollment of non-residents were described.

III. Systemwide Review: Report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP) from the Fourth Year NSTP Taskforce

UCAP briefly discussed the report on the fourth year of the NSTP at the May 2017 meeting.

Discussion: Expanding the NSTP to more campuses seems reasonable and will allow UC to gather more data on its impact. It was noted, however, that the Task Force did not find that the program helps with recruitment and retention even though administrators assert that it has. One member expressed concerns about the private monies that can be used by faculty to raise their salaries. Unlike the Health Sciences

Compensation plan, the NSTP does not change the base salary, which Chair White indicates is a disadvantage of the former program. The NSTP does not impact the retirement plan. There are issues related to faculty who do not have access to grants. One CAP has expressed the concern that the NSTP will contribute to existing inequities and Vice Chair May commented that faculty from underrepresented minority are not benefitting from the NSTP. A member remarked that faculty in the Arts and Humanities are generally unable to buy themselves out of teaching. UCAP members agree that it would be reasonable to obtain more data but there is concern that continuing the program will make it more difficult to end.

It is not clear how the NSTP serves UC's goal of increasing diversity and ways to use the program to enhance diversity should be explored. There is also the issue of increased work load for staff in the administration of the program and this should be considered in the implementation and included in the calculations of the cost of this program. Members will submit any additional comments to Chair Yeh and the analyst by November 10th so that the draft memo can be circulated to the committee and finalized.

IV. Update on Senate Travel Procedures

- *Mona Hsieh, Office Manager, Academic Senate*

The Senate's Office Manager joined UCAP to explain the current travel procedures.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel, UCOP*
- *Pamela Peterson, Executive Director & Deputy to the Vice Provost, Academic Personnel & Programs, UCOP*

Vice Provost Carlson joined UCAP to update the committee on Academic Personnel's activities. The feedback on the APM policy on LSOEs is being reviewed by Academic Personnel and it is likely that the policy will need to undergo another systemwide review to resolve areas of disagreement. The ADVANCE program pilot last year went well and the results show that the interventions did make a clear difference in the hiring of diverse faculty. The State has provided additional money for this program and UCB, UCI, UCSF and UCSB will receive these funds for their programs. It is a good sign that the State continues to support this and an advisory group will figure out how to carry on this work in the long term. Vice Provost Carlson explained that not all campuses are requiring the diversity statements. Academic Personnel is gathering data to be used for discussions about a salary program.

The report on the NSTP at UCI, UCSD and UCLA is out for systemwide review. The Task Force was interested in data that was not initially gathered. One question was whether faculty were redirecting funds from their labs to increase their salaries, but the data shows that lab funding grew. The Task Force recommended expanding the NSTP to other campuses. Once the systemwide review is completed Provost Brown will decide whether to expand the program.

Discussion: It was noted that UCSC and UCM did not participate in the ADVANCE program but Vice Provost Carlson indicated that it is not clear if other campuses will be included in the future. At UCSD, the medical school did not require the diversity statements while other units on campus did so there is a question about whether Academic Personnel counted this campus as a participant or not. A member remarked that there is not a control group and that teaching loads and salaries increased for all UC faculty. Participants in the NSTP were already teaching less than other faculty. Executive Director Peterson reported that there are no major policy revisions coming up. Chair White can share, on a limited basis, data on faculty salary which includes information on off-scale salary amounts. This report should not be shared with divisional committees at this stage but it will be seen by UCPB, UCFW and UCAADE.

VI. Campus Report/Members Items

Chair Yeh invited members to share any divisional CAP issues or questions with the committee.

Davis: Faculty in the Arts and Humanities department have received a significant number of accelerations in the past few years. The CAP workload is heavy in part because it reviews every merit. The CAP does not accelerate in time.

Irvine: Last year the deans proposed that the CAP could delegate the merits to the deans, but the CAP decided to set up a subcommittee that will look at merits that are not two year accelerations. Currently the CAP sees every other merit and there is a workload issue related to this. UCSB's CAP looks at accelerations in step and time and essentially all merits. Vice Chair May proposed that UCAP could think about adding more steps and noted that the above scale faculty have lifetime access to merit increases.

Santa Cruz: The administration set a flat rate of \$16k for above scales but it was difficult for the CAP to determine how much beyond the flat rate could be awarded. A decision about this is forthcoming following consultation with the divisional Senate. UCSC's CAP has questions about requiring the diversity statement at recruitment and it is not clear if any UC campuses are requiring it.

Davis: There is a question about how CAPs handle book contracts. UCSC and UCSD's CAPs ask for a letter from the publisher that indicates that a book will be published. UCSC's CAP requires external reviewers to have a copy of the final manuscript. UCI's CAP gives credit for completion of a larger work. For merits it may be more acceptable to give credit for partial works than it would be for tenure cases. Some CAPs maintain lists of the items that have already been counted.

San Diego: The representative is interested in how other CAPs handle the diversity contribution. One member commented that the CAP looks for meaningful diversity statements and that an absence of a diversity statement does not hurt a faculty member.

UCD has a second CAP that considers the appeals of faculty who are denied by the regular CAP, which is separate from the shadow CAP which reviews cases of CAP members.

The CAPs do not have members who are LSOEs. At UCD, there is a Federation for Unit 18 lecturers and UCSD's CAP does look at major actions for LSOEs.

VII. UCAP 2017-2018 Meeting Schedule

UCAP is scheduled to meet on January 10th, March 14th and May 9th. Chair Yeh will be traveling in May so the committee will probably have a videoconference on the 9th.

VIII. New Business

There was no New Business.

IX. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 3: 05 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Michelle Yeh