

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

MEETING MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2018

Attending: Dan Farber, Chair (UCB), John Gilbert, Vice Chair (UCSB), Sharon Block (UCI), Reza Ahmado (UCLA) (videoconference), Susan Tapert (UCSD) (videoconference), Charles Langley (UCD), Marilyn Westerkamp (UCSC), Sherryl Vint (UCR), David Saloner (UCSF), Ignacio Lopez-Calvo (UCM), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel), Pamela Peterson (Executive Director & Deputy to the Vice Provost, Academic Personnel & Programs), Kimberly Grant (Director, Academic Policy & Compensation), Robert May (Chair, Academic Senate), Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Welcome and Announcements

Chair Farber welcomed everyone to the meeting and described issues to be discussed this academic year.

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate

- *Robert May, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair May reported that a UCLA vice chancellor has asserted that he has the right to interview CAP members about personnel matters. Senate leadership will discuss this with the Office of General Counsel and the committee will be updated in January. The concern is that CAPs should be able to deliberate without the threat of information being disclosed. Chair May would also like the committee to discuss offensive comments in student course evaluations.

UCAP is encouraged to discuss issues for faculty in the health sciences. Chair May reported that the represented librarians are asking for academic freedom in their contract negotiations with UC. With the help of Academic Personnel, the policy for active service-modified duties has been changed to one year. Effective January 1st, UC will have one definition of a domestic partner and signing up for the health and welfare benefits automatically signs an individual up for survivor benefits.

Discussion: The committee may wish to issue a statement indicating that offensive comments on course evaluations are unacceptable. It should be made clear to students that the evaluations are taken seriously. UCAP could review the questions on the course evaluations and recommend revisions. UCI is piloting a new evaluations and this work should be shared with UCAP. Establishing best practices would be valuable.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel and Programs*
- *Pamela Peterson, Executive Director & Deputy to the Vice Provost, Academic Personnel and Programs*
- *Kimberly Grant, Director, Academic Policy and Compensation, Academic Personnel*

The Negotiated Salary Trial Program is in phase two and a workgroup developed metrics for evaluating the program which will soon be approved by Provost Brown. Academic Personnel is working with the Office of General Counsel on revisions to the leave policies and more substantive changes to the APM 700 series policies will be proposed in the spring. Academic Personnel will also work on an academic

freedom policy for UC's represented librarians and updates to APM 120, the policy for emeritus faculty. Gender neutral terms will be added throughout all policies as part of the general clean-up.

Vice Provost Carlson explained that the Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) asked Academic Personnel to model different approaches to closing the faculty salary gap. One option is adding 5% to the scales annually for the next four years which would leave a 1.3% gap, assuming nothing is done with the off scale salaries. UCFW was also given a mock-up of a market-based scale for general campus faculty. The principles behind this model include that faculty would be hired at market, every year the scale would be adjusted to keep it at market, and that promotion to Associate and to Full would automatically have 10% increases.

Discussion: The memorandum of understanding for the Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOEs) indicates that they are Senate members regardless of full or part time status. Vice Provost Carlson does not think the criteria for evaluation of LSOEs should change significantly and the policy explains the expectations for teaching, scholarly achievement and professional activities. All campuses will be transitioning LSOEs to steps in the coming year. Vice Provost Carlson noted that Academic Personnel is researching whether the statements on contributions to diversity make a difference.

IV. Academic Analytics Subscriptions

Last year, UCAP discussed concerns about the company Academic Analytics, which provides data that administrators at some campuses are using in personnel reviews. The accuracy of the data is questioned and the service is expensive. Members are asked to monitor the status of continued use of Academic Analytics.

V. Systemwide Review Items

Proposed Presidential Policy entitled "Principles of Accountability with Respect to Financial Transactions"

Action: The committee will not opine on this matter.

Proposed revisions to Presidential Policy BFB-RMP-7 Protection of Administrative Records Containing Personally Identifiable Information

Action: the committee will not opine on this matter.

Proposed revised Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment (SVSH)

Discussion: There is a question about whether CAPs should receive information about findings against faculty who have been involved with SVSH cases. It is unclear if outcomes of informal resolutions should be included in the file. Some department chairs will mention issues while others do not which could result in faculty being treated differently, and UCAP might recommend that there be consistency to. Guidelines related to this might be helpful. The definition sexual harassment may not include some types of contact that are violations. Members discussed whether they would be required to report an allegation made by a student in a course evaluation. It is not clear if CAPs should receive any official information about a disciplinary action. Chair Farber proposed that the resolution from the disciplinary committee should include recommendations to CAPs about future personnel actions. UCAP can also recommend having a standard for the information that is or is not included in the file and that the relationship between the personnel review process and the disciplinary process should be clearer.

Action: The chair and analyst will draft a memo outlining the committee's concerns.

VI. Faculty Salaries

UCFW has taken the lead on the advocating for closing the faculty salary gap with UC's comparison eight institutions. Chair Farber indicated that one issue is whether future increases should be applied to the scales or if campuses should have discretion to decide. In the past, campuses used the funds to address retention or equity issues.

Discussion: Members discussed how their campuses treated off-scale salaries.

VII. Evaluations of Lecturers with Security of Employment Series

UCAP will begin to consider guidelines for the evaluation of faculty in the LSOE series.

Discussion: UCR's CAP has concerns about the LSOEs appointments and there is resistance to appointing more LSOEs. A clearer distinction between LSOEs and Assistant Professors is needed. A concern is that the use of LSOEs is a threat to faculty. The LSOEs at UCSB have significant responsibilities and the CAP would like the evaluation of LSOEs to be flexible. It was noted that the requirement for research in pedagogy was eliminated from the policy. The way CAPs evaluate teaching is different from how research is evaluated and UCI's CAP is concerned that it has not been effectively evaluating LSOEs. The CAP is discussing changing the number of independent external letters required for LSOEs and whether it is fair for LSOEs to be evaluated by CAPs that are only research-based faculty. An ad hoc review committee might be comprised for LSOEs from different departments.

At UCR, LSOEs are appointed under the office of the vice provost for undergraduate education and since they are not evaluated by a department, the campus has considered setting up ad hoc committees to evaluate the LSOEs. At other campuses, LSOEs are in departments. Some departments at UCR feel that LSOEs' work is not consistent with their mission which is an obstacle to the goal of treating LSOEs more like ladder rank faculty. The committee discussed whether having a parallel evaluation process for LSOEs is feasible. Including LSOEs on CAP may ultimately be a campus decision. UCSB has considered including senior LSOEs on its CAP.

A concern is that the number of LSOEs will be increased and utilized more frequently than ladder rank faculty. Campuses can limit the number of LSOEs hired and it would not be desirable to have a handful of individuals responsible for all teaching at a campus. LSOEs have been hired when ladder rank faculty have been unwilling to teach courses. The specifics of what is required of an individual LSOE should be documented and made available to CAPs. A member asked if UCAP could make a statement that all LSOEs should have a permanent department. The APM indicates that review of LSOEs should follow the general review pattern of members of the professorial series. The CAPs at campuses that have large numbers of LSOEs are concerned about the increased workload. UCI has created a flow chart on the progression of LSOEs. UCAP members should find out whether their CAPs will take the lead the reviews of LSOEs or if the reviews will be the responsibility of deans and are asked to monitor their campus' plans for evaluation of these faculty.

VIII. Contributions to Diversity Statements

UCAP will discuss the contributions to diversity statements. The committee will not create rules about what faculty are required to do or about how CAPs should assess these statements. There is confusion about what types of activities count as a contribution to diversity. The goal is for UCAP to develop non-binding best practices or guidelines for campuses.

Discussion: There is confusion about who decides when a statement is needed and about what a diversity statement is or should be. UCI requires faculty to write a diversity statement at hire but it is optional for other actions. At UCSB, it is unclear if departments can require a statement for merit actions. Members agreed that faculty should not be penalized for not making contributions to diversity and that not contributing to diversity does not prevent advancement. Candidates may not realize the broad range of activities that constitute contributions to diversity but UCAP agrees that the activities have to go beyond a faculty member's regular daily activities.

UCAADE is developing guidelines for the diversity statements submitted at hiring and UCAP may want to develop guidelines for the statements when there are merits and promotions. In the past, UCAADE hoped to require evidence of contributions in order to advance. UCSC's CAP will give a candidate an extra bump in salary if there is an extraordinary contribution to diversity in teaching or in service.

IX. Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs (SSGDP)

The committee needs additional information about issues related to CAPs and SSGDPs and will discuss this matter in January.

X. Course Evaluations – Offensive Comments and Discrimination Issues

Chair May has asked UCAP to discuss offensive comments in student course evaluations especially for women and under-represented minorities. There is literature that questions the reliability of the student evaluations as a gauge of teaching and evidence that the evaluations can be discriminatory. The committee could provide best practices to CAPs. The types of evidence the CAPs review is not completely clear.

Discussion: UCAP could write a statement to CAPs outlining the published research on the bias of students. Students should be educated about the purpose of the course evaluations and their responsibilities. CAP members and other faculty should also be educated about how to read the evaluations. The information from students can provide valuable insight. At UCI, department evaluations are not the same whereas a subset of questions is the same for the evaluations used at UCSB. Members will discuss with their CAPs how offensive comments are handled.

XI. Campus Reports/Member Items

UCR: The CAP will be using new software that has not tested successfully and there are concerns that glitches could result in data being mistakenly excluded from files. Members described issues with online systems used at their campuses and noted it would be difficult for the systems to be standardized across the system.

XII. New Business

The analyst reported that it is time for the triennial CAP Practices Survey to be completed by the CAP analysts. Committee members are asked to suggest new questions, particularly related to LSOEs, and to identify current questions that might be eliminated from the survey.

XIII. Executive Session

Executive Session was not held.

Meeting adjourned at: 3pm
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Dan Farber