

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 2018

Attending: Michelle Yeh, Chair (UCD), Georg Striedter (UCI), John Gilbert (UCSB), Margaret Stuber (UCLA), Pablo Ortiz (UCD), Carla Freccero (UCSC), Ignacio Lopez-Calvo (UCM), John Kuriyan (UCB), Rajiv Gupta (UCR), David Saloner (UCSF), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel), Pamela Peterson (Executive Director & Deputy to the Vice Provost, Academic Personnel & Programs), Kimberly Grant (Director, Academic Policy & Compensation), Amy Lee (Diversity, Labor, & Employee Relations Director), Gregory Sykes (Academic Policy & Compensation Data Analyst), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Consultation with Academic Personnel

- *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel, UCOP*
- *Pamela Peterson, Executive Director & Deputy to the Vice Provost, Academic Personnel & Programs*
- *Kimberly Grant, Director, Academic Policy & Compensation*
- *Amy Lee, Diversity, Labor, & Employee Relations Director*
- *Gregory Sykes, Academic Policy & Compensation Data Analyst*

The Faculty Exit and Retention Survey was administered in partnership with Harvard's Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education. Having data from this survey about why faculty stay at UC or leave has been helpful during the current discussions about faculty salary. Salary was the most frequently cited reason for decisions about staying or leaving. Seven campuses have volunteered to continue the survey.

UC is in the second year of a program to support best practices in Equal Employment Opportunity in Faculty Employment and \$2M in funding has been provided to four campuses. The state is very interested in diversity by race and ethnicity, and under-represented minority faculty in particular. This year, UCB's School of Engineering received about a quarter of the money, UCSB's Department of Economics has a quarter of the money; at UCI, four schools in the STEM disciplines received funding; and UCSF received funding for hiring ladder rank faculty in the biomedical sciences. Reports from the campuses have been promising so far and UC will report to the Legislature and the Department of Finance. The preliminary report for this year will be shared with UCAP.

The Senate's feedback to the report from the Task Force that looked at how well the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP) was working indicated that evidence of success is not strong enough to make the program permanent at this point. The NSTP is continuing at UCLA, UCI and UCSD, and UCR is finalizing its plan to join. Campuses continuing the program are updating their campus-level implementation guidelines. Other campuses, including UCSC, are considering joining the NSTP.

Academic Personnel will continue to collect data and data on the fourth year of the program, which ended in June 2017, is currently being gathered. Provost Brown has indicated the need for consultation with the faculty and that he supports continuing the trial program. The provost has also asked Academic Personnel to convene a group to design a revised set of data to assess program outcomes. Several administrators have been nominated for this group and Vice Provost Carlson is waiting to hear from Senate Chair White about the faculty who should be involved. Better quantitative data on the impact of the NSTP is needed. Vice Provost Carlson remarked that it is important to make changes related to the data collected to reflect that there is an effort to monitor the NSTP.

Executive Director Peterson introduced the new Director of Academic Policy & Compensation, Kimberly Grant. Academic Personnel is working on technical revisions to leave policies to bring them into compliance with state and federal leave laws. A new APM policy for the Veterinary Medicine Compensation Administration is being developed. Next week, Academic Personnel expects to issue a technical change to the Specialist series to bring the policy into alignment with the published salary scales that added steps. Today is the deadline for administrative feedback on the proposed revisions to the policies for the Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOE) series. Vice Provost Carlson, Chair Yeh, and others will discuss the proposed revisions tomorrow to determine how to move forward on the Senate's recommendations. Right now, the areas of agreement and disagreement on important issues are being identified.

Discussion: The chair expressed concern about only considering retention when a faculty member has a formal offer letter from another university. Vice Provost Carlson noted that retention should be thought about at other times and that UC should have strong salary programs for all faculty. The survey found that faculty are not leaving the University due to climate issues, which is a positive. One member questioned whether CAPs should be involved with pre-emptive retentions. UCSB's CAP wants to see formal offer letters and is involved with pre-emptive retentions as well as salary discussions. Almost 50% of the new hires at UCD are dual career couples and Chair Yeh noted that, in terms of a department's long range planning, the partners are not necessarily consistent with the department's goals. When departments have to hire the spouse, there can be issues related to quality which is problematic. Vice Provost Carlson agreed that it can be difficult to balance department planning and partner accommodation, although hiring partners can be a good retention tool.

This year, eight proposals were submitted for faculty in the STEM fields. It is hoped that there will be more funding from the state and disciplines that have not received these funds will be a focus in the future. It is not clear that the STEM disciplines received the Equal Employment Opportunity in Faculty Employment funding to support hiring diverse faculty because other disciplines are doing well with respect to diversity. If UC receives additional funding, distribution of funds to the humanities and to the three campuses which have not received funding in the past would be a good focus.

UCSC's CAP was asked if it would like to see every case involving faculty in the NSTP. On this issue CAP is not sure what it would examine but equity might be one thing. Vice Provost Carlson indicated that the CAPs on the three participating campuses have decided if the CAPs should be a reviewer based on how each CAP handles salary actions. If the CAPs currently look at salary, they may look at cases for NSTP participants. It is important for there to be consistency with the CAP's current practices and role. A member asked if Academic Personnel has determined how the NSTP would be ended and, according to Vice Provost Carlson, some campuses are creating proposals for what would happen if the program ends. Chair Yeh commented that Academic Council was very concerned about the NSTP but there was agreement that more data should be collected. It was noted that Provost Brown's letter explicitly mentioned that the program may end if the data supports this decision. Vice Provost Carlson noted that the NSTP does help in certain disciplines. In addition to participating faculty increasing their own salaries, part of the money brought in goes to support the research enterprise and it also means that some salary money is not coming out of state funds. The Vice Provost suggested that a different program might be needed for other types of faculty.

After reviewing the responses to the Senate's systemwide review of the LSOE policy revisions, Chair Yeh believes there is not much support for the proposed policy. Chair Yeh asked why a new LSOE series that mirrors the Professor series is being created instead of simply better defining the policies for LSOEs. There currently is an expectation of professional activity in the APM for faculty in the LSOE series and the goal of the revisions is to clarify what the expectations are. The policy should be flexible enough to accommodate campuses that have different expectations related to scholarly engagement. Campuses are

hiring more faculty into this series and Academic Personnel wants a policy that is up to date and better describes the work of these faculty.

II. Chair's Updates

Chair Yeh reported that last November, Academic Council had a special meeting focused on the state audit and the report commissioned by the Regents. At several meetings since December, Council has discussed Huron Consulting's report on the structure of the Office of the President and suggested potential changes such as eliminating the Presidents' Post-Doctoral program. President Napolitano has appointed a Senior Faculty Advisor, Former Senate Chair Dan Hare and the Senate has emphasized the need to increase the profile of the Provost's Office and give it a bigger role in decision-making. Chair Yeh remarked that Huron's report found that UC is an effective organization and that Council is developing a statement of principles in response to this report.

The systemwide Committee on Academic Freedom sent Council a memo in response to a UC Student Association (UCSA) letter about free speech and hate speech. Council is preparing a short cover letter to the UCSA. The proposed revisions to the LSOE policy have been discussed at Council and one idea is that faculty now in this series should be consulted about the policy. Chair Yeh shared that Council has met with three Regents with the goal of familiarizing them with what faculty do and these discussions have been positive. It was also noted that graduate students are now allowed to unionize. UC was opposed to this as it would change the relationship between faculty and graduate students, but the University's position is now neutral.

Chair Yeh asked members if the diversity statement is required at the campuses.

Discussion: At UCSC, the diversity statement will be required of all applicants. At UCSB and UCR, individual departments do not require the statement but the statements are encouraged. At UCM, the statements are required of all applicants. At UCD, every hiring committee looks carefully at the diversity statements. At UCSF, at review the diversity statements are taken into account but individuals are not penalized based on them. At UCM, the attempt to make the statement on diversity mandatory was met with pushback. Individuals are not penalized for not having the statement. UCLA is debating whether the diversity statement should be required.

III. Consent Calendar

Action: The October 11, 2017 UCAP minutes were approved.

IV. Plan to Close the Faculty Salary Gap

The faculty salary gap has been an important issue for the Council this year. Provost Brown and the president are reportedly in support of closing the gap. The Council is pleased with the degree of flexibility given to the campuses in terms of how the salary increases are allocated including how off-scales are addressed.

Discussion: A member commented that some faculty will have to be paid more in order to retain them.

V. Outcome of the Second Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to APM Sections 285, 210-3, 133, 740, 135 and 235

Chair Yeh asked members for their suggestions to the workgroup looking at the proposed policy revisions for the LSOE series.

Discussion: Chair Yeh indicated that faculty may be given the option to use “LSOE” or “Teaching Professor.” UCSC’s CAP continues to have a number of questions and found that the proposed revisions have conflicting statements. Workload is covered by campus Academic Personnel Manuals and not the APM. In order to standardize more detail is required and what is required at each campus needs to be clarified since the teaching loads are not the same. It is likely that campuses will protect the flexibility they now have.

Members agree that senior LSOEs should be consulted about the policy. UCD has a federation for Unit 18 lecturers and these faculty are unionized, so this complicates the discussion. Some of the demands, such as sabbatical, came from the LSOEs. Making the LSOEs equal does not mean they have to be equivalent to ladder rank faculty and members agreed with the idea of a similar step system without the barrier steps. Viewing the Teaching Professor series as the only faculty who teach may not be the right way to look at the matter, especially as it suggests that the Research Professors do not teach. The Research Professor title is common at other universities.

VI. Campus Reports and Member Items

Merced: The representative attended a conference where the question of how collaborative research should be evaluated was asked. The CAP would like to see both collaborative and individual research. How do other CAPs feel about papers that have multiple authors and when the faculty member has no independent research or single authored papers? The response may be discipline-specific. UCB is very accommodating and in the sciences, the work is increasingly collaborative. At UCR, the CAP does not ask for single authored papers but looks for components of the faculty member’s research that show independence and UCI’s CAP finds that collaborations between junior and senior faculty can be complicated in these situations.

In large collaborative efforts, the CAP needs some way to understand an individual’s independent contribution and outside letters can be helpful with this, so CAPs do not have to guess. Due to the size of data sets that are needed in some research projects, there can be a hundred authors so the question is whether there is clearly a unique contribution. A member recommended that how the contribution is evaluated should be left to the individual CAPs. Identifying expertise that is specific to one researcher can be difficult.

The UCM representative asked about expectations for book disciplines and if CAPs expect publications to be in print for them to be considered. UCM is inclined to consider a book only if it is accepted for publication or is in print and UCD only accepts books that are in press or the actual book, but the CAP has seen cases where the book was reportedly in press but was never released. Good faith statements that a book will be published can complicate the matter for CAPs, so at some point there could be the need for a norm across the campuses. Chair Yeh remarked that one candidate’s book was released ten years after the CAP reviewed the case.

A letter from the publisher stating that the manuscript does not require further revision may be helpful for CAPs. How CAPs handle tenure cases in the book disciplines is especially important. A completed manuscript reviewed by all of the external reviewers is required at UCSC. It is important that each department has clear expectations with respect to what stage a book is in. A set of rules or parameters from each discipline would be helpful. UCI’s CAP has serious concerns about work being counted twice.

Santa Cruz: The representative asked if the CAPs review Presidential Professor nominations and what CAPs do with the information. The CAP is not told whether the people should be ranked and if they are

adjudicated. The UCB CAP reviews all chair appointments and looks for anything that is odd about the case, but there is no ranking.

Irvine: A committee has proposed revisions to the teaching evaluation. One proposed element is to do away with the numbers, and focus more on qualitative feedback, for example by asking students what they have gotten out of the class. The numbers are helpful for individual CAP members and help identify areas where the students' comments should be reviewed. UCSC has a new software program for online evaluations and the campus is reevaluating the questions and structure. UCSB's system allows departments to tailor some of the questions. This CAP looks at the overall course evaluation to identify problem areas. Several CAPs note the return rate of student surveys.

UCI's CAP will begin meeting with the deans next fall in an effort to establish better communication and any advice on how other CAPs do this will be appreciated. The UCLA CAP has found meeting with deans to be helpful. This helps new deans understand what CAPs are examining and it has been very helpful to meet with deans who repeatedly do not provide the right information with a file. UCD has a new vice provost for Academic Personnel and CAP meets with him once a quarter to discuss the actions he has overturned. The CAP also meets with school-based faculty personnel committees in order to unify criteria. The UCSC representative is invited to the meetings for deans and chairs and the vice provost for Academic Affairs is invited to a CAP meeting if there is disagreement about issues beyond salary before a decision is made. The UCSB CAP chair meets every week with the vice chancellor or dean. At UCLA, CAP's chair and co-chair meet with the vice provost on a weekly basis and all CAP members have lunch with the vice provost every month. UCD's CAP could do more in terms of meeting with the new vice provost, who wants to be transparent.

San Francisco: The hospital will sometimes expand and incorporate another medical center whose staff need to be incorporated into UCSF's faculty. An example of this is the UCSF Benioff Children's Hospital Oakland. The appointments are being sent to CAP and it is a challenge to monitor all of the new packages. Typically the new staff are appointed at Health Sciences (HS) Clinical and but HS Clinical is not appropriate for the research unit at Children's Hospital. The tracks and the steps have to be monitored. The individuals have never had academic appointments in the past but there is a mandate from the institution to manage these positions. UCLA has bought a number of practices and because trainees are there, there is a need for academic appointments and the appointments are desired even when there are not trainees. UCLA has put people into the HS Assistant Professor title without steps and the expectation is that they can remain at this step forever. Without step means the case will be reviewed every five years but people who simply want a professorial title agree to this.

Los Angeles: There are deans and/or department chairs who consider bringing in money to be service to the University. They have made the case that this is fine when faculty members are doing research but no service and they bring in funds used to pay for their graduate students. The CAP was flabbergasted by this argument. The UCSB CAP has dealt with similar situations and does not allow bringing in money to count as service. Some faculty have argued that they have always been accelerated for bringing in money or that it is the expectation of their deans. UCI's CAP does not give credit for service for bringing in money.

Davis: Department chairs decide whether or not to forward negative comments to hiring committees, and it is very easy for the chair to be biased in one way or another. UCLA's CAP does not document comments when there is a negative vote and CAP worries when there are a sizable number of votes against the candidate. At UCD, the candidate has been asked to label the external letters as "at arms length" and the CAP looks at whether the letter writer has a close association with the candidate. The advantage of having the letters labeled helps candidates understand that the writers should have an "at arms length" relationship with them. "At arms length" means that the writer does not have a conflict of

interest, and the UCI CAP refers to this as “independent.” At UCSC, writers are asked to state what their relationship with the candidate is. Sometimes there is only a small pool of people able to judge a candidate’s work and it is likely that these people have worked with them.

VII. New Business

Chair Yeh asked members to keep May 9th on their calendars for the last UCAP meeting. It is not yet clear if the meeting will be in-person or by videoconference.

VIII. Executive Session

Executive Session was not held.

Meeting adjourned at: 2:35PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Michelle Yeh