

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (UCAP)  
2004-05 ANNUAL REPORT**

**TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:**

In Academic Year 2004-05, the University Committee on Academic Personnel met four times and held two teleconference meetings to conduct its business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 135. The issues that UCAP considered this year are described briefly as follows:

**Modifications to APM 220-18:**

UCAP was asked by Academic Council to review APM language describing the criteria for advancement from Step V to Step VI and to Above Scale (APM 220-18), and if necessary, to recommend changes. The committee worked over several meetings on this charge, focusing its efforts on modifying APM language to make the criteria clearer, more balanced and distinct, and more closely in line with actual campus CAP practices. UCAP identified elements in the APM language that required additional clarification and consulted with divisional CAPs about possible improvements. Members also collected and reviewed campus data on specific successful and unsuccessful Step VI cases to understand what the advancement criteria were in actual practice. In its report to Council, UCAP noted that the vagueness of some parts of the criteria may have led to differing campus practices, and consequently, to differences across campuses in advancement rates for faculty. UCAP said its proposed modifications would provide for more consistent and objective CAP decisions, grounded more firmly in the language of the APM, rather than on differing local interpretations. UCAP retained the emphasis on excellence in the three areas of research, teaching and service traditionally associated with Step VI and Above Scale advancements, while adding that the notion of “sustained excellence” over the entire career should be taken into account for these advancements. UCAP reviewed suggestions taken from a preliminary review by Council committees and campus divisions, and then forwarded a final, revised version of the modifications to Council in June. In July, Council endorsed UCAP’s modifications, restored one phrase to the criteria for Step VI advancement, and sent the final document to the administration with the recommendation for implementation.

**Study of determinants of advancement to Step VI:**

UCAP was asked by Council to conduct an in-depth study into faculty career advancement at Step VI, the barrier step, with special attention to the question of possible disparities in the advancement success by gender and ethnicity. The project was prompted by concerns raised last year by the Step System Task Force that women and underrepresented minorities may be facing disproportionate barriers to career advancement, particularly at the Step V barrier. The Senate was unable to establish whether this was indeed the case, because at the time, there was insufficient supporting longitudinal data on faculty experiences in the step system and the lack of statistical analysis. Over the course of several meetings, UCAP offered consultation to a UCOP database specialist and analyst into the development and parameters of a faculty career database that was expected to provide more definitive information. UCAP reviewed two

iterations of this database and concluded that there was not evidence of gender or ethnic disparities were evident at the barrier step. However, the committee also concluded that the size of the faculty cohort was not sufficiently large enough to detect small disparities in advancement frequencies. The study did show significant differences between campuses in the frequency of advancement to Step VI and between age groups at this action. Members agreed that the database should be expanded to other cohorts and opened up to further Senate analysis in a continuous, ongoing effort, including analogous studies of tenure and promotion to Professor. At year-end, UCAP submitted a comprehensive reporting of these efforts to Academic Council, which sent the report out for general review. UCAP looks forward to offering consultation to the Office of Academic Advancement in further development of the database.

### **The Role of Collaboration in Evaluating Research and Scholarship Achievements:**

UCAP discussed how the participation in research collaborations is evaluated in the personnel process—individuals may have made important definable contributions to a research project as collaborators, but may not be viewed as “independent” within the project because they were not the first or senior author on a paper or were not the listed principal investigator on a grant or award that supported the research. The committee found that while collaboration in research is becoming more common and widespread in academic culture, the traditional requirement for faculty to demonstrate independence for merit and promotion is insufficiently detailed in the current APM. In particular, UCAP noted that research “independence” was a major criterion for some actions, such as in the Professional Researcher series, but paradoxically not for some actions for ladder-rank faculty. The committee members agreed that it was the responsibility of the department chair or the head of another academic unit to indicate in the departmental letter the unique contributions of a faculty member participating in a collaboration when the usual indicators of research independence might be absent. The committee made plans to continue addressing the lack of standards in this area next year by considering APM modifications that will provide clearer guidance to campuses on these issues.

### **Family Friendly APM Policies:**

UCAP submitted comments to Academic Council about revised APM policies related to work and family being proposed by the Office of Academic Advancement. The committee expressed general support for the revised policies, and offered a few suggestions, including a concern about Appendix B – guidelines for pro-rating scholarly productivity as a percentage of part-time appointments. UCAP offered its collective services to the Office of Academic Advancement to further develop and clarify the language of Appendix B.

### **Additional Business**

In response to requests for comment from the Council, UCAP also submitted views on:

- Academic Council’s Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources.
- Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 128.
- Technical Revision of APM 190, Appendix F – Policy on the Use of Non-19900 Fund Sources to Support Ladder Rank Faculty.

UCAP also reviewed, but did not submit comments on:

- The Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee report.
- Council's Recommendations for Guidelines and Procedures Governing the Academic Senate's Role in the Development of a New Campus and for Granting Divisional Status to a New Campus.
- A Draft Policy on Human Subject Inquiry and Guidelines for Implementation.

### **Member Items:**

UCAP devoted part of each regular meeting to reports and updates from its members about issues facing local committees, the structure and activities of divisional committees, and individual campus practices.

### Recusal Policy

Members discussed local policies regarding the recusal of CAP members from participation in cases when a member had collaborated, taught or published with a candidate. UCAP agreed that each campus CAP should consider developing a formal policy with regard to conflict of interests during the review of cases, if one did not exist. This message was conveyed to divisional CAPs through UCAP committee members.

### Salary Issues

Members discussed the role of CAPs in determining salary and off-scale offers that have either a merit or a market component. Significant concern was expressed about wide variations in pay scales across fields and schools, a trend toward the disassociation of salary and merit, the arbitrariness of off-scales, and the lack of CAP involvement in many of these decisions.

### Sharing Campus Practices

Members participated in several informal e-mail surveys on topics including the use of ad hoc committees; how the title "Distinguished Professor" is used on different campuses; what documentation campuses require in the dossier for a normal merit case; and the use of overlapping steps.

### Other Issues

Finally, the committee touched briefly on career equity review guidelines; the use of "shadow" or "reserve" CAPs on some campuses to review the cases of CAP members; the personnel process at the National Labs, practices related to the review of endowed chairs; improving efficiencies in the personnel process, review candidates who decline to submit proper documentation; non-reappointment at the mid-career review; and credit for electronic-only publications compared to print publications.

### **Interaction with the UC Merced CAP:**

UCAP members provided advice to the Merced committee representative on a variety of academic personnel issues, including policy for joint, split, and affiliated appointments; systemwide norms regarding CAP's role in setting or reviewing salary; appropriate ranks for initial appointments; justifications for off-scale increments; and timelines for promotion and advancement reviews. In addition, the Chair of UCM-CAP joined one

UCAP meeting by phone to report on the status of CAP at Merced. The committee assisted the Chair in relating campus practices for the recording of votes of non-senate members in personnel letters. Although an independent Merced Senate formed in July, a portion of CAP's membership will continue to consist of UC faculty members from other campuses. UCAP may be called upon to suggest new external members and to provide advice and expertise about systemwide CAP processes to the Merced faculty, especially as issues such as promotion to tenure become more relevant.

#### **Interaction with the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity:**

In 2003, UCAP and UCAAD agreed that as a means of improving communication between the two committees, UCAAD's Chair would be invited to two UCAP meetings per year to discuss issues of mutual interest. This year, UCAAD's Chair and Vice Chair attended a portion of one UCAP meeting each, primarily during discussions of the faculty career database and Step V report. At year-end, advice was offered about methodologies that could be used to extend the analysis of gender and ethnicity at the barrier step.

#### **UCAP Representation:**

UCAP's Chair represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council and the Assembly of the Academic Senate.

#### **Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements:**

UCAP benefited from regular consultation and reports from Assistant Vice President for Academic Advancement Ellen Switkes and Director of Academic Personnel Myron Okada, who presented the committee with regular updates on systemwide APM policies under review and the progress of collective bargaining negotiations, as well as other topics including benefit and compensation plans, state sexual harassment training laws, salary scales, and a proposal to allow grant income to partially fund off-scale salaries for ladder faculty. Data Management Coordinator James Litrownik joined two meeting to discuss the faculty career database.

Also joining the committee as guests or consultants were UCAAD Chair Ross Frank, UCAAD Vice-Chair Gibor Basri and UCM-CAP Chair Geoffrey Mason. Academic Senate Chair George Blumenthal and Vice-Chair Clifford Brunk updated the committee on issues facing the Academic Council and Senate. Academic Senate Executive Director María Bertero-Barceló spoke to UCAP about Senate office procedures and Committee business.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Barbour (UCI), Chair  
Joseph Guglielmo (UCSF), Vice-Chair  
George Andersen (UCR)  
Cynthia Brown (UCSB)  
Anna Maria Busse Berger (UCD)  
Inder Chopra (UCLA)  
Mary Croughan (UCSF)

Craig Haney (UCSC)  
Russell Jones (UCB)  
William Maurer (UCI)  
Harvey Sollberger (UCSD)  
Roland Winston (UCM)  
Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst