

Attending: Katja Lindenberg, Chair (UCSD), Harry Green, Vice Chair (UCR), Kyaw Tha Paw U (UCD) (telephone), Alan Terricciano (UCI), Jeffrey Knapp (UCB), David Hovda (UCLA) (telephone), Michael Pirrung (UCR) (telephone), Dana Takagi (UCSC), Clinton Winant (UCSD), Carl Guterrez-Jones (UCSB), Mike Colvin (UCM) (telephone), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel), Nancy Tanaka (Executive Director, Academic Advancement), Janet Lockwood (Manager-Academic Policy and Compensation, Academic Personnel), Bob Anderson (Academic Senate Chair), Bob Powell (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Martha Winnacker (Academic Senate Executive Director), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Welcome and Announcements

- APM 668, the negotiated salary plan, was defeated at Academic Assembly. Only two campuses (UCSF and UCSD) were in favor of the plan.
- A blue ribbon panel is still working on the evaluation of the Online Instruction Pilot Project. Phase II was supposed to wait until this evaluation was completed, but this second phase of the project has already been rolled out by the Administration.
- Chair Lindenberg is a member of the Salary Equity Task Force, which is working on a plan to improve faculty salary scales. It is not clear where any money would come from to fix the scales. The current idea of the Task Force is to incorporate UCI's methodology. [KL: Rather than report the incomplete information presented and discussed at the meeting, I am ex post introducing the web site that details the Irvine methodology: http://www.ap.uci.edu/APP/6-13_offscale.html#UCIScale]. The costs of different models are being calculated. A final recommendation has not been made yet. Most members of the Task Force support some combination of a systemwide scale and along with some campus specific discretionary aspects.
- The UCAAD Salary Equity report was an extensive study across the system. Compared to white males at all ranks, it found that women and minorities at some ranks and in some units are underpaid. UCOP has indicated that there are problems with the methodology and will respond to the report. Some campuses may be thinking about what to do with the report or may conduct their own studies at their campuses.
- The new Funding Streams process, which will leave money generated by each campus at the campus, is being implemented. However, there are still issues to be worked out, such as how the campuses will be taxed in order to fund Systemwide operations.
- There is ongoing discussion about Rebenching, which is how state funds should be distributed more equitably to the campuses.
- At recent Academic Council meetings, the police actions at UCB and UCD have been discussed. The incidents are still being investigated and there is no news on what the outcome will be.
- Chair Lindenberg shared a request to UCAP (and to a number of other committees) to comment on proposed child abuse mandated reporter bill language by January 3rd. There would be significant costs associated with training UC faculty and staff to be mandated reporters. Chair Lindenberg did not feel that she was sufficiently knowledgeable to comment in isolation and suggested that the Office of General Counsel provide recommendations.

Discussion and Answers to Questions:

- Concerning the Salary Equity Task Force analysis: Departments with a separate scale are being excluded from the task force discussions. Salary data from comparison institutions is being

reviewed. UCD has started looking at the salary equity study more closely and suggests that a better longitudinal study be conducted. Methodological improvements are under discussion.

- Concerning the child abuse mandated reporter bill: A member noted that there is a mechanism for training faculty and staff on sexual harassment prevention training. UCAP could request an analysis of what the proposed child abuse mandated reporter language would mean.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved with minor corrections.

III. APM 210

Chair Lindenberg shared a document written by Don Rutherford from UCSD assessing contributions to diversity at UCSD. At issue is the clarity or confusion on the issue in APM 210 and how the wording of APM 210 should in his opinion be interpreted. The discussion arises because there is confusion on this issue across the system. The main question is whether APM 210 introduces a “fourth leg” to be evaluated when a faculty member is reviewed for a merit increase (in addition to research, teaching, and service) or whether APM 210 in fact does not do this. The Rutherford document concludes that APM 210 in fact does not, but there is clearly confusion about this.

Discussion: There are different practices across the campuses with regard to how information about diversity activities is collected. At UCSB, departments are not monitoring the activities and the activities are not indicated on the biobib. At UCI, within each area on the biobib there is a place to discuss diversity contributions. A number of members of UCAP feel that awareness and training are needed. Equity advisers do not currently provide training on APM 210 within the review process. The general opinion of UCAP is that faculty that focus on diversity in their academic field should not receive a bonus simply because of this focus. UCSD's CAP spends a lot of time discussing this issue. Science and Engineering departments at UCSD do not note contributions to diversity. UCSC's CAP and CAD chairs and EVC distributed a letter at the end of last year that pointed out that diversity is part of APM 210. The UCSC CAP considers diversity in all three categories and looks for activities that are beyond the normal range. The UCSC representative believes the APM's language is satisfactory and that the issue is lack of understanding that diversity is not a fourth leg.

At UCM the issue of diversity is different due to the demographics of the school and region and therefore a lot of the activities automatically have a diversity component. The UCM CAP recognizes contributions to diversity very consistently and the UCM representative does not think the APM language needs to be revised. A Faculty Welfare committee member at UCR was concerned that the APM could infringe upon academic freedom. The UCR representative indicated that CAP members familiarize themselves with the call and the APM and heed any restrictions. Files are evaluated as a whole. UCLA handles evaluation of diversity activities on a case by case basis. Each dossier is evaluated strictly on its merit for teaching, service and research but when there is evidence of a contribution to diversity it is highlighted in the final report. It is not weighted as something that is more important than scholarship and it has not usurped poor teaching evaluations.

UCB's online evaluation system asks about contributions to diversity in each area. There is outreach with chairs and deans to discuss how credit might be considered. The UCB representative suggests that APM 210 might be seen as specifying content. The UCD CAP considers diversity activities on a case by case basis, and feels that the language allows for local interpretation by each CAP.

UCAP could work on a rewording of section 1.d of APM 210. This work should be done in collaboration with UCAAD and the local affirmative action committees.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel*
- *Nancy Tanaka, Executive Director, Academic Advancement*
- *Janet Lockwood, Manager-Academic Policy and Compensation, Academic Personnel*

Vice Provost Carlson introduced Nancy Tanaka, the new Executive Director of Academic Advancement.

A number of items were presented by the OP personnel:

A document on the Academic Personnel website on the use of APM 210 was revised. The Council on Climate and Inclusion's faculty diversity workgroup made recommendations regarding APM 210. UCAP should review these documents before considering revised language.

UC has been awarded four NSF Advance grants. A steering committee with representatives from each grant will strive to coordinate activities.

Changes to APM 133 have been proposed which will modify the ban on return to service in specific titles. The five year ban would be changed to three years and the list of titles that would be prohibited would be modified. UCFW has proposed completely eliminating those portions of APM 133 that forbid one campus to ever hire someone who has been denied tenure at another campus.

The Salary Equity Task Force has worked on developing a plan and Vice Provost Carlson thinks the group is moving towards consensus. Administrators as well as Senate representatives have affirmed the salary scales, the merit process and peer review. The task force's work will be completed by the end of January. The principles and recommendations should be part of what transpires in the Spring with UC's budget. The aim is to bring more faculty back on scale by raising the scales, while also recognizing campus differences and a degree of campus autonomy.

Academic Personnel is in the process of analyzing comments received in response to systemwide reviews of APM 670 and 668. With both policies, there is concern about what the proposed changes would mean for the role of CAP.

Discussion: The ban on return to service in APM 133 was originally considered as a way to protect the integrity and quality of the faculty. APM 133 does not affect the eight year "up or out" rule, and APM 510 is a separate issue as well. UCAP members agreed to support UCFW's position and will submit a memo to that effect to Chair Anderson.

A member noted that faculty at their campus are awarded off scale salaries as a reward for distinguishing themselves. The rationale for rewarding an off scale salary is not transparent at every campus, nor is it the same at all campuses. A huge fraction of faculty is off scale. Awarding an off scale salary based on merit is similar to the UCB and UCSC practice of awarding a half step. The first element of the salary plan will raise the salaries at UCSC and UCD quite a bit and relatively fewer faculty at UCB and UCLA will receive a higher salary.

V. Consultation with Senate Leadership

- *Bob Anderson, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Bob Powell, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate*

Chair Anderson reported that there was a plan to take the proposed UCSD affiliation with the law school to the Regents without Senate review. UCAP should review the proposal thoroughly even if it takes more time than the administration would like. Regarding APM 210, Chair Anderson understands UCAP's concerns. The budget submitted to the Regents has three percent for faculty and staff raises, which is on top of merits. Changes to tuition will be discussed by the Regents in March. One of the changes the governor made to the budget is simply an accounting change. Ninety million dollars in the budget is an augmentation to UC's budget and the governor has indicated that it can be used for contributions to UCRP. The governor has also talked about limitations on increases to tuition. UC is looking at a four percent increase from the state and a six percent increase in tuition. It is not clear that UC can have competitive salaries with the money that will be available. If the tax measures fail, UC will have an additional cut.

Executive Director Winnacker reported on the bill proposing language for mandated reporters of child abuse. There is an existing law mandating reporting, and there is a burden on school teachers. There are a lot of programs at UC campuses during the summer that are attended by minors and all employees running these programs would be mandated reporters. The policy would apply to any alleged abuse that occurred on campus.

Discussion: APM 210 1.d could be revised to alert faculty to look out for contributions to diversity. The UCSB CAP is asking candidates to write a narrative about diversity activities. A member commented that at some point, UC may need to state that quality has decreased. The administration has typically taken the view that if there are further cuts quality will suffer, but are loathe to say so publicly. Chancellors are concerned that if they state that quality has suffered, the ability of campuses to attract faculty, graduate students and possibly undergraduate students will be impacted. If UC proposed reducing enrollment, Chair Anderson believes that the state would respond with a cut. There has been a decline in students from middle and upper middle class families. Chair Anderson remarked that it is not clear if UC could do a better job with lobbying. UC was hurt several years ago when thirty-six senior executives threatened to sue UC over their pensions. CSU cut its enrollment which may have helped UC. It would be possible for UC to develop a list of job titles of mandated reporters.

VI. Annual CAP Survey

Chair Lindenberg asked the committee to consider whether the right questions are being asked on the survey and if it would be useful to see trends over time.

Discussion: The UCSC representative is using data from the survey to support a proposed change to a CAP practice. On each item, campuses could be asked to indicate if there has been a change since the previous year. The committee agreed to complete the survey every other year and that the committee should receive the most recent survey results at the beginning of the academic year.

VII. Sharepoint

- *Todd Giedt, Associate Director, Academic Senate*

An overview of UCAP's Sharepoint site was provided.

VIII. UCSD's Proposed Affiliation Agreement with the California Western School of Law

A long standing question has been how UCSD might start a law school, and one strategy is to acquire one. In 2002 there was an agreement between UCSD and the California Western School of Law, and according to Chair Lindenberg nothing in the agreement was implemented. It is not clear why the UCSD administration has put forward the new proposed agreement. The cover letter states that the agreement will be like other affiliation agreements and Chair Lindenberg reported that no such agreements could be found so there is no precedent. The agreement would result in diplomas indicating that graduates have an affiliation with UCSD. The proposal has been sent to the systemwide and UCSD graduate councils. Chair Lindenberg noted that UCSD is looking for a new Chancellor so this decision should at least be postponed until the search is completed.

Discussion: It would be problematic for the faculty of the California Western School of Law to not be evaluated by the CAP. There are four law schools in San Diego and some of them will be closed, so the question is which schools will survive. The affiliation with UCSD would enable the school to attract students. The CAP would have to evaluate the files if the faculty member wants an appointment to UCSD. The long term evolution is unclear and the process should not be rushed. Since there is no precedent at UC there should be a policy on affiliation before UC enters into this agreement. Many additional concerns about this plan were voiced.

Action: Chair Lindenberg will draft a memo outlining the committee's concerns.

IX. Campus Reports/Member Items

UCI: The CAP debated with the law school about powers to veto bylaws. The CAP will increase from eleven to thirteen, and the CAP will discuss splitting into two committees. Faculty in the law school have been advocating to be on CAP. The quality of the files from the law school has been inconsistent and having a law school faculty on CAP would be beneficial.

UCB: A study found a huge gap six years after promotion to the associate professor stage: Eighty percent of PSTEM faculty had been promoted to full professor and 20% of book-based discipline faculty had been promoted. Fourteen years later there is still a 20% gap. It is not clear how to solve this inequity. UCAP members agreed that this is a systemwide problem. Publishers are disappearing so the ability to publish a book is limited. Members agreed that UCAP should discuss at its next meeting how to handle disciplines where the media or venues or generally outlets for publication are changing.

As publishing outlets change, the expectations around what constitutes a productive and creative scholar also change. Disciplines need to develop alternative proposals for review of files. Candidates and chairs could have a better understanding of how CAPs evaluate files. When a tenure file is reviewed or at mid-career, CAPs want to know what new projects or research areas the faculty is beginning to work on. The committee should think about discussing mentoring of younger faculty and information transfer. UCAP would like to see data on comparative progress through the ranks. The analyst will check with Vice Provost Carlson about the availability of this data and the UCSC representative volunteered to analyze it.

X. New Business

There was no new business.

XI. Executive Session

There was no executive session.

Meeting adjourned at: 2:25 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Katja Lindenberg