

Attending: Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair (UCD), Katja Lindenberg, Vice Chair (UCSD), John Lindow (UCB), Kyaw Tha Paw U (UCD), Henry Pontell (UCI), Kathleen Komar (UCLA), Thomas Harmon (UCM) (telephone), Julia Bailey Serres (UCR), Patricia Cohen (UCSB), Dana Takagi (UCSC), Richard Arneson (UCSD), Paul Garcia (UCSF), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel), Patricia Price (Interim Director, Academic Personnel), Jim Litrownik (Coordinator, Data Mgmt, Academic Advancement), Dan Simmons (Academic Senate Chair), Bob Anderson (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Welcome, Updates and Announcements

There have been several Council meetings and an Assembly meeting. Post employment benefits have been decided and the plan was approved by the Regents. Council was pleased with the outcome. Chair Palazoglu provided background information about Appendix E, a letter from 36 administrators to the President about their pensions. The senate made a statement against this previously. The committee will receive a report on the new funding model that is being proposed but this may not be relevant to UCAP's charge. Immediate Past Chair Powell has worked with a committee to create a report on what the University should look like and there will be a task force looking at how to implement the principles, including how strategic planning should be done. There was a presentation by the chair of UCOLASC to the Council about the negotiations between Nature Publishing Group and UC. NPG was charging \$300,000 and proposed an increase to \$1.2 million. An outcome could be that UC does not renew the license and UC faculty boycott the NPG journals.

The resolution on the faculty salary increases was discussed during UCAP's last meeting. By the end of December it became clear that there was money the president could put into salaries. The president indicated that it would be difficult to sell this to the Regents if the salary increases are across the board. Some Regents believe that there are some faculty who are not progressing so the president may implement the increases based on merit. The chair would like UCAP to discuss the letter from Chair Simmons to the president. The letter indicates that the salary increase should be across the board since the scales are actually based on merit. An alternative is that anyone who received a merit increase in the past five years should be caught up in the new scales and anyone who has not should wait. Council would like UCAP to comment on this proposal.

Discussion: The published scales will go up and the increase is only on the scale, not on the off scale component. Some people want the increase to apply to the off scale component. UCAP carried out a study in 2008 to determine how many faculty were not progressing or disengaged and found that it was a small percentage. The letter to the Academic Senate by UCAP dated June 6, 2008 about this study is a part of the current discussion. The point was made that when funds are limited they should be used to prevent attrition of faculty who can get outside offers. Funds can be put into the salary scales and also used for retentions. Focusing on faculty who could get outside offers does not necessarily make faculty happy, and women would probably be disadvantaged since they are less likely to seek outside offers. Members agreed that this is a morale issue. If morale goes down, more people will probably consider leaving. It was noted that faculty workloads have also increased.

Despite the new budget proposed by the state the president does seem committed to the salary increase, however it is unclear where the 3.5% for the increase would come from. In the Humanities the number of faculty at the associate rank (stalled at Step 3 or 4) excluded from the salary increase may be significant. The Humanities need to rethink criteria due to the changing nature of publishing. It may be better to recommend local implementation since the policy may not work as intended. One campus considered a one time infusion which would give everyone a minimum amount of money and faculty granted off scale or greater than normal during the last three reviews would get an additional amount of money. This approach is very complex and would not be recommended. Chair Simmons' letter anticipates a merit based increment based on off scale or above scale salary and an increase that excludes the off scale. The scales are based on merit and this should be emphasized with the Regents. Some Regents and members of the public may believe that UC faculty are already paid too much.

One issue is what to do with the off scale and whether it would be increased by 3.5% or stay the same. One

solution could be to indicate that the scale is a range meaning that different people at the same step are paid different salaries. CAPs that do not deal with salaries might need to become involved with salary decisions. The merit system has mechanisms for dealing with non-progressing faculty although Vice Provost Carlson indicated that Provost Pitts is told by the EVCs that this system is not working. Merits are based on work that has been done and does not factor in future progress. The system accelerates some faculty and decelerates others. Members agreed that UCAP needs to stick to its principles and argue for the merit based scales. The position on off scales is that the dollar amount off scale should be maintained. Individual CAPs should discuss the associate professor issue especially related to Humanities faculty. Decisions on tenure are more frequently left in the hands of the funding agencies. The analyst and chair will draft a memo outlining UCAP's position.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

III. Report from the Task Force on Senate Membership

UCAP has the opportunity to comment on the Report from the Task Force on Senate Membership. Some concerns were raised including how the membership might change.

Discussion: The Committee on Committees at one campus reviewed the report and noted that there was very little on graduate education. Seven of the eight senate committees at UCSF strongly opposed this and felt that faculty in certain titles such as adjuncts should be granted Senate membership as they are performing all the functions of service as required. Reclassifying the titles is not a viable approach. Faculty doing work in the health sciences could be in a health sciences Senate. At least two CAPs have sub CAPs that look more intensively at the health sciences. The health sciences faculty would outweigh faculty in other disciplines if they were added to the Academic Senate at campuses that have both a college and a medical school. There was a discussion about the criteria used by UCSF's CAP which differs from the criteria used by other CAPs, including how dissemination is defined. The medical school at UCSD has its own CAP which looks at cases before they go to the campus CAP.

A recommendation from the task force is for UCAP to look at how titles are being used to ensure more consistent use of the titles. Since UCSF's issues may be unique this campus may want to examine its practices. At UCSF one issue is there are faculty who have only clinical functions and do not teach and another issue is related to the adjunct category. At UCSF the distinction between ladder rank and adjunct professors is that their relative contribution to scholarly work and teaching is unbalanced. Their primary work should be done as in residence. Adjunct professors can be a PI on a grant whereas this is not the case at some campuses. How senate membership is defined is one question. Faculty in a non Senate title who are performing Academic Senate functions may ask for membership on an individual basis. There is no reason to oppose the task force's first recommendation since membership is defined based on historical precedence. UCAP, as stated in the second recommendation, should look at how titles are used and the consistency across the campuses. This will help identify any faculty who are being disadvantaged and should be Senate members. There is also a funding issue for people who want to come over from Extension titles which requires an FTE. Members noted that the functions that make faculty eligible for Senate membership need to be defined. Disenfranchised people who are neither faculty or staff do not have a voice at most campuses.

UCAP also agrees with the fourth recommendation which indicates that a revision of administrative titles automatically granting Senate membership should be conducted. Individuals who move from faculty to an administrative position should remain Senate members. UCAP agrees with the task force recommendation to retain the historical practice of separating curricular authority for undergraduate/graduate and professional school education.

Action: The committee agreed to draft a letter supporting the recommendations but noting the UCSF's representative's concerns and the issue related to disenfranchised people. The memo will also note that the graduate students have been left out and that there are undergraduate students in professional schools. A distinction should be made regarding health sciences with respect to curricular authority. The chair and analyst will draft the memo.

IV. Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs

CCGA was concerned that the Senate was being bypassed with respect to decisions about self supporting professional degree programs.

Discussion: One issue is that there is no contingency plan for programs that fail and the campus would have to pay any faculty hired for these programs though not from state funds. UC is legally obliged to get the students in through the program so the faculty cannot be let go. The general campus would not receive any of the revenue and the members discussed charging the programs for certain services provided by the campus. The pension would be coming from another source which might be from the general campus. These programs also may not be part of the general campus community. One campus has an online program that is very successful and brings students onto campus as a cohort and has several events on campus during the year. There could be logistical issues related to integrating students who might be taking night courses into the campus so there should be flexibility. Another issue is where surplus funds will go and one campus decided to direct these funds into the PhD program to support graduate students.

Action: The chair and analyst will draft a memo outlining UCAP's position.

V. Faculty Compensation Plan

The work group on the faculty compensation plan has not met yet. The idea of the faculty compensation plan is to allow faculty to add on to their salaries monies that can be built into their grants.

Discussion: Research may focus on areas where research funding is available. Places where the salary is set by the CAP will not allow this to happen. This proposal would also legitimize the off scale component and it would guarantee that the faculty salary scales are permanently broken. If this proposal was implemented, faculty would be ahead of the comparison 8 institutions but this would be on the backs of faculty without grants.

Action: The chair and analyst will draft a memo outlining UCAP's position.

VI. Senate Service in Personnel Reviews

There have been brief discussions in the past about how Senate service is considered in personnel reviews. A question is whether there should be incentives for service.

Discussion: One CAP always comments on service in the personnel review. A member noted that lack of service is noted but does not prevent promotion. It might be that faculty who might serve are not necessarily known by the campus committee on committees. There is a variety of types of service and it is not clear that Academic Senate service is more valuable than other types of service. The point was made that different people should be elected to serve on the campus committee on committees. An expectation of participation in shared governance could be established. CAPs could reward faculty who serve as opposed to punishing those who do not. There should be stronger understanding of and support for faculty who participate in the Senate by providing concrete recognition. Language in the chair's letter could emphasize how much service matters. UCB has a one time service bump up to Professor V that is half a step which also could be given to significant service as department chair. The bump is given only once in the faculty person's career and does not go away. Another campus gives an acceleration for department chair service. It was noted that the service is evaluated and properly recognized by CAPs.

VII. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel*
- *Dan Simmons, Chair, Academic Senate*

Vice Provost Carlson and Chair Simmons presented a report on faculty competitiveness prepared for the Regents. This is item J1 on the agenda for the Committee on Long Range Planning and Compensation. The report includes data on who faculty are including that there has been a significant decline in ladder rank faculty. Total faculty in the health sciences has grown by about 30% and student enrollment in the health sciences has grown about 13%. Clinical faculty have increased by 40% which suggests that the clinical enterprise is growing but the teaching enterprise is not growing although research funding has increased. Student growth has outpaced the growth of professional and equivalent faculty FTE by about 20% which will create significant challenges with respect to maintaining quality. Since 2009 there has been a shift toward older faculty which means that in coming years there will be many retirements. UC faculty are behind the comparison 8 institutions in terms of

total remuneration. There has been a decrease in new appointments both for tenured and non tenured faculty in 2009-2010. Data shows that UC is still struggling with respect to hiring underrepresented minorities although this varies by discipline. Around 350 faculty have separated in the past few years. Overall the report illustrates that UC is not losing critical numbers of faculty yet.

Discussion: Members discussed the decrease in the number of postdoctoral and graduate students deciding not to pursue a faculty position. A lack of available faculty positions and other external factors contribute to the decrease. UCAP suggested how best to end the presentation. There was a discussion about the nature of diversity and efforts campuses make to increase diversity. One member noted that the programs with the most minorities and women are the ones being targeted for cuts.

VII. UCB's Online Academic Personnel System

The UCB representative indicated that there is not a problem with the entire system but only with the component where data on teaching is entered. The system is not ready to be launched this year. The assertions made in the letter are baseless. Funding to address the functionality issue is probably not available.

Discussion: UCLA is developing an online system and ultimately faculty will be responsible for entering their own data. UCSD's roll out has been smooth and UCI is adopting this system. UCSF's system facilitates getting letters. UCD uses a system that uses documents that are scanned in, although this has not been implemented completely across the campus.

IX. Lecturer Potential Security of Employment Series

There is confusion at UCSD about what an Academic Senate lecturer is and is expected to do and what scholarly contributions are expected. A task force is being established to explore this. Former CAP members are paired up with lecturers to share what is expected.

Discussion: To be in the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series at UCSD requires recognition in the field beyond the campus. There is a sense that the distinction between unit 18 lecturers and LSOEs should be maintained. There is confusion about how to count the written scholarship. All campuses but UCSF have some LSOEs though the numbers are limited. At UCSD the numbers of LSOEs are growing. Instead of assistant professor they come to UC as Lecturers with Potential Security of Employment and then become LSOEs. The LSOEs teach large numbers of undergraduate students and there is an expectation of professional achievement but not for research. There is an expectation of outside letters and at the senior lecturer level the expectation is for international outside letters. How different campuses interpret and implement the APM is not clear.

Expectations in the areas of research and service may be lower for the LSOEs although at another campus sometimes LSOEs do more than assistant professors. LSOEs have also been used to manage teaching assistants in language programs. There is no expectation of research for unit 18 lecturers. Every campus CAP but UCSC looks at unit 18 lecturers at the point of the initial continuing appointment. Based on the discussion, UCSD is more restrictive and more demanding than the other campuses. UCM is more frequently considering LSOEs and the cases are reviewed by CAP with a focus on teaching and performance. UCB treats the teaching and service identically. The task force at UCSD should take into consideration what other campuses do with LSOEs.

X. Comparison Eight Institutions

- *Jim Litrownik, Coordinator, Data Management, Academic Advancement*

In the mid 1970s California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) coordinated the development of an annual report on faculty salaries at UC and CSU. The methodology was negotiated and approved by several stakeholders. Four public and four private institutions were identified. Any changes in methodology need to be negotiated and approved by these groups. Several institutions were changed because at the time UC's average salaries were higher than the 8 institutions, so two with higher and two with lower salaries were replaced. The current institutions are: SUNY Buffalo, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, University of Virginia, University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Stanford, Yale, MIT, and Harvard. Differences in the relative size of the institutions are taken into consideration. The UC budget office uses the comp 8 salary figure showing the lag to advocate for increased funding for UC faculty salaries. There were several concerns that led to the total remuneration studies. The 2010-11 evaluation is in progress right now. Based on American Association of

University Professors (AAUP) data, there are other public institutions that are paying more than UC and there is tremendous range across the UC campuses.

Discussion: The data used does not directly take into account the funding source but it is generally state funded faculty. Comp 8 data is collected directly from those institutions. There is no discussion about changing the comparison 8 institutions at this time. The institutions were selected based on their size and diversity of programs. The health sciences are concerned about competitiveness with the private sector and with the public institutions.

IX. Campus Reports/Additional Member Items

UCB: The main issue is the non implementation of the online file system.

UCD: There are several Target of Excellence positions being seen by the CAP and there is sometimes a question of rank and step. CAP has said yes at a lower level than what eventually comes back to the CAP. There is a lot of pressure related to ANR and membership on Senate committees.

UCSC: This campus does not have plans to use an online system. The main issue this fall has been continued requests to the EVC for analysis of faculty salaries in comparison to other campuses. Under consideration is using an extra half step increment to catch up would take ten years to reach that outcome.

UCI: The campus is moving ahead with an online system which is being piloted in 20 departments. It may not be fully online until how outside letters are handled can be resolved. Representation on CAP is being discussed because of new schools such as the public health and law schools. Except for UCSF, all schools at other campuses are not represented on the CAPs.

UCSB: There are increasing numbers of retention cases.

UCSD: There is a range in the degree of file preparation across the departments which makes it difficult to distinguish which faculty are doing well and which are not. Cases can be sent back until the file is right though this punishes the candidate.

UCR: Everything done by the CAP is online. The CAP has been dealing with non re-appointments for non tenure in an early merit case before the mid career review. There are contradictory opinions in the department. These are situations where the CAP concludes that the person could not get up to speed and a full file may be needed for a thorough recommendation. Two CAPs have recommended non re-appointments when the record as submitted is below standards. Another CAP recommended that the faculty switch series.

UCM: One half of the CAP is UCM faculty and the other half is faculty from other campuses. It is not at the point where it can be only UCM faculty. The system is being understood now. A few people are testing the UCI online system. A task force was set up to identify key bottlenecks in the academic personnel process. Last year the CAP was delinquent on some critical cases which could cause problems for junior faculty starting off their careers. Another issue is that there is now movement within the three schools to develop departments, some of which are small. CAP members have been forced to stretch their writing about colleagues outside their area of expertise. More people will go up for tenure this year.

X. New Business

- *Dan Simmons, Chair, Academic Senate*

According to Chair Simmons the campuses will receive information about their budget cuts. The president wants to provide faculty salary increases but these will need to be merit based and not across the board. The president will not agree with having two salary scales. At the moment the president does not think there will be another fee increase but this may change. It will be difficult politically to move forward with the faculty salary increases. Chair Simmons indicates that there will be significant layoffs which probably will not include faculty. The proposal on faculty salaries will not go to the Regents in January.

XIII. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:45
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Ahmet Palazoglu