

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

MINUTES OF TELECONFERENCE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 2010

Attending: Alison Butler, Chair (UCSB), Ahmet Palazoglu, Vice Chair (UCD), John Lindow (UCB), Rob Feenstra (UCD), Steven White (UCI), Robert Lehrer (UCLA), Julia Bailey Serres (UCR), Maureen Callanan (UCSC), Katja Lindenberg (UCSD), Patricia Cohen (UCSB), Janet Lockwood (Associate Director, Academic Personnel), Patricia Price (Interim Director, Academic Advancement), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Announcements and Updates

The Council met three times since the last UCAP meeting. UCPB, UCFW and UCAP will be working together on a plan to fix the faculty salary scales. An initial letter drafted by the chair of UCPB was circulated among UCAP members and a working committee with representatives from each of these committees will work on this. The chair and vice chair of the Senate have asked the standing committees to monitor the UC Commission on the Future workgroups and the funding strategies and the size and shape working groups are relevant to UCAP.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved with corrections.

III. Proposed APM Revisions

Revisions have been proposed to APMs 015, 036, 140, 160 and 220. Comments are due by January 15, 2010. The language of the APMs is being brought into line with non-discriminatory language.

Discussion: Members did not have any concerns about the proposed revisions.

Action: The committee will submit a letter indicating that the proposed changes are reasonable.

IV. Management Consultation on APM changes.

APMs 241 and 246 are proposed new policies. There are proposed revisions to APMs 245 and 633 and it is proposed that APMs 242, 630 and 632 are rescinded.

Discussion: According to Interim Executive Director, Pat Price, a work group was formed several years ago to work on formal policies for faculty administrators. There are three types: 100% time with primarily an administrative appointment; those who are less than 100% time with varying degrees of emphasis on the faculty appointment; and department chairs. Existing policies were revised policies and new policies were created for faculty with less than 100% administrative time. The new policies are intended to put a structure in place and to conform with the dean's policy. The policies allow campuses the flexibility to use titles as currently used and have avoided being overly prescriptive. UCAP members feel the policies being considered will not change current practice. The stipend policy needed technical corrections to incorporate titles that have been introduced over the years.

Action: The committee agreed to submit a letter indicating that the changes are reasonable.

V. Faculty Salary Plan

Associate Director Lockwood would like to find out what questions UCAP has about the four year salary plan and the report on year one. The information includes the methodology used to develop the plan.

Discussion: The committee discussed whether merits had an impact on the salary plan. In order to have any meaning, the scales need to be adjusted because so many people are off-scale. Associate Director Lockwood indicated that the goal is to identify the methodologies used in the past that can be used again in the future, and to identify the issues going forward. Given the large actions that have impacted compensation, UCAP should consider how to look at salary scales. UCPB's position seems to be that UC should simply resume the salary plan at year 2. The information in the agenda reflects results achieved after year one of the plan. UCAP would like new data on faculty hires, step and off scale salaries to determine if the scales should be bumped up. Academic Personnel is in the process of collecting data from the comparison 8 institutions which will be available in mid to late February. Academic Personnel also has faculty salary data from October. Academic Personnel will work with Chair Butler and the UCAP analyst to finalize the data to be collected and analyzed.

According to Academic Personnel, there are no discussions about changing the comparison 8 institutions although the question has come up. The absence of a vice provost is one barrier to moving in the direction of changing the comparison 8 in the future. The data now available is historical for the comparison 8 and historical data would not be available if different institutions were used. A member commented that data about the salaries offered to new hires across disciplines could be examined instead of focusing on the comparison 8, and recommended looking at data from the past three years. There is variation among the CAPs in terms of the new hires seen. UCAP requested data from Academic Personnel on ladder rank and equivalent, step and off-scale. This data will enable the CAPs to look at the lower salaries of people who have been at UC for a longer time than new hires who are receiving higher salaries. Members commented that the four year salary plan is no longer useful. It makes more sense to increase the scales instead of attempting to get faculty on scale. The system should be completely reevaluated so that inequities are removed. It was noted that if the four year salary plan is no longer of use another plan is needed. The state provides UC with a pot of money which is given to the campuses, and each campus has its own methodology of maintaining the staffing and the state does not have a line item for each FTE. Someone from the OP Budget Office will be asked to consult with UCAP at the March meeting to explain the budget allocation from the state to UC.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Janet Lockwood, Associate Director, Academic Personnel*
- *Patricia Price, Interim Executive Director, Academic Advancement, Academic Personnel*

Interim Director Price reported that there has been a search for a vice provost for Academic Personnel and a more informative update may be available in March.

VII. Campus Reports

Berkeley: There is an effort to streamline procedures to move cases through the CAP more quickly. Procedures have been proposed such as making the minutes shorter and encouraging the deans and chair to handle the cases according to the schedule.

Davis: In addition to the normal work on CAP, there are discussions about the work load for staff and faculty. Certain cases may receive an expedited process. Multiple senate committees are looking at these issues. This CAP does not give an opinion on off-scale salary amounts but has started looking into this.

The CAP looked at off scale amounts in the past and the campus APM indicates it should be doing this. In the past, CAP looked at these cases but was essentially agreeing with the dean's decision.

Irvine: CAP is implementing on a trial basis a mechanism for systematically providing more input to the administration concerning what the appropriate off-scale increment should be for particular cases. In recent years, CAP has had little input on off-scale salaries, but has often awarded 1 or 2 year off-cycle accelerations. This year, for budget reasons, the administration is strongly discouraging 1 year accelerations.

Los Angeles: This CAP does not consider salaries and decided against looking at salaries after agreeing that the deans of academic personnel are equitable. Last year's backlog of cases has been cleaned up. All members of CAP are at step VI or above which may be a factor in the lack of gender balance on the committee. The campus is in the process of changing the use of Associate IV and V.

Riverside: The CAP is dealing with defining what a normal lateral promotion is versus an acceleration. Some campuses do not use Assistant level step VI while others use it only occasionally. The CAP is discussing when a book actually counts, considering whether a book in contract but not in press counts as part of the package. A member indicated that the CAP would like to see a manuscript sent to outside reviewers as well as a definition of an advanced contract, but the published book is not counted in the next review. It was noted that the time to publication varies across disciplines.

Santa Barbara: The CAP has a deadline of June to finish cases, and there are no retroactive reviews. CAP looks at step and salary and grants both accelerations in time and off scale increases.

Santa Cruz: The CAP is looking at streamlining procedures, including delegation of some cases back to the deans. Deadlines are working, and there is a public website that tracks departments' progress.

San Diego: The CAP is seeing between 30-35 files per week. More files are completely online for some departments. The candidate will be able to see the information only after a decision on the case has been made (similar to the current paper process). In the offline system, the candidate does not see the dean's letter automatically but has to request it.

Meeting adjourned at: 11:55 A.M.
Minutes prepare by Brenda Abrams
Attest: Alison Butler