

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

MINUTES OF MEETING

TUESDAY, JANUARY 6, 2009

Attending: Steven Plaxe, Chair (UCSD), Allison Butler, Vice Chair (UCSB), David Lieberman (UCB), Ahmet Palazoglu (UCD), Mary Gilly (UCI), Carol Aneshensel (UCLA), Harry Green (UCR), Maureen Callanan (UCSC), Katja Lindenberg (UCSD), Janet Lockwood (Associate Director, Academic Personnel), James Litrownik (Coordinator, Data Management, Academic Advancement), Patricia Price (Interim Director, Academic Advancement), Mary Croughan (Academic Council Chair), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Announcements – *UCAP Chair Steve Plaxe*

The Chair provided updates from several Academic Council meetings. UCAP recommended a UCSD faculty member for the UC Merced CAP. The search for a permanent provost continues and will likely become a national search, and there are also ongoing chancellor searches. The process of outsourcing UC Retirement Plan benefits administration has slowed down, and contributions into the plan are scheduled to start again. There is ongoing discussion about the Eligibility Reform proposal and whether the grade point average utilized will be 3.0 weighted or 2.8 unweighted. Senate's comments on the Accountability Framework were submitted to UCOP and UCOP discussed the rationale for using public data. Chair Croughan requested letters from committees describing the importance of UCOP consultants to Senate work. UC's budget situation has been discussed at several meetings.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: UCAP approved the minutes with corrections.

III. Differential Fees

UC Berkeley's Vice Chancellor Birgeneau submitted a paper regarding differential fees to The Regents. Formal comment from UCAP has not been requested but differential fees might have implications for academic personnel. The Vice Chancellor's proposal was discussed at the last Council meeting. Members should bring this issue to their CAPs.

Discussion: Currently this paper only represents the position of the UCB Vice Chancellor. President Yudof's opinion about the concept of differential fees is not clear. Differential fees would undermine efforts to bring the campuses back onto one scale. There was a discussion about whether increased fees charged by one campus could be considered system money. As a result of increasing its fees, a campus could offer higher salaries to recruit and retain the best faculty. The committee's concerns include whether this would make it difficult for other campuses to compete with UCB for faculty, how it would impact faculty evaluation criteria, and that the different fees could create the perception that quality varies across the campuses.

IV. Cross Campus Comparison of Off-Scale Amounts and Advancement Rates

UCAP continued to review and discuss the UC Santa Cruz report on faculty salaries.

Discussion: There are questions about the methodology, specifically about the schools included in or excluded from the analysis. It was noted that the argument for raising faculty salaries should focus on equity and morale. The committee discussed appropriate strategies for

addressing off-scale salaries, including whether raising the scales will align the salaries at UCSC with salaries at the rest of the campuses. The salary scales should be adjusted to make UC competitive with other universities. One campus specifically indicates when an off-scale salary is market driven and has given off-scale salaries on a pre-emptive basis when certain criteria are met. The amounts were generally less than a step, and were provided mostly to faculty in departments where salaries were low. At another campus, off-scale salaries are permanent.

V. Faculty Salary Scales

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

A new analysis of data from 1980 to 2007-08 uses data that UC collects and does not identify any individual comparison institutions. The analysis is limited to general campus fields, uses a narrow definition of faculty, and the data is not rank adjusted. It shows that average UC faculty salaries are closer to the public institutions and increasingly lag behind the private institutions.

Discussion: The methodology was discussed. This new analysis addresses some of UCAP's concerns about the data in the Accountability Framework, and there is a question about whether this can replace what is in the Framework. Stratified analyses by rank will eventually be helpful for implementation of the second year of the faculty salary plan. Adjusting for rank will increase the gap between UC and the private institutions. Because of the rank weightings, calculating the mean is complicated. One suggestion is to include a line on the graph that is the combined salaries of the public and private comparison institutions. There are questions about the best way to present the results of the analysis, which institutions should be the comparisons, and how UC should be compared to them. The comparison institutions could be based on where UC faculty obtained their degrees or where they work after leaving UC. UCAP could make a request to change the comparison institutions. It was also noted that this data does not take into account the vast differences across disciplines.

An analysis of resignations of tenured faculty over the past 10 years showed that the resignation rate was 1%. An analysis of approximately 470 faculty who resigned from UC found that they went to over 100 institutions worldwide, with the largest numbers going to Stanford, Columbia, USC, NYU and Harvard. Fifteen percent of those who resigned went to another UC campus, although they did not all go to faculty positions. Centralized data on recruitments is limited to successful recruitments. UCAP would like raw data files without identifiers that will include rank and step at hire and variance across campuses by discipline.

VI. Capital Funding Strategy

The Regents have proposed a strategy for capital funding and UCAP has the opportunity to comment.

Discussion: The proposed funding strategy has implications for academic personnel only in terms of how it will compete with other priorities such as salary scales.

Action: UCAP declined to opine.

VII. Health Sciences Compensation Plan

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

A small working group that includes UCAP's Chair is reviewing the proposed revisions to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP), APM 670 and determining what revisions need to be made. The working group will produce a report for the Vice Provosts of Academic Affairs. The revisions will be drafted and circulated for informal comment in early spring 2009. The working group has developed a list of topics for discussion.

Chair Plaxe asked UCAP to consider which job titles should be included in the HSCP. There are currently nine titles covered by the plan but there are significant differences in terms of the work performed and responsibilities. In addition to the question of whether any of these nine titles should be excluded from this plan, there is a question of whether other titles, such as vice provost and executive vice chancellors, should be included. Another question is what drives eligibility for the HSCP.

Discussion: The main issues are related to compensation, appointment and promotion. A basic plan and a clinical compensation plan were merged sometime in the 1990s. A separate compensation plan for clinical faculty may no longer be needed. An important issue is split appointments where faculty are subject to the rules of two plans and can select the best benefits from the plans. The revision of APM 670 should contain a framework for split appointments. The HSCP is more restrictive than other plans with respect to how outside activities are treated. General campus faculty follow a different set of rules. Vice provosts and executive vice chancellors retain their professorial appointments, are compensated through the Senior Management Group plan, and the Deans policy does not apply to them.

UCAP discussed whether good standing criteria should be included. The issue is that the plan continues to pay the additional compensation to those faculty who have been suspended from practice. The faculty cannot bring in the clinical revenue to cover their high salaries. It has been suggested that criteria be added to allow the dean or department to rescind that portion of the salary under special circumstances. The policy needs to describe the criteria, who will decide if the criteria have been breached, and the appeal process. The process should be separate from the work conducted by the CAPs. The committee agreed that good standing criteria should be included and discussed what could be used. In the past this has been left to the discretion of the department chairs, and decision-making can be subjective and will not be uniform across departments if not coordinated. A standard procedure can be included in the policy which includes an appeal process to protect the faculty member. There was a lengthy discussion about "X," "Y," and "Z" compensation and about the potential for an extra requirement to be placed by the department on clinical faculty when compared to academic faculty.

VIII. Retention of Personnel at the Office of the President

Due to the restructuring at OP, some Senate committees may not have access to the same level of data analysis as in the past. At the last Council meeting, Chair Croughan suggested that the

committees impacted should submit letters expressing concerns to the President. Chair Plaxe circulated a draft of the letter to UCAP for review.

Action: UCAP members will submit any feedback on the letter to Chair Plaxe.

IX. Proposed UC Budget Request for 2009-2010

The proposed budget request is a more realistic assessment of the funding required to operate UC. The request also includes funding for year two of the faculty salary plan.

X. Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Policy APM 240, Deans

Proposed revisions to APM 240 will be formally reviewed later in January.

XI. Campus Reports/Additional Member Items

Irvine: One member asked how campuses evaluate teaching staff in the medical school. UCSD reported using a set of specific forms to collect information and that a project is underway to create a more transparent evaluation of medical school files.

Berkeley: In response to a question from the UCB representative, only a few members indicated that the CAPs are involved in searches for the next appointment cycle.

Santa Cruz: The representative from UCSC wondered how the CAPs handle administrators' files. Merits are denied by one CAP if research is not being conducted. For another CAP it depends on the percent of the administrative appointment. There was also a question about how CAPs handle foreign institution offers in light of fluctuating currencies.

Santa Barbara: The CAP has received cases where there is a request to match the salary of an outside offer that has expired. Members discussed why the offers may have expired and reporting sending these cases back.

Meeting adjourned at 1:50
Minutes taken by Brenda Abrams
Attest: Steve Plaxe