

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

MINUTES OF MEETING

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2008

**Attending:** Steven Plaxe, Chair (UCSD), Ahmet Palazoglu (UCD), Maureen Callanan (UCSC), Mary Gilly (UCI), David Lieberman (UCB), Carol Aneshensel (UCLA), Margaret Peggy Walsh (UCSF), Harry Green (UCR), Katja Lindenberg (UCSD), Roland Winston (UCM), David Seibold (UCSB), Janet Lockwood (Associate Director, Academic Personnel), James Litrownik (Coordinator, Data Management, Academic Advancement), Patricia Price (Interim Director, Academic Advancement), Mary Croughan (Academic Council Chair), Harry Powell (Academic Council Vice Chair), Martha Winnacker (Academic Senate Executive Director), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

**I. General Announcements and Updates – UCAP Chair Steven Plaxe**

Chair Plaxe welcomed UCAP members and he noted that the Vice Chair is absent. UCAP's charge and committee procedures were reviewed. UCAP will discuss campus academic personnel issues and submit comments and reports to Senate. Additional issues include faculty salary scales, cross-campus comparisons, support for UC Merced's CAP, and APM revisions.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** UCAP approved the May 13, 1008 minutes and the 2007-2008 annual report.

**Action:** UCAP opted to not opine on the Report from the UC Task Force on Planning for Doctoral and Professional Education.

**III. Consultation with Academic Senate**

Chair Croughan provided an update on issues facing the Senate and UCAP, as well as rules and procedures for the committee. The major issue is the budget deficit which is almost \$150 million. An emergency meeting of the Regents is being scheduled to determine the budget for 2008-09. The budget still includes \$10 million in graduate student support and \$20 million for year 2 of the faculty salary plan. The merits are in the budget but campuses will have to make up the differential aspects.

There will be a November or January vote by the Regents on the eligibility reform proposal. Recommendations include eliminating the SAT II requirement for general admission, lowering the GPA from a weighted 3.0 to unweighted 2.8, and changing eligibility in the local context from 4% to 9% in a high school's graduating class. There is guaranteed admission into a UC campus, although not into the students' campus of choice. The changes will result in more diversification. Students at Merced and Riverside will have higher average GPAs and SAT scores.

APM 220 was approved by the President. This year there will be changes to APM 670, the health sciences compensation plan, which will also be of interest to UCFW. Another issue is off-scale amounts and advancement rates including the issues at UCSC. There will be continued analytic work on faculty salary scales even if the money is not there since other universities will raise salaries at least for inflation. UCAP will also comment on the policy of re-employment of UC retirees, which is a much more restrictive policy. All comments from the review will be incorporated into the new policy by the Regents.

UCAP should provide comments on the sections of the accountability report related to salary. There is a discrepancy in the data that shows that UC faculty are paid more than faculty at comparison institutions, although confidential data suggests otherwise. The salary data from the comparison institutions in the accountability report is not accurate. Jim Litrownik may have ideas about what can be done to get accurate data or other issues. Coordinator Litrownik can provide data on the year by year increases in salary by campus. Academic Personnel at UCOP may look to UCAP for insight and feedback.

Regarding committee procedures, some information will be confidential in nature, such as real comparison institution data on faculty salaries. It is important to communicate with the local CAP and bring issues to UCAP from the campuses. Requests for systemwide reviews are sent to the division chairs and agendas are sent to the division executive directors. Chair Croughan explained the lines of communication. UCAP's Chair has full access to its consultants, and Chair Croughan will help the committee get what it needs. Chair Croughan thanked UCAP members for their service.

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

*Janet Lockwood, Associate Director, Academic Personnel; Jim Litrownik, Coordinator, Data Management, Academic Advancement; and Patricia Price Interim Director, Academic Advancement*

Chair Plaxe described last year's UC Santa Cruz report on salaries across campuses. The data showed that faculty at UCLA & UCB are paid the most, and faculty at UCSC are paid the least. Even if the salary scales are corrected, certain campuses will still lag. Possible reasons for the differences might be due to local CAP practices or initial appointment.

**Discussion:** UCSC's representative shared the Report of the Joint Senate Administrative Faculty Salary Task Force which has recommendations to address the local situation. Members discussed possible reasons for the differences across campuses. The UC accountability report includes a comparison of salaries by campus. A joint effort with UCAF might be needed to deal with this matter.

Coordinator Jim Litrownik suggested adding data on rank and step at hire to the original dataset, and looking at advancement, initial appointments and the variance across campuses and by field, and change over time in rank and step of initial appointment and the variance across campuses and by discipline. For comparisons across campuses, discipline is the best unit to use and the campuses validate that the disciplines are mapped

correctly. It is not possible to separate out market rate versus merit when looking at off-scale amounts, although it is possible to look at the distribution of off-scale salaries between campuses. The data used for the UCSC report is probably from the professorial series faculty dataset (excluding health sciences) that Coordinator Litrownik sends to the academic personnel and IR directors at each campus for cleaning and validation. Jim compiles the campus responses.

Two other files are updates of this data, one with data just prior to the new salary scales in September 2007 and the second with data just prior to the new scales in October 2007. These datasets allow for the comparison prior to and after adjustment and this data was used to develop the report on what happened with year 1 of the salary plan. Coordinator Litrownik can provide data to UCAP without confidential information for review. UCAP can suggest the types of analyses that would be useful. The goal is to explain the gaps across the system and determine how the situation looks if the causes are rectified. Unknown variables might be involved, and there is no performance or quality data. The committee discussed different campus practices that could result in off-scale salaries.

Coordinator Litrownik explained the limitations of the data from the comparison institutions. The AAUP and CPEC data are fundamentally different, and AAUP is available publicly but CPEC data is confidential. For AAUP, UC uses a global definition of faculty and it is unclear what other institutions report. The data collected for CPEC is agreed upon by various entities and is a more controlled and accurate set of data. It is unclear whether UCAP can review the CPEC data.

Even though there is no funding for the faculty salary plan, it is important to continue working on the salary scales in order to know where UC salaries should be. UCAP should receive data on an ongoing basis showing the comparison of UC to the eight institutions in the accountability report. It was noted that the data in the accountability report showing that UC is ahead of comparison public institutions will be seen by the state legislature and it contradicts the data that was the basis for raising salaries through the salary plan. Coordinator Litrownik suggests using CPEC data that compares UC as a whole and aggregated data for the eight comparison institutions. Since the data would not be differentiated by institution, it could be used publicly. The accountability report currently includes only the AAUP data which does not show that UC lags behind the comparison public institutions.

Members agreed to recommend that the analysis in the accountability report should be done differently. Coordinator Litrownik indicated the CPEC data is adjusted to control factors such as the larger size of public institutions and the more extensive use of full professors at UC in comparison to the comparison institutions. There are questions about the methodology used with the AAUP data and how it would be aggregated. It might be possible to aggregate the CPEC data on public institutions to create a public average and aggregate the data on private institutions to create a private average that would be compared to CPEC data on the UC system. UCAP concerns are about the comparability of the data presented and about the choice of the index (for example the AAUP data is not adjusted for the number of people at different ranks). UCAP would like the

accountability report to add another way of evaluating faculty salaries or substitute the currently data used. Members also agreed to recommend increased staffing in the Academic Advancement Data Management unit.

## **V. Faculty Salary Scales**

Year one of the five-year faculty salary plan in 2007-2008 brought UC salaries closer to the comparison institutions and brought more UC faculty on scale. Year 2 of the plan will not be implemented due to the current budget situation, but UCAP should continue to track the salary comparisons. Results from year one indicate that the percentage of off-scale faculty – by UCOP’s definition those receiving at least \$1 more than their published rank and step – decreased from 77% to 58% after implementation. The percentage also fell from 55% to 39% using Berkeley’s definition of “decoupled” off-scale. Approximately 10% of faculty systemwide remain above scale and UC’s market salary lag is projected to drop from 9.6% in 2006-07 to 7.2% for 2007-08.

**Discussion:** Members commented that the number of faculty off-scale decreased in year one and discussed campus practices to keep faculty on scale. It was noted that the market is the most important factor in determining salary. At some campuses, for new hires and retention, the distinction is made between market off-scale that allows faculty to compete in the market and bonus off-scale given for extra productivity. Not all campus CAPs look at salaries when reviewing files.

## **VI. Proposed Revisions to the Academic Personnel Policy**

**Issue:** A set of proposed APM revisions is before the Senate for systemwide review.

**Action:** UCAP reviewed and endorsed without comment APMs 230-17, 230-18 and 279-20. A letter endorsing the changes will be submitted to Academic Council.

**Action:** UCAP decided not to opine on APMs 110-4(10), 360-80-a, 520-4, 710-14-b, 710-14 -1, 710-38, and 710-46, and proposed new APM 765.

## **VII. Health Sciences Compensation Plan**

There are proposed revisions to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (APM 670) that include terminology as well as substantive changes. If a campus has a health sciences school, the CAP will see a significant number of files.

**Discussion:** UCAP members did not know if the proposed revisions to APM 670 had been sent to the local CAPs for review and felt discussion should be postponed until after campus review. It was noted that the revisions primarily address compensation in the categories not seen by the CAPs. Members discussed whether funding for salaries for faculty with joint appointments is clearly separated at all the campuses. There were questions about the relevance of this if a campus does not have the departments impacted or if the CAP does not look at salary. When the proposal comes back to UCAP for comment, the committee will review and discuss item 7 of the proposed changes.

## **VIII. Policy on Re-employment of UC Retirees**

The Chair provided a brief overview of the background of the policy. In addition to the re-hiring of the UC Berkeley police chief, there might be an issue related to how the IRS views the UC retirement plan.

**Discussion:** The committee agreed that the main problem is with the way this policy was instituted, but that the policy is not relevant to UCAP's charge.

**Action:** UCAP will submit a statement indicating its unhappiness with the process by which the policy was instituted.

## **IX. UC Accountability Framework**

The accountability framework was critiqued extensively during the committee's earlier discussion of the cross-campus comparison of off-scale salaries and advancement rates.

**Discussion:** The committee has not reviewed the framework in its entirety. The concerns expressed earlier were reiterated and include concerns about the internal and external salary comparisons and the way data presented. The external salaries do not reflect the current circumstance and more appropriate comparisons should be made. UCAP will recommend reanalysis and the additional staffing to support this additional work on the data. The framework should be reviewed at future UCAP meetings and members should discuss with the local CAPs.

## **X. University Professor**

UCSD has recommended the appointment of the University Professor title to a professor in the Department of Music. UCAP should review the list of proposed members for the ad hoc faculty review committee and recommend additions or deletions to the list.

**Discussion:** The committee reviewed the list of nominees and did not suggest that anyone be removed.

**Action:** A member recommended one faculty member from UC Davis.

## **XI. UC Merced CAP – *Roland Winston***

Professor Roland Winston from UC Merced joined the meeting by telephone to discuss the issues facing the CAP. There are four UCM members and six external members. Representatives are from UCI, UCB, and UCSB. The external members are beneficial in shaping UCM by bringing experience and wisdom from other campuses and helping maintain the quality found in the rest of system. The chair is from UCB. An external economist is needed. The external members are solicited by UCM faculty, the executive CAP director and the COC. The process is going well. There are close to 100 faculty now

and the CAP will see approximately 60 files this year. The committee meets every other week with external members joining by phone. First, second and third readers are assigned to each file although members are encouraged to review all of the files, and everyone votes. CAP forward files to the administrator for CAP affairs who forwards them to the provost. Ad hoc committees are used frequently for various issues.

Professor Winston noted that when cases are sent to CAP too much attention is paid to the amount of grant support. The APM does not include grant support as part of the criteria for promotion or a merit. UCAP members discussed how this is handled at their campuses. There was agreement that lack of a grant should not prohibit promotion. Some campuses view grants as sign of independence, as an indicator of continued productivity, or as a sign of national reputation. When hiring someone into a more senior position in a grant discipline it is important for that person to have been awarded grant recently.

**Action:** The Chair will notify the Senate Chair know that an economist is needed and discuss other concerns about the UCM CAP.

## **XII. Campus Reports/Member Items**

UCI – The CAP has difficulty getting a quorum. There is an issue with the appearance of conflict of interest related to external and internal letter writers. One CAP sends cases back to the departments when there is concern about conflict of interest. Another CAP welcomes letters from collaborators and colleagues and focuses on the quality of journal.

UCSD – Most of the members were on CAP before. There is a continuing issue with titles that are unclear, including lecturers, adjuncts, and professor of practice. The criterion for each title is confusing. The professor of practice title will be instituted in the future only at UCSD for someone hired due to professional experience.

UCD – A memo was sent to the vice provost on cases with missing or tainted searches or search waivers, and the vice provost agreed to address this issue. Another question being discussed is whether faculty are required to include all of their work done during the review period. At one campus all of the work done must be submitted. Members noted that the APM does not require that all work is submitted.

UCLA – The CAP was asked to opine on dean searches and get the curriculum vitae for several candidates. Other campuses do not participate in the process to determine if someone should be appointed. The UCLA CAP has been asked by P&T to participate on particular cases, and UCAP members reported that this is not happening on their campuses. Other campuses never discuss an individual file with a dean.

Minutes taken by Brenda Abrams  
Meeting adjourned at 2:50pm  
Attest: Steven Plaxe