

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

October 17, 2006 Meeting Minutes

Attending: Mary Croughan, Chair (UCSF)

James Hunt, Vice Chair (UCB), Carl Shapiro (UCB), Christopher Calvert (UCD) Alladi Venkatesh (UCI), Richard Sutch (UCR), Steven Plaxe (UCSD), Ambuj Singh (UCSB), Barry Bowman (UCSC), John Edmond (UCLA), Patrick Fox (UCSF), Jill Slocum (Director, Health Sciences Compensation), Michael Brown (Senate Vice Chair), Maria Bertero-Barcelo (Senate Executive Director), Michael LaBriola (Senate Analyst)

I. Chair's Announcements – Mary Croughan

Chair Croughan welcomed UCAP members and reviewed the charge of the committee. The chair represents UCAP at monthly meetings of the Academic Council and at the Academic Assembly, which convenes between two and four times per year. She encouraged UCAP members to communicate with their local committees and campuses about systemwide issues, and in turn, to report to UCAP about issues facing local committees. As a systemwide committee, UCAP may want to consider ways of bringing more cross-campus equity and consistency to CAP practices.

In September, systemwide Senate committee chairs and vice chairs met at a retreat to identify goals and priorities for 2006-07. Faculty compensation and the broken salary scale system were particular concerns of UCAP last year, and were also noted as major concerns by those present at the retreat. Council will continue to seek guidance from UCAP and other committees this year about these issues and their relationship to faculty recruitment and retention.

Academic Council met the day after the retreat. It discussed a request from the Board of Regents for Senate comment about a proposal to ban research funding from tobacco companies. Council re-affirmed its 2005 [Resolution on Research Funding Sources](#), which stated that such a ban would violate faculty academic freedom. The Assembly met in October to discuss the issue.

Action: The Analyst will forward the CAP practices survey for members to review and update.

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate vice chair

Vice Chair Michael Brown joined the meeting and thanked members for their volunteer service to the Academic Senate. He noted that The Regents have delegated authority for curriculum, courses and degrees to the faculty, and that UCAP is a vital piece of the shared governance structure. UCAP members should represent their campus and divisional viewpoints, but they are also expected, as systemwide committee members, to foster a systemwide perspective and make decisions that work well for the University as a whole.

The Senate chair and vice chair are ex-officio, non-voting members of all systemwide committees (except UCR&J), and serve as Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents. Vice Chair Brown noted that shared governance is a dynamic process. He said he and Chair Oakley want to understand faculty views and effectively and accurately convey those views to the Council, the administration and The Regents. The University faces many challenges in 2006-07, which makes it more important than ever for the faculty to participate in shared governance and help advance the academic mission of the University.

The vice chair thanked UCAP for their efforts last year in developing a set of recommendations for reforming the salary scale system. He said one of the traditional strengths of UC has been the role the faculty play in a peer review process that is based on merit and tied to a coherent salary scale system.

A Regents Task Force is forming to assess the interim senior management compensation “slotting” plan, which the Senate opposes because it appears to stratify UC campuses. The Senate chair and vice chair are committed to a One-University model, in which all ten UC campuses are treated equitably and allowed to aspire to equal levels of excellence.

The Assembly did not approve a formal recommendation about tobacco funding, but it passed a statement supporting academic freedom and noting that tobacco companies had historically suppressed academic freedom by manipulating researchers and research results.

Finally, Vice Chair Brown encouraged the committee to engage in regular executive sessions, which are an opportunity for faculty to meet without consultants present.

III. Consultation with the Senate Executive Director – *Maria Bertero-Barcelo*

Senate Executive Director Maria Bertero-Barceló reported that the mission of the Senate office and staff is to help the Senate fulfill its academic and administrative charges. The Committee Analyst provides professional support and is available to prepare agendas, to draft memos, reports, and minutes; to share institutional knowledge; and to help ensure proper protocol. The Senate has limited resources, but is considering the possibility of providing higher level analytical support so committees do not have to depend on UCOP for data analysis.

Once approved, UCAP minutes are posted on the Senate website, but other Senate documents and reports can be posted only with Council’s approval. [The Senate Source](#) is the newsletter of the systemwide Senate, produced by staff and distributed electronically to all UC faculty. UCAP members are encouraged to propose ideas for articles of interest the general faculty.

A new UCOP policy requires Senate travelers to submit expense receipts within 21 days. All UC employees, including faculty, soon will be required to complete an Ethics Training course online.

The executive director recommended that UCAP submit review documents to Council by the end of April to ensure that reviews are completed in 2006-07. She said shared governance is key to the excellence of the University, and encouraged UCAP members to recruit more faculty to Senate committee service. The online manual, [Guidelines for Systemwide Senate Committees](#) answers in more detail many additional questions about Senate service. UCAP members were encouraged to read the Guidelines.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President – *Jill Slocum*

Jill Slocum is Director of Health Sciences Compensation and Interim Academic Personnel Director in the Department of Academic Advancement. She reported that two former UCAP consultants have left the committee: Ellen Switkes has retired, and Myron Okada has moved to a new position within UCOP. Director Slocum, who is also a consultant on the University Committee on Faculty Welfare, and Acting Assistant Vice President for Academic Advancement

Sheila O'Rourke are UCAP's new consultants and will attend meetings regularly. The Department will continue to support UCAP to the best of its ability.

In September 2005, Mercer Consulting released a study of UC compensation, which suggested that although UC faculty salaries lagged the "Comparison Eight," UC was superior in total remuneration. Director Slocum stated that UCFW is concerned that the salary and COLA increases being promised to faculty are not guaranteed and will not adequately balance a planned and certain erosion of UC benefits, which will have a negative effect on total remuneration. UCFW believes cash compensation must simultaneously accompany each such erosion of benefits.

Director Slocum reported that the Department of Academic Advancement is preparing a document clarifying the procedure for reviews initiated by the administration. The process can include an initial management consultation before the systemwide review phase involving the Academic Senate and other constituencies.

The Department is planning several policy initiatives for 2006-07. These include changes to personnel policies covering outside activities and leaves for certain campus academic administrators who are within the Senior Management Group, and a new consensual relationship policy covering all University employees. The Department is also evaluating policy revisions covering sick leave, reasonable accommodation medical separation, and presumptive resignation, after the Senate raised several objections during last year's systemwide review. In addition, The Regents are reviewing two little-known policy provisions. One allows faculty and senior managers with fiscal year appointments to earn up to an additional 1/11th or 1/12th salary for the purpose of additional research in exchange for up to one month vacation. The second permits employees who separate from the University up to two days before July 1 retirement dates to be eligible to receive the UCRP inactive COLA of approximately 2%.

After extensive input from the Senate and others, UC passed a set of "family friendly" policy revisions related to family accommodation for childbearing and child rearing. One UCAP member noted, however, that there is still some confusion in CAP and at the campus level about how to interpret and implement the policy for tenure postponement/clock stopping for parental responsibility.

Action: The Analyst will forward the Mercer report to UCAP.

V. Consent Calendar

Action: The committee approved the minutes of May 16, 2006 and June 6, 2006.

Proposed Bylaw 16 – Executive Director. Bylaw 16 makes the Executive Director a non-Senate officer of the Academic Senate. The bylaw clarifies the reporting lines for personnel actions internal to the systemwide Senate.

Action: UCAP endorsed Bylaw 16. In its memo, the committee will also ask Council to recommend and encourage individual campuses to establish similar bylaws.

VI. Research Collaborators and the Academic Personnel Process.

UCAP discussed difficulties faced by campus Committees on Academic Personnel in interpreting “independence” and “collaboration” in research, how to reward those contributions appropriately in academic personnel reviews, and how to fix APM language to reflect the current thinking and actual review criteria.

Collaboration refers to efforts by individual researchers who make important contributions to a project, but who do not demonstrate “independence” as principal investigator or senior author. Collaboration and multidisciplinary research is becoming more common in academia. It can be conceived of as a theatrical production, which requires independent creative contributions—acting, lighting, sound, set design—all essential elements of the play as a whole. CAPs assume that independent creative contributions are required for promotion, but the requirement and definition are not well established in the APM.

CAPs do not consistently apply criteria for the Professional Research and Project Scientist series, and some campuses do not offer both series. The Professional Research Series (APM 310-4) requires individuals to demonstrate independence equivalent to a tenure-track Professor, but current CAP practice is to include non-independent collaborative efforts in promotional considerations. The Project Scientist series does not require independence, but it is not used on all campuses

Last year, UCAP decided to more clearly define “independence” and “collaboration,” and to recommend APM changes that would give faculty and CAPs clearer guidance about how collaborative contributions are evaluated. Chair Croughan noted that this could mean either eliminating the requirement for independence from the Professional Research Series, or keeping it and adding it to other series. UCAP will also recommend that letters from the chair and from external and internal reviewers should address independence. UCAP will continue to work on these definitions and revised APM language during the coming year.

VII. Proposed Modifications to Systemwide APM Polices 220-18-b (4)

For the second time in two years, Academic Council has released UCAP’s [proposed amendments](#) to APM 220-18b (4) for systemwide review. UCAP intended to make the Step VI and Above Scale advancement criteria more distinct, more consistent across campuses, and more reflective of actual practice.

UCAP first submitted a proposal to Council in June 2005. In March 2006, after the formal review stage and strong objections from UCAP about Council’s changes, the matter was referred back to UCAP. UCAP submitted a new version to Council in June 2006.

One major issue has been how to depict teaching in the advancement criteria. Council was concerned that UCAP’s modifications de-emphasized the importance of teaching, although UCAP felt its language ramped up teaching by strengthening previous Step VI requirements for teaching, research, and service, from “excellence” to “sustained excellence.” UCAP also disagreed with Council’s view that it would be possible for a candidate’s national or international distinction in teaching alone to be sufficient criterion for advancement to Step VI. UCAP Chair Croughan noted that UCAP’s view has been that Step VI should continue to be treated as a barrier step and a career review, not a regular step review.

One member commented that the current APM language comparing post-Step VI reviews to the Step VI review is illogical because CAPs do not consider the entire career in those later reviews; moreover, some campuses delegate the Step VII, VIII, and IX reviews to the dean. Another member noted that the language should address requirements for outside letters. Chair Croughan encouraged UCAP members to submit comments through their CAPs to their divisions. When final comments on the revised policies are received by UCAP in January, UCAP will incorporate all concerns into our final revisions.

VIII. UCAP Report on Salary Scales

In July, Council released UCAP's Report, [*Synopsis of the Present Status of the UC Merit and Promotion System and Principles of and Policy Recommendations for UC Faculty Compensation*](#) for systemwide Senate review. The report recommends the formation of a Senate-Administration working group to consider solutions to the crisis in faculty compensation and the lack of coherence and consistency in the UC salary scale system. Chair Croughan also raised the possibility of a second working group to examine issues of faculty recruitment, retention, and morale as they relate to compensation and to other issues.

UCAP members reiterated their concern that the salary scale system is broken. One of UC's strengths has been its transparent system, but 63% of faculty now receive an off-scale salary that has little relation to published salary scales. Moreover, shared governance is suffering from administrative control of off-scales; the faculty have lost their traditional ability to manage compensation through the process of peer review. UC needs at least \$100 million to bring faculty salaries up to market levels, and although this is unlikely, the salary scales can still be re-structured. It was unclear to members why SUNY Buffalo, rather than the multi-campus SUNY system for example, is considered a "Comparison Eight" institution.

UCAP believes the Senate should appoint the task force/working group so it is ready to begin work in January, when the formal review of UCAP's report ends.

Action: The Analyst will invite UCFW Chair Susan French to join UCAP on the phone at the next meeting to discuss how UCFW and UCAP could work together.

IX. Recruitment, Retention, and Morale

UCAP members discussed recruitment, retention, and morale problems facing the University. With UC salaries lagging behind the market, the University is struggling to recruit quality faculty, and is losing more of its young faculty to other institutions. To compete, departments are using off-scale supplements to attract and retain faculty, which has widened inequities. Junior faculty in certain disciplines sometimes arrive at UC with higher salaries than associate and even full professors. And senior faculty feel they must pursue outside offers to get off-scale increases.

Retention is a good investment. UCSF estimates that each lost faculty member costs a minimum of \$300,000 to replace when productivity and recruitment costs are factored in. Schools require a balance of youth and experience, but there are now some schools with 80% full professor faculty.

Salary lag and inversion creates obvious morale problems, but do UC faculty otherwise feel valued? A UCSF survey indicated that faculty do not feel they have access to enough mentorship opportunities—in such areas as teaching, grant writing, and service.

UCAP thought it would be useful for a task force to look more closely at recruitment, retention and morale, although there were concerns that it could be difficult to establish clear boundaries between such a task force and another looking at salary scale and compensation issues.

IX. UCEP/CCGA Report on the Role of Graduate Students in Instruction

UCAP reviewed a joint UCEP/CCGA [report](#) on the role of graduate students in undergraduate instruction. The report proposes the expansion of faculty oversight over graduate student instruction and the institution of two new standard systemwide non-faculty titles for all graduate student instructors.

UCAP discussed the scope of academic freedom for graduate students who are also instructors. Former University Committee on Academic Freedom chair Pat Fox was present at this UCAP meeting as a campus representative from UCSF. He noted that the concept of academic freedom does not apply to students in the same way as faculty members with instructional titles who undergo peer review. Academic freedom rights adhere to students through their faculty supervisor. Since the report proposes all graduate student instruction must come under the purview of a faculty member, UCAP felt it was consistent with the understanding of the academic freedom rights of the professoriate.

Members thought the changes proposed in the report were positive. Graduate students should not have instructional authority over courses without faculty supervision. The proposal strengthens quality control mechanisms for Senate oversight and creates more systemwide consistency and transparency for policies and practices governing graduate student instructors. In addition, it is important for graduate student instructors, as future faculty members, to have appropriate supervision and mentorship opportunities as they gain experience and training in the classroom.

One member noted that student instructors are frequently used in place of regular faculty, because campuses do not have the resources to hire an adequate number of faculty. This is another effect of insufficient state funding and more evidence that the UC compensation system is broken. To some extent then, the proposal addresses micro-level effects, while the macro-level causes continue. Finally, there were also some concerns that Senate committees would not have enough time to approve the instructors.

Action: UCAP will submit comments to Council.

X. University Service

UCAP discussed how service is viewed in academic personnel reviews and in the larger faculty culture. CAPs often review files with very limited University service, and in some instances, a CAP decision to reject a promotion based on limited service is overturned.

UCAP Chair Croughan asked the committee to consider adding a consideration of University service to its 2006-07 agenda; in particular, how to appropriately define, value, and reward

service. The committee also reviewed a set of draft Campus Service Guidelines developed by Berkeley's Budget committee.

UCAP began by outlining a number of questions. There is a perception that CAPs do not value service very highly. How do CAPs evaluate service and should expectations for service be higher? Can exceptional achievements in service ever replace teaching or research?

Are there appropriate incentives for faculty service, either through administration or committee work, and are there disincentives? How do CAPs get the information to evaluate service and how can service activities be better documented and rewarded? Should administrative roles be considered service? Should all CAPs evaluate the service aspects of a dean or department chair?

UCAP will take up these questions at a later meeting.

XI. Member Reports

For the benefit of consistency and knowledge, Chair Croughan encouraged all UCAP members to make a two year commitment to the committee.

San Francisco. The UCSF CAP is concerned that its recommendations in five-year stewardship reviews of deans, chairs, or unit heads have a minimal effect on the ultimate outcome of the review. CAP is considering adding an interim mid-course review.

Berkeley. The School of Law uses the title "acting professor" for assistant or associate professor, which makes it difficult for CAP to evaluate candidates within the larger rank and step system.

Santa Barbara. CAP is considering evaluative criteria for Above Scale faculty, who receive a 5-7% increase after four years at A/S, which is lower than the normal rate at lower steps.

Santa Cruz. CAP wants to understand why UCSC is ranked #10 in average salary among UC campuses and whether they can emulate strategies used at Irvine, San Diego and Berkeley to address salary lag with equity supplements or tenure bonuses. CAP is also considering ways to reduce paper in the academic personnel process.

Irvine. CAP has been discussing the requirements for external letters; the use of technology to modernize personnel reviews; and how to evaluate diversity efforts.

Los Angeles. UCLA is considering how CAP members can share the workload more equally, since the UCLA CAP also reviews medical school faculty. CAP wants better guidance about how to evaluate the role/commitment by funding for named Investigators, Co-Principal Investigators and the Principal Investigator on grants that are typical R01s, but especially for multi-component program projects and high funding awards in the multi-million dollar scale. One typical criterion is percent effort but there are several ways to define this. Another issue relates to how to interpret the contribution of a particular individual (not placed as first or senior author) on multi-authored publications that contain several distinguished faculty co-authors in a multidisciplinary venture, particularly when assessing the "independence"/contribution of the particular individual.

Davis. The UCD CAP has reduced the number of ad hoc committees, which used to be appointed for every promotion at Davis, and they want to reduce the time spent on individual cases. CAP is converting to an electronic file review system.

San Diego. CAP is seeking ways to define “disengaged” faculty, perhaps in terms of consecutive no-change merits, and how to re-engage them. They are examining the use of Above Scale for non-ladder rank series, and the use of the “Distinguished” title. Finally, CAP is discussing evaluative criteria for publications in non-traditional media and diversity contributions.

XII. Other Items

Teaching Evaluations: UCAP discussed the need to make teaching evaluations more consistent across campuses and even within campuses, and to communicate to students more clearly about the purpose of evaluations. Other questions include: Can evaluations be designed to take into account a more holistic view of teaching and mentoring? Are evaluations affecting the way courses are taught?

XIII. 2006-07 Priorities

The committee met in executive session to set priorities for the coming year.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Mary Croughan