

I. Chair's General Announcements – James Hunt

UCAP Chair James Hunt welcomed UCAP members, reviewed the charge of the committee, and summarized the meeting agenda. UCAP makes recommendations to the Academic Council on a broad range of policy issues affecting academic personnel – including salary scales, appointments and promotions, and related matters. The chair represents UCAP at monthly meetings of the Academic Council and at meetings of the Academic Assembly, which convenes between two and four times per year.

The chair noted that two items were being added to the agenda: the review of a University Professor appointment and discussion of campus Calls.

II. Consent Calendar

1. Draft minutes of May 15, 2007
2. Draft 2006-07 Annual Report

ACTION: UCAP approved the consent calendar.

**III. Consultation with the Office of the President – Vice Provost for Academic Personnel
Nick Jewell, Director of Academic Personnel Jill Slocum, and Assistant Vice Provost
Sheila O'Rourke**

UCAP's Office of the President consultants introduced themselves. Vice Provost for Academic Personnel Nick Jewell is replacing Sheila O'Rourke as a regular committee consultant. He is also Professor of Statistics and Biostatistics at UC Berkeley and a past member of UCAP. Jill Slocum is Director of Health Sciences Compensation and Interim Director of Academic Personnel.

Report: Director Slocum reported that the Regents hired the Mercer Consulting Group in 2006 to analyze existing University policies – particularly in the area of Senior Management Group (SMG) compensation – in an effort to identify unnecessary exceptions and areas of inconsistency between policy and practice. The SMG comprises approximately 300 top leadership positions in the University, including the president and all chancellors, vice chancellors, EVCs, provosts, vice provosts, and deans. SMG policies under review include those related to outside professional activities, professional development and sabbatical leave, hiring incentives, and bonuses. The Policy Review Project is also developing a proposal intended to clarify the boundaries between academics and members of the SMG, some of whom also have academic appointments.

Vice Provost Jewell said that he expects the SMG to be reconfigured so that deans and certain other positions with concurrent faculty titles, including vice provosts, for example, will be removed from the SMG and aligned more closely with policies governing academics. He said review guidelines for these positions, including the appropriate jurisdiction of the Senate, are still being considered, but the plan is to give campuses more flexibility and control. Jill Slocum noted that UCAP may be able to review specific policy recommendations as soon as December.

More recently, the Regents hired the Monitor Group, another outside consulting firm, to review the University's organizational structure, make recommendations for increasing efficiency, and define the appropriate relationship between UCOP, the Regents, and the campuses. Monitor's [report](#) was released in September. Over the summer, Regent Blum also released a [paper](#) outlining his own ideas for making UC more "strategically dynamic," which prompted a [response](#) from Provost Hume. Chair Hunt noted that Regent Blum issued his paper as an individual, not as a statement from the Regents.

In addition, there are a number of APM revisions currently being prepared for systemwide review in 2007-08. Director Slocum said these include provisions in [APM 025](#) clarifying reporting procedures for compensated outside professional activities, and a required five-year evaluation of [APM 670](#), the Health Sciences Compensation Plan. There will also be a formal review of new policies covering sick leave, reasonable accommodation, and medical separation.

IV. Proposed Modifications to APM 220

Vice Provost Jewell reported that Academic Council's proposed modifications to APM 220, articulating the criteria for advancement to Professor Step VI and Above Scale, had been sent to campuses over the summer as part of an informal management consultation. He said the review drew mixed, mostly negative reactions from administrators, who, in part, felt the proposed language weakened the advancement criteria by overemphasizing the role of teaching and service. Some were also confused about the meaning of "career review" and other aspects of the new wording.

UCAP originally proposed modifications to APM 220 in 2005. The committee also worked with Council on revised proposals in 2006 and 2007. UCAP's original intent was to clarify the distinction between the criteria for advancement to Step VI and for Above Scale, and to bring policy into closer alignment with actual practice. UCAP felt that vagueness in the language had led to wide variations in local interpretations of the advancement criteria, which in turn had created significant differences between campuses in faculty advancement rates.

Chair Hunt noted that UCAP's view of the role of teaching in APM 220 differed from Council's. UCAP felt it was not possible for excellent teaching alone to qualify a UC faculty member for advancement to Step VI, but Council disagreed, and their view ultimately prevailed. Council endorsed a final proposal in March 2007, after a systemwide review.

One UCAP member questioned the enormous effort expended on a few words when most CAPs experience no problem interpreting the criteria. Another member noted that there are clearly very different views and practices on the CAPs about how to view research, teaching, and service.

ACTION: UCAP will wait for guidance from Academic Council.

V. University Professor

In December, in accordance with [APM 260](#), UCAP nominated an ad hoc faculty review committee to review an appointment to the University Professor title proposed by a campus. APM 260 also requires the president to consult with UCAP before making a final recommendation to the Regents. UCAP members received confidential copies of the full file as well as the recommendation of the ad hoc committee.

Director Slocum noted that UCAP should submit its decision by October 15 for action at the Regents' November meeting. December 6 is the deadline for the January Regents meeting.

ACTION: UCAP members will review the file after the meeting and a vote will be called over email.

VI. Survey of Campus CAP practices

UCAP members reviewed the Committee's annual comparative survey of divisional CAP practices. Chair Hunt noted that as a systemwide committee, UCAP is sometimes asked to consider how to bring more cross-campus consistency to standards and policies applied by CAPs – for example, the appropriate level of CAP involvement in salary decisions. He said some of the differences in this area may impact UCAP's discussion of the new salary scales.

Chair Hunt asked UCAP members to clarify local practices around several topics: which CAPs meet in summer, which are involved in salary and off-scale decisions, average case turn-around time, and whether CAPs have access to files of previous reviews. There were a few corrections noted, including Merced's report that the UCM CAP is now permitted to comment on salaries and off-scales, although there is no official policy on the matter. UCAP members also requested that the question about "average case turn-around time from department submission to decision" be changed to address only the average time a case sits with CAP. Vice Provost Jewell added that both the administration and CAP have a shared responsibility to respond in a timely way. He said he wants to develop new mechanisms to help campuses track and measure case turn-around time. Finally, some CAPs view access to back files and previous reviews as vitally important to their work, while other CAPs do not have access to older files, or rarely use them.

ACTION: The committee analyst will update and augment the comparative survey with the additional questions and modifications, re-distribute the survey to members, and collect final changes from UCAP members as the year progresses.

VII. Report from the Senate Leadership – *Senate Chair Michael Brown, Vice Chair Mary Croughan and Executive Director Maria Bertero-Barceló*

Report: Michael Brown and Mary Croughan welcomed UCAP members and thanked them for their volunteer service to the Senate. Chair Brown encouraged members to communicate with their divisions about systemwide issues, and in turn, to share local concerns with UCAP. Members can put the "One University, Ten Campuses" theme into practice by forging a systemwide perspective that takes into account local perspectives but also considers what is best for the system as a whole. The Chair and Vice Chair are both ex-officio, non-voting members of systemwide committees and will try to attend UCAP meetings whenever possible.

The search for a new president is underway, and Chair Brown is a member of the Regents' presidential search committee. An Academic Council Advisory Committee is also screening candidate names. (UCAP member Katja Lindenberg is a member). Council feels strongly that UC must preserve the academic character of its senior leadership.

Chair Brown asked UCAP to investigate local campus applications/interpretations of the APM, know as "Calls" at Berkeley, and by various names (e.g. The [Red Binder](#)) on other campuses. These interpretations appear to have the force of policy, but they require no review by UCOP, and there is concern that some provisions could conflict with the APM. What information exists

on procedures, guidelines, and authority for writing and editing the “Calls” or at each campus? Who assembles these documents and ensures they are consistent with the APM? Is there general compliance when changes and updates occur?

Vice Chair Croughan also encouraged UCAP to consider the role of service in merit and promotion criteria. She said the Senate would be seeking UCAP’s advice in a discussion of the possible inclusion of non-Senate faculty into Senate processes.

Chair Brown noted other items of interest to faculty, including a BOARS [proposal](#) to reform freshman eligibility; an upcoming review of UC’s International Education programs; and implementation of a president’s directive that all non-resident tuition funds be made transparent and returned to the campuses earmarked (broadly) for graduate education.

Senate Executive Director Bertero-Barceló added that the goal of the systemwide Senate office is to help the faculty meet their academic and administrative missions. She said the committee analyst provides high-level, professional support to UCAP. UCOP requires Senate travelers to submit expense receipts within 21 days. Committee agendas are confidential, and once approved, minutes are posted to the [Senate website](#).

ACTION: Chair Hunt will ask the Senate to clarify its request regarding the “Call” and distribute that request via email. UCAP members will then research local practices for adding policies and procedures to the Call or equivalent.

VIII. Implementation of new Faculty Salary Scales

UCAP’s 2006 report, *Synopsis of the Present Status of the UC Merit and Promotion System and Principles of and Recommendations for Faculty Salary Compensation*, was instrumental in raising awareness about UC’s broken salary scale system. Shortly after its release, the president convened a Senate-Administration working group, which ultimately recommended a four-year plan to increase the fairness, relevance, and transparency of the published salary scales and to bring the majority of UC faculty back on-scale. The regents approved the first phase of the plan in September, which will involve salary adjustments that may not appear until the December paycheck, but will be retroactive to October 1.

Report: Vice Provost Jewell reported that all general campus faculty are intended to receive a 2.5% range adjustment (COLA). Individual campuses control whether that COLA will apply to the base salary or the total salary, but UCOP is urging that it be applied to total salary. In addition, there will be a market adjustment of approximately 10% to every salary scale between Assistant Professor I and Professor Step V. Faculty will receive the market adjustment if their salary including the 2.5% COLA is calculated to be smaller than the new scale. The increase will vary depending on the faculty member’s current salary. For example, a Professor Step III making the on-scale rate of \$81,800 will move up to \$83,800 with the 2.5% COLA. A different Professor Step III making \$85,000 will move up to \$87,125. After the market adjustment both professors will move up to the new step III base rate of \$89,900. A Professor Step III with an off-scale salary of \$100,000 will receive only the 2.5% COLA and no market adjustment, which may be applied to \$81,800 or \$100,000 depending on individual campus decisions. Approximately 60% of faculty will get something higher than the 2.5% COLA; in addition, approximately 1/3 of the 40% of faculty receiving only the 2.5% COLA will also have seen a merit increase on July 1, 2007. The 2.5% COLA comes from state funds, and the market adjustments represent a 1.6% increase to campus budgets, which UCOP will partially fund to accommodate a shortfall in what

is provided by the State budget. Campuses have the discretion to use part of that 1.6% to provide additional increases to above scale faculty, who represent 9% of faculty systemwide. Adding in 1.78% for the merit program means that approximately 5.9% additional money will be provided for faculty salaries this year.

Jill Slocum added that campus administrators and faculty in the Health Sciences Compensation Plan schools felt it was important to maintain the link to the general campus salary scales. Although only 10-15% of Health Sciences faculty will see an overall salary increase, there is a significant increase to their retirement benefit. The retirement base improves for those Health Sciences faculty whose “X” and “Y” salary components get reconfigured.

Vice Provost Jewell has encouraged campus vice provosts to communicate the details of the salary scale plan and its implementation with local faculty more than for past adjustments, because many faculty still do not understand its complexities. He said UCOP is not mandating specific implementation procedures because the plan will have a different impact on each campus. If they wish, UCAP members can help push for the COLA to be applied to total salary. He said COLAs and market adjustments are planned for the next three years, which is projected to reduce the number of off-scale faculty from 75% to 15%. Protecting the full four-year plan will be a challenge however, because continued funding of the Compact is not assured. The plan restores integrity to the rank and step system, one of UC’s traditional strengths. He said that one goal of the plan is to fix the “staircase” rather than only focusing attention on individual salaries on the “staircase.” The faculty reward system will be more fundamentally sound, which will have a positive effect on the UC family as a whole.

He added that last year’s review of a proposal to eliminate exception language from APM 620 policy governing off-scales and re-define “on-scale” in APM 620 to encompass the entire range between steps drew mixed reaction from the campuses. This issue is still under review.

IX. The Salary Scales and “Disengaged” Faculty

Vice Provost Jewell reported that some chancellors and regents are concerned that the new salary scales may reward some “underperforming” faculty who do not deserve to be rewarded. Although it is not clear that there are more than a handful of individuals on each campus who should be considered in this category, it would be helpful for UCAP to consider the issue so that accurate data can be collected and any new policy developed. He said this is a long-term issue and will not prevent any individuals from getting raises in this phase of the plan, but future salary plans could be threatened unless these questions are satisfactorily addressed. UCAP is the crucial Senate committee in this effort.

Questions to consider include how “disengaged” faculty should be defined, what are the divisional best practices for handling such faculty, and what new mechanisms, if any, are needed – e.g., can faculty be demoted from their step without changing salary? UCAP should give advice to the vice provost about what kind of data is needed to accurately estimate the scale of the issue, and then develop policy options based on that data. One possible starting point is to look at what percent of faculty have not received a merit increase in the past five years.

UCAP members expressed concern that the problem is probably small and not worth a lot of time and resources. They suggested including data about age, and noted that faculty at barrier steps and deans should not be included.

ACTION: UCAP will provide input to UCOP about what data is needed. UCOP will provide the data to UCAP. UCAP members will gather best practices and discuss the issue with their local committees in time for the January meeting.

X. Extramural Funding of Faculty Salaries

Last year, Council asked UCAP and UCPB to review a UC Davis accounting practice involving the re-charge of a portion of faculty salaries to extramural grants. UCAP noted its concern that the administration had developed the policy without faculty consent and provided no written assurance that faculty would be guaranteed their full base salary from 19900 funds if their extramural funding decreased or disappeared. There was also concern that a split appointment could have a negative effect on faculty sabbatical accrual, retirement benefits, and the expectations for advancement. Jill Slocum said practices like the one at Davis are not contrary to policy and in no way impact sabbatical credit, tenure or the guarantee of state funds. There is value in allowing campuses to have this kind of flexibility.

UCAP Vice Chair Plaxe noted that the larger issue facing the University is how to ensure accurate, compliant, transparent, auditable percent effort reporting. UC needs a better web-based reporting system.

ACTION: Jill Slocum will look into the effort reporting requirements for faculty on state funds, and how the Davis practice of splitting ladder and non ladder rank appointments could affect the security of individual faculty researchers.

XI. Campus Reports

Davis. The UCD CAP is concerned about a growing number of search waivers and believes it should be involved in search waiver decisions.

Santa Cruz. CAP is discussing the poor compensation of its members compared to other CAPs, and the fact that Santa Cruz is the only CAP that permits review of its own members. UCSC benefits significantly from the new salary scales because the campus had the largest proportion of on-scale faculty and faculty with small off-scale salaries.

Irvine. The UCI CAP members differ on whether Irvine's CAP should comment on salary. CAP is discussing the need to seek outside expertise to help it make sound judgments about candidates being recruited for the new School of Law at Irvine.

Berkeley. The Budget Committee wants UCAP to discuss possible systemwide changes in the rank and step system for UC law schools, which is out of synch with other disciplines. UCAP members agreed that UCAP should study the issue and consider making a recommendation.

San Diego. Some San Diego faculty are unhappy about CAP's involvement in salary. There is uncertainty about the basis of CAP salary recommendations. UCAP members noted that their CAPs use data from AAUP and other sources to help justify salary recommendations.

Santa Barbara. The UCSB CAP has requested that CAP no longer see mandatory review cases.

San Francisco. The UCSF CAP is discussing advancement differences between and within schools and departments on campus. The committee is also discussing the appropriate criteria for accelerated promotions.

Los Angeles. CAP is discussing reporting protocols for the committee and how substantive the CAP report for 4th year appraisals should be.

Merced. The UCM CAP expects to review a large number of tenure cases within the next two years. CAP seeks advice about how to evaluate these founding faculty, whose research may not have advanced as quickly as another UC campus normally would expect for tenure. Many young Merced faculty are focusing time and energy on building the new campus. UCAP members recommended looking at the trajectory of the research, giving more time to the faculty who need it; and applying sabbatical policy liberally.

XII. Executive Session

UCAP met in executive session to discuss priorities for 2007-08.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: James Hunt