UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
February 7, 2006 Meeting Minutes

Attending: Tony Norman, Chair (UCR)
Mary Croughan, Vice Chair (UCSF), James Hunt (UCB), Cynthia Brown (UCSB), Daniel Mitchell (UCLA), J. Hampton Atkinson (UCSD), Catherine Morrison Paul (UCD), Charles Ribak (UCI), Margaret Walsh (UCSF), Allen Zych (UCR), Susan Gillman (UCSC), Ellen Switkes (AVP, Academic Advancement), Clifford Brunk (Academic Senate Chair), John Oakley (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Michael LaBriola (Senate Analyst)

I.   Chair's Announcements – *Tony Norman*

The Academic Assembly will consider three major items at its February 8 meeting: Council's nomination of BOARS Chair Michael Brown (UCSB) to serve as 2006-2007 Academic Senate Vice-Chair; a set of four Council-endorsed Compensation Principles; and a Memorial to the Regents proposing the elimination of non-resident tuition for academic graduate students after their first year. If Assembly passes the Memorial, a mail ballot will be circulated to all faculty on the campuses.

II.   Consent Calendar

Action: The committee approved the minutes of December 6, 2005.
Action: The committee approved its letter on child care for submission to Academic Council.

III.   Report from UCOP Consultants– *Ellen Switkes, Assistant VP, Academic Advancement*

President Dynes is preparing to sign a new set of "family friendly" personnel policies related to family accommodation for childbearing and childrearing. The main purpose is to clarify and publicize existing policies to faculty, chairs and deans; extend Active Service Modified Duties benefit for birth mothers; and emphasize that personnel actions delayed because of ASMD or childbearing/childrearing leave should be considered on-time and reviewed without prejudice. However, the research expectations for part time assistant professors will remain the same as for full time assistant professors.

Another set of policies, soon to be sent out for formal review, will provide clearer guidance to faculty and departments about the use of sick leave; outline procedures for the dismissal of faculty who are unable to continue work because of a disability; and provide guidelines for the constructive resignation of faculty who may be making excessive or inappropriate use of leave.

The special open enrollment session for disability insurance yielded a large number of new enrollees from the academic group. Efforts will focus now on convincing young faculty members to take advantage of the opportunity when they join UC.

UCOP is encouraging campuses to increase pre-retirement counseling programs to help aging faculty make informed decisions about retirement planning. There is also more interest in encouraging faculty to retire earlier through incentives like a phased retirement program.

President Dynes is appearing at a special hearing in Sacramento on February 8 to discuss University compensation practices. A follow-up hearing is scheduled for February 22.

The Senate is discussing APM policies concerning the length and recompense for sabbaticals and leaves by administrators with academic appointments, particularly the 2003 policy which allows administrators with accrued sabbatical to take the sabbatical at the administrative rate of pay after returning to a faculty position. UCAP members noted that sabbatical credit from other universities is a faculty recruitment issue only in rare cases.

IV. Formal Review of UCAP's/Council's Proposed Modifications to Systemwide Academic Personnel Polices 220-18-b (4)

UCAP was asked to provide comments about proposed modifications to systemwide academic personnel manual criteria for advancement to Professor VI and to Professor Above-Scale salary levels, which the committee originally submitted to Academic Council in June 2005. The Academic Council-approved version had been sent out by the administration for formal review.

Academic Council concurred with nearly all of the modifications in UCAP's original proposal, with one exception: Council added the words "or teaching" to the text, suggesting that national or international recognition in teaching alone could advance a candidate to Step VI. Council members feared that there had been a subtle change effectively de-emphasizing the importance of teaching, which was problematic from both a political and an academic standpoint. Moreover, part of the thinking was that a textbook could have revolutionary impact on pedagogical innovation, and therefore be counted as "teaching" and enough to advance a candidate.

Members overwhelmingly opposed Council's change. First it was noted that based on current CAP practices as reviewed by all the campus CAP representatives to the 2005/06 UCAP, it was impossible and inaccurate to suggest that a candidate's national or international distinction in teaching alone would be sufficient for advancement to Step VI.

Members considered that instead, there had been a shift in the emphasis on teaching not out of the text but earlier in the paragraph, and taken as a whole, the language proposed by last year's UCAP ramped up teaching. UCAP sought to explicitly recognize the longstanding centrality of teaching to the UC academic mission by strengthening previous Step VI requirements for University teaching, as well as for research and service, from "excellence" to "sustained excellence," indicating that the entire career should be taken into account for these advancements.

The committee decided to submit an enhanced clarification of its reasoning for last year's modifications and against Council's change, along with several additional proposed modifications to the text that they thought would enhance the clarity and grammatical accuracy of APM 220. The clause "involves a career review" was moved later in its sentence to avoid potential confusion with the equity-based "Career Review." In an effort to avoid grammatical and logical inconsistencies, the phrase "with respect to scholarly or creative achievement or teaching" was substituted with the more general term "academic."

Council Chair Brunk agreed that clarity was very important. He said UCAP's comments would be regarded very seriously and closely. After committee comments are received in February, the

divisions will have an opportunity to opine, and after that, a reasonable new revision might appropriately be placed on the consent calendar.

Action: UCAP's new modification and clarified justification will be submitted to Academic Council by February 13. The committee will vet the draft transmittal letter over email.

V.   Comparison of Campus Step VI and A/S Solicitation Language

Members compared the official language their campus CAPs distribute regarding the criteria for advancements to Step VI and to Above Scale, which distinguish them from 'normal' Step IV to Step V or Step VIII to Step IX advancements. They also provided and compared descriptions of their CAP's approach to evaluation of files for Step IX to AS, including how CAP considers International Reputation or other stated or unstated requirements such as membership in the NAS (or comparable) winning a Nobel Prize, etc., and whether they regularly satisfy or require this standard.

A cross-campus database of step VI and Above Scale assessment criteria should be developed to help CAPs compare how other campuses promote faculty in various departments and fields. Some campuses already use cross departmental databases to assess equity within their own campus, and to compare professors who have attained step VI with those up for step VI review. Members thought it would be difficult to quantifiably compare criteria like teaching and publication in a meaningful way, considering the diversity of local campus cultures and academic personnel practices. However, they thought it would be useful to see a list of all Above Scale faculty for each campus to help get a sense of where faculty sit.

VI.   Scholarly Communications Special Committee (SCSC) draft white papers - "Responding to the Challenges Facing Scholarly Communication"

Academic Council established SCSC in 2004 during a period of concern over the unsustainable hyperinflation of academic publication costs, its effect on research and scholarship, and the University's attempt to find economic leverage against publishing giants. UCSF faculty took the lead in this effort, incensed at the skyrocketing costs threatening to bankrupt the UCSF library.

In five white papers, SCSC considered the role and effect of new technologies on scholarly communication, and recommended best practices for publishers and scholarly societies to better support development and dissemination of scholarly work. The committee also made one main recommendation to the Senate—for individual faculty authors to adopt the practice of granting publishers non-exclusive copyright of their research, while retaining copyright for other educational purposes, including placing work in open access online repositories. SCSC suggested faculty could also opt out of this agreement for any specific work.

UCAP did not support the "Proposed Policy on Scholarly Work Copyright Rights." Members noted that the issues described in the white papers were very serious for the University and for the academic personnel process, but the best approach should be for UC, not individual faculty, to bargain with the publishing giants. Most scholars' primary publishing concern is to disseminate their research as widely as possible, not work out contracts. Many of the issues and problems described by SCSC should be taken up at the systemwide level—for instance, by the systemwide Office of Technology Transfer, rather than at the individual faculty level.

3

Members identified a number of other concerns related to academic personnel. The current crisis in scholarly communication hinders the ability of faculty in all fields to publish and have successful career advancement, both in the Sciences, where costs are skyrocketing, and in the Arts and Humanities, where smaller academic publishers are struggling to publish books. However, compulsory restrictions on an individual faculty member's privilege of retaining his or her own copyright, could force faculty to publish in less prestigious journals to avoid copyrights.

Regarding the question of whether the academic personnel process respects electronic publishing, we believe it does. CAP has been and will continue to be open to new forms and formats of publications. These do not hamper the CAP process. CAPs continue to look closely at how we evaluate presses with the rise of small presses and in the new technology and differentiate and evaluate. However, the committee has electronic publication preservation and archiving concerns: ensuring that a faculty member's full publication career remains accessible to CAP and the scholarly community in the midst of evolving technological advances.

Finally, each white paper is interesting and informative and provides a good description outlining the main issues and problems, yet the final "Proposed Policy on Scholarly Work Copyright Rights" does not reflect or address most of these problems.

Action: UCAP will prepare a memo to Council with comments.

VII.   Research Collaborators and the Academic Personnel Process.

In December a UCAP subcommittee formed to consider a proposal from the UCSF Collaborative Research Committee for new APM language that would provide clearer guidance to CAPs in their evaluations of academic personnel candidates who may have made important contributions to research projects as collaborators, but who did not demonstrate "independence" within the project as senior author or principal investigator.

UCSF proposed language acknowledging collaborative efforts in the academic personnel process, and more clearly defining "independence" and how "distinctive or essential" contributions to collaborative research or scholarly activity should be evaluated. UCSF noted that CAPs look for independence in promotion cases, yet it is not well established in the APM. Moreover, CAPs in practice usually assume that the criteria for the promotion of Professional Researchers include non-independent collaborative efforts, but the APM language does not reflect that either. The proposed language also shifts the main responsibility for defining a candidate's "essential research contributions" to a collaborative effort away from the chair, to both the candidate and internal and external reviewers. Finally UCSF recommended changes to Professional Research Series APM 310-4 to agree with current practice and not exclude research collaborators. The criteria for the series require the individual to have the independence of a Professor, which is not how it is used in practice.

Members considered how the model of a performing arts production—where independent creative contributions of the set designer, director, and costume designer are considered essential and independent—could apply to the evaluation of collaborative contributions in other fields.

Members also discussed the Project Scientist series, which does not require appointees to be independent. Project Scientist may be a more appropriate place for collaborators; however it is not available or widely used on all campuses.

Members agreed that UC faculty deserve to have a broader definition of collaboration in the Professor, Project Scientist and Professional Research series in the APM. Faculty should be in the right series based on their job description and therefore get promoted appropriately for what they do. The subcommittee will continue its work, using UCSF's language as a starting point for a systemwide proposal.

Action: Mary Croughan will circulate proposed language modifications for the Professor, Professional Research and Project Scientist series.

V.   Campus Reports

Members spent the last portion of the meeting comparing campus CAP practices and discussing topics of local concern.

On some campuses, CAP culture can change each year depending on the chair. The academic personnel process may also rely on past experience and precedent more than on the text of the APM. On other campuses there is greater consistency from year to year, with processes and decisions more strongly anchored in APM language. Members agreed that it is important for the APM to be as clear as possible so faculty and CAPs have the perception that the process is fair and the rules are unambiguous.

Campus CAPs are considering the meaning of "international acclaim"; "collaboration;" notions of mobility between classifications; diverse productivity requirements for advancements; and issues of self plagiarism. There is a lot of interest in the "shadow" salary scales in use on some campuses, and the effect of market driven inequities on recruitment and retention. At UCSB assistant professors are being hired at higher levels than in the past, leading to earlier tenure reviews, which is problematic for CAPs when the record does not have what is normally considered sufficient experience in teaching for tenure. At UCB, rampant inflation at the rank and step system is being encouraged at all levels, particularly at the time of appointment, which is having a disproportionate impact on young Arts and Humanities faculty.

UCAP meets again in person on May 16

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Tony Norman

Distributions
1. UCSD CAP comment: Proposed Revision to APM 220-18
2. Campus Step VI and Above Scale Solicitation Language
3. UC Academic Research Titles, UCSC