

Attending: Harry Green, Chair (UCR), Jeffrey Knapp, Vice Chair, (UCB), W. Martin Usrey (UCD), Alan Terricciano (UCI), Lynn Pulliam (UCSF), Benjamin Hermalin (UCB), David Hovda (UCLA), Michael Pirrung (UCR), Andy Teel (UCSB), Christina Ravelo (UCSC), Myrl Hendershott (UCSD), David Kelley (UCM), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel), Janet Lockwood (Manager-Academic Policy and Compensation, Academic Personnel), Martha Winnacker (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I. Welcome and Announcements

Council discussed faculty workload and the governor's statement that faculty should teach more. BOARS proposed revisions for the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum for the STEM fields which will create a pathway for STEM majors to ensure they are prepared when they come to UC. The administration has recast the executive budget committee and excluded the Senate. Council has requested that the chair, vice chair and the chair of Planning and Budget be added to this committee. UCI faculty voted against implementing the negotiated salary plan but the Irvine provost decided the plan will be implemented in spite of the vote.

The Academic Planning Council discussed MRUs and self supporting programs (SSPs). The SSPs do not receive UC funding. When an existing program converts to a SSP, the campus' funds supporting the program are redirected which creates an issue related to rebenching because the students in SSPs are not included in the rebenching calculation.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

III. APM 210

UCAAD does not agree with one of UCAP's proposed revisions but other suggested changes have been accepted. UCAAD is prepared to send its revisions to Council. UCAP could propose different wording.

Discussion: Vice Chair Knapp proposed changing the last sentence to: "mentoring and advising diverse students or faculty members are also to be encouraged and should be given the same weight in the evaluation of a candidate as any other contributions to mentoring." UCAAD's letter emphasizes recognition and UCAP's revision would eliminate this word entirely. One committee member indicated that mentoring is a part of a faculty member's job and should not be considered in promotions. Giving recognition acknowledges that there are certain types of activities that might have more impact towards the goals of the university. It was noted that members of CAPs make judgments about the quality and impact of someone's activities and there is no guidance in the APM about how this is done. Perhaps there should be a conversation about impact in regards to diversity in order for CAPs to have a clear understanding of what this means and become more comfortable with looking at the contributions to diversity. A member recommended that some guidance be created for CAPs although there will never be a formula that can be applied to determine quality and impact. A member suggested keeping the last sentence but changing it to say "due recognition" but other members indicated that this language is ambiguous and does not align with language earlier in the paragraph. Eight members voted in favor of sending the vice chair's proposed language to UCAAD. The committee voted on the revision "given due recognition" and six members opposed the change and four approved it. UCAP will submit a letter to UCAAD with the change proposed by the vice chair.

Action: The chair and analyst will submit a memo to UCAAD with the proposed revision.

IV. APM 430

UCAP has looked at APM 430 before and this is the final review. Chair Green reviewed the committee's comments from October.

Discussion: The committee had no further comment on the proposed revisions to APM 430.

Action: The chair and analyst will submit a letter indicating that UCAP has no comments on the revisions.

V. APM 600

Chair Green looked at the current revisions and most of UCAP's previous suggestions have been incorporated into the current version. APM 510-16.b has not been modified to address the stipends for administrative positions and deans continue to be separated out. The administration did not remove "negotiated salary plan" from APM 667.

Discussion: Members agreed that UCAP should submit a memo indicating that the committee continues to request that "negotiated salary plan" should not be in APM 667-18 and that APM 510 16 b should be modified as per UCAP's earlier feedback.

Action: The chair will draft a memo about UCAP's feedback.

VI. APM 700

UCAP has previously reviewed APM 700, the policy regarding presumptive resignation.

Discussion: A member described how a faculty member was sick with terminal cancer and did not inform anyone at his campus or respond to emails. It is not clear how the policy handles nine-month appointments where faculty are receiving summer compensation through grants. When the clock starts for faculty with nine month appointments should be clarified and UCAP should submit a memo about this question. A member commented that this policy is in response to faculty who essentially disappear and cannot be contacted. In the case of faculty without departments, there is no department chair to determine if this policy applies. CAPs have to figure out how to respond when the promotion of a faculty member with a split appointment is supported by one department and not supported by the other. When a faculty member does not have a department, who initiates the process is not clear and the policy should provide a general statement about who is responsible.

The proposed revision of APM 700 raised questions for one member about APM 75, the policy regarding termination for incompetent performance. APM 75 refers to finding that a faculty member has been incompetent for several years and what several years means should be defined. Perhaps the policy could state that two consecutive review cycles with no merit approved would trigger an investigation into incompetent performance. The committee agreed to submit to Council a separate memo regarding APM 75. A member mentioned that UCLA is considering to put a five year action plan in place after the first review for each individual that shows deficiencies. If the faculty member disagrees with the plan, the process of termination begins. It is not clear where this would be placed if included in the APM. UCAP might suggest that APM 75 should be reviewed. The committee discussed how a candidate's independence is assessed. Decisions should be based on the demonstration of leadership and independence instead of lack of funding.

Action: The chair and analyst will draft memos about APM 700 and APM 75.

VII. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel*
- *Janet Lockwood, Manager-Academic Policy and Compensation, Academic Personnel*

On April 10th, there will be a third roundtable about the Advance program for administrators focused on mentoring and professional support for faculty. Shirley Malcom from the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) is the keynote speaker and faculty engaged in mentoring at various levels will participate. Panels will discuss mentoring at UCSF and UCLA and there will also be a panel discussion about mid-career mentoring. The information from the roundtable will be available online. Data will be analyzed to find any patterns by gender and by race/ethnicity about why untenured ladder rank faculty leave UC. Part of the plan is to showcase what UC does well and identify what can be done better. UCSF is starting to use an exit interview and UCSC is working on gathering this data, and the vice provost would like to make the data collection a systemwide effort.

The negotiated salary plan is moving ahead with a trial on three campuses. Implementation documents from UCSD and UCLA have been submitted and UCI is working on its plan now. Academic Personnel is reviewing these plans to ensure that they are consistent with the program developed. The provost acknowledged that the metrics did not seem appropriate so work will be done on them. A small group including Dan Hare, chair of UCFW and representatives from each of these campus will be convened to define the metrics which need to be in place by July 1st when the program starts.

UCFW asked Academic Personnel to look at stopping the tenure clock and the primary language is in APM 133. New parents, primarily assistant professors, are encouraged to stop the clock but the APM is silent on other reasons people may need to stop the clock. Explicit language has been added about stopping the clock when a faculty member is sick or has other urgent family obligations. Campuses do give extensions of the tenure clock for these other reasons but they are not stated in policy, and the vice provost agrees that it will help faculty to know under what conditions they can stop the clock.

Discussion: A member suggested that the data analysis should look at faculty at the barrier steps. It was pointed out that in addition to learning why people leave UC, it would be helpful to know why people stay at UC. It would be good to have insight into the decisions younger faculty make. Vice Provost Carlson indicated that it is difficult to get external funding for this data analysis since the outcome is so specific to UC. It was noted that there are no academic reasons to justify stopping the clock. UCAP members agreed that CAPs do not need to know the reason the clock was stopped. Vice Provost Carlson reported that a discussion will be needed about stopping the clock automatically for childbearing or rearing. The option to request modified duties is separate from the stop the clock process. The mechanism for how the request to stop the clock will be automatic needs to be determined. A member recommended that faculty should not have to request stopping the clock by a certain deadline. Some faculty members might be concerned that stopping the clock will be viewed negatively. It was reported that one CAP has only seen stop the clock requests from women, but other CAPs have received requests from men.

An issue for CAPs is how a case is handled when the faculty member has stopped the clock. What stopping the clock really means should be defined. The APM has language stating that a faculty member should not be penalized for having taken a year off. Women who have stopped the clock have told one member that a concern is about what is stated in the letters sent to outside writers. Stopping the clock is a standard used at other universities. It was reported that the UCSF CAP does not see the solicitation letter, so it can be very confusing for the CAP. At other campuses, the solicitation letters are included in the file. It is important for CAPs to see these letters to know what directions were given. Documentation about sick family members may be requested which UCAP members think is reasonable. Currently there is no rationale for stopping the clock after tenure. A question is whether the clock should stop for a faculty member at the associate professor level who has a child. It is problematic to not have a five year review. UCAP will provide comments when Academic Personnel has more details about the policy for stopping the clock.

VIII. AB 609

Assembly Bill 609 will make it mandatory for any publications reporting state-funded research should be

available in open access.

Discussion: It was noted that UC's proposed open access policy will align with the National Institutes of Health's open access policy. However, the writers of AB609 apparently have not been well informed and the bill would create a set of rules that contradict existing policies. A member found that an intern in the assemblyman's office is a UCD student in the plant sciences has worked on this bill, possibly explaining the oversight. The intellectual property of researchers is protected. Executive Director Winnacker reported that Vice Chair Jacob spoke with a staff person from Assemblyman Nestande's office and was advised that input on the bill is being sought. A concern is that open access will restrict where faculty can publish because the state law would require that articles are available after six months, something that publishers may not be willing to do just for research funded by a single state. The costs associated with publishing need to be considered as well. UCAP should focus on asking for consistency across the various policies. The language needs to be clarified: state employee needs to be defined and the specific state agencies should be identified.

The bill does not spell out where the manuscripts will be deposited and it is not clear that a single archive will be selected. There is a lack of understanding about what this bill will entail and UCAP could outline the issues that need to be addressed. It is not clear that the writers of the bill understand how complex publishing is. CAPs should not be asked to track compliance with the open access policy. The scope of AB 609 is limited to original research manuscripts. Compliance has different impacts depending on a person's field. One member would prefer that CAPs not be involved with the compliance issue if UC passes an open access policy. Eventually UCAP may have to fight a battle about monitoring compliance with open access policies. CAPs might have to determine when there is compliance with each of the different open access policies. A member pointed out that there are mandated requirements faculty have to comply with now without oversight from the CAPs.

IX. Salary Equity Surveys

The campuses have provided information about how their plans to address salary equity issues will be instructed. According to Chair Green, most of the campuses have indicated that CAPs will be involved and UCAP will recommend that the local CAP should be involved in developing these plans.

Discussion: Although many of the CAPs do not look at salaries, all CAPs should be concerned about equity. Even if CAPs do not look at salaries, the impact of the step advances should be taken into consideration and CAPs should know about any systematic biases. All CAPs are surely interested in merit equity. The UCB representative looked at data that showed disparities in merit equity across departments. There may be biases related to discipline. President Yudof's statement about the data he would like to see was very general so many campuses have focused on just gender and ethnicity. UCAP should ask for a better definition of what is included in these studies, and one member recommends the definition should be broad. Any pattern of discriminatory rank, step or salary differences would be the broadest definition. Analyzing only rank and step will not reveal whether white men are accelerating faster than others because the comparison would only be between people at the same step, with no measure of the rate that individuals of different gender or ethnicity are passing through those steps.

It was reported that the committee on faculty welfare at UCSC has conducted the analysis for their salary equity surveys. The committee discussed whether CAPs look at the off scale salary. UCSC had a meeting about book based disciplines and the CAP provided guidelines about publishing. The guidelines will help the CAP think about these disciplines by illustrating, for example, that it is possible to get advanced to full professor having articles or a coherent body of work that has the heft of a book. The goal for the study is to identify the patterns of inequality and potential solutions. UCAP will recommend that equity should be the focus, not just salary equity, and there should be a good definition of equity. One recommendation is that a set of the same metrics should be used across the campuses to allow for comparison.

Action: The chair and analyst will draft a memo outlining UCAP's feedback.

X. Working Group on the Changing Teaching and Publication Context in Merit Reviews

Two members of UCAP are asked to participate on this working group which was requested by UCAP last year.

Discussion: UCAP members will talk to their CAPs and ask for volunteers especially from the humanities. The members have questions about the timeline and commitment involved. It would be helpful if the leadership of the workgroup could be identified and provide a paragraph about the expected activity.

XI. Campus Reports and Member Items

Davis: The Davis representative reported that there is a case of an assistant professor who CAP felt was incompetent but it is not clear whether the assistant professor could be released before a tenure review.

Irvine: At Irvine, the CAP is still figuring out the peer review process for the law school. There is an open empty seat on CAP for the law school member but the bylaws have to be approved before someone is appointed. The presentation and content of the files is below par. The law school has attracted very talented people and the CAPs are concerned that people are too low in rank and step. The law school has argued that it has a different culture than the rest of the campus. The content of the files needs to be consistent so the CAP can make a good decision. The CAP will ask the campus Senate to consider this matter.

San Francisco: The CAP is looking at salary inequities which occur because the medical center faculty at this campus are physically spread out.

Santa Barbara: The policy at UCSB has been to match outside offers, with only consideration of the quality of institution from which the offer comes and the representative would like to know how much other CAPs are involved in retentions.

Discussion: At one campus, non-reappointment is used to address the situation described by the Davis representative. Regarding UCSB's question about outside offers, the UCSF CAP requires that the outside offer is in writing and discusses how many years the candidate should be accelerated but the CAP does not look at salary. At UCB, the CAP is inclined to match offers from peer institutions. If the offer is not from a peer institution the CAP will consider a smaller increase. The UCSC CAP makes recommendations on salaries and there is a practice of matching up to 20%.

XII. New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:05 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Harry Green