

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

MINUTES OF MEETING

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 2007

Attending: Mary Croughan, Chair (UCSF)

James Hunt, Vice Chair (UCB), Carl Shapiro (UCB), Alladi Venkatesh (UCI), Richard Sutch (UCR), Steven Plaxe (UCSD), Jack Talbott (UCSB), Barry Bowman (UCSC), Paul Micevych (UCLA), Margaret Walsh (UCSF), Sheila O'Rourke (Acting Assistant Vice President), Jill Slocum (Interim Director, Academic Personnel), Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

I. Chair's Announcements – Mary Croughan

In February, Council hosted a joint meeting with the executive vice chancellors to discuss, among other topics, the University Committee on Planning and Budget "Futures Report," which outlines potential long-term funding scenarios and their consequences for the University. Council and the EVCs also discussed the availability of matching funds from UCOP for the construction of on-campus child care facilities.

At its March meeting, Council will discuss the University Committee on Research Policy report on Institutional Review Board operations at UC, and in April and May, Council and Assembly will finalize their discussion of RE-89, a proposal before The Regents to restrict the acceptance of research funding from the tobacco industry.

The University Committee on Faculty Welfare has challenged Mercer Consulting's assessment of UC compensation, which suggested that UC provides better total remuneration than its competitors, despite lower faculty salaries, when UC benefit packages are taken into consideration. Chair Croughan is a member of a Council subcommittee that is drafting a resolution opposing Mercer's recommendations for job slotting and the stratification of the UC system into different tiers of campuses.

Chair Croughan noted that she was elected incoming Academic Council vice chair for 2007-08. She encouraged UCAP members to continue on the committee next year and to consider serving as UCAP vice chair. UCAP Vice Chair Hunt added that he was invited to serve on the UC Merced CAP, which is dominated by UC faculty external to UCM.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The committee approved the draft minutes of December 19, 2006, with minor changes

III. Review of Senate Feedback to UCAP's Salary Scales Report

UCAP reviewed feedback received by Council from Senate systemwide committees and divisions to 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*. Because the feedback revealed little consensus, Council decided to send all comments to the President's Work Group on Faculty Salary Scales to inform its deliberations and recommendations. Chair Croughan, UCFW Chair French, UCPB Chair Newfield, and UCAP consultant Sheila O'Rourke sit on the President's Work Group, which is chaired by Provost Hume. Council also asked Provost Hume to give Council an early consultation on initial drafts of recommendations produced by the Work Group, and the Senate a full review of the final recommendations.

Committees and divisions expressed conflicting views about the extent to which market forces should determine faculty salaries and how much systemwide salary scale uniformity should be preserved. The proposal to partition the faculty into separate salary scale cohorts by discipline was particularly controversial, although there was more general support for partitioning business and economics. Some campuses, including Berkeley, strongly resisted any change that would limit their ability to offer higher salaries or recognize a different set of competing institutions than other campuses.

Chair Croughan noted that UCAP was not being asked to respond formally to Council, but the committee could still influence the Work Group's ultimate proposal. She asked UCAP members for comments that she could relay to the Work Group.

UCAP members noted that the UC step system has been a great benefit to the success and excellence of the University, but it has lost meaning as the scales have become less competitive. In the current system, there is too much incentive for faculty to use outside offers as a strategy to secure raises. Lagging salaries and the widespread use of off-scales promote inversion and contribute to recruitment, retention and morale problems. In addition, the diversion of unallocated FTEs to fund off scale salaries has a negative impact on the student-to-faculty ratio.

It is a practical necessity for individual campuses, units, and disciplines to have the ability to compete in the marketplace if they want to maintain excellence and aspire to greater excellence. Berkeley has a different set of competitors than, for instance, Riverside, and Merced needs the flexibility to offer competitive off-scale salaries to attract professors to a young campus. However, smaller campuses also worry that changing the published salary scales to instate an obvious stratification goes against the spirit of the UC system and will prevent some campuses and units from aspiring to greater excellence. Replacing the current system with either a more stratified or more restrictive system would hurt some campuses more than others. Members also noted that the early ranks have more immediate compensation needs that traverse all campuses and disciplines, while middle ranks (Associate–Full III) are less well compensated.

UCAP members expressed support for:

- Keeping a peer-reviewed scale system that is tied to merit.
- Raising all scales to eliminate the disparities between UC and its Comparison Eight.
- Re-defining “on-scale” to encompass the entire range between steps, recognizing that such a cosmetic fix is only part of the solution.
- Maintaining a single UC salary scale that also respects the autonomy of individual campuses to have continued flexibility to use off-scales for recruitment and retention.
- Modifying the policy language governing off-scales to recognize that off-scale salaries are not temporary exceptions but a legitimate and integral part of normal compensation practices to meet the current competitive environment for recruitment and retention.
- Making upward salary scale adjustment a priority at the assistant, associate, and early full professor levels and instituting a system that fixes and prevents salary inversion between assistant and associate professors.
- Giving faculty on the Health Sciences Compensation Plan who earn most of their salary from non-19900 funds increases to retirement and compensation benefits that result from an adjustment to the scales that are equivalent to state-funded faculty.
- Providing parity allotments for productive faculty who have not advanced as quickly or been able to use outside offers as a tool to accelerate their rank and step.

Action: Chair Croughan will circulate discussion notes to UCAP and then forward them to the Work Group.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President – Sheila O’Rourke and Jill Slocum

Interim Director of Academic Personnel Jill Slocum distributed a list of proposed academic personnel policy reviews being prepared for systemwide review. She said the mostly minor APM changes will be released for review by the end of March.

The Department of Academic Advancement is asking campus administrators to publicize a little known UCRP policy permitting employees who separate from the University for up to two days before a July 1 retirement date to receive an “inactive COLA” of approximately 2%.

Potential changes, mentioned at a previous UCAP meeting, to an APM 600 provision allowing faculty and senior managers with fiscal year appointments to earn an additional 1/11th or 1/12th salary in exchange for one month vacation, are on hold.

Acting Assistant Vice President for Academic Advancement Sheila O’Rourke reported that the Regents’ Study Group that is considering the impact of Proposition 209 on student and faculty diversity and campus climate, is expected to present its final report to The Regents in May. The Work Group team assigned to consider faculty diversity led by UCAAD Chair Basri, is building on the [Report](#) of last year’s President’s Task Force on Faculty Diversity. They are expected to ask the larger Study Group to recommend the institution of an annual Regents report on faculty diversity as well as Regental adoption of the Senate-developed [Statement on Diversity](#).

Mercer Consulting was hired to conduct a comprehensive analysis of all existing University policies, which is known as the Policy Review Project. The goal is to construct a more coherent, understandable and transparent policy framework particularly around compensation policy. Representatives from the Senate and administration are working with Mercer to identify areas in which policy and practice can be made more consistent and where policy exceptions can be eliminated.

V. Implementation of diversity modifications to APM 210

Chair Croughan asked UCAP members to report on the progress of implementing the July 2005 modifications to APM 210 that allow faculty to receive credit for diversity related research, teaching and service activities, and how, if at all, those activities have become a factor for CAPs in personnel actions.

One campus CAP has applied the new diversity language in at least two reviews this year, but has faced some difficulty with implementation, particularly when credit is sought under the service category. In those situations, CAP has used the criteria as a tiebreaker.

Another CAP is actively giving credit under the new criteria for activities related to research, mentoring, outreach and recruitment of underrepresented minorities.

Another CAP is waiting until next year to implement the modifications.

Another CAP is aware of the changes, and some deans do address the issue in their letters to CAP, but it has not been a substantive issue in any cases this year.

Another CAP considers the new language to have relevance under the categories of service or teaching only. CAP depends heavily on the candidate and the department to make the case that CAP should consider the criteria.

Another CAP has applied the new language criteria to teaching, service, and research on an individual basis as a tie breaker or to increase the off-scale amount.

Another CAP applies the new diversity language on an individual basis. CAP does not automatically award extra “points,” but continues to judge the quality of the research, teaching, or service. CAP does not use the criteria as a factor in 4th year appraisals.

Another CAP noted that chairs and deans now more often mention diversity activities in the files and letters they send forward to CAP. In practice, the criteria tend to come up most often in the service or teaching categories when a candidate has been involved in mentoring activities or in committees and campus organizations that work to increase diversity. CAP remains sensitive to the criteria as a potential way faculty can contribute to a career.

VI. UCAP’s Proposed Modifications to APM 220

UCAP members reviewed feedback received by Council from systemwide committees and divisions in response to UCAP’s [proposed modifications](#) to APM 220-18b (4), articulating the criteria for advancement to Professor Step VI and Above Scale. UCAP also reviewed a draft Council recommendation to endorse UCAP’s proposal with additional modifications. Council is sending its final recommendation to Provost Hume, who will initiate a systemwide review.

Chair Croughan noted that Council was not asking UCAP to formally opine on Council’s final draft recommendation; however, she wanted to make sure UCAP felt Council’s changes were consistent with its original proposal. She said considering the amount of feedback, Council’s revision differed only slightly from UCAP’s original.

In general, UCAP members supported the revision and felt the language was a good compromise. There was one concern expressed that the new criteria elevated teaching and service to a level inappropriately close to research, and that great academic distinction in *only* teaching or service would be insufficient to advance a candidate to Step VI. Acting Assistant Vice President O’Rourke noted the importance of having consistent academic personnel policies and practices.

VII. Research Collaborators and the Academic Personnel Process

In February, Chair Croughan established a UCAP subcommittee (Margaret Walsh, Chair, SF; Chris Calvert, D; Mary Croughan, SF; James Hunt, B) to consider the need for new APM language that could provide clearer guidance to CAPs in their evaluations of “independence” and “collaboration” in research and creative work.

Subcommittee Chair Walsh summarized the deliberations of the subcommittee. (**See Subcommittee Minutes, Appendix I**) whose charge was to 1) determine which campuses use the Professional Research Series and/or the Project Scientist series, including the numbers of faculty in each; 2) determine how each campus has evaluated (or given weight to) independent vs. collaborative research; 3) determine if new APM language is needed for some or all of the series with regard to research endeavors; and 4) if new APM language is needed, draft language for review, taking into account the recommendations of the UCSF Chancellor’s Committee.

She reported that the consensus of the subcommittee was to not recommend changes for all series. Some subcommittee members felt the APM language was not a problem, and that their CAPs interpret and evaluate collaborative contributions on a case by case basis with the help of the chair's letter and other internal and external review sources. However, there was support for deleting the word "independent" from the Professional Research Series to make the language consistent with other APM language and current CAP practice. The subcommittee also thought campuses should use their Calls to draw attention to the APM to make sure it gets interpreted correctly based on individual campus needs.

Jill Slocum noted that a proposal to remove the word independence from the APM might raise concerns and objections from vice chancellors and vice provosts, and that she would consult the relevant campus administrators about the idea at a meeting in the near future.

Action: Jill Slocum will contact campus administrators for initial feedback.

VIII. Systemwide Review of The Regents' Proposed RE-89 – Adoption of Policy Restricting University Acceptance of Funding From the Tobacco Industry

The Regents asked the Senate to clarify its position on a proposed policy to ban research funding from tobacco companies. Faculty are divided between those who view the principles of academic freedom and no-strings-attached research funding as the highest concerns and those who are uncomfortable with the unethical and manipulative practices of the tobacco industry.

In addition, Regent Moores sent Chair Oakley a memo on behalf of The Regents, asking a series of questions related to the proposed restriction of tobacco industry funding. Chair Croughan chairs an Academic Council Work Group that is coordinating a response to the Moores memo.

Action: UCAP members decided the issue was ancillary to the committee's charge and declined to submit formal comments.

IX. Service

The APM defines "service" broadly, but some campuses would prefer that the APM place more emphasis on Senate service, partly because it is becoming more difficult to fill Senate committee rosters. The UCLA division chair suggested a change to APM language to include Senate service as an explicit criterion of career reviews. There are others concerns that the system disincentives service activities, particularly administrative service, because CAP does not value it properly when service as a chair or dean slows down scholarly productivity.

Chair Croughan asked members to share how CAPs credit service activities in personnel actions. It was noted that extra credit for administrative service is well grounded in [APM 245](#), which states that department chairs may be awarded accelerations in advancement up to Step V for exceptional service that is combined with sustained scholarly production. It is common for CAPs to grant a department chair or the chair of a major Senate committee an extra half-to-full step advancement to compensate for service contributions, although some CAPs do not grant extra advancement credit to chairs and deans because they consider the extra administrative compensation reward enough. UC Berkeley gives up to one full step advancement once in a career below Professor Step VI for outstanding service contributions.

UCAP members noted that ultimately UC faculty cannot move up the ranks in a research university solely on the basis of excellent service. Some felt it would be inappropriate for UCAP

to suggest that Senate service is superior to other service. It was suggested that if committee membership problems worsen, UCAP could release a statement about the importance of service – reminding faculty and departments that service expectations increase throughout a career; encouraging departments to include more details about the quality of the service in the files they send CAP; encouraging Senate offices to promote APM 245; and preferentially rewarding University service over professional service.

X. Systemwide Review of a UCOP Proposal on the Relationships Between (Pharmaceutical) Vendors and Clinicians

Action: UCAP chose not to opine.

XI. Campus Reports

Santa Cruz. The UCSC representative asked UCAP members to describe how the CAPs that review salaries determine the appropriateness of a given proposal. The Berkeley Budget Committee, which reviews salary proposals very closely, obtains survey data from the Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE), and compares other salaries and off-scales being used in a given department to get a sense of the suitability of a proposed salary. For appointments in some competitive disciplines, the UCSD CAP reviews a detailed analysis of average salaries and then votes to approve an off-scale supplement the department can use if necessary to stay competitive.

Irvine. The UCI CAP is considering the conditions under which a faculty member can be granted a review postponement. The EVC has directed that a negative mid-career review decision should prevent a faculty member from getting a later postponement, while some faculty argue that publications in some disciplines have a different trajectory and delays should be treated more liberally.

San Francisco. The School of Nursing is proposing that CAP follow the UC Berkeley model for post retirement appointments. It would allow UCSF to bring more retirees back to campus but maintain accountability.

San Diego. CAP is spending a lot of time discussing salary actions.

Berkeley. The Budget Committee is discussing the shared governance implications of a proposed multidisciplinary biosciences institute partnership involving BP, UC Berkeley, and the University of Illinois. Some faculty feel that the Senate was not sufficiently consulted during the development of the proposal. Other faculty have political concerns about the agreement itself. The Committee also reviewed a study of salary as a function of years on campus which indicated that the book-based disciplines significantly lagged the Sciences.

Los Angeles. CAP recently approved the ability of deans to approve two-year accelerations within a rank instead of the current one-year. For the first three years, CAP will continue to pull a certain percentage of those cases to review themselves to determine what CAP's decision would have been. CAP is creating a new standing subcommittee to consider clinical compensation cases.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 PM.
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Mary Croughan

Attachment: UCAP Collaborative Research Subcommittee Minutes

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (UCAP)
COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE
MARCH 1, 2007 MEETING MINUTES**

Attending: Margaret Walsh, Chair (SF), Chris Calvert (D), Mary Croughan (SF), James Hunt (B)

Background: In February 2007, UCAP Chair Mary Croughan proposed the establishment of a UCAP subcommittee to consider the need for new APM language that would provide clearer guidance to CAPs in their evaluations of “independence” and “collaboration” in research and creative work. UCAP had discussed the issue several times in 2005 and 2006 after a UCSF Chancellor’s Committee for Collaborative Research Evaluation made recommendations for modifying the APM. Both that committee and UCAP noted that there had been a shift in academia toward more collaborative research. UCSF and other CAPs were sometimes facing difficulty in interpreting and assessing the contributions of an individual on multi-authored publications in a multidisciplinary, collaborative venture, particularly when evaluating his or her independence in research and other creative work.

The UCSF Chancellor’s Committee for Collaborative Research Evaluation noted that the APM does not sufficiently define the requirement for “independence” or provide guidance about how to evaluate collaborative efforts in research and other creative work. In the Research series, however, APM 310-04(a), states that “the Professional Research series is used for appointees who engage in independent research equivalent to that required for the Professor series and not for appointees whose duties are limited to making significant and creative contributions to a research project or to providing technical assistance to a research activity...” Moreover, the Project Scientist series (APM 311-4) is set aside for individuals, including scientists, who do not work independently, but make “significant and creative contributions to a research or creative project.” Apart from references in these two series, there is little reference to independence in the APM, and none in the Professor series (APM 220). Thus, the requirement for independent research and creative work in the appropriate academic series is not well established in the APM. Moreover, there is only one reference to collaboration in APM 210-1-d-(2), which notes that the department chair is responsible for establishing the role of a candidate in a collaborative effort. The UCSF report noted that in the advancement/promotions system it is essential to be able to acknowledge contributions of collaborators who demonstrate unique, essential creative contributions to research and other creative accomplishments. UCSF noted that the concept of “independent contributions to collaborative research” was more complex than provided for in the APM, and that modifying certain APM sections could recognize the shift toward collaboration and give faculty and CAPs clearer guidance about how collaborative contributions should be evaluated in academic personnel reviews.

Discussion: Subcommittee Chair Margaret Walsh (UCSF) convened the subcommittee and reviewed its charge: 1) Determine which campuses use the Professional Research Series and/or the Research Scientist series, including the numbers of faculty in each; 2) Determine how each campus has evaluated (or given weight to) independent vs. collaborative research; 3) determine if new APM language is needed for some or all of the series with regard to research endeavors; and 4) if new APM language is needed, draft language for review, taking into account the recommendations of the UCSF Chancellor’s Committee.

The subcommittee reviewed data provided by the Office of the President detailing the number of individuals in the Professional Research series and Project Scientist series on each campus.

UCAP Chair Croughan noted that any UCAP decision to modify the APM language should take into account the differences between CAP practices and policies on the campuses. She noted that the process of systemwide APM review is often long and difficult.

Subcommittee Chair Walsh noted that at UCSF, collaboration in research is increasing and becoming more essential to the funding and success of projects. Many problems associated with recognition of essential creative contributions in collaborative research and other creative accomplishments centers upon the Professional Research Series (PRS). UCSF occasionally appoints individuals to the PRS who are not Principle Investigators but act more as collaborators who demonstrate unique, essential creative contributions to the research in which they are engaged. The Project Scientist series pay scale is relatively low, and if collaborative members of the PRS who make unique, essential contributions to research were moved to that series, they would not receive a raise for many years. CAP has found it difficult to interpret and apply the current APM language to recognize the essential, unique contributions of these collaborators in merit and promotion actions.

Professors Hunt and Calvert reported that the Berkeley and Davis CAPs do not consider the Professional Research Series APM language to be a problem. CAPs evaluate the contributions of individuals in all series on a case by case basis. The department chair, the internal and external reviewers, and the individual up for review are responsible for including information about independent contributions in the case for advancement. The Berkeley and Davis CAPs place a high value on independent contributions to collaborative projects, and despite the APM language, interpret the Professional Research Series liberally. They consider “significant and creative” contributions from members of the PRS to be “independent” contributions if the case is made. They prefer that the APM language remain as flexible as possible. The current comparison in APM 310-4 between the independence of a Professor and a Professional Researcher is useful.

Subcommittee Chair Walsh noted that some CAPs and faculty prefer having APM guidelines that are as objective as possible, rather than leaving things up to subjective judgments. There is the potential for more fairness and confidence in the system if the merit and promotion criteria are seen as more objective.

The Subcommittee discussed the possibility of recommending changes to the APM language if CAPs view it as inaccurate or out of date. One option is to align the language of the Professional Research series more closely with current practice by opening it up to individuals who provide “essential and creative research contributions.” One means to accomplish this would be to remove the word “independent” from APM 310-4(a) to make it consistent with other series. Another option is to add the concept of “independence” to the other series, or to add both independence and collaboration to all professorial series. Finally, UCAP could recommend that campuses use the Calls to draw attention to the APM to make sure it gets interpreted correctly based on individual campus needs.

Recommendations: The subcommittee decided not to recommend changes for all series. There was some support for deleting “independent” from the Professional Research Series to make the language consistent with other APM language and current CAP practice; although the members from Berkeley and Davis felt their CAP practices would probably not change as a result. The members expressed their hope that such a small change would not require a full Senate review. Chair Walsh will report the deliberations of the subcommittee and propose possible next steps to the full UCAP when it meets on March 14.