

Director Slocum reported that a [package of policies](#) related to leaves of absence, sick leave, reasonable accommodation, and medical separation are currently under systemwide review. In addition, a Senate-Administration work group is forming to discuss a set of possible changes to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan ([APM 670](#)).

IV. Systemwide Senate Review of Proposed Transitional Leave Policy for the Senior Management Group

UCAP reviewed three proposed policies for members of the Senior Management Group (SMG) with concurrent faculty and administrative titles who want to take a transitional leave after they leave the SMG before returning to a faculty position. SMG titles include chancellors, vice chancellors, vice provosts, and deans.

No UCAP member favored maintaining current policy (“Policy Option 1”) which allows SMG members to accrue up to one year of sabbatical leave paid at the administrative rate after five years of SMG service. The majority of committee members supported Policy Option 3, which would allow SMG members to accrue standard sabbatical leave credit during their service in the SMG, paid at the faculty rate of pay. Members in favor of Option 3 noted that leave for administrators should serve the same purpose as for any faculty member taking a sabbatical. While UC should eliminate as much as possible policy disincentives to good faculty deciding to serve in the SMG, the current policy is more generous than necessary. Current salary incentives intended to bring senior SMG members back to the faculty ranks might be better spent in recruitment and retention efforts or to benefit junior faculty.

A few committee members favored Policy Option 2, however, and the majority also saw valid arguments in favor of Option 2, which would maintain the administrative rate of pay for an SMG leave and increase the service requirement for one full year of transitional leave to ten years. Members in favor of Option 2 noted that it would be more likely than Option 3 to attract faculty members to serve in administrative positions. As administrative salaries continue to outpace faculty salaries, it could also become less likely that faculty will want to return to academic life after several years or more in an SMG position. Option 2 would encourage faculty members who serve in SMG appointments to eventually re-enter the faculty as productive members, because the possibility of maintaining a higher salary in the transition period would give SMG members more time and incentive to reengage at the faculty level.

It was noted that the ability of faculty to rotate in and out of administrative capacities on a temporary basis has been critical to the strength and health of the University of California. Vice Provost Jewell noted that UCOP wants to eliminate policy disincentives to good faculty deciding to serve as deans. He said some long-term senior administrators suffer financially when they return to faculty positions, and added that most of UC’s peer institutions do not provide administrative rates of pay for faculty administrators transitioning back to faculty positions.

Action: UCAP will submit comments to Council by March 14.

V. Implementation of New Faculty Salary Scales

UCOP’s faculty salary scales plan has generated local variations and concerns. Chair Hunt invited members to discuss local implementation issues and plans for moving forward.

Santa Cruz. A small but significant number of UCSC faculty feel the absorption of their off-scales was unfair, and are fighting to have them restored. Some are considering it a P&T issue. CAP is concerned that half step merits will be absorbed by a similar adjustment in year two of the plan. In some cases, CAP is looking at merit history and awarding faculty two steps to address and maintain off-scale differentials. The overall general perception on campus, however, is that the plan has done more good than harm.

Los Angeles. UCLA is implementing UCOP's plan as written. Some off-scale faculty feel unfairly penalized. The UCLA CAP does not wish to review or comment on salary, but sometimes comments on individual cases, usually when the salary seems too low.

Santa Barbara. UCSB is implementing the new salary plan. Complaints about the implementation of the plan have been minimal. In some cases, CAP is accelerating deserving faculty in step rather than awarding off scales, unless the step acceleration is not merited.

San Diego. UCSD is implementing the plan as sent to the campus by UCOP, and complaints about the implementation of the plan have been minimal. CAP awards two kinds of off-scale awards: a "market off-scale" is awarded in a recruitment or retention case when a specific discipline can show that the UC scale lags their market. These off-scales are reviewed every six years and reset. A "bonus off-scale" is awarded when a fraction of a merit or more than a full merit is earned. It is tapered to a quarter step at the next review unless another bonus is earned. In addition, any faculty member may request a Career Equity Review of salary or step one time in the Associate ranks and once in the Full Professor ranks.

Davis. UCD is implementing the plan as written. CAP does not consider salary currently, but it is discussing the possibility, although there are concerns about the added workload.

Irvine: The systemwide market adjustments raise the scales approximately to the level of UCI's "shadow scale" the campus had been using. CAP began considering salary for the first time this year; the committee suggests an additional salary supplement ("merit plus") for deserving candidates, but leaves the specifics to the administration.

Berkeley. The Budget Committee uses a system of 18 half-steps. The Committee feels strongly that merit-based differentials should be preserved and midpoint faculty protected from any negative effects of the market adjustment. Most UCB faculty midway between steps received of an extra half-step acceleration – an "unadjusted off-scale increment" – after the 2.5% market adjustment was applied to total salary.

Merced. The Merced CAP is currently composed of almost all non-Merced UC faculty. CAP does not review salary.

Riverside. Two years ago, the UCR administration announced that all off-scales would be permanent, which has created confusion and prompted CAP to begin considering salary issues. CAP awards a "merit off-scale" for a fraction of a merit or more than a full merit. CAP is allowing faculty between steps to request an out of sequence review on a case-by-case basis.

Vice Provost Jewell noted that UC is at the very beginning of a four-year process to bring the scales back to market, and there is no data yet on how the plan may be easing retention pressures. He said he believes any change to the systemwide scales affects off-scale promises made in offer and retention letters and added that APM policy intends off-scale increments to be temporary and

reduced over time. He said the components of the UCOP adjustments – COLAs, market adjustments to the scales, and merit increases – do not address other retention and salary enhancement efforts on campuses, for which no specific budget source exists. The Regents want details about the additional money each campus has spent beyond the UCOP adjustments. Chair Hunt noted that it is good to expose the real cost of maintaining UC. UCAP agreed that future systemwide salary augmentations should emphasize market adjustments over COLAs.

V. Consideration of Non-Progressing and “Disengaged” Faculty

A concern arose at a Regents meeting that the new salary scales may reward some faculty who are not actively engaged in their research or teaching duties. To estimate the number of potentially “disengaged” faculty, UCAP requested and received data from UCOP on associate and full professors who have remained at the same rank and step for at least six years, excluding faculty at a barrier step and those who held administrative positions during that period. In January, the committee analyst forwarded the UCOP data and a survey form to members over a secure email server. Members were asked to review the individual files from their campuses to discover the individual circumstances in each case causing the lack of advancement. No individual faculty names will go forward to either Council or the Regents.

Campus representatives reported on their preliminary analysis of faculty identified as non-progressing. UCAP members were pleased that the real numbers of disengaged faculty appear to be very small and the academic personnel systems at the individual campus appear to be working. Five year reviews result in an individual’s teaching duties increasing when their research and creative activities are deficient. There was also a suggestion for UCAP to extend the project to examine faculty stuck at Associate and Full Step V to get a more complete picture of disengagement, but the committee decided to limit the review to the original parameters.

Action: UCAP will send a report to Council.

VI. Step X

During a recent Academic Assembly meeting, a member suggested that the Senate consider adding Step X to the salary scales. UCAP considered the issue after reviewing the history of the step system. In the past, increasing the number of steps was one response to deficiencies in the salary scales. UCAP proposed Step IX and X in the mid 1990s. Step IX was added in July 2000.

Some members wanted to recommend Step X; others felt it could make the achievement of Above Scale more difficult. There was a question about whether a cohort of faculty exists for whom Step X is needed because Above Scale is not an option. There was another question about whether there are large numbers of faculty now sitting at Step IX who deserve promotion; and if so, whether those numbers are similar to the accumulation during the reviews of Step VII and VIII. It was noted that Step X may be a step beyond the normal length of a faculty career, although the average length of time at each step may also be compressing. It was suggested that UC add a number of steps to the top of the scale or place all faculty above a certain barrier step on a separate Distinguished Professor scale. It was noted that adding a step could be an expensive proposal and have an effect on UCRP. One member said it would be better to invest the money in the junior faculty ranks.

Committee members also shared practices related to Above Scale. At UCSC, UCSD, and UCI, the increment rate between Step IX and Above Scale is identical to the jump from Step VIII to Step IX. UCSD may also recommend greater than normal increments, and UCI gives salary increases to meritorious Step IX faculty who do not qualify for Above Scale. UCLA does not discuss specific salary, but reviews Above Scale faculty for “Further Above Scale.” UCSB gives 5-7% from Step IX to Above Scale or within Above Scale. UCR gives 5-10% for an Above Scale merit.

Action: Members will bring the issue of Step X to their local committees.

VII. Regents Study Group Report on Diversity

UCAP members reviewed a draft committee response to the Regents Diversity Study Group report and suggested edits and improvements. The committee agreed with most points, although some members felt the suggestion for CAP involvement in the search process for junior level appointments was neither practical, as it would slow down the search process and add work for already burdened CAPs, nor appropriate, as the search and diversity advocacy roles are not in CAP’s normal domain. Other members felt earlier and broader involvement would be useful in helping build a more diverse faculty. The detail in the memo will be removed.

Action: Prepare a final memo for submission to Academic Council.

VIII. Comparison of CAP Practices

1). The Davis CAP representative had requested a comparison of campus practices to determine the relative “harshness” or “generousness” of the CAPs. It was suggested that a comparison of steps, pay, accelerations, and time since hiring for all campuses would help illuminate the issue. The Santa Cruz representative noted that UCSC had gathered data on rank, step, salary, median off-scale, and median age since hire and PhD for every UC campus.

Action: Santa Cruz will forward data for review at next UCAP meeting.

2). UCAP members noted no problems with this practice of granting lateral promotions (e.g., Assistant V to Associate I) and the subsequent first merit action. The APM says the period for consideration of the subsequent merit is two years. Some make tenure after one year at Assistant V, which means that in a two year merit review after a lateral promotion, the last year at Assistant V is also considered for Associate II.

IX. Systemwide Senate Review of Proposed Regulations Governing the Code of Conduct for Health Sciences

UCAP felt the proposal was only marginally relevant to academic personnel. The only series where clinical practice is taken into account is Clinical X.

Action: UCAP will submit a brief endorsement.

X. Campus Reports

Santa Cruz. CAP was surprised to learn that the Office of Human Resources and campus Counsel are not allowing the deans to access CAP’s letters for cases in which the deans do not

have final authority because of privacy concerns. CAP feels it is appropriate for the deans to see CAP's analysis because the dean is a supervisor. Several UCAP members noted that their CAP's analysis is shared with the provost, who in turn shares it with the dean. UCSC has no clear policy about counting compensated administrative service for faculty rank and step. Some campuses not consider SMG service.

San Francisco. The committee is holding its annual joint meeting with the deans and vice chancellors in June.

Los Angeles. CAP is having trouble securing a sufficient number of external letters for some cases. The committee is also discussing departmental practices for voting on Above Scale and how to appropriately implement the diversity modifications to APM 210.

Santa Barbara. CAP is discussing the independence of external letters.

San Diego. CAP is dealing with a very high workload.

Irvine. CAP is seeing an increasing number of cases where there is an appearance of conflict of interest in internal letters written by deans and department chairs who are also co-authors with the candidate. High staff turnover and a poor response rate for student teaching evaluations are problems affecting CAP's work. The response rate for student teaching evaluations has plummeted with the introduction of an electronic-only format. CAP recently reviewed its first two candidates for the new School of Law.

Berkeley. Berkeley is moving to an electronic course evaluation system. There is a proposal to hold grades until the student completes the evaluation. The Budget Committee wants to implement an electronic system to help standardize case preparation.

Merced. UCAP members discussed two issues with the UCM representative. First, a CAP member who questions the scholarship on a case completely outside of his or her field should, in general, defer to CAP colleagues in the field who can make a professional assessment of the research. Also, conducting Web searches to verify or add information to a file runs against APM policy 200-30 because it introduces new information without the candidate's consent.

Riverside. CAP is implementing a new academic personnel e-file system that will be made available to other campuses. So far, the system has frustrated many Riverside faculty. CAP is contesting a change to the Call made by the vice provost to say that Senate members will be members of departments only, because it affects the ability of faculty who are members of MRUs or research institutes to evaluate colleagues.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: James Hunt