

Attending: Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair (UCD), Katja Lindenberg, Vice Chair (UCSD), John Lindow (UCB), Kyaw Tha Paw U (UCD), Henry Pontell (UCI), Kathleen Komar (UCLA), Julia Bailey Serres (UCR), Patricia Cohen (UCSB), Dana Takagi (UCSC), Richard Arneson (UCSD), Paul Garcia (UCSF), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel), Larry Pitts (Provost and Executive Vice President), Dan Simmons (Academic Senate Chair), Bob Anderson (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Welcome and Announcements

The Chair thanked the committee members for their work following the last meeting. At a recent Council meeting, the president was more pessimistic about UC's budget situation. If the tax measure is not on the ballot the outcome will not be good. The tax measure may have additional items attached to it that may not be wanted. The president has said there will be no furloughs but there might be layoffs. Fee increases will not occur in the near future unless the tax measure fails. CCGA raised the issue of professional degree programs and there is disagreement between the administration and the Senate about the Senate's concern about fee increases for professional degree programs. UCAP did not opine on the funding streams proposal but other committees raised some of the issues that members had noted. Rebenching needs to be done along with changing the funding streams.

The UCEP Chair has raised the issue of unit 18 lecturers and whether they are mentored and reviewed. The chair is concerned about the lack of mentoring. A task force on faculty salaries has been established and the Chair is a member along with the chairs of UCPB and UCFW. A recommendation from this task force to the president will be submitted in June. The Chair reminded members that the annual survey should be submitted as soon as possible. The CSHE report on Peer Review should be discussed at a UCAP meeting.

Discussion: There are concerns related to the funding streams proposal. One issue is to ensure that graduate student support remains in place. Another issue is how DANR will be funded. The Senate wants to make sure there is a systemwide policy on the enrollment of graduate students. The student faculty ratio will increase quickly since faculty who retire will not be replaced.

Unit 18 lecturers at UCB are reviewed every two years by the deans. In some areas, there is a formal center for professionalizing these lecturers. There is a complete review at the time when they come up for continuation status. The larger units have associate deans charged with reviewing the lecturers. At UCSC there is a divisional review by CAP every two years. UCLA also conducts reviews every two years. There is concern about using lecturers for only a few years instead of creating a way to retain them. These positions are often used for graduate students who are looking for permanent jobs. Lecturers at UCSD teach a large number of students and receive high ratings. After six years they receive security of employment which is reviewed by CAP. UCAP should consider how to improve mentoring as there is an increased use of lecturers in the future. There should be a better orientation for new lecturers. UCSB does not review lecturers at six years. There is a significant variation among the CAPs with respect to whether lecturers are reviewed. UCI does not review lecturers. Even if CAPs do not review these faculty members, the deans will do this. The mentoring issue may be more of a concern. UCAP's response should be in the context of the downsizing of UC.

There was agreement that the CSHE report on peer review is very important for UCAP to discuss. The chair of UCOLASC may be invited to participate in this discussion. Members agreed that CAPs have been conservative in interpreting what constitutes scholarly work, especially when it comes to digital media.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

III. Proposed Revisions to APM policies

The changes to the APM are primarily related to other changes that have previously been made in other policies.

Discussion: Members agreed that the changes were not substantive. There is a change related to visiting appointments that is not clear. Chancellors are given the authority to make the terms of service for consecutive service longer than two years for some of the visiting titles and longer than three years in mathematics. It is not clear why the change applied to mathematics.

Action: The committee had no objections to the changes.

IV. Intercampus Transfers

UCAP was asked by UCFW to discuss the limit to salaries for faculty who transfer to different campuses. UCFW feels this policy is overly restrictive.

Discussion: The faculty must have a competing offer from outside of UC. Members stated that the restriction is not necessarily bad as it prevents campuses from competing with one another. Competing for faculty does not benefit the system as a whole and costs other campuses money that could be spent elsewhere. Career equity reviews could be conducted after the recruitment is completed. Endowed chairs may be an exception to this policy. The guidelines provide sufficient direction in terms of how offers are handled. The committee understands the concerns but agrees with APM 510. The chair will call into UCFW's meeting on Friday. A note to UCFW will be prepared by the Analyst and the Chair to articulate UCAP's interpretation of APM 510.

V. Consideration of a Book in Academic Personnel Reviews

This issue came up during UCAP's last meeting and is related to the CSHE work on Peer Review. One question is at what stage it is considered a publication.

Discussion: The standard in the humanities has always been the book manuscript. It was noted that many series have been shut down. A faculty member had a book accepted but the series was shut down by the press. Junior faculty in the humanities especially will be in danger of not having their books accepted because the series do not exist. UCAP needs to think about this issue. Research is more accessible if it is published online rather than by university presses. There should be a subvention for the publication of books as set up for all junior faculty. Online publications should be considered much more seriously. In terms of when something is a book, a letter from the press that indicates the manuscript has been vetted is acceptable to one campus. At another campus, what is accepted as a book is what will be published. CAPs may not communicate what the norm is to different disciplines and CAPs should be responsive to changes in disciplines.

There was a case at one campus where a digital presentation was not approved by the CAP which insisted that there needed to be a written document. The department did support the digital presentation. The faculty member received a grant to conduct this work which is one form of peer review. The work in whatever form it is should be peer reviewed. Faculty in dance or music are not required to document their work in text. One campus requested that each department provide the CAP with requirements but the response was limited. At the disciplinary level, institutes have developed statements about what is acceptable which might be useful. There will either need to be financial support for publication or support for electronic publication. There could be a board of review that assesses the documents and publishes it online. Subvention for publishing does not resolve the issue for presses that no longer exist. For online publications a peer review structure needs to be in place. Established faculty will need to show junior faculty that it is acceptable to publish in more creative ways. The point was made that publishers have reduced the number of books they publish which unfairly penalizes the faculty. Departments may tell CAPs what the standards are but the CAPs might disagree.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

- Larry Pitts, Provost and Vice President

UC should be a leader in higher education even as things are in flux in a way that is beneficial to the system and community. Research is significantly more important than teaching and service with respect to promotion. There are fewer faculty hires already and undergraduate student enrollment is flat. It is important to now consider what the faculty should look like. There is a new lower baseline in UC's budget and UC will need to adapt to the significant reduction. Not enrolling students eliminates a source of revenue. There may need to be more teaching and this might be achieved with the use of more lecturers. How teaching loads are handled will be an issue.

Provost Pitts remarked that Clinical X faculty, who are not Senate members, provide value which is not always

recognized. There are a small number of LSOEs and one strategy may be to increase their numbers. UC needs ways to reward teaching. UC has a high proportion of tenured or tenure track faculty compared to other institutions. Faculty who are willing to teach more may be needed and they should not be punished for not conducting research. The provost asked UCAP to think about how faculty can be used differently and more wisely.

Discussion: A member remarked that there is more flexibility in the medical sciences as faculty are able to move in and out of different series. Faculty could weigh the work they are doing at different times in their career. This may not be feasible in the general campus. There is already an expectation that lecturers will do more teaching and there is also an expectation that tenured faculty continue their research. Professors who are less productive in their research are unlikely to agree to move into a lecturer position. APMs allow a good deal of flexibility. There are expectations about research ebb and flow during different points in faculty members' careers. The health sciences take advantage of the flexibility in the APM. Off scale funding could be provided to faculty who want to increase their teaching. Step VI is a significant barrier and faculty cannot move past it unless they have major research.

There are some faculty who do very little teaching but are rewarded because of their research. Research generates funding whereas teaching does not. Provost Pitts stated that UC does not receive sufficient indirect costs to cover actual costs and money from the rest of the campus is used to cover the deficit, so it is not the revenue generating source it is believed to be. At some campuses faculty are given accelerations in time primarily for their research but achievements related to their teaching are also recognized. Hiring more LSOEs would mean hiring fewer research faculty. There should be a way for ladder rank faculty to increase their teaching without being punished. The quality and amount of research is going to be diminished. Post tenure there could be increases in teaching appointments as there are in administrative appointments. The committee discussed the consequences for faculty who take administrative appointments. Dedicating more time to teaching in some disciplines will reduce research and make it difficult to increase research in the future. It was noted that the social sciences and humanities subsidize faculty in other disciplines since they teach 40% of undergraduates. Allowing faculty to buy out of teaching has the negative effect of denigrating teaching. The chair summarized that there should be rewards associated with teaching, more use of LSOEs and temporary moves (off-scales) to emphasize teaching.

VII. Executive Session

No minutes taken during Executive Session.

VIII. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel*

There are a couple of groups working on academic personnel issues. One group is one of five subcommittees on campus climate and inclusion on faculty size and diversity. This group wants to ensure UC continues to make progress with respect to diversity. The CAP review process may not be conducive to achieving the desired diversity. The makeup of the CAP committees is being examined. Another issue is whether the APM language in 210 is working or not. The general experience of people in this group is that it is not working. Are there ways to prepare CAPs to understand this work and increase the amount of credit given? A guidebook for CAPs could be developed. Information about how each campus is collecting information on diversity is being gathered.

A second group was convened by UCFW to discuss part time appointments for faculty. An issue for this group is whether part time faculty are treated fairly when reviewed by CAPs. This group is gathering information about best practices and policies to determine if some type of intervention is needed.

Discussion: Members noted that CAPs do recognize activities that contribute to diversity. CAPs could be trained at the beginning of the year to increase awareness of issues related to diversity and underrepresented minorities. A case study could be used to help a CAP learn what options are possible. CAPs need to be reassured that considering diversity is not an added burden. Activity that contributes to diversity is rewarded by a few CAPs. This information should be in the bio-bib to ensure that the candidate reports the activity. Currently the information about diversity activity is not included in every campus bio-bib. CAPs cannot rely on department chairs to remember and report this information. A brief presentation with statistics for CAPs at the beginning of

the year would be valuable. The group working on the diversity issue will likely make recommendations and UCAP will have the opportunity to provide additional feedback.

IX. Campus Reports/Additional Member Items

Davis: There has been one case of non-consultation on an appointment of an endowed chair. The person claimed to already be at the campus. The situation was resolved when the chair talked to the dean.

Santa Cruz: There is an issue with the economics department as 80% of the faculty have received outside offers. There is a concern about losing faculty. Evaluation of the work is difficult due to how complex it is.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:30

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Ahmet Palazoglu