UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
MINUTES OF MEETING
THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 2012

Attending: Katja Lindenberg, Chair (UCSD), Harry Green, Vice Chair (UCR), Kyaw Tha Paw U (UCD), Alan Terricciano (UCI), Jeffrey Knapp (UCB) (telephone), David Hovda (UCLA), Michael Pirrung (UCR), Dana Takagi (UCSC), Clinton Winant (UCSD), Jan Wallander (UCM) (telephone), Benjamin Hermalin (UCB), Meg Conkey (Chair, UCAAD), Chris Kelty (Chair, UCOLASC), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel), Janet Lockwood (Manager-Academic Policy and Compensation, Academic Personnel), Bob Anderson (Academic Senate Chair), Bob Powell (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Announcements and Discussion

Chair Lindenberg welcomed UCAP members to the meeting.

The UCLA representative was asked to explain a rumor that a firm was hired to find a way to evaluate scholarship and replace the CAP. The UCLA representative had researched the issue and learned that no such firm has been hired. The rumor is entirely false.

Three task forces have been mentioned frequently during Academic Council: the Task Force on Rebenching, the Task Force on Principles, Process and Assessment of UC Systemwide Research Investments, and the Task Force on the Negotiated Salary Plan. APM 668 concerning a negotiated salary plan for general campuses was not approved following systemwide review, and Provost Pitts introduced a pilot of the plan for implementation on a subset of the campuses which was seen by the Senate as a run around. In response to objections articulated by Chair Anderson and Vice Chair Powell, President Yudof halted Provost Pitt's pilot plan. Instead, a working group consisting of faculty and administrators is looking at how to proceed. UCAP Vice-Chair Green has been appointed to represent UCAP on the working group.

According to Vice Chair Powell, the Rebenching Task Force had its last meeting yesterday. The recommendation is to implement Rebenching over six years and to bring all faculty salaries up to the level of UCLA faculty. UCM and UCSF are being treated separately because this is not a budget model that works for these two campuses. UC is working toward having a five year agreement with the Governor which would provide new money that can be used for salary increases

Another task force was mentioned that will discuss how systemwide programs run by UCOP are funded. Vice Chair Powell also reported that there is a task force looking at UCSF's proposal to leave the system.

Chair Lindenberg reported that there are searches for the Provost at UCOP and for a new UCSD Chancellor.

UCAP's position on APM 133 was unanimously endorsed by Council.

A memorial to the Regents will go to the campuses for systemwide review. The memorial asks the Regents to advocate for legislation to support budget measures that would help UC, including legislation on the November ballot.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

III. Proposed Open Access Policy
  • *Christopher Kelty, Chair, University Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication*

Several years ago, UC attempted to approve an open access policy but this effort was not successful. Several other universities, including Harvard, have since passed their own policies that address some of the criticisms of UC's failed policy. There is currently a greater understanding of and interest in open access at UC. The new effort will separate the policy from issues related to implementation of the policy. The main goal is to make research more widely and freely accessible to the public, which is something publishers do not do because of the subscription model. UC campus libraries, including the California Digital Library, are at the limit of being able to pay for research publications. The policy would also create an infrastructure for a repository for making those works available which already exists through eScholarship. One question is what kind of effect this would have on promotion and tenure.

The policy would call for the publishers to agree for the pre-publication versions to be available in UC's repository. Publishers will be notified that the pre existing non-exclusive right agreement exists, and faculty will have the ability to opt out if they feel they will suffer as a result of the policy. A large number of the smaller presses already agree to non-exclusive licenses. The policy can also be used during negotiations with publishers. The goal of the policy is to make the research as available as possible. To have an open access policy would make it clear that this is the direction UC wants to go. Whether the policy will really change publishing practices is unknown. Faculty with NIH funded research already understand this model and there is also a good precedent on the medical campuses.

Faculty already depositing their work in PubMed will not have to start using eScholarship. A member asked if CAPs will be responsible for monitoring compliance. A condition of review by CAP could be that a link to the open access version of any scholarly articles appear in the dossier. A member indicated that there are faculty who do not publish their work due to intellectual property issues and want to restrict the information that is released during the patent process. This policy should not impact patenting because the policy only deals with public versions of articles that would otherwise appear in public venues. The draft policy calls for the author's final version to be placed into the repository and there may be another version that the publisher sells. The problem of multiple versions is not worsened by open access policies. The California Digital Library will assist with implementation of the policy including working on the issue of which versions are available and when they become available. The policy gives faculty the flexibility to negotiate on embargo periods with publishers. Chair Kelty indicated that at other universities compliance with open access policies varies.

IV.   **Consultation with the Office of the President**
   • *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel*
   • *Janet Lockwood, Manager-Academic Policy & Compensation, Academic Personnel*

VP Carlson made an announcement about the UC Advance PAID program. A National Science Foundation grant was awarded to a project involving the collaboration of the ten UC campuses. The grant has two components, including one that supports roundtables focusing on using research on ten-campus data to improve the faculty search process in the STEM fields. There is a steering committee with representatives from each campus and the chairs of UCAP and UCAAD. The goal of the first roundtable is to understand how well current efforts to diversify faculty are working. Faculty should be the main voice in the conversation, along with others who participate in decisions about hiring faculty. Another part of the grant entails gathering demographic data about candidates in the search pools and data about who is hired.

The UCI representative is scheduled to attend the roundtable. A member commented that his CAP does not review files of any junior faculty. Diversity is an issue, particularly in Engineering. The committee discussed how to ensure that the individuals who most need information about diversity attend the roundtable on faculty searches.

Vice Provost Carlson provided background information about the final Faculty Salaries Task Force report. The Task Force, which she chaired, was asked to look at how the university can stay competitive with respect to salaries. The Task Force was equally divided between Senate members and administrators. Members of the Task Force agreed to a number principles deemed integral to maintaining the quality of the faculty. Vice Provost

Carlson explained the Task Force's recommendations. President Yudof continues to state that the budget being prepared includes funds for merit increases and three percent raises, even though it is not yet clear how this would be funded.

It was noted that the recommendations in the Faculty Salaries Task Force report will not necessarily reduce the amount that faculty are off scale. The first adjustment recommended will continue to raise the scale. A member asked whether all CAPs should start discussing salaries or not. Several CAPs do not want to add this to their workload. Vice Provost Carlson advised UCAP that the faculty salaries report can be shared with others.

A policy on presumptive resignation, APM 700, will be sent out for management consultation and UCAP will comment on this in the near future.

Last year, UCAP requested that faculty members who are Above Scale be granted the title of Distinguished Professor. UCB was concerned about the proposal because it uses the title for endowed chairs. Academic Personnel compiled information about how the titles are used at the campuses. The Executive Vice Chancellors have asked for flexibility for each campus on use of the Distinguished title, and language is being devised to accommodate the various concerns.

Discussion: APM 210
- *Margaret Conkey, Chair, University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD)*

Chair Conkey indicated that there is an interest in discussing best practices related to diversity at the campus CAPs and committees on diversity. The aim is to develop generalized local practices. UCAAD has heard feedback from a number of committees that are concerned about implementation of APM 210. Across the campuses there is a range of understanding of APM 210 and of how the policy is interpreted. UCAAD is concerned about whether faculty know they can add activities related to diversity explicitly, and also with where in the biobibs attention is paid to APM 210. UCAAD has discussed the opportunities to report on activities related to APM 210 on the biobib that are missed by faculty.

A member remarked that the language in APM 210 does not make it clear whether CAPs are being asked to give extra credit to faculty whose academic work is on diversity or to recognize that faculty are doing things that add to diversity on a campus. It is important that the CAPs do not have different interpretations of what is being asked. Chair Lindenberg referred to language in the policy that could be interpreted to mean that research that highlights inequalities is a special type of research, and several members agreed that it would be better not to specifically refer to this area of research. A member commented that UC is not meeting its responsibility as a land grant university with respect to the changing demographics of California's population.

Some members suggested that it would be appropriate to state that conducting research is a public service. The committee discussed how CAPs evaluate and value research on inequalities in comparison to research in other areas, and concerns about whether there is double dipping. Some members opined that there are areas of study that are disrespected. Members agreed that CAPs have an understanding of what constitutes good or bad research. UCAAD would like to have even more places in the biobib to report activities related to APM 210. There was a discussion about revising the language on criteria for appointment, promotion and appraisal to exclude the reference to research that highlights inequalities.

V.   APM 430

UCAP has been asked to review proposed APM 430 on visiting scholars. Manager Lockwood reported that a couple of campuses have requested a policy that regularizes short term visitors to UC for time periods that range from two weeks to six months. Most of the time the visitors are students enrolled in institutions abroad. Some use the title already, and others have asked to have a similar title.

Campuses have different mechanisms in place for processing the visiting scholar forms. Granting the title

enables visitors to use library resources. Chair Lindenberg suggested minor changes to sections 430-4 and 430-10. The beginning of section 430-4 should be revised to state "a Visiting Scholar is an individual who is sponsored for a temporary visit to UC" and the criteria for the appointment in section 430-10 should be enumerated. The policy will not impact a faculty member's ability to pay students directly from grants. The draft policy was developed in response to concerns from a labor union. Students could be on almost any type of Visa to have this appointment. The policy codifies current campus practices so there should not be any additional costs to the campuses.

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

VI.   Faculty Salaries Task Force

UCAP members were asked to provide comments in response to the Faculty Salaries Task Force report. Chair Anderson indicated that comments from the campuses have not been received yet.

Discussion: The UCB representative reported that this campus' CAP is concerned about how the recommendations would be funded. More money is needed to pay for this plan, and if there is no or limited state funding this could become an unfunded mandate. The state is an unreliable partner and could withdraw funding. Another concern at UCB is that the proposal doubles the price of hiring or retaining anyone whose salary is above average, so there should be flexibility for the campuses in their implementation. UCB uses a number of practices to make sure its limited resources are used effectively for hiring and retention. The UCB representative agrees that there should be one scale but that this proposal is not the best approach. Chair Anderson indicated that there will not be a salary increase without an influx of state money but it is possible that revenue will be available.

How well UCI has done with its strategy to raise salaries should be examined before implementing it on a systemwide basis. Campuses should be able to put in place programs that meet their goals with the limited resources that are likely to be available. Other members agreed that the strategies in the report are a reasonable start to fixing the scales, and there was support for giving campuses flexibility. It is inevitable that some under performing faculty will be rewarded if the Task Force's recommendations are implemented. The UCSC representative commented that it is important to fix the scales, especially intercampus differences, but that one solution will not fix all of the problems. The plan is a good first step although it will fall short and does not resolve salary differences between faculty at UC and the comparison eight institutions.

Action: The chair and analyst will draft a memo with the committee's comments.

VII.   Changes in Publication Venues

The topic of changes in publication venues has come up on previous UCAP agendas. The issues are different depending on the discipline. Faculty are publishing in non-traditional venues. As publishers are disappearing, some faculty in the book disciplines are turning to self-publishing. The question is how does the personnel review system handle this.

It is important to have faculty with the right expertise on CAPs. A member indicated he would prefer to have letters from experts in the field weighing in on the quality of the research than him/herself trying to understand the faculty member's papers. CAPs will never have all the different expertise that would be needed. A good review system is built on good ad hoc committees and good external letters. A group of social sciences, humanities and arts faculty and a group of faculty from physical/biological sciences and engineering could meet to talk about the change in venues and perhaps produce a white paper on best practices for dealing with the changing environment. Information about practices that CAPs currently use could be gathered and discussed at UCAP.

UCOLASC Chair Kelty commented that the venue issue is related to the amount of publications expected of

people and how this impacts decisions about advancement. As more journals are introduced it becomes difficult to evaluate the impact. It is also hard to determine the prestige of any new journals. University presses publish books but the presses are shrinking and disappearing. It is the perception of people in the book disciplines that different types of publications, such as digital or open access books, are not the same as hardcopy books. CAPs could say that work should be evaluated based on their merit, on who reviewed it, which press is publishing instead of whether the work is on paper or not. It might be valuable to limit the number of publications allowed to be presented for review at the barrier steps. The issue of the change in venues affects the work that CAPs do. Chair Lindenberg would like to suggest the appointment of systemwide groups of faculty, not necessarily UCAP members, to develop systemwide guidelines to deal with these issues.

VIII.   Campus Reports and Member Items

Los Angeles: According to the APM, the Research series has an 8 year limit but UCLA's Call does not include this limit. They cannot apply for intramural grants because they are not Senate members. The plan is to move these faculty into the project scientist series. The representative asked how other CAPs define research or scholarly independence when the project involves multiple collaborations.

Riverside: The campus now has its second Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE). Members indicated that LSOEs are expected to be great teachers, pedagogical leaders, and to have some sort of scholarly work. There are discussions about what the scholarly work should be. When the faculty member moves from LPSOE (P for Potential) to LSOE (which conveys tenure), CAP does receive letters. The LSOEs are very distinguishable from Unit 18 Lecturers.

Davis: The CAP has found that there are no CAP criteria for looking at Unit 18 Lecturers. The union agreement includes criteria for evaluation.

San Diego: for the past twenty years, some units on campus have allowed Adjunct Professors to vote on files. The campus will propose to make this part of the APM.

IX.   New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting adjourned at: 3 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Katja Lindenberg