

tenure. The first cohort was hires between 1993-1994 and 1996-1997 and the second was hires between 1997-1998 and 2000-2001. In the first time period, there were a total of 900 new hires in general campus and health sciences and 73% of these new hires were tenured eight years later. A very small percent were still assistant professors, 5% left UC after attaining tenure, and 21% left UC were still assistant professors. In the second time period, there were a total of 931 assistant professor hires, 66% of whom were tenured and still at UC. A small percent were still assistants, 21% left UC as assistant professors, and 12% left UC after attaining tenure.

Discussion: Committee members indicated that the separations seem to be due primarily to retirement. At one campus, faculty who retired were able to continue their research. Merits and promotions have been closer to 2.5%. Salaries in the health sciences are negotiated and their salaries would not necessarily increase when given a merit but it does affect their retirement. A different data set would be used to look at the salary range of comparison eight faculty at the full professor rank but it is not clear that this data should be the basis for a recommendation on the salaries for UC faculty. The differences among the various scales have not been considered. It may be possible to use AAU institutions' aggregate data to look at the discipline and rank and the distribution of salaries. Looking at the salaries of people in different institutions who have just been elected to a society would be interesting data but difficult to get. The costs in the models are higher than the cost of year two of the faculty salary plan. An analysis of assistant professors who left UC for a higher salary would be informative. At one campus, the Chancellor was interested in keeping the above scale faculty above scale since these faculty were considered the greatest achievers and a plan that keeps these faculty above scale would be best. Plan two could be modified to make it 11.3% for the entire above scale salary. It is likely that a full 13.3% on above scale would split the difference between the two plans. The committee agreed that plan two is better than the four year faculty salary plan and the preferred plan. Analysis of an increase of 13.3% for above scale faculty was requested.

Members reported what CAPs give at the four year review and at step IX and above scale. At UCSB, the normal would be 5%, exceptional 7%, and from 10% to 13% in very special cases. At UCB, the CAP gives increases only at four years in increments of \$10,800 and a normal advancement would be one increment. The UCSC CAP generally gives 11% for four years. The UCR CAP recommends a fixed maximum or median dollar amount when people come up for above scale. At UCI, the CAP does not specify the amount but a typical amount for a merit would be around 5%. The UCSD CAP has a scale: an "a" merit is normal which is the difference between step VIII and IX; a "b" is half of that; an "a+" is one and a half increments; and an "a++" is a double increment and there are only a few of these every year. UCD is strictly on a four year schedule and it is an increment between VIII and IX. The UCLA CAP is not involved with the dollar amounts. The average is higher than the 5% granted at UCI but there is a range that depends on the quality of the file.

The rate of getting tenure for faculty who come up is not known, but the committee agreed that the CAPs could collect this information in the future. The committee felt that the data on tenure rates did not suggest that it is easy to attain tenure at UC and that a high rate of granting tenure is not a weakness. Chair Butler will write a response to UCFW's inquiry.

IV. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Harry Powell, Academic Senate Chair*

Chair Powell thanked UCAP members for their service especially in light of the difficulties UC has faced this year. The Commission on the Future generated a first set of recommendations which did not identify specific cost savings strategies, so the administration has developed a set of recommendations that would go directly to the Commission. Chair Powell has encouraged the president to send these recommendations to the working groups for consideration. Online education has been discussed at length but would not generate significant cost savings.

The restart of contributions should be accelerated and there should be an injection of dollars using the University's debt capacity. The Senate is advocating for pension obligation bonds. When there are no contributions but continued retirements, a significant amount of money must be kept liquid. Changes to the pension plan, for new hires and to health benefits, and possibly to the retirement at a future point for current employees are being considered. It is not clear if the benefits of current employees can be modified in the future, but the health care benefits can be changed. Employees are likely to pay significantly more for health care benefits in the future. Chair Powell and Vice Chair Simmons arranged a budget retreat and have been visiting the campuses to discuss post-employee benefits. The purpose of the tour has been to engage Senate faculty in the discussion about benefits. There are four different options identified by the post employment benefits task force. Ramp up to the full value would be increased from 55 to 65 years of age. Health care benefits would be structured to encourage employees to retire at age 65. UC benefits from having faculty who are committed to the university and stay for the length of their careers. The pension obligation bond would require a federal law. Pension benefits are under ideological attack and the point should be made that employees accepted lower salaries based on the promise of a good benefits package.

V. Peer Review in Academic Promotion and Publishing

- *John Lindow, UCB*

The UCB representative to UCAP attended a meeting organized by the Center for the Studies of Higher Education (CSHE) which is based at UCB. CSHE received Mellon Foundation funding to examine peer review in various ways to identify the advantages and disadvantages. Concerns include the overuse of use citation metrics and the overuse of secondary indicators in the academic peer review process. The question is whether it is possible to separate publication from peer review and to separate peer review from publication. The Center issued a series of working papers. There is a notion that there could be many types of peer review including informal peer review while research is ramping up, feedback given to a conference paper that is not in publication format, publication-based peer review and post-publication peer review. There was a lengthy discussion about informal ways of commenting but the conclusion was that this generally does not work very well. Some fields have peer review of data. The peer review for academic advancement is relevant to UCAP, reviews for grants and funding and cumulative peer review.

It was noted that solutions being proposed to create access may involve more than one version of the work being available which raises the question of which version is the registered one. It would be possible for the version in a repository does not have what is in the article version. The peer review system is expensive for the journals and faculty spend a lot of time participating in reviews. There is a significant expense for libraries, including the cost of journal subscriptions. Solutions center on repositories for electronic materials which are relatively open access. Green open access is deposit of a work into a repository connected to a publication, though there may be a delay in access. These repositories can be institutional, governmental or discipline-based.

One issue with green open access is that generally the author does not own the copyright. Another open access model is the deposit of the version before the final paper into a repository which is problematic for librarians. Gold open access is an author-pay model where all expenses involved with publishing research is paid by the person publishing the work, so this expense is built into grants. In gold open access, authors own the copyright and pay a certain amount per page. Some funding agencies may require publication in an open access repository. Universities have made resolutions to set up repositories and MIT has done the most in this area. All MIT authors must go into the MIT repository and authors own the copyright no matter what allowing the work to be published elsewhere. MIT faculty voted to use this model and receive extensive support from the library to ensure their work is deposited. It is unclear whether UC has the resources to protect faculty when journals challenge placement of a publication elsewhere. The MIT repository is a means for faculty to share their work with everyone in the world. Resolutions at other universities have allowed faculty to opt out. Publishing in open access repositories will still involve the journal peer review process.

At the end of the meeting there was consensus that it should be possible to separate the results of the publication review from academic personnel review. Secondary indicators such as the quality of the journal or press for book-based disciplines and bibliometrics are frequently used. A radical proposal is to strip the name of the journal and send the work out for expert evaluation based only on the quality of the work and not secondary indicators. There could be a recommendation that academic advancement should be based on the quality of the work instead of the secondary indicators. Faculty would have to take the position that quality is the most important factor and move away from the use of secondary indicators. Most CAPs probably are making decisions based on the right information.

Discussion: Members commented that it can be difficult to examine the quality of work outside their specific fields. One campus uses a significant number of ad hoc committees in order to ensure the expertise is in place. Another strategy is to use faculty from other campuses. Using one reviewer would be problematic as there could be bias. The outside letters can provide useful information related to quality.

VI. University Professor

Chair Butler summarized the University Professor title nomination. The professor has been at UCR since 1969 in the Sociology department. The ad hoc committee report indicates the recommendation in support of the nomination is unanimous. The professor has 34 books, 57 book chapters, 81 publications with three in press, and fifteen textbooks. The letters are very good.

Discussion: The members agreed that the impact of this professor's work is impressive.

Action: The committee voted unanimously in support of the nomination.

VII. Report on the Faculty Compensation Committee

- *Dr. Steve Plaxe, Faculty Compensation Committee, Immediate Past UCAP Chair*

The committee's work continues and the recommendation is a work in progress. The committee's goal is to address the competitiveness. The strategy is meant to complement the four year faculty salary plan. The health sciences compensation plan is structured so that UC can pay faculty competitive rates, using non-state salaries. This compensation plan might be applicable to faculty in other disciplines. In research grants there is a provision for support of a portion of the

faculty person's salary. The problem for ladder rank series faculty is that their salaries have to be paid with state funds. Ways to use research grants to fund these salaries are being explored. Funds left over could go back to the campus or division to be used for other purposes. There are a number of regulatory issues regarding how federal and other grant funds can be used, and there may be an impact on the retirement benefits. This is not intended to deemphasize teaching. A general framework would be established but implementation would be done at the campus level. There will be many levels of approval including by the Senate and president. It would look like an X and Y component model. Permitted outside compensation is being examined such as consulting.

Discussion: Faculty in certain disciplines, especially those not in the sciences, have limited opportunities to obtain outside funding so alternative ways for these faculty to raise funds need to be identified. Some funders will pay only two months of summer salary but not three. This strategy will not work for everyone and the number of faculty who can take advantage of this is a very small portion and will primarily be in disciplines like the business, engineering, and veterinary medicine. Looking at where grant funding flows should not necessarily be the basis for how faculty are compensated. Fields not doing well still have access to funds and fields that are expanding have limited access to funds. The intent is to raise the salary of valued faculty and not to harm UC. According to Interim Director Price it is not definite that this plan will move forward. This strategy will impact the time available to teach. The plan would also create two different classes of faculty. Making this change would require revisions to the APM and the earliest the new plan could be in place would be July 2011. This plan would make UC faculty look more like faculty in private institutions.

VIII. Commission on the Future Recommendations

UCAP has the opportunity to respond to the work group recommendations to the Commission on the Future. There is a Funding Strategies recommendation to look at alternative faculty compensation plans.

Discussion: Several CAPs have responded formally to their divisional Senate chairs, and the response from one CAP was shared with UCAP. Issues related to the Education and Curriculum working group's recommendation about online education were discussed. Faculty who are forced to teach online are much less satisfied, and it is very expensive. There is an implication that ladder rank faculty would be removed from teaching at the lower division. Another issue may be how faculty are evaluated from a performance standpoint. There is an assumption that faculty can be more efficient using online instruction. A CAP issue is the students' review of faculty. Online evaluations of faculty by students have been found to have a low rate of return and the evaluations tend to be negative. The committee discussed whether CAPs rely too much on scores. Scores can help identify really good or really bad teachers, but do not provide much information about those in the middle. It was noted that reviews by peers who observe lectures are always positive and do not provide much information. The chair's letters are generally helpful.

The committee disagrees with the recommendation to examine faculty compensation plans. The Senate should have a chance to respond when there is more information. Buying out teaching time from their grants is happening due to the furloughs, and the opportunity to do this depends on the discipline and department. Alternative compensation plans should not change existing rules in departments such as policies about buying out, and if possible there should be no

decrease in teaching. Some members felt that the possible change identified by the Faculty Compensation Committee to use the health sciences compensation plan for faculty in other disciplines is dead on arrival. As presented by Dr. Plaxe, members have concerns about and are categorically opposed to decoupling salary from research, teaching and service and coupling it to grants which will dramatically change the culture at UC. Such a plan should not be done at the general campus. A better option would be to increase the fees at professional schools and the number of out-of-state students to raise faculty salaries. The committee also expressed concern about the Education and Curriculum work group's recommendation 1.3 about making more effective use of faculty resources by extending the use made of research grant funding to buy out ladder faculty from instruction. UCAP should also comment that the recommendations are vague and there should be additional Senate consultation when the recommendations are more specific.

IX. Survey of CAP Practices

Discussion: The committee discussed the results of the survey of CAP practices in 2008-09. There is a question about how CAPs are calculating the rate of agreement with the EVC and whether it is based on any disagreement. Disagreement on the amount of salary is not being factored into the rate by at least one campus. It was noted that the use of ad hoc committees has decreased at several campuses, and these committees are hard to convene and create delays.

X. Campus Reports/Member Items

Davis: Discussions about increasing off-scales are ongoing. A report on streamlining was presented to the executive committee. Merits that appear to be strong will have an abbreviated review.

Santa Barbara: The CAP considered codified statements by two deans about buying out and indicated negotiations should be done on a case by case basis.

Berkeley: The CAP is getting appointment cases that do not provide information about the range of faculty views or the issues raised during the discussion. The vote is electronic. The amount of department discussion varies.

Santa Cruz: There are more retention cases this year. A memo from the EVC about how cases are being decided created some tension.

Riverside: There is a deadline on when files need to be submitted but one college has not submitted 49% of the cases. These files may not be considered. At other campuses, if mistakes are found it does not derail the cases. If a candidate does not submit materials on time, there is no retroactive review.

Irvine: The workload has been reduced this year and more has been delegated to the deans. The adjunct professor series and some between I and V in the full professor series have been delegated. The EVC has asked the deans to discourage one year accelerations in time. The new law school's twenty faculty wanted representation on CAP. However, the CAP does not want the committee to get too big because this would reduce the committee's efficiency. There is a disadvantage for departments who do not have representation on CAP for significant periods of time.

San Diego: The COC is working on getting new CAP membership in place. There is no clear system for what kind of relief CAP members get and who provides it, and it varies across

departments. The workload is less this year due to lack of recruitments. Membership on the CAPs varies from 2 to 3 years.

Los Angeles: The CAP's work is streamlined. It is difficult to get faculty to sit on CAP although the relief is good.

XI. New Business

University on Committee on Planning and Budget's Choices Report

The committee agreed that the primary comment is that reference to reinstating year two of the four year faculty salary plan should be removed from the report, and a better statement would be that salaries should be on par with the comparison eight institutions.

Chair Butler thanked committee members for their active participation during the year and the members expressed their appreciation for the Chair's service.

Meeting adjourned at: 2:45 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Alison Butler