

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

MINUTES OF MEETING

TUESDAY, MAY 12, 2009

Attending: Steven Plaxe, Chair (UCSD), David Lieberman (UCB), Ahmet Palazoglu (UCD), Mary Gilly (UCI), Roland Winston (UCM), Robert Lehrer (UCLA), Harry Green (UCR), Maureen Callanan (UCSC), Katja Lindenberg (UCSD), Peggy Walsh (UCSF), Janet Lockwood (Associate Director, Academic Personnel), James Litrownik (Coordinator, Data Management, Academic Advancement), Patricia Price (Interim Director, Academic Advancement), Kathleen Dettman (Director, Institutional Research), Marsha Kelman (Associate Vice President, Policy and Analysis), Mary Croughan (Chair, Academic Senate), Harry Powell (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Announcements

There have been many discussions about budgets and strategies like furloughs. Policies are being developed and Chair Croughan has been involved with this. Campuses are in different situations. Merits and promotions are not at risk and are in campus budgets. The EVCs met with Council in April and the focus was on planning principles for dealing with the budget. Priorities will be set and there is an interest in making UC more efficient overall. Opportunities to consolidate and streamline will help UC emerge as a better functioning entity. Increasing revenues and differential fees for professional schools have been considered. The timing of sharing information with the faculty has been discussed. Faculty Welfare reported on total compensation, comparing UC to the eight institutions and UC looks worse by about 13%. Chancellor searches at UCSF and UCD have been completed. There have been discussions about the MRUs and MRPIs. Council discussed Academic Freedom's memo on collegiality. At the March Council meeting, the decision to not outsource the management of UCRP was announced.

Discussion: Allowing campuses to deal with the budget should not lead to UC becoming less of a system. All campuses are looking at the same principles which should help avoid this. Campuses will not have differential fees. An approval process should be in place for strategies that have systemwide implications. No decision has been made about cutting health benefits and retiree health benefits, but the president has convened a task force to look at these benefits. Chair Croughan and members of Faculty Welfare are on the task force. One approach that might be considered is providing retiree benefits more cost effectively.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved with one correction.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Janet Lockwood, Associate Director, Academic Personnel*
- *James Litrownik, Coordinator, Data Management, Academic Advancement*
- *Kathleen Dettman, Director, Institutional Research*
- *Marsha Kelman, Associate Vice President, Policy and Analysis*

Associate Director Lockwood reported that a new draft of APM 240 will be sent out for a second systemwide review. The policy attempts to clarify the unique role of the dean as a senior academic leader who is also the senior administrative leader. The definition of who should be

moved from the senior management group and into the academic personnel programs is in the policy. A methodology for salary is included. Disciplines have been grouped to encompass the current deans' salaries from the lowest to highest paid. Deans will be moved from SMG into the new structure without increasing salary. Stipends for current deans are so varied that there was no methodology to extract from them. Chancellors will have more flexibility to appoint deans quickly. The salary structure is based on a tiered system and compensable factors such as academic discipline, size and complexity of the campus or school, and complexity of the administrative duties. Strategic prioritization is another compensable factor related to how much administrative oversight is required at a campus. Consultation with the Senate is emphasized and specified in the policy. Sabbatical, transition and administrative leave are addressed as well as return to service. Rate of pay for transition will be calculated manually based on when sabbatical credits were earned. Language about annual reviews will be strengthened. The review process for the dean in their faculty appointment will remain the same, no adjustments or exceptions will be made. Comparison with 26 universities (AAUP's public institutions) was used to provide a broader range of salaries and this group has always been used for the SMG salary methodology.

APM 110 is the definition of domestic partners and there is ongoing debate about this. Many questions are related to attendant rights of domestic partners and about legal marriage. UC is waiting for the Supreme Court's ruling which may provide clarity. The definition includes meeting a set of criteria and a section addresses what happens if the criteria are not met. UC broadens the state's definition of domestic partnership so domestic partnership can be declared with UC. A question is whether marriage in another state will be recognized. The appendix to APM 010, student freedom of scholarly inquiry principles, will be out for systemwide review.

Associate Vice President Kelman discussed the work of Policy and Analysis, and the Institutional Research, and Issues Management, Policy Analysis and Coordination unit. The goal is to increase UC's capacity to plan and make decisions on the basis of high quality, timely and accurate management information. The units are in the process of hiring staff. A primary objective is for these units to collaborate with the functional units at OP and the Senate. A model for getting central management information together is being developed and the model from Santa Cruz to bring in payroll and budget data will be utilized. The aim is to provide good quality information and easily retrievable data. Coordinator Litrownik will work closely with these new units. A group of analysts has been hired to support IR Deputy Director Agronow. Someone familiar with academic personnel should be hired soon to increase support in this area.

Discussion: A question is whether deans will be regarded primarily as administrators with faculty appointments or as faculty with administrative appointments when evaluating the dean. The annual review will be of the operations functions and the five year review will take into account the administrative achievements and leadership as an academic. The academic personnel process will require significant guidelines. CAPs have to figure out what service is and what are the components of the job as dean. General principles are needed to guide the CAPs even though each case will be slightly different. Associate Director Lockwood asked for several UCAP members to work on this issue and the UCR, UCSF, UCM representatives and Chair Plaxe agreed to participate.

Chair Plaxe explained the analytic support that UCAP has required, mentioning that Associate Director Lockwood and Coordinator Litrownik have been indispensable to the committee's functioning. Significant time has been spent on adjusting the salary scales and continued support will be needed for this work. Another topic has been cross-campus comparisons and there are

concerns across divisions about equity and the appropriateness of how much faculty are paid because there are clear disparities. Diversity has also been a focus of UCAP discussions. A standardized and centralized way to track recruitment is needed so UCAP can discuss how UC is doing. The committee has also discussed the right comparison institutions for UC. A databank that can be accessed by individual units would be valuable. Capacity to look at salaries by discipline will be part of the decision-making support system, which will provide consistent information across the campuses. Custom queries could be written and made public. Integration of more national and comparative data in the decision-making process may also be included. Data exchanges and national organizations make data available. The impact of furloughs on faculty related to grants has not been analyzed yet but the costing of strategies like furloughs will be examined. The president has made it clear that furloughs are the last resort and is focusing now on creating policies in the event that these measures have to be taken. Academic Personnel and the Policy Analysis units will work with Vice Provost Greenstein and the campuses to make sure unintended consequences are studied. It was pointed out that the guidelines are not specific in terms of timelines. Feedback from the systemwide review will be incorporated into the guidelines. At this phase the goal is to ensure that faculty have the opportunity to comment.

IV. Cross-Campus Comparison of Off-Scale Amounts and Advancement Rates

The committee has previously reviewed the UCD and UCSC reports on off-scale amounts and advancement rates. A question is whether UCAP should look at this data on an ongoing basis and determine whether any progress has been made. The methodology used for the reports is different and a standard methodology that is useful to each of the campuses may be valuable.

Discussion: Departments vary across the campuses which make integrating data difficult. Salaries within departments may also vary significantly. Looking at variation within a department across the campuses would be valuable. One useful and relevant way of looking at the data is required and a uniform set of data analyzed in a uniform way is necessary. There is currently no database with information on the number of faculty who received retention offers. A number of factors should be examined such as period of hire and gender. This is an issue that will carry over to 2009-2010 for UCAP. The Academic Personnel directors are discussing this issue. IR has asked about the types of reports needed and IR's effort now is to understand what is available at the campuses and the systems available in order to set up a corporate system. Academic Personnel is looking at the systems that can be shared and at creating a system that allows data to be shared more readily. UCAP can help inform Academic Personnel and IR about the priorities for data reports. The divisional chairs should identify what reports are important and send this information to Chair Croughan. The chairs should be informed that UCAP is requesting a report to look at salary differentials across the campuses.

Action: UCAP will submit a memo to Chair Croughan requesting that divisional chairs identify reports about faculty salary they would like to receive.

V. Faculty Salary Scales

The committee has previously reviewed the report on rank and step.

Discussion: The data on average salaries shows a large spread and does not capture the details that would provide a complete picture. UCAP may identify additional questions about the data.

VI. Furlough and Salary Cut Guidelines

UCAP has the opportunity to provide comments about the furlough and salary cut guidelines.

Discussion: It would be good to eliminate the redundancy in the guidelines. Chair Croughan has indicated that there is a difference between emergency and exigency, and that UC is using emergency. In an emergency, faculty cannot be laid off. Clear language stating what will happen after the declaration of a grave emergency should be in the guidelines. The guidelines are very open-ended and should include a sunset clause to clarify the end date of the emergency. Provisions for a fixed term and a process for the president to extend it should be included. The process for consultation with the Senate is not clear and should go beyond consultation with the chair and be more specific and consultation with the divisional chairs should be specifically required. It is problematic that the document attempts to address both financial disasters and natural disasters. Financial disasters might be anticipated and provide an opportunity to consult and natural disasters occur on a local level. There should be a separate document addressing how to deal with a financial emergency in an operational way.

Chair Croughan indicated that the first draft of the guidelines included a sunset clause was revised. The president already has the authority to furlough staff and that he wanted to incorporate shared governance into the process. Voluntary reduction of time through the START program cannot be used for faculty. Any actions would start after the July Regents meeting.

Action: Chair Plaxe will draft a memo with the committee's comments.

VII. University Professor

UCAP reviewed the nominee's file and work products and the ad hoc committee report.

Discussion: It was noted that the ad hoc committee unanimously supported the nomination. UCSD's representative reported that the nominee is deserving of the title.

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

VIII. Diversity Accountability Framework

UCAP has the opportunity to informally review the Diversity Accountability Framework.

Discussion: The indicators are clearly spelled out and include all various subgroups. The indicators are quantifiable and goals are measured well. UCAAD has been concerned about implementation of the diversity initiatives and that committee will be consulted by the staff in OP. CAP should be provided with concrete guidelines to help with evaluating diversity. One CAP has taken into consideration the fact that a faculty member's academic discipline is in the area of diversity and use a different standard. This approach sets a precedent that some disciplines may be considered more favorably. The committee discussed the issue of placing values on research and the APM addresses this explicitly. The chair of UCAAD could be invited to CAP meetings to discuss this matter.

IX. Collegiality as a Factor in Academic Personnel Reviews

The use of collegiality as a factor in academic personnel reviews was raised several years ago. UCAF drafted a new letter in an attempt to clarify the concept of collegiality and proposed to include it in the APM. Council did not approve the request to include collegiality in the APM.

Discussion: It was noted that UCAF's new letter raises the question of whether collegiality should be defined. There are cases at some of the campuses where a faculty person's collegiality was an issue. Although collegiality is not a formal factor and may not be documented in the file, it does become a problem. Chair Croughan indicated that there are ad hoc ways to handle faculty

who are considered to not be collegial, which is a reason not to address the issue in the APM. The Faculty Code of Conduct provides guidelines to address collegiality.

X. Survey of CAP Practices

The committee reviewed the results of the 2008-2009 annual survey of CAP practices.

Discussion: The rate of agreement between the CAP and administration was discussed and the rate may have been calculated differently by some campuses. The processes at their campuses for reconciling disagreements between the CAP and administration were described. The committee confirmed that the survey results can be shared with people at the campuses like the EVCs and the CAPs.

XI. Campus Reports/Member Items

Irvine: The EVC is proposing elimination of the employee contributions to the defined contribution plan and redirect those funds into the campus operating budget. Vice Chair Powell indicated that this proposal is not going forward due to limitations with what can be done with remuneration. This proposal is an example of the misinformation at the campuses about how the budget cuts will be handled.

Los Angeles: This campus is dealing with accelerations for advancement and there are no clear guidelines for how these are handled. Accelerations in time that are off cycle are discouraged at most campuses and the APM addresses this.

Merced: This campus will get several prestigious endowed chairs. It would be good to use these to attract new, high quality faculty but administration is considering filling them with internal faculty.

XII. UCAP Priorities for 2009-2010

Discussion: The committee identified the following topics for 2009-2010: policies related to ORUs; cross-campus comparisons; salary scales; the accountability framework including diversity; UC's budget; Step X; and Senate membership.

Action: The analyst will send committee minutes from last UCAP discussion about Step X.

XIII. New Business

Organized Research Units

There is an issue with ORUs that are sunseting and a question about what happens to the researchers who are interdisciplinary and have no other department affiliation. It is not clear who will make the decision about the fate of these researchers. There is an end-date for the researcher's position. This is an issue for the CAP at one campus.

Discussion: Another campus has a similar situation and there is no policy to guide what happens. The concern for CAP is that these researchers are put into jeopardy.

Chair Plaxe thanked the committee members for their participation and contribution. Members thanked Chair Plaxe for his service as chair.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30

Minutes taken by Brenda Abrams

Attest: Steven Plaxe