

business community has signaled that they intend to approach legislators from both sides of the aisle to encourage support for higher education funding.

Jill Slocum distributed draft data comparing the percentage of faculty with on and off-scale status before (September 2007) and after (February 2008) implementation of the new scales. UCOP is currently verifying the accuracy of the data with campuses, but they indicate that the percentage of off-scale faculty – by UCOP’s definition those receiving at least \$1 more than their published rank and step – decreased from 77% to 58% after implementation. (The percentage also fell from 55% to 39% using Berkeley’s definition of “decoupled” off-scale – a salary equivalent to at least one step above the official rank and step.) The data also show that off-scale faculty at UCLA are being paid the largest average off-scale amounts. By discipline, most fields, with the exception of business management, have similar proportions of off-scale faculty and average off-scale amounts. Approximately 10% of faculty systemwide remain above scale. She said the results of the first year are promising. UC’s market salary lag is projected to drop from 9.6% in 2006-07 to 7.2% for 2007-08. She said the planned model for year two involves similar range adjustments, merit increases, and salary scale market adjustments. Over four years, the plan should have the desired effect.

Discussion: Chair Hunt noted that the data are good news, but he also expressed concern about the differences in UCLA off-scale averages compared to other campuses. He said these differences could be amplified as more off-scales get absorbed. Some administrations have indicated that they want more flexibility, and will continue to implement selective faculty salary increases, independent of the funding they receive from UCOP for that purpose.

Members noted that UC has taken a big step toward fixing a very large problem; returning faculty salaries to competitive levels should remain a top priority for University; and restoring and maintaining the integrity of the step system has an intrinsic value.

There was concern that the second round of adjustments will upset the same faculty who were unhappy about the absorption of their off-scale differentials in year one. These faculty felt their differential status was based on merit, should be permanent, and its absorption devalued their accomplishments. Other members noted that the issue is not a big one for their faculty, who understand that APM policy intends off-scale increments to be temporary and reduced over time. It was noted that accomplishments should be reflected in rank and step, rather than off-scale increments. A career equity review is one mechanism to address a perceived deficiency.

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

Report: UCSC Representative Bowman presented data he collected from the UCOP data warehouse showing the average off-scale salary amount for each rank and step at each campus in the liberal arts – humanities, arts, social sciences, and sciences – excluding economics. The figures include faculty who have no off-scale. Next, he presented a graph showing the average number of years faculty at each rank and step take to reach that rank and step on each campus from the time of their Ph.D. He noted that Berkeley faculty tend to reach each step a couple of years earlier than other campuses, but the average rate of advancement is similar for all campuses over the long term. For example, an Assistant Professor III at both UCB and UCSC is likely to be Professor VII 30 years later.

He pointed to a third chart showing a large divergence in salary equity across the system, with UCLA and UCB at the top. Salary inequities cannot be explained by rate of advancement; on average, the differences are seen at every rank and step. He said the factors contributing to this entrenched inequity are hard to pinpoint. Although UCSC benefits most from the

adjustments, he expressed pessimism about ultimately “fixing” the scales, because UCLA and UCB will keep pushing off-scales upward in response to the market.

Discussion: Members noted that campuses will value the comparison. There was a suggestion to forward the data to Academic Council along with a report or recommendation. Is systemwide salary equity a goal? If so, the University must recognize that it is not being realized. Both individual campus policies and UCOP policies affect this goal. UCOP is attempting to address equity by fixing the scales, but campuses may continue to put additional money into salaries for the purpose of hiring and retention. Director Slocum noted that last year’s proposed modification to APM 620 policy that would have changed the definition of “step” from a point to a range was put on hold, but the Senate may want to look into it again.

Action: A subcommittee will draft a report, which will be circulated over email and submitted to Council if UCAP can agree on a recommendation.

V. Possible Compromise on Proposed Modifications to APM 220-18 (4)

Issue: UCAP originally proposed modifications to APM 220 in 2005, and worked with Council on revised proposals in 2006 and 2007. The original intent was to clarify the distinction between the criteria for advancement to Step VI and Above Scale, and to align policy with actual practice. UCAP thought vagueness in the language had led to variations in local interpretations of the advancement criteria, which in turn had created differences among campuses in faculty advancement rates. Council endorsed a final proposal in March 2007 after a systemwide review. In late 2007, administrators raised their own concerns during an informal review. Chair Hunt, Vice Provost Jewell, and Director Slocum then crafted a [revised document](#), which Council adopted and forwarded to Provost Hume. The administration is now seeking feedback on several additional changes before releasing the proposal for a final, formal systemwide review.

Discussion: Chair Hunt noted that one of the main revisions in the present version is to eliminate the possibility that national or international distinction in service alone, exclusive of teaching or research, could advance someone to Step VI. UCAP members supported the revision.

VI. Proposed Revisions to APMs [220-85b](#), Professor Series; [335-10-a](#), Cooperative Extension Advisor Series; and [740-11-c](#), Leaves of Absences/Sabbatical Leave; and Proposed Rescission of APM [350](#), Postgraduate Research

Issue: A set of proposed APM revisions is before the Senate for systemwide review.

Action: UCAP found the changes to be non-controversial and will forward its enthusiastic endorsement to Academic Council.

VII. Consultation with the Office of the President - Executive Director of Academic Personnel Jill Slocum

Report: On July 1, UCOP will be issuing a package of [policy revisions](#) related to medical leaves of absence, sick leave, reasonable accommodation for academic appointees with disabilities, and medical separation. Vice Provost Jewell is forming a Law Faculty Salary Scales Work Group [UCAP recommended](#) in January to review the incongruity of the law scales in relation to other professorial scales. Other policy issues in the pipeline for discussion next year include

modifications to policy on Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members ([APM 025](#)); the use of non-state funds for academic year faculty salaries; a set of proposed changes to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan ([APM 670](#)); policy on staff and senior management recall appointments; and policy on non-SMG faculty administrators.

Discussion: UCAP recommended that the Law Faculty Salary Scales Work Group include three Senate faculty members and three administrators.

VIII. Non-Progressing and “Disengaged” Faculty

A. UCAP’s Draft Report to Council: UCAP reviewed its draft report to Academic Council on “non-progressing” and “disengaged” faculty, responding to a concern that the salary scale adjustments may reward some faculty who are not actively engaged in their research or teaching duties. UCAP was asked to collect and analyze data that would accurately estimate the scale of the concern and to report its findings back to Council.

Discussion: Chair Hunt noted that the memo includes only systemwide statistics. One member said the memo should emphasize the bottom line – how many of the non-progressing faculty are disengaged and the overall percentage of “disengaged” faculty in the system – which is 1% or less. It was noted that there are re-engagement procedures in place on each campus to help re-engage the small number of disengaged faculty, and the state legislature may have a different view of disengagement than a chancellor.

Action: UCAP will send its final report to Council.

B. Interest and Concern among Campus Administrators: Some campus administrators who were not informed about UCAP’s data gathering project expressed worry or had additional questions once they learned about it. The UCR administration also suggested that UCAP consider new systemwide guidelines for addressing disengaged faculty.

Discussion: There was a consensus that additional guidelines or policies are not needed beyond current APM language indicating that if research or creative activity falls below standards normally expected for advancement faculty are expected to take on more teaching. It would not be productive to add additional formulas not presently in the APM, and local procedures to implement the APM should remain discretionary. One member noted that moving an unproductive faculty member from a ladder rank to Lecturer with SOE is rarely enforced or encouraged.

VIII. Comparison of CAP Practices/Member Topics

Annual CAP Survey: The committee reviewed the annual survey of campus CAP practices. There was a consensus that the survey remains useful. UCAP members will update the 2007-08 data and forward the corrections to the committee analyst.

Conflict of Interest (COI) in External and Internal Letters: The UCI CAP is seeing more cases with an appearance of conflict of interest in the letters written by deans and department chairs who are also co-authors with the candidate. UCI follows the NIH guideline that collaborations more recent than four years ago carry an appearance of COI. However, this policy seems to be at variance with trends toward increased collaboration and cross-disciplinary

research in academia. UCAP members were asked to compare local practices regarding letters from co-authors and/or collaborators with the candidate; time limits for the appearance of COI, department-nominated vs. candidate-nominated external letters; and external vs. internal (chair and dean) letters. UCI is considering stricter standards, including a COI checklist, for department-nominated letter writers.

UCLA CAP is struggling to secure a sufficient number of external letters for some cases. It does not have an official COI policy, but tends to discount letters from recent collaborators. UCSD also tends to discount letters from co-authors and collaborators, but occasionally considers them if the collaboration occurred many years ago, or in large team efforts where ‘co-authorship’ may not involve personal contact between candidate and letter writer. Letters judged to lack sufficient independence are sent back to the department. UCSB tends to discount letters involving a collaboration in the last three or four years, and the practice at UCB is to discount letters rather than send them back. UCM is encouraging, but not requiring external letters for junior appointments. If the UCD CAP notices a persistent problem with COI letters from a unit, it asks the Vice Chancellor to confront the chair. The School of Medicine can be particularly problematic because it does not have the same tradition of objective scholarly evaluations as traditional academic structures. At the opposite end, UCSF expects to see letters from colleagues and collaborators close to the candidate.

Special Accelerations for Dean and Faculty Service: UC Davis asked whether campuses have a policy for granting once-in-a-lifetime accelerations for deanly service and how that compares to acceleration policy for faculty colleagues with strong service but less strong scholarship and teaching. Like most CAPs, the Berkeley Budget Committee does not review advancement for deans. It does occasionally allow a special one-time advancement for faculty up to Professor IV on the basis of exceptional service. It was suggested that there be a UC policy outlining guidelines for the review of SMG members.

Cross-Campus CAP Advancement Comparison: Recently, a group of UC Davis chairs suggested that the Davis CAP is not liberal enough in terms of granting large accelerations in retention cases. CAP has been asked for statistics about where it falls relative to the other CAPs in terms of “harshness” or “generousness.” It was noted that the data presented by UCSC earlier in the meeting comparing median rank, step, salary, off-scale, and age since Ph.D. for every campus, helps illuminate the issue. There was a suggestion for UCAP to compare the number of two-step accelerations granted at each campus per 100 cases. There was also a suggestion that UCAP compile a data wish list for UCOP, outlining short and long term needs.

UC Merced CAP Issues: UCM representative Winston noted that his CAP is struggling to find new external members, who remain critical to CAP’s work. Although this would seem to be the job of the UCM COC, he said he feels the UCM CAP is an unusual case and suggestions should come from outside Merced. He asked whether assistance could be provided at the systemwide level. It was suggested later that the UCM Senate Director ask the other campus Senate Directors for assistance from their COCs.

A second question is whether the money a faculty member brings into the University in the form of grants can be considered as a criterion in the merit and promotion process, and whether the systemwide APM lists such a policy. It was not clear that the APM addresses this, although some local campus procedures may stipulate that the presence of grant money cannot in and of itself be used to judge scholarly work. The UCR Call stipulates that grant support can be considered as recognition of one’s standing in a field, but a lack of grant support cannot be a

negative, *except* in cases where such funding is essential for research. It was noted that some disciplines require a lab for scholarly work, but scholarly work can progress without grant money. All reviews should be a retrospective on past work, not predict the future.

Search Waivers at Davis: The UCD CAP has noticed a growing number of search waivers, either to hire locally or out of some need for administrative expediency, which CAP learns about after the hire. It was noted that search waiver policy does not appear in the systemwide APM; all policy is local. The Senate needs to inject itself in the search waiver decisions before they become an accomplished fact.

Evaluation of Teaching: The USCS CAP is concerned that its evaluation of teaching has become dependent on student evaluations, which it views as having marginal or inconsistent value. The “Pick-a-Prof” website successfully sued UC and other universities for the right to post data about the average GPA given in every course at every UC campus, sortable by instructor. CAP does not use Pick-a-Prof, but it likes the idea of having access to grade distribution data. It was noted that on some campuses, departments will assign a faculty member to observe a lecture.

IX. Step X

Issue: At a recent Academic Assembly meeting, a member suggested that the Senate consider adding Step X to the salary scales. UCAP considered the issue with their local committees and decided not to pursue the issue further.

UCAP members gave Professor Hunt a round of applause in appreciation for his service as chair.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: James Hunt