

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

February 8, 2005 Meeting Minutes

Attending: Alan Barbour, Chair (UCI)

George Anderson (UCR), Anna Maria Busse Berger (UCD), Cynthia Brown (UCSB), Inder Chopra (UCLA), Piero Madau (UCSC), Russell Jones (UCB), William Maurer (UCI), Harvey Sollberger (UCSD), Roland Winston (UCM-phone), Ross Frank (Chair, UCAAD, UCSD), Ellen Switkes (AVP, Academic Advancement), James Litrownik (Coordinator, Data Management), Clifford Brunk (Academic Senate Vice-Chair), Michael LaBriola (Senate Analyst)

I. Chair's Announcements – Alan Barbour

Chair Barbour reported that UC Davis Professor of Law and UCFW Chair John Oakley had been nominated to serve as the next Academic Council Vice Chair.

University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity Chair Ross Frank joined the meeting as a guest. In 2003, UCAAD, UCAP and Academic Council agreed that as a means of improving communication between the two committees, the UCAAD Chair would be invited to two UCAP meetings (in-person or conference call) per year to discuss issues of mutual interest.

The committee agreed to meet in-person on May 10 rather than May 3. Members were asked to hold March 8 and April 12 from 10-12 for possible telephone meetings.

Action: The committee approved the minutes of December 7, 2004.

Action: The committee approved the consent item: Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 128.

II. Report from UCOP Consultants

– Ellen Switkes, Assistant Vice President, Academic Advancement

Assistant Vice President Switkes reported that lawmakers in Sacramento will likely be proposing legislation and/or a ballot initiative that would replace the defined benefit plan with a defined contribution plan for all public employees, including UC faculty and staff. As currently proposed, the legislation would affect new employees only, effective July 2007. It may also seek to limit employer contribution rates to 6%, which if passed, could seriously hurt faculty recruitment efforts.

A new written policy establishing titles for paid and volunteer clinical faculty is in the final stages of development. The titles for this faculty series are still pending.

UC is projecting that by next year, its faculty salaries will lag comparison institutions by a margin of 13.9%. A Senate-Administration work group has met to talk about possible creative solutions to this problem, and their discussions have resulted in the beginnings of a proposal that would allow grant income to partially fund off-scale salaries for ladder faculty. AVP Switkes encouraged members to contact her with additional ideas. A formal proposal from the work group may come before UCAP.

III. Faculty Career Database

– *With James Litrownik, Data Management Coordinator*

The Office of Academic Advancement has developed a database with 15 years of data on faculty career advancement. The project was originally prompted by concerns raised last year by the Academic Senate Professorial Step System Task Force with regard to the advancement of women and underrepresented minorities in the academic personnel process. The Senate was unable to establish with certainty the accuracy of the Task Force conclusion that advancement disparities at the barrier step were related to gender and ethnicity, because at the time, there was insufficient supporting longitudinal data on faculty experiences in the step system. (The Task Force's main recommendation, that the barrier step be eliminated, was not endorsed by Council).

James Litrownik distributed a series of data tables looking at three Full Professor cohorts—women, men, and women/men-combined—who were at Step 5 in 1996 and 1997, and then again six years later at their status in 2002 and 2003, including whether they had left the university. Mr. Litrownik said the database was not completely longitudinal, in the sense that it did not track individual faculty members' advancement over time. The tables were snapshots with summary data for two-year periods that showed faculty at a given rank, years at rank and years at a step. Preliminary analyses of the database were presented. Ross Frank, UCAAD chair, also provided an analysis from his committee on the issue of gender differences in faculty advancement.

UCAP member Dr. Mary Croughan was involved in a recent survey of faculty advancement issues at the UCSF campus and reported on the survey's findings. Dr. Croughan said it would be important for any comprehensive step system equity analysis to be broadened beyond just the barrier step. The Task Force's conclusion to eliminate the barrier step on the grounds of equity was based in part on the analysis of the build-up at Step 5, but such an analysis does not take into account other periods of bunching, such as from Associate Professor to full Professor.

Some members questioned whether, considering the incoming data, UC overall had an equity problem in its career advancement for faculty. Others were not convinced that the methodology used to produce the new data sets addressed the questions asked in the original Step 6 report. Members were in agreement that the database provided for progress in addressing these issues and encouraged expansion of the database to other cohorts and further analysis. Individual members will contribute their suggestions and efforts for this analysis.

Members agreed that it would be useful to develop a methodology to consider differences between campuses as well. A preliminary analysis of the database indicated that campuses differ substantially in the frequency of advancement from step 5 to step 6 or beyond. Local CAP practices may account for some of these differences—for instance, in the style or amount of delegation. Berkeley, Santa Cruz, and Riverside do not delegate personnel cases to deans. UCSD and UCLA delegate all cases to deans up to Step 6; The UCSF CAP considers all promotions, but not the majority of regular merits; and UCSB delegates most normal cases although CAP also audits the deans' review. Irvine has recently instituted a trial of delegation of a proportion of normal merits to deans.

UCAP will continue to discuss future queries in collaboration with UCAAD, and offer consultation to the Office of Academic Advancement in further development of the database.

Members are encouraged to develop templates for issues and questions they would like addressed.

IV. Family Friendly Policies – *with Ellen Switkes*

Three years ago, UC took steps to increase the recruitment and hiring of women faculty after a state audit concluded that women were underrepresented in the faculty ranks. Last summer, a California Research Bureau [report](#) was released with data on the diversity of faculty, managers and senior administrators at UC, and it has persuaded legislators who requested the report to call for a hearing and audit to address issues of minority faculty hiring. A task force will be meeting to audit campus Affirmative Action practices, and a summit is planned for the fall akin to the [gender equity](#) summit held in 2002.

As awareness of family and diversity increase as issues of importance, new “Family Friendly” personnel policies are being issued for formal review. The intention is to clarify that family accommodation policies for both childbearing and childrearing are important to the university and a productive academic environment. The policy aims to spell out what types of family accommodation are available, clarify definitions and standards of active service modified duties; and emphasize that faculty who take an ASMD or additional time off the clock for childrearing should not be decelerated or otherwise treated unfairly.

In addition, language about part time appointments and temporary reductions in time has been added to APM 220, along with a discussion of research evaluations for Assistant Professors, and implementation guidelines that suggest written agreement about work and review expectations. The part-time appointment policy was first introduced in the 1970’s to encourage the hiring of female faculty. CAP committees will be important players in these discussions. Members are AVP Switkes welcomes member comments and suggestions before the policy is released for formal review.

V. Report from UCAAD Chair – *Ross Frank*

Chair Frank reported that the [proposed amendments](#) to APM 210, 240, and 245 that UCAAD and UCAP worked on together last year would likely be released this spring. UCAAD believes it will be crucial to integrate the changes quickly into the CAP and faculty cultures so that they have an immediate positive effect on faculty behavior and personnel review actions. UCAAD is interested in the processes for disseminating and informing the faculty and CAPs when significant changes to the APM like this occur. Chair Frank proposed that the two committees work together on pro-active strategies to draw awareness to the changes.

UCAP members agreed that procedures for disseminating information vary by campus and individual CAPs. Senate newsletters, websites, and communications from EVCs and staff to chairs and CAPs are all important to the process. Members also noted that a related and larger problem exists with a general lack of understanding among faculty and administrators about APM policies and procedures. There may be ways to make the academic personnel process and all the evaluation criteria more transparent. One member noted that it would be pro-active in the case of the current APM revisions to make presentations to individual departments.

VI. Member Items

Berkeley and San Francisco both have well-developed CAP Recusal Policies, and all CAP members on these campuses are asked to sign off on a statement at the beginning of their service indicating they have read the policy. The policy outlines specific criteria about what is considered a conflict of interest in a review—e.g., if the CAP reviewer has published, collaborated with, or had an intimate relationship with the person under review. It also lists specific guidelines about what a CAP member's role in review or voting can be in such situations.

The committee agreed that all campus CAPs should take steps to develop similar formal policies with regard to conflict of interests during review of personnel cases. Members thought it would be appropriate to bring the UCB and UCSF recusal policies to the attention of Divisional CAPs, along with a statement from UCAP about the importance of developing a recusal policy. (While making it clear UCAP is not imposing such a policy.)

VII. Salary and Off-Scales: Merit or Market?

Members discussed the role of divisional CAPs in determining salary and off-scale offers that have either a merit or a market component. CAP members are concerned about a trend toward the disassociation of salary and merit, the relative arbitrariness of off-scales in some cases, and the lack of CAP involvement in many of these decisions.

Members reported that at some campuses, nearly 50% of faculty may be earning an off-scale, while the other half are on the regular salary scale system alone. In addition, the off-scale increment often has less to do with merit than outside determinants, for example, as a response to an outside job offer. Members are concerned that it is becoming more common for faculty to seek and use outside offers as a strategy to obtain a pay raise.

Some CAPs are closely involved in determining salary, including off-scales. For instance, Berkeley plans to implement an across-the-board off-scale bonus at the time of tenure, along with an additional increment as needed, if the individual's salary was determined to be below market range. Members agreed that CAPs could, and perhaps should take a more pro-active role in providing input on faculty salaries on their campuses.

AVP Switkes noted that there is a new web-based recruitment and retention survey coming out in the spring that will address issues like salary, climate, and housing costs. She also said that faculty salaries are a top priority for President Dynes.

VIII. Research Collaborators and the Academic Personnel Process

Campuses are more frequently facing the problem of how to evaluate and reward candidates in the academic personnel process who may have had unique and valuable contributions to research projects as collaborators, but who might not have “independence,” by the criteria of senior authorship or Principle Investigator status within the project. Moreover, the traditional requirement for faculty to demonstrate independence for merit and promotion is not well established in the APM. UCAP has discussed proposing language for the APM that will provide clarification on these issues.

The UCSF CAP has decided to change its letters to ask external reviewers to indicate what they see to be the candidate's level of independence. Members also thought it would be useful to ask the department letter to define the norms of collaboration in the discipline along with the role of the collaborator in a particular case.

Action: Mary Croughan and Joe Guglielmo of UCSF will develop draft language for APM modifications. The draft will be circulated to the committee for comment and further development.

IX. APM Language Criteria for Step 6 and Above Scale

UCAP continued its review of the APM language describing the criteria for advancement to Step 6 and Above Scale. The committee's goal is to modify the two sets of criteria so they are clearer, more distinct, and more closely in line with actual campus practice. The expectation is that these modifications will help ensure that CAP decisions are grounded objectively in the APM. UCAP also met by conference call in January to vet potential changes and discuss local CAP responses to those proposed changes.

The committee worked from a draft proposed by UCSC, which members agreed was effective in eliminating some of redundancies in the text. There was discussion about several possible modifications and additions, including whether it was appropriate and accurate to define either or both the Step 6 and Above Scale actions as a "career review."

Action: A new draft encompassing suggested changes will be circulated, and members will bring the draft to their divisional CAPs for input. UCAP will submit a final proposed version will to Academic Council in the spring.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

The committee will meet in person May 10, 2005.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Alan Barbour