

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

January 8, 2008 Meeting Minutes

Attending: James Hunt, Chair (UCB) Steven Plaxe, Vice-Chair (UCSD), Carl Shapiro (UCB), Barry Bowman (UCSC), Scott Bollens (UCI), Carol Aneshensel (UCLA), Christopher Chase-Dunn (UCR), Katja Lindenberg (UCSD), Erika Froelicher (UCSF), Alison Butler (UCSB), Mary Croughan (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Nicholas Jewell (Vice Provost, Academic Advancement), Jill Slocum (Executive Director, Academic Personnel), Jim Litrownik (Data Management Coordinator); (Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

I. Chair's General Announcements – James Hunt

The Faculty Salary Scales Task Force is discussing implementation of the four-year plan to restore the market relevance of the UC salary scale system and bring the majority of faculty back on-scale. The plan combines catch-up salary increases for all general faculty with market adjustments to the salary scales. The Regents want to fix the scales in fewer than four years, but California's \$14 billion budget deficit makes that prospect unlikely. The Task Force is considering a variety of strategies for moving forward according to different budget scenarios.

At its December meeting, Council adopted and forwarded to Provost Hume a [revised version](#) of the proposed modifications to APM 220, originally proposed by UCAP, articulating the criteria for advancement to Professor Step VI and Above Scale. Chair Hunt, Vice Provost Jewell, and Director Slocum worked together to craft a document that addressed concerns raised by administrators during an earlier review.

Many of the major issues being discussed by Academic Council, such as a proposal to reform freshman eligibility policy have marginal relevance to academic personnel and are not circulated or placed on the UCAP agenda. Chair Hunt noted added that the agenda announcement about the Regents Diversity Study Group report would now be a full discussion topic.

II. Consent Calendar

- Draft minutes of October 9, 2007

Action: UCAP approved the consent calendar.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President - Vice Provost for Academic Advancement Nick Jewell and Executive Director of Academic Personnel Jill Slocum

Policy Review Projects. The University is reviewing policies affecting members of the Senior Management Group (SMG), including those related to outside professional activities, sabbatical leave, and salary and merit review programs. One goal is to clarify policy for SMG members who currently have concurrent faculty and administrative titles – for example, deans and vice provosts. Campuses have a difficult time recruiting deans; in part because of the lengthy Regental approval process for SMG appointments and because SMG polices on outside activities are more restrictive. UCOP is developing policies that might apply if deans are removed from the SMG and aligned more closely with policies governing academics. UCOP has discussed with The Regents a number of policy proposals affecting salary and merit reviews, compensated and un-compensated outside activities, and transitional leave for deans. But a systemwide review of those proposals cannot proceed until the Regents decide what titles they

want to remain in the SMG. UCAP members noted that the delay is affecting the recruitment of potential deans, who need more certainty about the policies under which they can expect to work.

Health Sciences Compensation Plan. Director Slocum distributed a set of possible policy changes to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan ([APM 670](#)). The HSCP provides health sciences faculty with a competitive salary structure that allows them to supplement state-funded base salary with additional non-state funds. The plan is essential for recruitment and retention. It varies slightly by campus, but generally consists of three components (“x,” “y,” and “z”). All health sciences faculty receive a base salary, or “x” component, defined by the faculty member’s rank, step and Academic Program Unit salary scale (0-9). The “x” is the only portion drawn from state funds and used to calculate UCRP retirement benefits. On some campuses, there is an “x prime” component, which comes from non-state sources. 80% of health sciences faculty also receive a “y” salary component, a guaranteed annual amount drawn from available grants and clinical revenues and negotiated annually with the chair. A third “z” component includes periodic bonus and incentive pay calculated as a percentage of other professional services income – e.g. clinical work and consulting. Director Slocum said she would welcome early input from UCAP on potential changes and suggested that the committee organize a joint effort with UCFW to discuss how much change, if any, is needed in the current policy.

Action: The Senate chair and vice chair will organize representatives from UCAP and UCFW to discuss potential changes to the HSCP. Vice Chair Plaxe volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

Extramural Funding of Faculty Salaries. Last year, UC Davis raised concerns about a practice of recharging a portion of faculty salaries to extramural grants and splitting payroll titles for faculty at UCD who have a portion of their salary covered by extramural sources. In the Senate review of the issue, there were concerns that the practice could negatively impact the security of employment or benefits of individual faculty researchers, complicate teaching expectations, and possibly lead to inaccurate reporting of teaching effort. UCAP Vice Chair Plaxe raised a larger concern about the need to ensure accurate, transparent, auditable compliance with federal effort reporting guidelines.

Director Slocum suggested policy could be changed to strengthen the tenure guarantee to faculty who reduce effort in their ladder rank appointment and move to a research appointment. She also noted that there have been suggestions made in the past to modify the APM to allow the off-scale portion of general campus faculty salaries to be paid by extramural funds.

Chair Hunt asked if CAPs face problems evaluating colleagues who buy-out 50% of their academic duties on a grant. Do CAPs expect teaching and service to be reduced and research productivity increased by an equivalent amount? Members noted that some CAPs take into account teaching effort as a scaled percentage of a buy-out appointment, while others do not. There was also a comment that requiring a 50% faculty member produce at 100% effort is unfair.

IV. Implementation of New Faculty Salary Scales

UCOP’s plan to implement the new faculty salary scales has generated local variations and concerns. UCAP Chair Hunt invited members to discuss issues that arose during the implementation, as well as campus plans for moving forward.

Santa Cruz. UCSC is implementing the salary scale adjustments as written, but CAP is concerned that other campuses are taking steps to maintain off-scale differentials, which in some cases has resulted in faculty moving up a step. Allowing campuses to implement different compensation plans undermines the principle of UC as one university, as well as the overall goal of bringing more integrity to the salary scales, although there is a legitimate concern about the fairness of giving two faculty members equivalent pay who previously had a merit-based pay differential. CAP awards half-step merits and is concerned that the market adjustments have, in effect, negated those merits. Half-steps awarded his year also will disappear if they are absorbed by a similar adjustment in year two of the plan.

Irvine: The market adjustments bring the scales up to about the level of the UCI “shadow scale” that was being used. It is expected that despite the adjustments, the use of off-scales will continue. Deans often request preemptive off-scale salary enhancements for retention. CAP does not comment on salary.

San Francisco. The salary scales plan affects faculty on the Health Sciences Compensation Plan differently. For most faculty at UCSF, the 2.5% range adjustment will be applied to the base salary calculated for retirement, not to actual total salary.

Los Angeles. Some uncertainty remains on campus about what the adjustments mean for individual faculty. Some off-scale faculty feel they are being treated unfairly.

San Diego. UCSD is implementing UCOP’s plan as written, and CAP is not aware of any major discontent. CAP has not discussed the issue that half-step merits awarded this year may be absorbed and negated by later scale adjustments.

Santa Barbara. UCSB is implementing the new salary scale. It was not possible on short notice to implement a half-step or continuous scale this year.

Riverside. CAP believes the problem of disappearing between-step off-scales can be solved by creating formal half-steps in the systemwide salary scales. Half-step on-scale merits can be used to reward faculty but also reduce the use of off-scales. For the time being, CAP is allowing faculty between steps to request an out of sequence review on a case-by-case basis.

Berkeley. The Budget Committee uses a more finely graded step system with 18 half-steps. Most faculty midway between steps were the recipients of an extra half-step acceleration. The Committee feels strongly that these merit-based differentials should be preserved and midpoint faculty protected from any negative effects of the market adjustment. The administration agreed, and provided funding to augment UCOP’s scale adjustments. Most faculty view UCOP’s plan and the campus’s solution to the half-step problem as fair.

Vice Provost Jewell said UCOP was unable to identify an easy fix to the half-step problem. Campuses and CAPs should continue to have the flexibility to solve local issues based on local circumstances and needs, rather than have them imposed by UCOP. He encouraged CAPs to be more aggressive in awarding full-step accelerations within the current system, and noted that having an off-scale does not affect a faculty member’s ability to receive future merit increases or range adjustments. With encouragement from UCOP, all chancellors did agree to apply the 2.5% range adjustment to total salary. He emphasized that UC is at the very beginning of a four-year process to fix the scales. The plan restores integrity to the rank and step system, which is one of UC’s traditional strengths. The scales tie salary to merit in a way that does not exist at other institutions. Jill Slocum added that the Senate did not support a proposal to re-define “on-scale” in APM 620 from being a point to the entire range between steps. Chair Hunt added that despite the noted concerns, UC is moving in the right direction to fix the system.

Senate Vice Chair Croughan encouraged UCAP to make the case for standardizing CAP involvement in salary decisions. Some CAPs are split on the question of whether they should make recommendations on salary. Guidance from systemwide articulating the reasons for cross campus uniformity would be welcome. For CAPs that don't currently review salary, taking on additional work may require additional compensation.

V. Consideration of “Disengaged” Faculty

There is a concern that the new salary scales may reward some faculty who are not actively engaged in their research or teaching duties. At the October UCAP meeting, the Senate chair asked UCAP to collect data that would accurately estimate the scale of the issue. The committee requested data from UCOP on faculty who have remained at the same rank and step for at least six years, excluding faculty at a barrier step and those holding administrative positions.

There was a comment that UCAP should be careful not to automatically interpret non-progressing faculty as “disengaged.” Associate professors in book-based fields may experience delays publishing a book required for promotion. Other faculty may be more heavily engaged in service duties or facing unusual personal circumstances. It was noted that the data show the system is working, and the APM provides CAPs and departments with adequate tools for managing disengaged faculty. Vice Provost Jewell suggested a number of positive actions to address the problem, including improved mentoring at the associate level and encouraging campuses to develop programs that will help faculty meet their full potential.

Mary Croughan suggested that UCAP review the individual files to discover the individual circumstances in each case causing the lack of advancement. She added that the Regents have explicitly asked the Senate to look into this issue and respond.

Action: The committee analyst will forward the UCOP data and a survey form to members over a secure email server. CAPs will review the files from their campus and note the reason for lack of advancement. UCAP will compile the data and prepare a report for Academic Council for possible dissemination to the administration.

VI. Comparison of CAP Practices where the APM is Flexible

In October, UCAP was asked to investigate campus procedures for writing and implementing local academic personnel policies supplementary to the systemwide APM – commonly known as “the Call.” Is there a process to insure the documents are consistent with the APM?

Santa Cruz. [The Call](#), issued each year, is a list of faculty eligible for review in the upcoming year. The Campus Academic Policies and Procedures Manual supplements the APM with additional details about implementing academic personnel policies. Additions and changes proceed through the normal Senate review process, which involves CAPs.

Irvine. The [Academic Personnel Procedures](#) manual supplements the APM with additional details – e.g., policy on non-progressing faculty. CAP participates in modifying the APP.

San Francisco. CAP works from the systemwide APM.

Los Angeles. Formalized local interpretations of APM policy are included in [The Call](#), which CAP helps modify. CAP also relies on a collection of internal memos speaking to local CAP practices that don't rise to the level of inclusion in the Call.

San Diego. The [Policy Procedure Manual](#) collects local operating policies and procedures for the APM. The CAP chair also documents difficult or idiosyncratic situations in an annual statement to the faculty, “Where CAP Stood.”

Santa Barbara. The [Red Binder](#) spells out CAP practices and procedures.

Riverside. CAP participates in annual revision of [The Call](#), which addresses gaps or ambiguities in the APM. CAP also submits a year-end annual report to the faculty.

Berkeley. The Budget Committee refers to a collection of internal ad hoc memos that address noteworthy or difficult issues. The vice provost is notified whenever a document is produced.

UCOP consultants noted a concern that some local interpretations could conflict with the APM and have the force of policy, but require no review by UCOP. UCOP has no way to judge, control, or defend local documents and applications. There was a comment that the Academic Senate has more input into and control over the local documents than the APM.

Action: Chair Hunt will relay a sense of the discussion to Senate Chair Brown.

VII. Collegiality as a Factor in Academic Personnel Reviews

At the request of the Committee on Academic Freedom, Council asked UCAP and UCP&T to consider the use of “collegiality” as a criterion in the faculty merit/promotion review process and to suspend the use of collegiality in the evaluation of candidates until the matter is clarified.

It was noted that CAPs review files based on criteria outlined in APM 210. There was a question about whether UCAF is referring to the specific term “collegiality” or the more general concept. If UCAF considers “collegiality” as a code word for a professor with unpopular political or academic views, then UCAP agrees with UCAF’s concern. UCAP members could not recall a case where a CAP recommended denial of a merit or a promotion based solely on the term “collegiality” in this sense, but this would represent a violation of academic freedom. If a faculty member is disruptive and fails to interact cooperatively with colleagues, however, that is important and has to be part of the review.

Action: UCAP will circulate a draft memo and submit comments to Council.

IX. Regents Study Group Report on Diversity

Senate agencies have been asked to comment on the four reports of the Regents’ Study Group on University Diversity. Chair Hunt noted that the [Faculty Diversity Report](#) is of particular interest to UCAP. Committee members noted a few CAP-related procedures and issues they felt were relevant to the report’s recommendations for increasing diversity.

- Academic planning and particularly FTE allocations have an impact on diversity. Berkeley’s Budget Committee reviews and provides advice about FTE allocations; perhaps other CAPs should too. Faculty pools in the younger ranks are more diverse than those being hired into tenure positions. Not all CAPs review junior level appointments.
- Academic personnel reviews by CAPs are at the tail end of the pipeline. Most CAPs see cases only as they come out of departments, and given the trend to delegate review authority to deans, there are infrequent opportunities for CAPs to provide independent monitoring. CAPs could involve themselves earlier and more frequently in the review process particularly for assistant and associate professors.
- CAP membership is sometimes inadvertently self-replicating. CAPs could diversify.

- Not all CAPs review search waivers.
- CAPs should continue to implement the new diversity component in APM 210.
- Dual appointments aid diversity. CAPs could attempt to be more flexible and accommodating. More FTE can be provided for dual hires.
- Retention rates for URM faculty at UC are lower than other faculty. Academic careers may be less attractive to women. The “family friendly” APM changes [issued in 2006](#) regarding active service modified duties and accommodations for childbearing/childrearing were a positive step. CAP is cognizant of these policy changes, but it is too soon to assess their impact on recruitment and retention.
- CAPs could provide more leadership in helping to make the tenure process more transparent and in communicating advice about how to assemble a successful file.
- CAPs could add a discussion of diversity issues to their agendas at least once a year.

Action: Prepare a draft response for CAP discussion at the next meeting prior to a formal submission to Academic Council.

IX. Law Faculty Scales

Berkeley representative Carl Shapiro reported that UC law schools do not use the assistant and associate professor titles. Un-tenured law faculty are appointed Acting Professors (typically Acting Professor III at Berkeley) on the law salary scale according to provisions outlined in [APM 235](#). The practice was adopted as a systemwide policy in the 1960s to increase law salary competitiveness, although today, competitive off-scales are used to address market deficiencies. The anomalous situation is awkward for the Budget Committee, which faces the problem of evaluating a young professor for Step VI quite early in a career. In addition, acting professors carry a two-year appointment, which is out of phase with the normal three-year review period for professors, requiring additional reviews that are only formalities. At the same time, most U.S. law schools do not use the associate professor title, and UC does not want to disadvantage itself by giving the associate modifier to recently tenured faculty. He said the UCB law dean is interested in discussing reform as long as it does not harm salary. The UCLA representative also noted that the issue comes up frequently at Los Angeles. Chair Hunt recommended that UCAP, rather than proposing a specific solution, ask Council to approach UCOP to initiate a review of the law school scales. The review should involve the law deans.

Action: UCAP will send a request to Council outlining the problem.

X. Campus Reports

Santa Cruz. The deans have expressed concern about a lack of access to CAP’s letters for cases in which the dean did not make the final decision. CAP wants the deans to see CAP’s letters and is implementing a new system to insure that all involved see them.

Irvine. CAP is learning about the proper criteria for evaluating candidates being recruited to the new nursing and law schools. CAP may add new members with specific expertise to accommodate the new cases, and is also considering whether dean delegation may occur as an interim mechanism in the case of Law. Finally, CAP is discussing the evaluation of independence in research in adjunct professor cases.

San Francisco. Faculty are facing more difficulty securing NIH grants, which has led CAP to consider evidence of faculty effort in applying for funding. The committee is also discussing the proper criteria for reviewing e-journals.

Los Angeles. CAP is discussing e-journals, the impact of new federal funding restrictions in tenure decisions, and whether the move from Above Scale to “further” Above Scale should be considered a merit or a barrier step. CAP is also troubled by the misclassification of medical school faculty. Finally, two-year accelerations are now a dean’s final action starting this year.

San Diego. CAP is not experiencing any problems except in its enormous workload. The committee has been discussing the proper criteria for accelerations.

Riverside. CAP and the Academic Personnel office are developing procedures to address disengaged faculty. CAP has been asked to write a report recommending ways in which the academic personnel process can be made more efficient, and is considering how the growth of the campus and the new schools of medicine and public policy will impact the committee. Finally, CAP is implementing a new e-file system that will be made available to other campuses.

Berkeley. In addition to previously noted concerns about merit-based differentials in the salary scales and the anomalous law school scales, the Budget Committee is discussing pre-emptive retention action. There is a new proposal at Berkeley for a one-time promotion bonus.

Santa Barbara. CAP is proceeding as in previous years and is uncertain how the new salary scales will affect the case load next year and in subsequent years.

Chair Hunt noted that UCAP’s Merced representative left the committee to take an administrative position. UCM is expecting a large number of tenure cases as its junior faculty age, but because those faculty have also been overwhelmed by service obligations, the campus is considering a more liberal sabbatical policy to help them prepare for the tenure decision. Merced is looking for senior UC faculty from other campuses to come to UCM on a part-time basis to assist with administrative burdens.

Distributions:

1. Health Sciences Compensation Plan Summary November 2004
2. Review of APM – 670 Health Sciences Compensation Plan Possible policy changes
3. UC-Riverside CAP Report

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: James Hunt