

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
October 11, 2005 Meeting Minutes

Attending: Tony Norman, Chair (UCR)
Mary Croughan (Vice-Chair, UCSF), James Hunt (UCB), Cynthia Brown (UCSB), Margaret Walsh (UCSF), Catherine Morrison Paul (UCD), Charles Ribak (UCI), Arthur Woodward (UCM), Allen Zych (UCR), Susan Gillman (UCSC), Ellen Switkes (AVP, Academic Advancement), Myron Okada (Director, Academic Personnel Relations), Clifford Brunk (Academic Senate Chair), John Oakley (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Maria Bertero-Barcelo (Senate Executive Director), Michael LaBriola (Senate Analyst)

I. Chair's Announcements – *Tony Norman*

Chair Norman welcomed members and reviewed the charge of the committee. In addition to new business, UCAP will devote some time this year to at least two carry-over items from 2004-05 – the ongoing review of data on faculty career advancement through the step system, and the issue of how collaboration is evaluated in research and scholarship achievements. UCAP's chair represents the committee at monthly meetings of the Academic Council.

UCAP has a budget for four in-person meetings this year, and additional telephone conference dates have been reserved and will be used as needed. Tapes of meetings are erased after a Chair-approved draft of the minutes is circulated to members. Members can communicate with each other through the UCAP listserv by addressing an email from a registered account to UCAP-L@LISTSERV.UCOP.EDU.

If members can't attend an in-person meeting, they are asked to contact their divisional senate office and the committee analyst as far in advance as possible so an alternate can be found and appointed.

II. Message from the Senate Chair and Vice Chair – *Cliff Brunk and John Oakley*

Academic Senate Chair Cliff Brunk and Vice Chair John Oakley thanked members for their volunteer service to the Academic Senate, and encouraged UCAP to be proactive in initiating reviews of APM language and other policy areas relevant to academic personnel.

Chair Brunk suggested a few topics he hoped UCAP would discuss in 2005-06. The committee might consider how the increasingly multidisciplinary nature of academic research and scholarship should be addressed and evaluated in the academic personnel process; to what extent variations in academic personnel procedures across campuses could be made more uniform; and the role of service in academic personnel evaluations. UCAP may also want to consider how the movement to electronic and other non-traditional modes of publication is changing scholarship and how CAPs should respond to that shift. Finally, UCAP should continue to monitor data on the role or non-role of gender and ethnicity in personnel actions.

Vice Chair Oakley added that he hoped UCAP would also consider the evaluation of teaching, particularly in terms of the value given to peer review vs. student evaluations. He also said that APMs can be made uniform, but they can be applied in very different ways across divisions. Differences across campuses may be appropriate, but UCAP should consider whether there are

acceptable or unacceptable degrees of local autonomy and whether UCAP has a role in recommending the standardization of certain practices.

The Chair and Vice Chair are non-voting members of UCAP and will try to attend meetings whenever possible. All Senate committees are encouraged to schedule regular executive sessions.

III. Message from the Academic Senate Executive Director – *María Bertero-Barceló*

Senate Executive Director Bertero-Barceló reported that the administrative goal of her office and staff is to ensure that the academic mission of the Senate and its faculty are met. The committee analyst is available to prepare agendas, to draft minutes, responses and reports, to share institutional knowledge and help ensure proper protocol. Meeting minutes are posted on the web and other committee documents are publicly discoverable, so members should monitor for sensitive content on the assumption that anyone could potentially see these materials. A password-protected website will soon allow UCAP to post drafts and working documents online. UCAP may be asked to comment on proposed federal and state legislation of interest to faculty to assist the Senate leadership in providing a faculty perspective in the development of UC's legislative policy positions. Committees are encouraged to suggest topics for inclusion in [*The Senate Source*](#), for which the committee analyst is available to draft and write articles. Committee members are required to use UCLA Travel to book airline tickets. Finally, UCAP should strive to accomplish its goals before the end of the year and members are encouraged to consider at least two years of service on the committee to help preserve continuity.

One member suggested that the email accompanying *The Senate Source* include brief highlights with links.

IV. Report from UCOP Consultants– *Ellen Switkes, Assistant Vice President, Academic Advancement and Myron Okada, Director, Academic Personnel Relations*

Director Okada briefed UCAP on the two-step policy making process at UCOP. Most policy initiatives emerge from campuses, the Senate, external political bodies, or UC administration. During an initial, informal review period, input is gathered from administrative bodies, the Academic Council and Senate Chairs. Following is an extended formal review phase, during which the proposal is distributed more widely to the Senate and other constituencies. Depending on the level of interest or controversy, additional review time may be provided. This fall, the Office of Academic Advancement will initiate a formal review of UCAP's Council-endorsed [proposed changes](#) to APM language criteria for advancement to Step 6 and Above Scale.

Ellen Switkes reported that the OAA will soon issue a set of personnel policies related to family accommodation for childbearing and childrearing. New "family friendly" policies were first issued in 1988 after faculty argued that birth mothers who could not afford to take leave without pay should not be forced to stay on the tenure clock. However, many in the UC community are still not aware these policies exist, so OAA has set out to clarify and publicize them and to emphasize that reviews delayed because of leaves of absence or Active Service Modified Duties should not affect reviews. In addition, birth mothers will receive an extra quarter of ASMD. UCAP members expressed disappointment that the policy continued to provide an unequal benefit for faculty on quarter and semester systems, and also remarked that it did not provide

sufficient guidance for CAPs on the problem of pro-rating the scholarly production of part-time faculty.

Another set of policy initiatives regarding sick leave, medical separation and general leaves of absence will go out for formal review this fall. New sick leave policy will provide guidance to faculty and departments about the use of sick leave and how much—one year for every 10 years of service—will be paid. APM 080 outlines procedures for the dismissal of faculty who are unable for medical reasons to continue long term work because of a mental illness, disability or other reason. Separations would be determined on a case-by-case basis through procedures involving the campuses and Senate P&T committees. Finally, APM 700 adds guidelines for the constructive resignation of faculty who may be making excessive or inappropriate use of leave.

There will be a special guaranteed open enrollment session for disability insurance this November, which all faculty are strongly encouraged to take advantage of. UCOP's annual salary survey continues to project a significant lag between UC and its "Comparison 8" institutions, although an independent study by the Mercer Group determined that taking into account total compensation such as benefits, UC is closer to market. UC has begun an internal audit of minority faculty hiring practices. Teams of administrators and faculty are conducting campus visits to review appointment procedures, and a summit is planned for spring 2006. AVP Switkes invited members to contact her with questions about academic personnel issues or with suggestions for policy changes.

The committee discussed the shortage of on-campus child care – a family friendly issue which has not been a high priority for the University in the shrinking budgets of recent years. Members expressed strong support for increasing resources around child care, including lactation rooms. Facilities should be available to help female academic personnel participate fully in university academic life, and additional spending for child care and lactation rooms should be a high budget priority as new funds from the Compact become available. Campuses should also take advantage of matching funds which are available from UCOP for the construction of on campus child care centers. From an academic personnel perspective, child care is clearly a recruitment and a retention issue and is an issue that affects not only future junior colleges, but also Assistants and regular faculty. It is also a fiscally sound investment. One member estimated it costs her campus \$300,000 to replace each lost faculty member when productivity and recruitment costs are factored in.

Action: UCAP will submit comments to Council.

V. Campus Reports.

Members shared data on local CAP practices. This data will be synthesized into a comparative survey, distributed to members and later augmented with additional data if necessary.

Riverside. The UCR CAP has 10 members. Last year it reviewed 268 case files and convened approximately 20 ad hoc committees. CAP reviews all ladder rank appointments, appraisals, merits and promotions. It does not see appointments or promotions of adjunct faculty. The EVC has final authority in most cases, except for merits in some series, for which the dean has final say. CAP members do not vote or attend discussions about personnel actions from their own department, and a "shadow" CAP reviews CAP members. As compensation for CAP service, members get one quarter teaching release or one month of summer salary. The CAP Chair gets

additional release time or two months of summer salary. CAP is run entirely by the Academic Personnel Office with administration staff support in administration offices. Last year, CAP disagreed with the administration on personnel actions approximately 1-2% of the time. CAP makes salary recommendations for new appointments and for off-scales.

Santa Barbara. The UCSB CAP has 12 members this year, plus one substitute, and former CAP members are also on call to help during periods of heavy case loads. CAP reviewed 442 files in 2004-05 and 461 in 2003-04. CAP reviews all tenure appointments, as well as non-tenure appointments with salaries more than four steps above that level; promotions to Associate and Full Professor; advancements to Step VI and Above Scale; non-routine merits including decelerations and accelerations; routine merits when there is a disagreement between department and dean; appraisals at Assistant IV; and “special” levels like Assistant V, and Associate IV and V; or finally, if CAP advice is sought or flagged by CAP in a prior audit. CAP’s involvement at pre-tenure and step II and III is minimal except if the salary is high, and adjuncts are not handled by CAP. The dean has final authority on non-tenure appointments, lecturer in PSOE, routine merits, deferrals and routine sabbaticals. CAP members have the option of voting in their department or in CAP, but most vote in the department, and shadow CAP reviews CAP members. Most CAP members receive one course release, based on the good will of the Department Chair, and 1/9 summer salary based on the average of all CAP members. CAP is administered through the Senate and does opine on salary. Ad hocs are always convened for promotion to tenure and Above Scale, and to Step VI and Full if the case is problematic.

Irvine. The Irvine CAP has 11 members. The committee reviewed 442 cases last year and 374 in 2003-04. CAP reviews appointments at all levels, including pre-tenure and lecturer SOE, merit promotions for change of series and non-change of series; promotions to Tenure, Full Professor, Step VI, Above Scale; 5-year reviews; and career equity reviews. CAP is currently evaluating files in which the dean has disagreed with the department for delegated merit increases. Last year, CAP agreed with the department 79% of the time, and agreed with modifications 89% of the time. There is a proposal to delegate Assistant II and III to deans. CAP members do not vote at the department level and recusals are required for collaborations, joint funding and family ties. CAP members receive one course per quarter release time plus \$6000 in a personal account. CAP is administered through the Senate, and eight ad hocs were convened last year.

Davis. The Davis CAP has nine members. The committee reviewed 427 files last year and convened 40 ad hocs. CAP reviews appointments at the Assistant IV level and above; promotions including Step VI and Above Scale; terminations; multi-year accelerations within rank; high level merit actions; 3rd year deferrals; and five-year reviews. Each College has a Faculty Personnel Committee, which judges most regular merit cases and appraisals. The deans make decisions on other actions, usually on the recommendation of the FPC. CAP members do not vote on cases from their own department. CAP is not informed about off scales and does not opine on salary. Compensation varies; members may be offered one course relief per year or a one-month salary financial stipend. CAP receives staff support and funding from the Academic Senate.

San Francisco. The UCSF CAP has nine members. It reviewed 376 files in 2003-04 and 374 in 2004-05, not including stewardship reviews (reviews of department chairs and deans). CAP reviews appointments in all Senate and non-Senate series; appraisals for promotion to tenure and Full Professor; advancements to Step VI and Above Scale; accelerations and decelerations of two years or more; five- year reviews; and appointments of ad hoc and search committees. The

final decision always rests with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. CAP members are not allowed to vote or be present at the department level, and are not permitted to vote or be present during CAP discussions about a fellow department faculty member. There is no release time for CAP activities, but members receive a stipend of \$5000 unrestricted funds. (CAP chairs receive \$10,000). Committee members are required to serve for three years. CAP has no input into salary, and ad hocs are convened about 10% of the time. CAP meets for three hours each week for most of the year. The EVC communicates disagreements in person rather than in writing. CAP is administered entirely by the Senate.

Berkeley. Berkeley's Budget and Interdepartmental Relations Committee has nine members. In 2003-04 BIR reviewed 1006 files, including 123 "reconsiderations" (requested by the dean after a preliminary decision). BIR reviews all appointments to professorial titles, Lecturers, Visiting appointments, Adjuncts, In-Residence, and Clinical Researchers, as well as recalls for emeritus faculty, post retirement appointments, change in departments, endowed chair appointments, and five-year reviews. BIR reviews every merit increase for every unit, and does review off-scales. Ad hocs are almost always convened for appointments to Tenure and Full Professor, but never for Step VI or Above Scale. CAP members do not vote on or otherwise participate in reviews of faculty from their own departments at the department level. As compensation, teaching loads are halved and members receive one month summer salary. In addition, the BIR Chair gets a full teaching release and three months summer salary. The BIR is supported with four FTE and funded through the Academic Senate, but housed in the Chancellor's building. BIR meets six hours per week from January to June and three hours per week from July to December. BIR does not submit a vote with its recommendations, and correspondence only goes to the dean, not the candidate. Last year there was greater than 99% agreement with administration.

Merced. Merced has 10 members, five of whom are UC faculty members external to UCM. Case load was not reported by last year's off-campus CAP chair. CAP reviews everything, but campus personnel actions have focused almost entirely on new appointments. Members are offered no release time or stipend, and CAP currently has no staff. CAP follows Berkeley's recusal policy and does not opine on salary or off-scales. Approximately eight ad hocs were convened last year. Currently CAP files are vetted electronically, and the new CAP Chair is trying to secure a paper file system as well as staff support and dedicated CAP space on campus.

Santa Cruz. The UCSC CAP has eight members. CAP reviewed 267 actions in 2004-05 and 264 the year before. CAP also convened 60 ad hocs last year. UCSC reviews nearly everything, including all appointments, tenure reviews, mid-career appraisals, career equity reviews and merits. CAP is considering delegate more actions to the deans, who currently review Acting Assistant Professor, and Assistant Professor Step III. CAP also reviews cases that are in the dean's final authority purview. CAP meets three hours per week from September to June, a schedule which has sometimes had a negative effect on appointment and retention. As compensation, members may choose between one course relief per year or one month summer salary. CAP members sign a recusal policy and can vote on cases from their own department at either the department or CAP level. CAP is funded by the Senate but housed next to Academic Human Resources, which also provides staffing. The CAP letter is sent to the department chair. The candidate can ask for a copy of the letter, but does not automatically receive it. CAP considers salary, and last year there was about 90% agreement with administration on cases.

Action: This comparative data on CAP practices at the meeting will be compiled into a draft survey, which will be circulated to members for additional input.

VI. Future CAP Priorities and Topics

Members considered a few topics that the committee wants to address and make progress on in 2005-06.

- *Research Collaborators and the Academic Personnel Process.* Members agreed that UCAP should consider ways to provide clearer guidance to CAPs on the issue of how to evaluate candidates in the academic personnel process who may have made important contributions to research projects as collaborators, but who did not demonstrate “independence” within the project as senior author or Principal Investigator. The requirement for faculty to demonstrate independence for merit and promotion is not well grounded in the APM, and appears instead to be an implicit understanding based mainly on CAP tradition. At the same time, collaboration in research is becoming more common and widespread in the academic research culture. The committee may suggest APM modifications or other best practices related what should be requested in evaluations from external reviewers, deans and the candidates.
- *Divisional CAP Differences.* After developing a snapshot survey of campus CAP practices and experiences, UCAP will consider areas where campus practices might be brought into closer congruence.
- *When is Leadership Scholarship?* UCAP will consider developing a set of criteria that will help CAPs more appropriately and meaningfully evaluate service as an intellectual activity and provide guidance about how to weight it relative to other criteria for promotion.
- *Faculty Career Database.* Ongoing monitoring of data on faculty career advancement through the step system by campus, gender and ethnicity.
- Discussion of the system of “Shadow Scales” being used on many campuses.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Tony Norman