

Attending: Alan Barbour, Chair (UCI)

B. Joseph Guglielmo, Vice-Chair, (UCSF), George Anderson (UCR), Anna Maria Busse Berger (UCD), Cynthia Brown (UCSB), Inder Chopra (UCLA), Craig Haney (UCSC), Russell Jones (UCB), William Maurer (UCI), Harvey Sollberger (UCSD), Roland Winston (UCM), Ellen Switkes (AVP, Academic Advancement), Myron Okada (Director, Academic Personnel Relations), George Blumenthal (Academic Senate Chair), Clifford Brunk (Academic Senate Vice-Chair), Maria Bertero-Barceló (Academic Senate Executive Director), Michael LaBriola (Senate Analyst)

I. UCAP Chair's Announcements – Alan Barbour

Chair Barbour welcomed members, reviewed the charge of the committee, and encouraged members to review the committee [guidelines](#). UCAP has been budgeted for four in person meetings this year, but the committee can schedule additional telephone meetings as needed. The conference call format has worked well in the past. The Chair represents UCAP on Academic Council and Academic Assembly. UCAP communicates its opinions formally through the Academic Council, and it can contact other Senate committees directly as needed. The proposed changes to APM 210, 240 and 245—which UCAAD developed last year in consultation with UCAP—were approved by Academic Council and will be sent to the campuses and the Senate for formal review this fall. The Committee Analyst records UCAP meetings, but the tapes are erased after the Chair approves the minutes and they are circulated to members. Finally, members can send messages or documents to all committee members through the UCEP listserv by addressing an email to UCAP-L@LISTSERV.UCOP.EDU.

II. Message from the Academic Senate Chair – George Blumenthal

Academic Senate Chair George Blumenthal joined the meeting and thanked members for their volunteer service to the Academic Senate. He explained how systemwide Senate committee work gives faculty a voice in shared governance and the opportunity to directly influence University policy. He encouraged UCAP to be proactive, not simply reactive, and asked that members report regularly to their local committees about systemwide business, and in turn, to share local information and concerns with UCAP. Members should be informed about divisional positions on policy, but they are not bound to represent any particular view except their own. The Chair and/or Vice Chair of the Senate will attempt to attend UCAP meetings whenever possible.

Chair Blumenthal briefly outlined some of the major issues and challenges facing the systemwide Academic Senate and the University in 2004-2005. These include:

- Long-range strategic budget and academic planning in the context of the Compact.
- Declines in funding for and quality of graduate education; visa issues, diversity, etc.
- Competing for continued management of the DOE Labs.
- Research strings, restrictions on funding sources, government panels, and academic freedom.
- Senate involvement in oversight of the California Institutes for Science and Innovation.
- Continued study of admissions, eligibility and comprehensive review policy, including admissions by exception, geographical preferences and the new SAT.
- Review of the Compendium and systemwide Senate regulations and variances.
- How to improve transfer articulation between UC and the Community Colleges.
- Efficiency of the personnel process and data on gender/ethnic disparities in the step system.
- Faculty welfare issues: potential changes to the funding of the University retirement system; recall policy; fee waivers; and parking.

- Authorizing official divisional status for the UC Merced Senate in May.

Chair Blumenthal encouraged UCAP to consider personnel standards could be applied more uniformly across the system; to study pending longitudinal data on the step system; and to examine faculty interaction in the personnel process at the National Labs. The Senate may soon ask that UC faculty representatives be part of the search process for senior scientists at the Labs. The Senate recently launched a legislative tracking and monitoring effort, which it hopes will be effective in keeping faculty informed about proposed and pending Federal and State legislation affecting the University. Some elements of the California Performance Review—proposals to save money in state government—could have a negative effect on the University. Finally, UC was able to successfully negotiate a 5-year agreement with the scholarly journal publisher Elsevier, and a Senate Task Force is convening to discuss a range of issues surrounding the future of scholarly communications, including peer review.

The Committee Analyst is available to help prepare agendas; to draft minutes, responses and reports; and to share knowledge about the work of other Senate committees.

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

Senate Executive Director Bertero-Barceló described her role and the administrative role and mission of the Senate Office, which is to support the academic mission of the faculty through their Senate committee work.

Committees are encouraged to suggest topics for inclusion in the electronic newsletter *The Senate Source*, for which the committee analyst is available to draft and write articles.

A new Senate web page dedicated to legislative matters is coming, and committees or committee members with expertise about particular issues are encouraged to get involved. A password-protected website will soon allow UCAP to post complete agendas, minutes and working documents online. Meeting minutes, including minutes on executive sessions, are publicly discoverable, and members should monitor for sensitive content on the assumption that anyone could potentially ask to see them. Senate policy has changed so that hard copies of agenda packets are no longer provided or mailed unless they exceed 125 pages. All systemwide committee members are now required to use UCLA travel to book airline tickets.

In the past UCAP has been budgeted for more meetings, but the committee did not end up using.

IV. Consultation with UCOP – *Ellen Switkes and Myron Okada*

Associate Vice President Switkes and Director Okada reviewed the role of the Office of Academic Advancement (OAA) and updated UCAP about a few upcoming issues and projects. AVP Switkes encouraged members to contact her if they have questions about APM policy or if they spot possible problems with policy.

The Office of Academic Advancement is planning a minority faculty hiring initiative, similar to the [women's initiative](#) that was so successful a few years ago.

There will be no salary scale reviews in 2004-2005, although the most recent survey of UC's Comparison 8 institutions projected a 10.7% salary lag this year. UC last reached parity with the Comparison 8 schools in 1997.

The OAA is currently reviewing systemwide policies related to paid and volunteer Clinical Professors; part time, summer session, and Emeritus faculty; compensation plans for academic appointees who are not faculty, recall policy, and post doc benefits. OAA's biyearly recruitment and retention survey of ladder rank faculty will be web-based this year. OAA continues to look for ways to create improve policies related to family. UCAP should expect to be consulted on most of these matters.

A committee of Senate members and campus and UCOP administrators met recently to discuss improving efficiencies in the personnel process. One best practice that emerged from that meeting was for campuses to increase electronic handling of paperwork and personnel files. UCAP members described progress toward increased use of electronic documents for the academic personnel activities on their campuses. At the systemwide level, the OAA talking about developing a common computer program to facilitate this. OAA is also looking at whether departments have a right to invite non-senate faculty to participate in discussion and voting in personnel matters. Collective bargaining negotiations continue with lecturers, librarians and graduate student employees, and OAA will occasionally brief UCAP on the status of these talks. Finally, OAA will soon have the capacity to analyze thirteen years of personnel data longitudinally, which will allow more accurate study of personnel issues, including some of the issues raised by the Professorial Step System Task Force last year.

V. Summary of Campus Reports

San Francisco. The issue of how credit for merit and promotion is given to “collaborators,” i.e. participants on research projects and papers who may have essential roles on the project but are not usually the first or senior author, has caused some conflict and confusion in the UCSF CAP, and a task force is forming to examine the issue. The derivation of the requirement that faculty demonstrate “independence” in research for promotion is elusive. This language appears in the APM in the Professional Research series descriptions, but not elsewhere. UCSF’s CAP generally looks for three measures of independence: senior authorship, letters describing independence, and PI status on major grants. UCSF asked UCAP’s help in sorting out an objective definition and possibly changing/clarifying the APM language.

Davis. The Davis CAP has been focusing mainly on two issues: (1) the problem of Associate Professors, especially in the Humanities and Social Sciences, who take a long time to finish a second book and remain at rank for extended lengths of time, and (2), concerns that were raised in the Step VI Task Force report, including the gender and ethnic differences at the barrier step, as well as the general issue of faculty who may find themselves stuck for years at Step V despite being productive.

Berkeley. UCB asked UCAP members for input into a recusal policy CAP has been asked to write, outlining situations where CAP members should remove themselves from participation in cases. Typically, CAP members must recuse themselves if they have collaborated, taught or published with a candidate. However, there was recently a case at UCB where nearly the entire discipline in the department was alleged to have a conflict of interest, according to the faculty member under review. One member related a similar instance on his campus—a recusal request finally had to be denied because there was no one else to review the case. At UCB, a “targeted decoupling initiative” occasionally will accelerate young faculty individuals who are seen as potential targets of outside offers. In some cases, CAP will also respond directly to outside offers with accelerations.

Action: Berkeley will distribute a draft of its recusal policy for UCAP member comment.

Merced. The Merced campus CAP consists of about half external members, which will change as the campus adds more faculty. UCM is seeking UCAP’s advice on a policy for joint/split/affiliated appointments. Several members said their CAPs consider shared FTE situations as generally undesirable, although there is not outright rejection of this as an option. A faculty member preferably should be anchored in one home, existing department, especially for academic personnel matters. It can also be difficult to ensure a truly shared service and teaching situation in a split appointment. Departments will sometimes try to undo a joint appointment, but this can be difficult when a professor has tenure, even at 0% FTE. However, split appointments

can also allow two departments to share a single FTE and can be recruitment tools, as long as the situation is fully described in precise terms in writing at the time of hire.

Action: Members are encouraged to forward examples of written policies to Professor Winston over email. He will eventually share a draft of the UCM policy.

Irvine. UCI's CAP has developed specific career equity reviews guidelines, which re-evaluate a faculty member's entire career to see if he or she has been placed at the appropriate rank and step. However, in practice male faculty members are often the ones taking advantage of the career equity review option, even though the process was originally intended more to be a safeguard against possible bias toward women and minority faculty. CAP is reviewing APM criteria for Above Scale promotions; specifically, what constitutes "acclaim," and is conducting a survey of departments in order to reevaluate the criteria for excellence reviews of Non-Senate Lecturers.

Finally, UCAP members discussed 50% in-residence appointments, which are increasingly common especially with new medical school hires at UCI, and are being extended to a more limited extent to other academic units on the campus.

Riverside. CAP is also reviewing the criteria for Above Scale review. The committee has also questioned whether it is necessary for ad hoc committees to be composed exclusively of Above Scale faculty. CAP is encouraging faculty under review for Step VI to secure letters from other UC faculty, because non-UC faculty do not understand the step system well enough to prepare appropriate letters.

San Diego. UCSD's expansion comes with academic personnel challenges. Many leaders in the new Pharmacy and Management Schools are from outside the UC system, and need to be educated about proper personnel procedures such as file preparation. CAP is also concerned about wide variations in pay scales across fields and schools; for instance, assistant economics professors with competing offers who enter UC with starting salaries that greatly exceed those for assistant faculty in other fields. UCAP members went on to discuss which campus CAPs get involved in setting salary (about half). At least one campus requires hard evidence of counter offers.

Santa Cruz. The Santa Cruz CAP is studying what the standards should be for career equity reviews. CAP is also concerned with the Professorial Step System Task Force's conclusion that UCSC may have a much higher than average number of professors sitting at Step V compared to other UC campuses.

Santa Barbara. UCSB has always required ad hoc committees for promotions to tenure and Above Scale and made them optional for Full Professor and Step VI. This year, CAP is experimenting with optional ad hocs at the tenure level. A quick survey of UCAP members showed that most campuses require ad hocs at tenure. (It was also noted that decisions to do an ad hoc should not disproportionately fall on the cases of women and minorities). CAP is encouraging more attention to teaching in department letters and peer review, and is also asking that self-evaluations include a philosophy of teaching. Finally, CAP is seeking stronger justifications from departments in acceleration cases, and is writing a proposal about how to encourage faculty "stuck" at Step V to stay productive.

Los Angeles. CAP is developing criteria for the evaluation and advancement of collaborators (in the sense described for UCSF's CAP), criteria for accelerations at senior professor levels, and criteria for advancement in the clinical and adjunct series, which are not as clear and consistent as those for ladder or resident series. UCLA is also considering limits on self-evaluation statements. (UCR said it has a two-page limit for merits, and a three-page limit for promotions). CAP is frustrated by outside letter writers' lack of knowledge about the UC step system. UCAP

members discussed “shadow” or “reserve” CAPs that review the cases of CAP members on some campuses. The “shadow” CAP consists of former CAP members who have never worked on CAP with the faculty member under review.

VI. Consent Calendar

Items considered non-controversial will be placed on the consent calendar unless there is a request to remove them for more in-depth discussion.

Action: UCAP approved the Draft Recommendations for Guidelines and Procedures Governing the Academic Senate’s Role in the Development of a New Campus and for Granting Divisional Status to a New Campus.

VII. Language Criteria for Advancement to Step VI and Above Scale

There has been a long history of Senate and Administration discussion about the step system in general and Step VI, otherwise known as the “barrier step,” in particular. Some faculty continue to raise concerns about the fairness of the barrier step. For instance, there is the concern that the Step VI barrier may act to prevent some professors at Step V, who remain productive but who generally do not meet the criteria for step VI advancement, from achieving a higher salary and staying motivated. Last year, a Senate Task Force convened to study the issue again. Among its other findings and [recommendations](#), the Task Force noted that the APM language describing the criteria for advancement to Step VI is difficult to distinguish from the language for advancement to Above Scale. The Academic Council now asks UCAP to undertake a review of the APM language describing the criteria for advancement from Step V to Step VI and to Above Scale.

During the discussion of this charge from the Academic Council, there was general agreement with Council that the definitions for advancement to Step VI and Above Scale were very similar. One member commented that for advancement to Step VI, there seems to be more emphasis upon the trajectory of the work and its promise for the future than on an end-of-career recognition for past achievement. The difference might be encapsulated in the difference between the word “sustained” with VI, and “cumulative” with Above Scale. There seem to be two main differences in Above Scale criteria, “Internationally recognized” reputation is mentioned specifically, and there is no mention of meritorious service. One member suggested Step VI be treated as an occasion for a full career review, in which some would advance beyond VI, to VII or VIII. It was also suggested that the letter accompanying external review requests could include clarifying language, identical for each campus, and that UCAP could make this recommendation.

Members discussed what specific elements in the APM language might require additional clarification. Some thought that in general, it would be useful for the criteria to be more objective, if possible. One member suggested that Step VI language be weakened and Above Scale elevated. For Step VI, the APM currently requires distinguished scholarship *and* meritorious service *and* evidence of excellent teaching. The suggestion was that one or more of the *ands* could be changed to *or*, for in practice, the research component is often more highly valued than teaching and service. On the other hand, as some members pointed out, the emphasis on excellence in all three areas has encouraged UC faculty to strive beyond a one-dimensional career, especially in terms of service.

Members agreed on the importance of ensuring fair and consistent application of advancement standards across gender and ethnic groups. For assessment of this, the committee looks forward

to the longitudinal study of faculty advancement across the UC system that is being compiled by the UCOP. The committee anticipates that the data and its analysis will help resolve questions about biases in the advancement process.

Members also agreed that differences between campuses in the interpretation of the definitions for Step VI and Above Scale advancements may be one of the determinants in the disparity between campuses in the proportions of in-line Professors who are Step VI and Above Scale. For instance, it seems from the data that advancement to Step VI and beyond is more stringent at UCSC. The lack of consensus on how this came to be and the extent of the problem on other campuses prompted the members to seek further information on this point at their own campuses and divisional CAPs.

Action: UCAP members agreed to gather data on both successful and unsuccessful Step VI cases from last year and during this year. Members will bring findings to the December meeting. Ellen Switkes will inform the appropriate campus personnel about this plan, and she will circulate a list of specific questions UCAP members should ask about the cases.

VIII. Future Topics and Meeting Dates

UCAP members discussed topics that the committee expects to work on or be consulted on during the year.

National Labs. UCAP may be asked to serve as consultants or advisors to oversight committees and National Laboratories themselves with regard to further development or change in what is equivalent to the academic personnel process at each Laboratory. At this point, UCAP members do not fully understand the workings and culture of the academic personnel process at the Laboratories. Members suggested a UC-style peer review culture would benefit younger faculty in particular, and might prevent problems like those seen recently at Los Alamos.

Electronic Publications and Peer Review. The perspective of the committee was that CAPs generally strive to credit electronic-only publications as they would a print publication, but there remains some skepticism about this form of publication, in some cases. Members also discussed the increasing number of people in the Humanities who are publishing with less-well-known publishers, and occasionally publishers that require a subvention. As electronic publication increases and University presses continue to cut back the number of new titles, these issues will become increasingly critical in the personnel process.

Collaborators. UCAP may be able to help develop standards for individual campuses to follow in regards to how the “collaborative researcher” who is not clearly independent by the traditional standards can be fairly evaluated in the academic personnel process. Members agreed that further defining “independence” and “collaboration” will be difficult, but very important, as much of the research in the biological sciences as well as the earth, physical, and social sciences is increasingly collaborative.

Action: Professor Guglielmo will review the APM and gather instances where language appears about the need for research to be independent.

Spring meeting dates. The next in person meeting is December 7. The committee will not meet in January. Members were asked to hold February 8, and will decide for sure in December.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Alan Barbour