

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA** **ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL**

December 6, 2005 Meeting Minutes

**Attending:** Tony Norman, Chair (UCR)

James Hunt (UCB), Jack Talbott (UCSB), Daniel Mitchell (UCLA) J. Hampton Atkinson (UCSD) Catherine Morrison Paul (UCD), Charles Ribak (UCI), Arthur Woodward (UCM), Allen Zych (UCR), Susan Gillman (UCSC), Daniel Weiss (UCAAD chair, UCSF) Gibor Basri (UCAAD vice-chair, UCB) Ellen Switkes (AVP, Academic Advancement), Myron Okada (Director, Academic Personnel Relations), Clifford Brunk (Academic Senate Chair), John Oakley (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Michael LaBriola (Senate Analyst)

**I. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** The committee approved the minutes of October 11, 2005 with a few modifications.

**Action:** The committee approved for submission to Council the draft letter on child care, pending confirmation that the policy providing matching funds for the construction of child care facilities in new constructions is still active. Ellen Switkes will also forward a list of the uses of the funds from the last five years.

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

Myron Okada reported that UCAP's Academic Council-endorsed proposal for [modifications](#) to APM language criteria for advancement to step VI and Above Scale has been sent to campuses for formal review. This review period will last up to three months. If a consensus is reached, the new criteria will be in place by July 1. In proposing the modifications, UCAP was attempting to address inconsistencies across campuses in the application of APM language criteria, and distinguish differences in the criteria for the barrier step and above scale reviews. Another change in the language emphasizes that the entire career should be taken into account for these advancements and that "sustained excellence" is important.

Vice Chair Oakley said there is no guarantee that changing APM language will have a discernable impact on culture. UCAP should continue to consider how supposedly uniform APM standards are being applied on the local level and whether UCAP has a role in enforcing more consistency.

UCAP discussed whether it might propose for systemwide use, new wording for the sample letters of solicitation that are sent to outside reviewers. Reviewers from institutions outside the system are sometimes confused by the UC step system. Some members of the committee supported this idea, while others said UCAP couldn't micro-manage this process, and campus personnel offices bore the main responsibility for incorporating the new wording into their calls and sample letters.

One member proposed that a cross-campus database of step VI and Above Scale assessment criteria be developed to help CAPs compare how other campuses promote faculty in various departments and fields. Some campuses already use cross departmental databases to assess equity within their own campus, and to compare professors who have attained step VI with those up for step VI review. Members thought it would be difficult to quantifiably compare criteria like teaching and publication in a meaningful way, considering the diversity of local campus cultures and academic personnel practices. However, they thought it would be useful to see a list of all Above Scale faculty for each campus to help get a sense of where faculty sit. If members have the need to consult the list, it is available will inform the academic personnel offices about the request to see the list of Above Scale faculty.

Director Okada noted that UCOP would be engaging in an upcoming bargaining session with Unit 18 lecturers.

Ellen Switkes reported that the special guaranteed open enrollment session for disability insurance yielded at least 3000 new enrollees from the academic group. Before the session, only 65% of UC faculty had been enrolled in the supplemental disability benefit. The concern now is to ensure that young faculty members take advantage of the opportunity when they join UC. A new sick leave policy is being developed to provide clearer guidance to faculty and departments about the use of sick leave and how much of it faculty can expect to accrue. A new medical separation policy outlines procedures for the dismissal of faculty who are unable to continue work because of a disability. Finally, a constructive resignation policy provides guidelines related to faculty who may be making excessive or inappropriate use of leave.

The Office of Academic Advancement is preparing to issue a set of “family friendly” personnel policies related to family accommodation for childbearing and childrearing. The main purpose is to clarify and publicize existing policies; extend Active Service Modified Duties benefit for birth mothers; and to emphasize that reviews delayed because of ASMD should be considered on-time and without prejudice.

President Dynes has appointed a [Task Force](#) charged with conducting a comprehensive review of efforts around minority faculty hiring and diversity at the University. The Task Force will complete its final report and recommendations in early 2006, and in the spring, President Dynes will convene a systemwide summit. UCAP and UCAAD both have an interest in and responsibility for faculty diversity.

### **III. UC Berkeley Compensation Working Group**

UCB representative Hunt reported that a working group at Berkeley has proposed a new and separate strategy for faculty compensation at UCB, which is available in a [report](#) on the web.

UC’s current faculty compensation system is not competitive. At Berkeley, faculty salaries lag 15-20% behind peer institutions, and an inordinate amount of time and resources are spent identifying “decoupled” or off-scale increments on a case by case basis that are believed will be competitive in attracting and retaining top faculty. Moreover, 84% of assistant professors at UCB are decoupled from the UC salary system to meet market conditions; so the current system has created an inversion between assistant and associate professor salaries, which are serious problems for equity and morale.

To compete with peer institutions, the working group has proposed a new system: identify the actual institutions Berkeley competes with for faculty and model the practices of those institutions in terms of how faculty are rewarded—specifically, institute the practice of offering substantial salary increments at promotion to tenure and at full professor, and second, identify market salaries separately by discipline. Gradually remove the inversions by phasing in market based salaries for all departments.

The working group has proposed several solutions to fund the system: a tax on endowed chairs; a strategy to “retire the old and hire the young”; and altering the downward shift in the percentage of campus resources going to faculty salaries (from 18% in 1990 to 16% in 2003).

Finally, the system must be transparent, and must maintain the current system of shared governance, including faculty review of academic personnel actions.

One member noted that the faculty should involve the administration, regents and legislature in an open conversation and honest negotiation about the role of faculty salaries in the budget, the need to hire more faculty, and the necessity of fairly compensating faculty.

Members discussed the effectiveness of campus incentives to encourage older faculty to retire faster. CAP also has the option of culling out non-productive faculty through decelerations.

Other campuses are also discussing strategies to address salary lag, inequities, and rampant decoupling, with varying levels of input from the Academic Senate. Council hopes that UCAP will come up with advice.

#### **IV. Consultation with UCAAD Chair and Vice Chair – *Daniel Weiss and Gibor Basri***

The chair and vice chair of the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD), joined UCAP to ask for help in the implementation of several APM policy changes that took effect on July 1. Modifications to APM 210 added diversity language to the set of possible criteria for faculty advancement, while 240 and 245 asked administrators to maintain and report on divisional affirmative action programs. UCAAD Chair Weiss said the modifications presented new opportunities for recognition of diversity activities in teaching, research and service. The June 2005 *Senate Source* contains an [article](#) that summarizes the changes.

UCAAD Vice Chair Basri and Council Chair Brunk both sit on the President’s Task Force for Faculty Diversity, which has been meeting with CAPs and other entities during scheduled campus visits. In general, the Task Force has found that faculty and department chairs are not aware of the changes. In the past, not all faculty members have felt comfortable claiming credit for their work in these areas. CAPs can help draw awareness to them by communicating to department chairs the shift in emphasis and CAP’s expectation that this issue will be addressed. CAPs may also want to consider how they will value these kinds of contributions. Finally, local diversity committees and CAPs should continue to build relationships around these and other issues.

Minority faculty in particular are often compelled to serve on multiple committees and take on extra mentoring activities, and as a result their research work is slowed down. Service is the least quantifiable element in a review, and faculty, in general, sometimes neglect to give themselves appropriate credit for service. But the APM revisions also recognize diversity in teaching and research, which may not have valued as highly in the past. Diversity “activities” from a scholarly perspective can take many forms. For example, a faculty-designed professional development program on one campus focuses on pedagogical methods of teaching math discussion sections to be more effective for students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

As usual, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to include evidence of these activities in the dossier. Chair Weiss said CAP should evaluate such activities the same way it does any other form of scholarly activity—on the basis of its excellence. The fundamental definitions of teaching, research or service have not changed, and diversity activities are not a requirement, or in their absence, a negative. The underlying intent is to give credit and formal recognition where there is real quality.

Members agreed that it would be important that for and deans to be informed. UCAAD would like to follow up with UCAP in the future to find out how many cases the CAPs saw, in which the new criteria were an element. At the end of the year it may be desirable for some report to be generated on each campus by CAPs or CAADs, which reviews what specific steps the campuses took to make faculty and departments aware of the APM modification, and how they came into play during the year—e.g. in what percentage of the files reviewed were these issues were a factor.

**Action:** Members will discuss implementation with their divisional committees. Chair Brunk will ask divisional senate chairs to place the topic on their advisory council agendas.

## V. Research Collaborators and the Academic Personnel Process.

Members discussed the possibility of proposing changes to APM language that would provide clearer guidance to CAPs in their evaluations of academic personnel candidates who may have made important contributions to research projects as collaborators, but who did not demonstrate “independence” within the project as senior author or principle investigator. As academic research becomes more interdisciplinary and collaborative, all CAPs are striving to fairly emphasize the contributions of collaborators, but no easy formula exists.

Many CAPs face the challenge of giving appropriate credit to the “names in the middle” of multi-authored papers. The list of all contributors to a project may total in the hundreds, depending on the discipline, if they are listed at all. Demonstrated “independence” is one type of emphasis in a review, and the importance of doing independent research and being a driving force behind the creative work in a project is clear. Some CAPs require an addendum that quantifies the creative role of the collaborator under review in terms of a percentage. But some contributors supply a very specific, specialized skill or contribution, which is integral to the project, but may be difficult to quantify.

Candidates themselves have to take responsibility for identifying their role in a project, but self-reporting can be inaccurate. The department letter should also interpret and explain the role in detail. A suggestion was made that CAPs ask the candidate to also describe the role of the other co-authors and, if a large number of papers are listed, to identify a subset where the candidate had the most significant contributions.

The UCSF Collaborative Research Committee has recommended new APM language for the Professor, Professional Research, and Project Scientist series. The proposed language seeks to address difficulty in evaluating collaborative work by clarifying that both the candidate and the department chair have a responsibility to establish and assess the candidate’s role in a multi-authored effort. It asks CAP to seek additional internal and external opinions for more information in complicated cases, and broadens that beyond performing arts to include more general cases of collaboration. One UCEP member said existing APM language was sufficiently clear about the department and candidate roles. Other members agreed with the UCSF committee that new APM language would be useful to guide CAPs in an environment of increased collaboration.

**Action:** A subcommittee of Charles Ribak, Tony Norman, and Mary Croughan will write a formal proposal for new APM language in the professor, professional research, and project scientist series. If UCAP as a whole concurs, the committee will submit the proposal and a justification to Academic Council.

## V. Campus Reports/Survey

Members discussed local CAP involvement in determining salaries and off-scale increments at the time of hiring or in retention cases.

**Irvine.** CAP does not determine or review proposals for salaries at hire or for off-scales, which are set by the dean and/or chair. CAP does review the justification for maintaining an off-scale, whether it is based on retention or other reasons submitted by the department. In retention cases where the department wants to promote an individual, CAP asks to see the written offer.

**Santa Cruz.** CAP reviews the department and dean salary recommendations made to the EVC, and then makes its own recommendation. CAP votes on rank and step (for merits and

promotions) and on the salary. CAP follows up to see the degree of agreement. CAP sees the whole file for retentions.

**Riverside.** CAP makes recommendations regarding off-scales after considering the department and dean proposals. Most of CAP's disagreements with the administration are over off-scales. CAP is not involved in the review or determination of salaries for new appointments and rarely sees retention cases.

**Berkeley.** At Berkeley, CAP is involved in a wide range of salary and off-scale salary reviews. For new hires, salary is determined by the market—based on the salaries of recent hires in the department or matching offers from comparable institutions. The campus's policy on retention is to match all outside offers from peer institutions, although this policy is under review. Berkeley's Targeted Decoupling Initiative (TDI) provides money to fund one extra step for the 20% of professors who are seen to pose a retention risk. CAP evaluates the off-scales of assistant and associate professors during their mid-career review (adjusted up only).

**Merced.** At Merced, the EVC makes all salary and off-scale determinations. CAP sees the dean's salary recommendation, but does not opine and has been told that its comments are not welcome. CAP is noticing rampant salary and off-scale inequities, but there is no campus policy for off-scales. The Senate wants to play a role in the development of a policy.

**Santa Barbara.** CAP reviews salary proposals for new hires. CAP also sees the departmental and dean recommendations for off-scale increments and may opine in disagreements in cases that exceed \$2000.

**Los Angeles.** At UCLA, as off-scales have become more common in recent years, CAP has asked to review salary information with mixed success. CAP does not routinely opine on 9-month salaries, but the committee has made comments when it views an off-scale offer as too low. As a result, some deans are now withholding off-scale information from CAP. Medical school cases sometimes list a \$0 (19900) salary in cases before CAP.

**Davis.** CAP does not opine on salary and is not informed about off-scales except in cases of hiring and retention. At Davis, most off-scales during a hire or in a retention case are based on a competing outside offers. 38% of Davis faculty are on an off-scale. There is a big concern on campus about equity, particularly the growing level of compression and inversion between ranks.

**San Diego.** CAP reviews salary for all appointments, accelerations and retentions, and all off-scale requests. The Engineering and Business Schools often present detailed market analysis—a practice CAP is encouraging of departments in the Humanities and Social Sciences. For some cases, CAP also requests information on the source of funding.

The comparative survey will be updated with the reported data on salary practices, distributed to members and later augmented with additional data if necessary. This snapshot of campus CAP practices and experiences will help UCAP identify areas where campus practices might be brought into closer congruence.

Members discussed what the best model would be for CAP involvement in salary and off-scale decisions. Some CAPs are satisfied with their current position—not commenting on salary—while others see their involvement in salary matters as a vital part of shared governance. CAP involvement is also useful in monitoring issues of equity across divisions. Giving CAPs the option of having certain level of input into salary might be one element of standardization to consider. UCAP could make a statement recommending that as a minimum, CAPs should be

entitled to the information and have the right, if they so request it, to see salary information. It would leave it to campus CAPs to request it. CAPs should ask Academic human resources should have this information available. It would be difficult to standardize anything because campuses have individual cultures. Every campus should have a clear, written, and excellent policy on the use of off-scales.

## **VI. Senate Response to the Broken Salary System**

The Senate is considering a response to the executive compensation controversy. It was suggested that UCAP play a leadership role in helping to advise Academic Council about how to respond.

Members agreed that the UC rank and step system has always been a key strength of the University, but the University has failed to negotiate budgets that would allow salaries to keep pace with comparable institutions. As a result, UC faculty salaries are 15-20% below comparable institutions and inequities are increasing across departments. The salary scale is losing its meaning. Every campus is struggling to address this problem, and two campuses, Berkeley and Irvine, have undertaken concerted experiments to address inequities within the broken system.

The committee agreed that the administration and faculty should engage in an open, transparent discussion about the crisis and work together to fix the system. Recommendations for best practices should be examined and assessed from many sources, including Berkeley and Irvine. One member suggested that UC should move toward semi-privatization on the Michigan model.

## **VII. CAP at UC Merced**

The Merced representative reported that there was a growing feeling of dissatisfaction at Merced over the lack of faculty input into salaries and off-scales. Although APM 620 requires each campus to develop, with the consultation of the Academic Senate, a policy and procedures for determining the criteria for appointment or advancement to a position with an off-scale, there is not such policy at Merced. Another point of concern for CAP is the EVC's request that CAP convene an ad hoc for every appointment, full professor and step VI case. On most campuses, CAPs themselves determine when or whether ad hocs should be convened, or there is a policy outlining when they should be convened. There is no ad hoc policy at Merced.

The Merced representative asked UCAP members to consider strategies that would help encourage an atmosphere of shared governance at the new campus.

**Action:** The committee will consider writing a letter to Council regarding the situation at Merced, pending more information from the Merced CAP.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.  
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola  
Attest: Tony Norman

### **Distributions**

1. Comparative survey of CAP practices
2. APM 210, 240, 245 showing modifications related to diversity