

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

## MINUTES OF MEETING

DECEMBER 19, 2006

**Attending:** Mary Croughan, Chair (UCSF)

James Hunt, Vice Chair (UCB), Carl Shapiro (UCB), Alladi Venkatesh (UCI), Richard Sutch (UCR), Steven Plaxe (UCSD), Jack Talbott (UCSB), Barry Bowman (UCSC), Paul Micevych (UCLA), Margaret Walsh (UCSF), Sheila O'Rourke (Acting Assistant Vice President), Jill Slocum (Director, Health Sciences Compensation), Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

**I. Chair's Announcements – Mary Croughan**

In early November, President Dynes convened a faculty-administration work group to discuss potential changes to the faculty salary scales. UCAP Chair Croughan and the chairs of UCFW and UCPB sit on the work group, which is chaired by Provost Hume and has met twice over the phone. Chair Croughan noted that the work group will consider UCAP's principles and recommendations document after the review period ends and Council acts on the document. She said that UCAP is poised to have an influential voice in the work group's ultimate proposal.

The work group is considering a number of recommendations for improving the fairness and transparency of the published salary scales. It wants to ensure that salary scale policies and practices are fair, consistent, and enforced. There is support for a single University scale that also respects the autonomy of the campuses and the continued flexibility to use of off-scales for recruitment and retention. The groups recognizes the need for higher salaries as well as for parity allotments for productive faculty who have not advanced as quickly or been able to use outside offers as a tool to increase salaries.

Acting Assistant Vice President Sheila O'Rourke noted that lagging salaries are a major cause of the salary scale crisis. But strategies to bring more faculty back on-scale could also involve adjusting the definition of off-scale. She said salaries are considered "decoupled" when the off-scale salary amount exceeds the next step in a range. For instance, if Step I of a range is \$50K and Step II is \$55K, \$52K is considered an "off-scale," while 56K is considered "decoupled." By treating steps as ranges (\$50,000-54,999) rather than as points, and by considering anything within that range to be on-scale, the number of faculty considered off-scale would decrease substantially with no associated cost. Currently, 63% of total faculty and 94% of new assistant professor hires receive an off-scale salary. Broadening the ranges alone would reduce that to 39%. Combined with a 5% salary increase, the total number of "off-scale" faculty would fall to 29%; with a 10% salary increase it would fall to 22%; and with a 15% salary increase, it would fall to 16%.

Chair Croughan noted that changing steps to be a continuous range could reduce the number of accelerated merits reviewed by CAPs and would give department chairs the flexibility to recommend a raise in salary without a merit review. She said the president is committed to raising salaries, and that there is strong support in the administration for viewing UC as One University with a common salary scale. She acknowledged a concern among faculty that any salary increases could be substantially negated by increased health care premiums and changes to the pension plan.

Chair Croughan met (by telephone) with the University Committee on Library in November to discuss the digitization of the academic personnel process. UCOL supports a move to an electronic-only review format. A few campuses have established electronic review mechanisms, but other campuses are resisting such a change due to implementation costs and concerns over security.

## **II. Conversation with UCFW Chair Susan French**

University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) Chair Susan French joined the meeting (by telephone) to discuss areas of interest shared by her committee and UCAP.

Chair French is on the Salary Scales Work Group with Chair Croughan. She noted the importance of fixing the salary scales, not only for reasons of competitiveness and fairness but also as a political necessity. There have been concerns raised that some undeserving faculty will benefit from higher base scales, but those concerns should not distract from the central need to raise salaries.

Chair French said UCFW has asked Mercer Consulting to reconsider some of the methodology Mercer used in its study of UC compensation, which suggested that taking into consideration benefits, UC provided better total remuneration than its competitors, although UC faculty salaries were lower. UCFW is previewing Mercer's updated study in January.

UCFW has also asked Mercer to study and project the impacts of various proposed changes to health care and retirement benefits. UCFW is concerned that increasing health care premiums and the expected resumption of UC employee contributions to the pension plan in July 2007 will have a detrimental impact on the UC workforce. In addition, UCFW continues to be concerned about on-campus child care facilities, parking, and the future of health care coverage.

One UCAP member noted that the UC faculty should have better access to the University's own health care facilities. UCAP will forward Chair French letters the committee wrote in early 2006 urging more support for the construction of on-site child care facilities, and comments received in 2005 about evaluating the advancement of part-time faculty on a part-time basis.

## **III. Consent Calendar**

- Draft minutes of October 17, 2006
- Proposed Modification to Senate Bylaw 205 Pt I. A

**Action:** The committee approved the consent calendar.

## **IV. Consultation with the Office of the President – Sheila O'Rourke and Jill Slocum**

Sheila O'Rourke reported that in general, the University is seeking to make policy and practice more consistent and to eliminate policy exceptions. The Office of the President has been tasked with creating a more transparent, logical, and understandable policy framework for Senior Management Group (SMG) compensation. The Office is also working on several specific policy revisions related to SMG compensation identified by The Regents as short-term priorities. These include new policies covering sabbatical leave compensation and permissible outside activities of SMG employees.

Health Sciences Compensation Director Jill Slocum described two additional policy initiatives for 2006-07. The first is modifying a provision in APM 600 that allows faculty and senior managers with fiscal year appointments to earn, in exceptional circumstances, an additional 1/11<sup>th</sup> or 1/12<sup>th</sup> salary for the purpose of research, in exchange for one month vacation. The second is revising a University of California Retirement Plan policy permitting employees who separate from the University for up to two days before a July 1 retirement date to receive an “inactive COLA” of approximately 2%. The Senate – and UCAP – will have the opportunity to review all policy proposals.

New policies governing the salary scales are still in the early stages of discussion, but there is a consensus that faculty salaries should be raised while allowing campuses the continued latitude to use off-scale increments to recruit and retain the best faculty. As such, policy language should recognize that off-scale salaries are not “exceptions” but a legitimate part of normal compensation practices to meet the current competitive environment.

One UCAP member noted that adjusting the ranges will still lead to a tendency over time for all faculty to move to the top of the range.

#### **V. Nominees to University Professor Ad Hoc Review Committee**

A campus is recommending the University Professor title for one of its faculty. [APM 260](#) requires that for such appointments the President appoint an ad hoc faculty review committee nominated by UCAP. UCAP reviewed a list of potential ad hoc committee nominees distributed at the meeting and made its recommendations to Director Slocum. Director Slocum will contact UCAP’s nominees, and at a later date, before the President makes a decision, UCAP will have the opportunity to review the full file as well as the recommendation of the ad hoc committee.

#### **VI. Academic Senate Analysis of Inclusiveness and Proposition 209**

UCAP discussed Council’s request for input into a comprehensive study about the effect of Proposition 209 on diversity at UC. UCAP was asked to investigate the following questions: *What have been the characteristics of our faculty since Proposition 209? What issues have had an impact on hiring, retention, and promotion of a diverse faculty since Proposition 209?*

Sheila O’Rourke reported that a Regents’ Study Group on University Diversity is charged with conducting the study. The Academic Council chair and vice chair sit on the Study Group, which is divided into four work teams. The team assigned to consider faculty diversity is building on the [Report](#) of last year’s President’s Task Force on Faculty Diversity. That report contains historical demographic data on faculty appointments, but does not address the Health Sciences, one area the faculty diversity work team will discuss in more depth.

The Task Force Report indicates that after Proposition 209, the hiring of underrepresented minorities (URM) and women dropped. A modest recovery followed, but overall numbers have remained flat. The post-209 recovery is weak when the data are disaggregated by field and weighed against the availability pool. Retention of minority faculty is a particular problem.

UCAP discussed issues and barriers having an impact on the hiring, promotion, and retention of a diverse faculty and possible steps to improve the situation.

- The University must be more aggressive in competing for minority faculty candidates, many of whom UC loses to institutions that are able to offer higher salaries and structure hiring practices outside the confines of Proposition 209. UC should offer more competitive salaries and enhance existing Proposition 209-compliant programs that increase the odds of hiring diverse candidates through FTE set asides and incentives.
- Departments and search committees should structure their recruitment and hiring practices to increase diversity by considering a candidate's diversity and mentoring activities in search criteria; by expanding programs (like UCSF's Search Ambassador Program) that provide extra outreach to minority candidates in searches; and by increasing expectations and accountability in the recruitment process..
- The University can do more to retain minority faculty by creating more leadership opportunities and increasing institutional support for minority mentorship programs.
- UC can recruit more of our own minority graduate students into faculty positions; increase diversity in the Pipeline; and increase outreach efforts to K-12 schools.
- UC can begin to see diversity and equity as part of the academic mission by setting aside FTE for diversity related research. A good example of this is UC Berkeley's Diversity Research Initiative.
- Finally, UCAP and campus CAPs can help the University implement the modifications to APM 210, 240, and 245, which give extra credit for diversity related teaching and service activities.

**Action:** Chair Croughan will convey the committee's discussion to the Academic Council in December.

## **VII. UCPB Budget Recommendations**

UCAP reviewed a set of budget recommendations from the University Committee on Planning and Budget. They are based on the UCPB "[Futures Report](#)," which outlines potential long-term funding scenarios and their consequences for the University. UCPB is concerned that UC's funding is not keeping pace with growth, and projects that funding discrepancies will worsen over time. UCPB's recommendations include a return to Comparison 8 salary parity by 2014-15, the expansion of graduate enrollment, and the reversal of an eroding student-faculty ratio. UCPB asks UCOP and The Regents to make specific requests for budget augmentations that will restore funding and meet these goals.

UCAP members noted that UCPB's document should assign priorities to the problems it identifies. It also would be also effective to present evidence that the budget situation is hurting UC's academic mission or California's economy. The real cost of hiring faculty has gone up in a way that state funding has not. FTE intended for new faculty is being used to supplement insufficient salaries, which is eroding the student-faculty ratio and forcing more frequent use of lecturers. UC is taking more students, but has not received equivalent support to hire more faculty. UC is a research university and UC faculty do not carry the same teaching loads as faculty in other segments of higher education.

**Action:** Chair Croughan will communicate UCAP’s views at the December 20 Academic Council meeting.

### **VIII. The Use of “Collegiality” in Personnel Reviews**

UCAP considered a request from the chair of the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) for information about the use of “collegiality” as a factor in promotion and merit decisions. The UCAF chair also asked UCAP to conduct a ten-year audit of divisional CAP records to determine how many CAP decisions were overturned by the administration and for what reason.

UCAP does not conduct such audits. UCAP members could not recall a case where a CAP recommended denial of a merit or a promotion based solely on “collegiality.” CAPs review all files based on criteria outlined in APM 210. However, the Davis CAP member noted in an email that there is an active case on his campus involving an accusation about the inappropriate use of this criterion. UCAP members decided the committee should not get involved in an active case on a campus. The issue raised by the UCAF chair is more appropriately in the purview of the Privilege and Tenure committee.

**Action:** Chair Croughan will contact the UCAF chair.

### **IX. Research Collaborators and the Academic Personnel Process**

UCAP discussed the possibility of modifying the APM to more clearly define the criteria for “independence” and “collaboration” in research. It is sometimes difficult to interpret and assess the unique creative achievements of individual collaborators in a multidisciplinary venture, particularly when assessing the “independence” of the individual. Modifying the APM could give faculty and CAPs clearer guidance about how collaborative contributions are evaluated in academic personnel reviews.

There was no clear consensus in UCAP about whether to pursue the issue. Some members felt it was of growing importance particularly due to the increase in collaborative and multidisciplinary research on the campuses, and because CAPs sometimes face problems valuing the unique creative achievements of individual collaborators. Some members felt the APM should be as ambiguous as possible because CAPs should view every case as unique, while others viewed the APM as an important guide for CAPs that helped to ground all decisions on clear objective criteria. UCAP considered the possibility of initiating a memo to campus CAPs asking them to consider the issue themselves and steps like making greater use of the Project Scientist title.

**Action:** UCAP will continue to work on these definitions and revised APM language during the coming year. A subcommittee will be appointed to address this issue.

### **X. Campus Reports**

**Los Angeles.** There is a proposal to create a special CAP subcommittee, which would be composed of one current CAP member and several past members, to review actions in the Clinical Professor X series. CAP is also discussing the consequences of going up for early tenure, especially before a Fourth-Year Appraisal and the Vice Chancellor’s request to change the policy for converting an unsuccessful early tenure attempt to a Fourth-Year Appraisal, giving candidates three chances at tenure. Finally, CAP wants to extend the medical school model for

preparing dossiers campuswide so that dossiers arrive at CAP with the best articles or creative works having been self-identified by the candidate.

**Berkeley.** The Budget Committee (CAP) is revisiting its procedures for campus Ad Hoc Review Committees, which the Budget Committee normally recommends for all senior appointment and promotion cases. The issue is whether the Budget Committee should discuss the case and draft a charge letter noting specific areas it wishes the Ad Hoc Committee to consider.

**Riverside.** The Regents recently gave UCR permission to plan for a medical school, and the UCR CAP is seeking advice from other medical school campus CAPs about how to review medical school cases. The UCR CAP is also discussing a proposal to move CAP staff from administration to Senate purview.

**Irvine.** CAP has been discussing the requirements for advancement to Step VI, the qualities that encompass excellent teaching, and what kind of policy should govern promotion between overlapping steps (e.g., Associate Professor Step IV and Professor Step I). Time at a lower overlapping step does not automatically justify skipping a step at the time of promotion.

**San Francisco.** The UCSF CAP is concerned that recommendations in five-year stewardship reviews of deans, chairs, or unit heads are not being implemented. CAP has asked the EVC to build into the process an interim progress report detailing the changes made based on the recommendations presented in the stewardship review. CAP has adopted a new policy asking for specific justifications for two-year accelerations. 90% of UCSF faculty fall into non-ladder rank series.

**San Diego.** CAP rarely uses Ad Hoc Committees. CAP has tried to strengthen the Fourth-Year Appraisal to make it more meaningful, which has been controversial with department chairs. CAP has spent time discussing a proposal for a Professor of Practice track in the business school and is also seeking to define the criteria for an “independent” external letter of recommendation.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Mary Croughan