

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
MINUTES OF MEETING
TUESDAY, MAY 15, 2007

Attending: Mary Croughan, Chair (UCSF)
James Hunt, Vice Chair (UCB), Carl Shapiro (UCB), Alladi Venkatesh (UCI), Steven Plaxe (UCSD),
Chris Calvert (UCD), Ambuj Singh (UCSB), Barry Bowman (UCSC), Paul Micevych (UCLA), Margaret
Walsh (UCSF), Sheila O'Rourke (Acting Assistant Vice President), Jill Slocum (Interim Director,
Academic Personnel), Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

I. Announcements – Mary Croughan and James Hunt

UCAP Vice Chair Hunt attended the May 9 meeting of the Academic Assembly, where the Assembly voted to oppose Regents' item RE-89, a proposal to restrict the acceptance of research funding from the tobacco industry. In addition, President Dynes announced to the Assembly that UC had been successful in its bid to retain management of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. The president also noted that The Regents had hired an outside consulting group to review the University's organizational structure and make recommendations for increasing efficiency.

UCAP Chair Croughan added that the Academic Council feels strongly that UC should consider using internal experts before turning to outside consultants. She noted that Council endorsed UCAP's [proposed modifications](#) to APM 220-18b (4) and sent its final recommendation to Provost Hume, who will initiate a systemwide review. Council also sent a memo to Provost Hume recommending dissolution of UC's contract with TALX. Finally, Chair Croughan announced that Steven Plaxe (UCSD) will serve as 2007-08 UCAP vice chair and encouraged all UCAP members to continue service on the committee next year.

Action: Chair Croughan will draft a memo summarizing their goals for the APM 220 revision for use by Academic Affairs.

II. Consent Calendar

1. Draft minutes of March 14, 2007
2. Systemwide Senate Review of Proposed Amendment to [Senate Bylaw 181](#) – Information Technology and Telecommunications Committee

Action: UCAP approved the consent calendar.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President – Sheila O'Rourke and Jill Slocum

Acting Assistant Vice President for Academic Advancement Sheila O'Rourke reported that the Regents Study Group considering the impact of Proposition 209 on University diversity and campus climate will present a preliminary progress report to The Regents in May and a full report in September. The Work Group team considering faculty diversity is expected to make a number of specific recommendations around reporting and accountability.

Chair Croughan noted that the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity wants to work with campus CAPs to implement the recent modifications to APM 210, which allow faculty to receive credit for diversity-related research, teaching, and service activities.

Interim Director of Academic Personnel Jill Slocum reported that representatives from the Senate and administration are working with Mercer Consulting on the Policy Review Project, which is analyzing all existing University policies in an effort to identify unnecessary exceptions and other areas of inconsistency between policy and practice, particularly in the area of Senior Management Group (SMG) compensation. The Project team is discussing the need to clarify the boundaries between academics and members of the SMG, many of whom have academic appointments, as well as the framework of policies governing those individuals and the appropriate jurisdiction of the Senate. New policy revisions relating to the outside activities of SMG members will soon be released for review.

Chair Croughan noted that a set of proposed technical APM changes was pulled from the UCAP agenda pending further information.

IV. Survey of Campus CAP practices

UCAP members were asked to review the Committee's annual survey of CAP practices and provide updated data as well as suggestions for new survey topics. Chair Croughan noted that the survey's snapshot comparison has helped campuses identify areas where local practices might be brought into closer congruence – for example, in the kind of incentives provided to faculty for CAP service, and the appropriate level of CAP involvement in salary decisions.

The committee discussed differences around the involvement of CAPs in salary and off-scale decisions. Some CAPs are content not having the opportunity to review or comment on salary, while others see their involvement in salary matters as a vital part of shared governance.

Members compared local processes for “reconsiderations.” The Berkeley Budget Committee is required to reopen any case at the dean's request, while the UCLA and UCSB CAPs entertain reconsideration requests from the administration, but will not necessarily reopen the case. At Davis, a separate committee made up of former CAP members reviews appeals.

Members suggested a number of new survey topics, including how many CAP members review an individual file, how many external and internal letters CAP requests, and whether the candidate sees CAP's letter.

Action: The UCAP analyst will update and augment the comparative survey with the additional questions and modifications, re-distribute the survey to members, and collect final changes.

V. President's Work Group on Faculty Salary Scales and APM 620

UCAP reviewed a summary of recommendations from the President's Work Group on Faculty Salary Scales for increasing faculty salaries to competitive levels, bringing the majority of faculty back on-scale, and improving the fairness and transparency of the published salary scales.

The Work Group's recommendations include:

- Eliminating exception language from APM 620 policy governing off-scales
- Re-defining "on-scale" in APM 620 to encompass the entire range between steps
- Raising salaries to eliminate disparities between UC and its comparison institutions by 1) raising all salary scales and 2) providing a COLA adjustment for both on- and off-scale faculty

Sheila O'Rourke noted that changing the scales from a point to a range will reduce the number of off-scale faculty, currently at 73.4%, to 49.5%. The attendant salary adjustment proposals are expected to reduce that further, to 6%. The Work Group has scaled back UCAP's original proposal to increase the number of field-specific scales, and is proposing new scales for Engineering and Economics faculty only. Campuses will not need to change existing local practices for setting salaries.

Chair Croughan noted that the development and implementation of the new scales is the most complicated part of the proposal. Local implementation of the scales will often proceed on a case-by-case basis and will require significant input from various campuses entities, including the Senate and campus CAPs. The Faculty Salary Scales Work Group may recommend a role for CAPs in the implementation of the new scales, which could be complicated by non-standard campus practices in this area. As the changes may have a significant impact on campus CAPs, consideration should be given to empowering all CAPs to review and/or set salary. It was suggested that UCAP make a statement recommending minimum standards of rights to salary information.

UCAP expressed strong support for the proposal to modify APM 620. The changes are essential to achieving the larger goals of improving the fairness, relevance, and transparency of the published salary scales and bringing the majority of UC faculty back on-scale. The new language recognizes that off-scales are not in actual practice short term exceptions but part of normal compensation practices to meet market conditions. Individual campuses, units, and disciplines are allowed the continued flexibility to compete in the marketplace for top faculty talent, to maintain excellence, and to aspire to greater excellence. Members also expressed hope that raising all the salary scales will help improve problems of equity and morale that cross all ranks and disciplines, particularly the problem of salary inversion and disproportionately low salaries in the assistant, associate, and early full professor ranks. Raising all scales may also have a particularly beneficial impact for women and ethnic minorities, who tend to be clustered in fields with more on-scale faculty.

There was concern noted that raising all salary scales may reward some faculty who do not deserve to be rewarded and could even upset some off-scale faculty, who will be unhappy to see their comparative advantage relative to other faculty reduced. UCAP believes the benefits of the proposal heavily outweigh these potential downsides, which will involve only a handful of faculty at most.

Action: UCAP will submit comments to Council about APM 620.

VI. Extramural Funding of Faculty Salaries

The Academic Council asked UCAP and UCPB to consider a new practice at UC Davis of recharging faculty salaries to extramural grants, after concerns were raised by the UCD Senate Chair Bisson. A Faculty Salary Exchange Program policy has also surfaced at UCB as a “pilot” program” (<http://apo.chance.berkeley.edu/FSEPguidelines.html>)

Chair Bisson noted concerns related to shared governance, as the policy had been implemented without faculty knowledge or sign-off. (UCAP’s Davis and Berkeley representatives had never seen the policies; they agreed that the lack of faculty consultation was troublesome). Chair Bisson also noted that the administration had provided no written assurance that faculty would be guaranteed their full base salary from 19900 funds if their extramural funding decreased or disappeared. Finally, there was concern about the effect a split appointment could have on faculty sabbatical accrual, retirement benefits, and the expectations for advancement.

UCAP members agreed that the manner in which the policy had been generated and implemented was not consistent with shared governance. Some members noted that it seemed to be a mostly benign accounting issue that did not seriously put faculty in jeopardy. However, the committee agreed that such changes did require significant faculty review, as well as written assurance and communication from the administration that the split appointment would be backed up by 19900 funds should the extramural funding decrease or disappear.

Action: UCAP will send comments to Council.

VII. University Service

Some have suggested modifying the APM to increase its emphasis on Senate service, perhaps making Senate service an explicit criterion of career reviews. In addition, there are concerns that the system discourages administrative service, because CAPs do not properly advance individuals whose service as a chair or dean has slowed scholarly productivity. Chair Croughan asked members to consider the role of “service” in merit and promotion criteria and CAP reviews.

UCAP reviewed the Berkeley Budget Committee’s draft *Campus Service Guidelines*, an educational document that outlines the role of service in the faculty reward system. The Budget Committee is also recommending changes to the way departments gather and document information about faculty service activities, which includes encouraging departments to provide more details in files they send to CAP about service quality.

UCAP members noted that ultimately, faculty cannot advance in the academic personnel system solely on the basis of excellent service, no matter how exemplary it is. The Berkeley Budget Committee does give up to one full step advancement below Professor Step VI once in a career for outstanding service contributions, but only if the candidate’s research is also excellent. [APM 245](#) states that department chairs may be awarded accelerations in advancement up to Step V for exceptional service that is combined with sustained scholarly production.

Chair Croughan suggested that next year UCAP ask Academic Council to endorse a statement about the importance of service and a recommendation that the Berkeley *Guidelines* document be circulated as a recommended model and incorporated into the Call on each campus.

Action: Berkeley will circulate a final version of the Guidelines.

VIII. Research Collaborators and the Academic Personnel Process

A UCAP subcommittee met in March to consider the need for new APM language that would provide clearer guidance to CAPs in their evaluations of “independence” and “collaboration” in research and creative work. UCAP decided to endorse the recommendation of the subcommittee to delete the word “independent” from the Professional Research Series (PRS) policy to make the language more consistent with the language in other APM series and with current CAP practice, but not to recommend changes for all series.

Chair Croughan noted that such a change would not be a “technical” revision involving a simpler review process, but would require a regular systemwide review. She recently ran the proposal by a group of academic personnel administrators, who were divided between those who endorsed the idea of removing “independent,” and others who wanted to maintain “independent” to help distinguish the PRS from the Project Scientist Series, as well as add the word to all APM series.

Some UCAP members were not sure the effort to change the APM would be worth the expected yield, and other felt it was better to leave the APM vague so campuses had the continued flexibility to interpret it according to local needs. Others felt that proposing the small change could also be an opportunity to promote consideration of the broader issues of independence and collaboration, perhaps through an accompanying White Paper, appropriate for the Call, which would provide guidance for the evaluation of independence in the context of collaborative work.

Action: UCAP will draft a white paper and potential revision of the APM for the informal review of CAPs.

IX. Proposed University of California Open Access Policy

UCAP reviewed a proposed University of California Open Access Policy, which would grant to The Regents limited, non-exclusive permission to make published faculty scholarly work available in an open-access online repository of publications

UCAP voted unanimously to oppose the policy on several grounds. First, the committee felt its value was unclear, because it would likely be obsolete in only a few years. Second, several provisions of the policy would impose an undue burden on faculty members, notably the proposed “opt-out” process and particularly, the opt-out options A and B, which would require varying degrees of consultation with a “UC Open Access Agent.” Finally, the Policy Implementation topic “Recording access characteristics of faculty publications,” related to the academic review process, was seen as problematic. The committee felt that a faculty member’s choice to post or not post scholarly work on an open access repository was irrelevant to the academic personnel review process and should not be a criterion for merit/promotion. The requirement could constitute intimidation, and would place another clerical burden upon faculty.

X. UCAF's Revised Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry Principles

Action: UCAP members will discuss the issue with their local CAPs and UCAP will decide at a later date if the Committee should opine on the issue.

XI. Campus Reports

San Francisco. CAP is concerned about recently being bypassed in the stewardship review process for a case involving a department chair. Campus Stewardship Review Guidelines give CAP the opportunity to review and opine on the final Stewardship Review Committee report. CAP has a representative on the Committee.

Santa Cruz. The UCSC representative reported a high level of cooperation between CAP and the administration this year.

Chair Croughan asked UCAP members to hold June 5 between 3 and 4 pm for a possible conference call.

UCAP members gave Chair Croughan a round of applause in recognition of her service to UCAP and the Senate.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM.
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Mary Croughan