

Finally, APM 700 adds proposed guidelines for the “presumptive resignation” of faculty who may be making excessive or inappropriate use of Leave. In such situations currently, faculty who have effectively left the University may linger on UC pay status for a year or more.

Formal review will occur in the fall. AVP Switkes also encouraged members to make suggestions if they become aware of any academic personnel issues that might be addressed in a new or revised APM section.

Members considered the revisions to have relevance to the personnel process. In CAP reviews, Leave and the evaluation of files containing large leave gaps are often difficult to address. One member remarked because sick leave is currently set up to be administered at the discretion of the department chair, “favored” faculty sometimes receive more of the benefit than others. The revisions to 710 could help alleviate this problem.

Action: The committee will review the proposed revisions and forward any comments or suggestions it may have to Academic Council.

III. Conversation with UC Merced CAP Chair Geoff Mason

UC Merced CAP Chair Geoff Mason (UCSC) joined the meeting by phone. CAP has been meeting more frequently this year, about every 2-3 weeks, as the pace of faculty recruitment and hiring increases. CAP’s business is conducted almost entirely in telephone meetings, and candidate files are accessed by members electronically through a website, which is administered at Merced. Additional staff support at UCOP helps CAP conduct its day-to-day business. Currently, UCM has approximately 40 Academic Senate members (including 12 administrators and 18 tenured faculty). It is expected that an additional 20 faculty will be hired in time for opening day, and 20-30 more next year.

UCM faculty make up about half of CAP’s membership. The rest are UC faculty from other campuses. Although an independent Merced Senate division forms in July, the participation of external faculty has been critical to CAP, and faculty have decided that Merced would benefit from a more gradual transition to a UCM-only CAP membership, as UCM has few faculty with tenured status or with UC or CAP experience. CAP has also recently added three “listeners” to its roster, who are UCM faculty with non-voting status who sit in on CAP meetings to become more familiar with academic personnel functions and procedures.

Chair Mason and at least one external member are stepping down from CAP at the end of the year. Over the next year, UCAP may be called upon to suggest new external members and to provide advice and expertise about CAP processes to the Merced faculty, especially as issues such as promotion to tenure become more relevant.

Chair Mason noted that shared governance is also an issue for UCM CAP. The committee has come under pressure to make decisions quickly, and is concerned about the large off-scale salary increments being offered to attract candidates in certain fields without CAP consultation or consent. CAP feels it should have more input into salary decisions to help ensure that inequities are not being built into the system. One UCAP member remarked that a CAP at a young campus

like UCM should expect to play a larger philosophical role in ensuring that candidates fit into the big picture direction of the campus.

Action: Vice-Chair Brunk proposed that CAP members, the UCM EVC and the systemwide Academic Senate leadership hold a face-to-face meeting in June at either Merced or Oakland.

Action: Chair Mason asked members for input into a practice occurring at UCM with adjunct faculty, who are non-senate members, voting in cases and having their votes recorded in personnel letters. Members will respond and provide advice over email.

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

Director Okada presented a brief update on the progress of collective bargaining negotiations.

AVP Switkes reported that all UC faculty qualify for participation in a new state law requiring two-hour sexual harassment training every two years for “supervisors.” UCOP is developing a web-based program to help facilitate the training.

A proposal to allow grant income to partially fund off-scale salaries for ladder faculty is receiving mixed reviews from the administration at UCOP. Current UC policy allows only state, fee, and endowment income to fund faculty salaries. Market forces and cross-discipline inequities are behind the request, which is especially popular among Biology faculty.

Action: AVP Switkes will send draft salary scales to UCAP for review when the scales become available.

V. Research Collaborators and the Academic Personnel Process

CAPs have been more frequently facing the problem 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 Principle Investigator. The requirement for faculty to demonstrate independence for merit and promotion is not well grounded in the APM, but 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, both in Science and the Humanities.

Joe Guglielmo distributed copies of his 11/10/04 email discussing APM sections where wording appears about the need for research to be independent. There is very little reference to independence in the Faculty Handbook or the APM. The Professional Research Series defines the duties that do *not* count toward independence, and the Project Scientist series states that independence is not a requirement for promotion. Professor Guglielmo recommended that UCAP consider APM modifications that would provide clearer guidance to CAPs on these issues.

AVP Switkes noted that the Professional Research Series was intended to refer to researchers who work at a level comparable to faculty in the Professor Series, while the Project Scientist series encompasses research helpers who are not required to do independent research. She said she would welcome UCAP’s recommendations for improved wording.

Members agreed that it would be a good idea to propose changes to the APM that would describe and define more clearly how credit is given for “independent contributions to collaborative research.” It was suggested that “independence” be removed from the Professional Research Series definition, as long as new wording continued to allow clear distinction of the Researcher series from the Project Scientist in terms of expectations for research and scholarship. The members discussed the department chair’s responsibility in evaluating a candidate’s collaborative contribution, such as directing external letter writers to address a candidate’s individual contributions in a collaborative project and in encouraging the candidate in her/his self-assessment to specifically address this issue.

Action: Joe Guglielmo will develop draft language for APM modifications, which will be circulated to the committee for comment and further development. The committee will take up the issue next year.

VI. Faculty Career Database – *With James Litrownik, Data Management Coordinator*

Data Management Coordinator James Litrownik joined the meeting to discuss a new iteration of an ongoing database on faculty career advancement. UCAAD’s Vice-Chair Gibor Basri (UCB) also joined the meeting.

The project was prompted by concerns raised last year by the Professorial Step System Task Force over their finding that women and underrepresented minorities may be facing disproportionate barriers to career advancement, particularly at the Step 5 barrier. The Senate was unable to establish with certainty the accuracy of the Task Force conclusion, because at the time, there was insufficient supporting longitudinal data on faculty experiences in the step system and because the report did not include a statistical analysis. To address this question more definitively, UCAP asked UCOP for data that would give them the ability to look at the advancement of individual faculty over time.

In February, UCAP reviewed a series of tables comparing three Full Professor cohorts who were at Step 5 in 1996 and 1997, with their status two review cycles later in 2002 and 2003. The data were snapshots of two-year periods that showed faculty at a given rank, years at rank, and years at a step. A preliminary analysis of that data showed no overall equity problem at UC in the career advancement for women or minority faculty, but the committee was not convinced that the methodology used to produce the new data sets addressed the issue comprehensively. However, members agreed that the database was a step forward, and encouraged its expansion to other cohorts, along with further analysis that tracked individual faculty members’ advancement over time.

Another analysis of the data was presented showing no overall equity problem in the advancement of women or minority faculty. One member said the build up at Step 5 could simply be a factor of age—i.e., the older faculty are, the less likely they are to be productive and advance. Another member said that the bulge could be attributed to historical factors. Since the bottom of the scale is no longer used (young professors are rarely hired at Step 1 whereas this was once the norm) which has naturally led to shorter time in the pre-barrier step ranks and more faculty at Step 5.

Again, not all members were convinced that the latest iteration of the data was comprehensive enough to provide clear answers to the questions asked in the Task Force report. They were reassured by the results, but not satisfied that it represented the true situation. Members agreed that the database was a good starting point and should be a continuous, ongoing effort. UCAAD expressed concerns that a final report would not be based on an insufficient study. UCAAD would like to see a thorough study of advancement histories over a longer period of time, and in a broader context that takes into account other periods of bunching, such as from Associate Professor to full Professor and in the tenure decision.

Concern was also expressed about data indicating that underrepresented minority faculty may be leaving the UC system at higher rates compared to other groups. These findings prompt more comprehensive determinations of why faculty members leave the UC system. One member suggested a study be done asking each faculty at Step 5 why they are at 5 and not at 6 to get a sense of how people perceive step 6 and whether faculty understand the benefit of Step 6. Finally, one member recommended that a similar analysis be performed for non-ladder rank faculty.

Action: UCAP will write a report to Council. The report will recommend further studies on an ongoing basis and will encourage campuses to put resources into continued studies. UCAP will continue to discuss future queries in collaboration with UCAAD, and offer consultation to the Office of Academic Advancement in further development of the database.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM.

The committee will meet by teleconference June 7, 2005.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Alan Barbour

Distributions

1. Guglielmo email re: APM wording on independence in research.