

After Years of Debate, UC Adopts a Policy On Termination of Incompetent Faculty

After more than a decade of deliberation, the University of California has adopted a policy on the termination of faculty for incompetent performance. UC President Richard Atkinson approved the policy on February 24; it now becomes policy 075 in UC's Academic Personnel Manual, the body of regulations governing UC faculty employment. Known as APM-075, the policy applies to both tenured UC faculty and to lecturers with security of employment.

Even in an institution known for the slow pace of its deliberations, negotiations over APM-075 took an extraordinarily long time. This was so in part because consideration of the issue stalled for extended periods, only to be revived again. The length of the deliberations, however, also reflected the sensitivity of the issues involved: On what grounds may a tenured member of the UC faculty be dismissed? What procedures does the University need to have in place to ensure minimal standards of performance from tenured faculty? In the end, the administrators and Senate leaders who negotiated over APM-075 attempted to strike a balance: a policy should exist, they agreed, but the procedure for actually firing a tenured faculty member should include multiple levels of review, with numerous safeguards built in for the faculty member in question. These policy elements, the reasoning went, should guard against the possibility that APM-075 could be used to embarrass or force the removal of faculty who are merely disliked or who are marginally productive, as opposed to faculty who are grossly incompetent.

"I think the policy does strike an appropriate balance between protecting tenure and academic freedom, while making sure that we are not forced to retain faculty who have ceased to perform," said current Academic Council Chair Lawrence B. Coleman, who negotiated with Office of the President administrators over the policy's final details. Some faculty involved in the consideration of the policy were never

(Please See: APM-075, Page 3)

With Wave of Faculty Hiring, UC Stands To Remake Itself During the Next 12 Years

The seemingly routine process of hiring faculty has emerged this academic year as a major long-term challenge to — and opportunity for — the University of California. For better or worse, UC administrators and Senate leaders say, UC stands to remake itself for decades to come through the faculty hiring it carries out over the next 12 years.

Hiring has been elevated to this status because of sheer numbers: UC will need to hire more ladder-rank faculty in the next 12 years than it currently employs on its general campuses. This level of hiring will, by itself, put the University into flux, UC planners say. Should UC be successful in recruiting a group of top-quality faculty in the coming years, it stands to remake itself as a stronger, more diverse institution. Should it fail in this effort, by recruiting lesser faculty, it stands to be weakened for decades to come, given the length of faculty careers.

The most important force driving the growth in UC faculty is the growth now

projected for UC student enrollments. California's Department of Finance has estimated that UC will add 60,000 undergraduate and graduate students to its rolls between now and the year 2010-11. Such a jump would equal UC's enrollment growth over the last 30 years and would result in a student body of about 210,000 students by 2010-11, as opposed to the 152,000 students UC has now. Faculty growth must accompany this student growth, of course, but this is only part of the faculty recruitment story. A large number of UC faculty will also be retiring or otherwise "separating" from UC in the next 12 years. Together, the growth and separation factors mean that, setting UC San Francisco aside, UC will have to hire more than 7,500 ladder-rank faculty by 2010-11, whereas at present it employs about 6,400 such faculty.

One of the caveats to this scenario is that enrollment projections are

(Please See: Faculty Hiring, Page 4)

Senate Submits Proposal Calling for Further Extension of Domestic Partner Benefits

Since 1994, UC's Academic Senate has sought extension of full benefits for the domestic partners of UC employees. When the UC Regents voted in 1997 to approve the extension of health benefits to domestic partners, they were voting on a proposal that had originated with the Senate's University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW). Health benefits, however, represent only a portion of the benefits regularly afforded to the spouses of UC employees; the Senate's Academic Council has now endorsed and sent to the systemwide administration a proposal calling on the University to extend the full range of such benefits to domestic partners.

The Senate's proposal is contained in the report *Ensuring Full Equality in Benefits for UC Employees with Domestic Partners*,

developed by UCFW in the period following the Regents' 1997 vote. (The report is available on the web at: <http://www.ucop.edu/senate/domes99.pdf>.) Endorsed by the Academic Council in June of 1999, the proposal was sent out for review last fall to all of UC's Senate divisions. This exercise reaffirmed broad-based faculty support for the proposal; with the receipt of this campus input, the Council voted to send the proposal to the administration for its consideration.

UCFW's proposal has two thrusts. The first is that UC establish complete symmetry between spouses and domestic partners in the realms of both health care and retirement benefits. The second is the recommendation, consistently made over the years by the Senate, that domestic partner benefits should be extended to opposite-sex domestic partners as well as same-sex partners.

The rationale for these proposals concerns both fairness and

(Please See: Domestic, Page 2)

Inside Notice: New Research Centers; UCD Personnel Review

Senate Colleagues Mourn Passing of Former Senate Chair Arnold L. Leiman

Arnold L. Leiman, Chair of the statewide Senate's Academic Council in 1995-96, died at his home in Berkeley on January 5 after a long struggle with cancer. He was 67. A professor of psychology at UC Berkeley, Leiman chaired the Berkeley Senate during the 1990-91 academic year. He had been the director of Berkeley's Center for Studies in Higher Education since 1996.

Leiman took on the Academic Council Chair's position at a difficult time: less than two months before he assumed office, the UC Regents voted to eliminate affirmative action as a consideration in UC student admissions. Leiman's second-in-command on the Council during that year was Vice-Chair Duncan Mellichamp of UC Santa Barbara.

"Arnie was an endlessly fascinating individual, a person who in my view was exactly right for his time," Mellichamp said. "To have been his friend and colleague during a particularly critical period in our University's life was a unique gift." Mellichamp notes that, in the wake of the Regents' affirmative action vote, Leiman co-chaired the task force charged by the Regents with developing a new undergraduate admissions policy for UC and served on the UC committee charged with developing enhanced outreach programs. Looking back, Mellichamp said, "virtually all elements of UC's new, broader, and fairer admissions procedures" were identified in the work that came out of these groups.

Leiman was born in 1932 in New York City and grew up in the Bronx. Though he had been at Berkeley since 1964, all who knew him agreed he never lost his New Yorker's streetwise sensibilities. He graduated from Antioch College in 1954 and received his doctorate from the University of Rochester in 1963.

At Berkeley, Leiman often taught large, introductory psychology courses, performing so well at the task that he was awarded the campus' Distinguished Teaching Award in 1990. Last year, he received the campus' highest faculty honor, the Berkeley Citation.

During Leiman's term as Council Chair, the statewide Senate dealt not only with affirmative action, but with a broader issue that stemmed from it, the nature of

(Please See: Arnold Leiman, Page 6)

News in Brief

THREE NEW RESEARCH CENTERS

The state budget that Governor Gray Davis unveiled in January contained a plum for the University of California: three proposed Institutes for Science and Innovation, located on UC campuses and supported by \$75 million in capital funding for each of the next four years. The result should be \$300 million in new, scientific capital funding for UC during this time. These state dollars, the budget proposal said, will need to be matched 1:2 by funding from other sources. The centers are intended to "house world-class centers of strategic innovation that would combine cutting-edge research with training for the next generation of scientists." UC's campuses will be expected to vie for the centers through a competition UC's Office of the President will be setting up. As of early March, UCOP had not released procedures for the competition, nor guidance on the kinds of disciplines that will be represented in the centers.

PERSONNEL REVIEW AT UC DAVIS

Are UC Davis faculty too hard on themselves when it comes to academic personnel reviews? The UCD Senate has formed a special Committee on the Academic Personnel Process that will be reviewing this question along with a number of others.

Part of the impetus for the review is an article that appeared last April in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* indicating that UCD faculty salaries are among the lowest in the UC system. A subsequent campus review revealed that this seems to have been the case for decades. The special committee has been charged with examining whether this is true and, if so, what the causes for it might be.

The group will also be taking up a wider range of issues having to do with UCD's academic personnel process — in particular with its Committee on Academic Personnel. A central question is whether the UCD CAP has been providing fair and consistent judgments over time and across disciplines. Last fall, a group of Davis faculty were upset enough about the campus CAP that they proposed rejecting the committee's annual report. The division's Executive Council subsequently voted to establish the special committee. Davis Senate Chair Jeffery Gibeling says he hopes the panel can turn in its report by June, but that if it needs more time to complete its work, it will have it.

Domestic Partners

(Continued from Page 1)

competitiveness. Current UCFW Chair Robert May has observed that there is "no reason to treat people differentially who are bound together in a relationship that has at its foundation a commitment to long-term mutual support." Beyond this, since the 1994 adoption by the Academic Council of UCFW's first proposal for domestic partner benefits, many universities, municipalities, and large corporations have adopted some variant of benefits for domestic partners. UCFW's report notes that six of UC's eight comparison universities afford spouses and domestic partners identical retirement benefits, while the remaining two offer the choice of at least one pension plan providing pension benefits on the same basis as spouses.

The issue of competitiveness, UCFW believes, is relevant not only to equity in retirement benefits, but also to health benefits. Robert Anderson, the immediate past chair of UCFW, says that while the lack of health insurance coverage for opposite-sex UC domestic partners poses difficulties in both recruiting and retaining faculty and staff, "it is on the recruitment side that these difficulties are particularly acute." Virtually all scholars accepting faculty positions at UC must relocate, typically from out of state, he notes. Accordingly, the spouse or domestic partner must leave a job, with a resulting loss of health insurance coverage. While a faculty spouse can obtain coverage from UC, an opposite-sex domestic partner may well be unable to get health insurance coverage on any terms until he or she obtains employment in California. With respect to staff, a large number of competing state and municipal employers currently provide health insurance to the opposite-sex domestic partners of their employees. Anderson's concern is that "if UC does not meet this competition, it will face increasing difficulty in recruiting and retaining outstanding academic and nonacademic employees."

How Do Benefits Differ?

What differences remain in the benefits UC provides to employees with spouses, as opposed to employees with domestic partners? To take one example, in the event that a UC retiree dies before his or her spouse, the spouse receives a "free" pension continuation benefit for life. For employees coordinated with Social

(Please See: Domestic, Page 6)

APM-075: Provides Framework for Firing Incompetent Faculty

(Continued from Page 1)

persuaded that it should be promulgated, however. In a decisive Academic Council vote taken on the policy last July, about a third of the Council members voted against proceeding with its development.

Multi-tiered Review Process

APM-075's provisions for judging and removing incompetent faculty are, without a doubt, multi-tiered. The process can only be set in motion by the chancellor or chancellor's designee, and then only after the faculty member in question has been given at least a year to improve his or her performance. If the process goes forward, confidential recommendations then must be produced by the faculty member's department, dean, and campus Committee on Academic Personnel. If the case goes forward after these reviews — it could stop at this point if both the department and CAP agree it should — the faculty member then would have the right to a full evidentiary hearing before the campus Privilege and Tenure Committee, which would look not only at the procedures and criteria used by the other groups in making their judgments, but at the substantive question of whether the faculty member is performing incompetently. The chancellor would then make a final decision based on input from all the parties involved and forward a recommendation that would go first to the President and finally to the UC Regents, who alone are empowered to dismiss a tenured UC faculty member. (The full policy is on the web at: <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/s1-075.html>.)

APM-075 also sets forth standards for determining incompetence, noting that "Reviewers should look at the faculty member's job as a coherent whole and examine comprehensively the individual's contributions in all areas of faculty responsibility . . ." Reviewers are given latitude to determine whether, "in the particular circumstances of the individual case, incompetence in a single area is sufficient grounds for termination." The policy then goes on to give general definitions of incompetent performance in teaching and in research or creative activity. In the latter, tenured faculty would be deemed incompetent if they engaged in no research or creative activity for several years and if they gave no evidence that they would be engaging in such work in the foreseeable future.

What practical effect is APM-075 likely

to have? Ellen Switkes, the Office of the President's assistant vice president for academic advancement, says that "the hope is the policy will never be used," in the sense of bringing about the dismissal of a faculty member by the Regents. Rather, the idea is to provide department chairs and deans with the leverage necessary to make faculty who are not performing come to an informal resolution of their cases. Indeed, the policy is sprinkled with suggestions for such informal resolution. It notes, for example, that "formal notification by a Chair or Dean that a faculty member's teaching and/or scholarship are unsatisfactory will often be sufficient to produce improvement in performance." Meanwhile, for faculty who are good teachers but who have ceased to be researchers "the Chancellor may offer the individual a transfer to the Lecturer with Security of Employment series." There may be instances, of course, in which faculty who are not performing either will not come to informal resolution or will be incapable of doing so (because of mental disability). In such cases, it is possible that APM-075 may set the rules for a full termination review.

Origins Stretch to Mid-1980s

APM-075 had its origins in the mid-1980s with the passage of the federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act, which brought about the end of mandatory faculty retirement. With this, institutions such as UC could no longer rely on the time-honored practice of "waiting out" incompetent faculty — that is, waiting until they reached mandatory retirement age. Faced with the prospect of a few incompetent faculty remaining on the payroll until death, the University promulgated a regulation that required all UC faculty to undergo a performance review at least once every five years.

These reviews brought a number of allegedly incompetent faculty to the attention of the Berkeley "Budget" (academic personnel) Committee. The problem, from Berkeley's point of view, was that it had no mechanism for instituting proceedings against such faculty. Regents Standing Order 103.9 allows for the dismissal of tenured UC faculty "for good cause," and Senate Bylaw 335 charges campus Privilege & Tenure committees with the responsibility of determining whether a proposed "early termination" has good cause underlying it. But none of the University's regulations explicitly took up the question of dismissal for incompetent performance. Who had

standing to initiate such a case? What procedures would be followed in seeing it through? What were the criteria for incompetence? Charles Nash, a former UC Davis Senate chair, recalls that, in the late 1980s, the Berkeley Senate believed UC needed a policy like APM-075, while the Los Angeles Senate regarded the idea as a threat to tenure. The result was a committee, chaired by Nash, that in 1990 issued a report calling for a policy on incompetent performance by faculty.

Seeking to Protect Tenure

In the years of deliberations that followed, an additional impetus arose for the development of such a policy. This was that tenure increasingly came under fire across the country. In 1997, the Texas Legislature drafted legislation that called for "post-tenure" review — with the possibility of dismissal — for faculty at all state institutions, while the University of Minnesota Regents proposed (and later withdrew) a regulation that would have allowed tenured professors to be fired if their programs were eliminated or restructured. UC has long been a leader in post-tenure review, but from the point of view of the administration and many Senate leaders, the University needed an additional means to assure the public that tenure at UC did not imply lifetime employment regardless of performance.

Will APM-075 accomplish its dual missions of clearing deadwood from the faculty ranks while leaving tenure and academic freedom unharmed? From the point of view of many faculty critics, the biggest threat the policy poses is that it may lead to "mischief," meaning use for nefarious ends. A chair dislikes a faculty member who is not particularly productive and sees APM-075 as a means of getting rid of him or her. A faction within a department sees, in a single faculty member, a *bête noire* who is frustrating departmental efforts to improve. They too would turn to APM-075, the theory goes. Are such scenarios plausible? Charles Nash believes not.

"No department chair would go down a road that is this complex merely because he disliked a faculty member," he says. "There's too much paper; too many people have to get into it; too many concurrences have to take place for any kind of search-and-destroy mission to get going." The many layers of the review process, he says, would expose such connivance for what it is. "I think it is a good policy," he says. "It will be enormously beneficial to the University to have it."

Faculty Hiring: Much Is at Stake in the Coming 12 Years

(Continued from Page 1)

notoriously unreliable. In the late 1960s, for example, UC faced a supposed enrollment surge that never materialized. Second, the assumption underlying these numbers is that UC will be holding constant its proportion of *ladder-rank* faculty within general faculty ranks. On the eight operating general campuses, UC has 7,860 funded ladder-rank faculty slots, but only 6,400 ladder-rank faculty filling them. The remainder of the slots are occupied by temporary lecturers. Under one view, UC faces a problem that it can address in part by temporarily increasing its proportion of lecturers. Some campuses, such as UC Riverside, intend to do this. Still, assuming, as UC planners must, that state projections are accurate and that temporary faculty are only a partial answer to the problem, what effect will the coming wave of faculty recruitment have on UC?

"The majority of people who are here in 2010 will be people who were not here in 1990," Vice Provost Barry Klein says of the UC Davis faculty. To meet the challenge of faculty hiring, Klein's campus has, paradoxically, halted all but "emergency" hiring this year so that it can complete an academic plan that will allow it to rationally distribute hiring across the academic spectrum beginning next year. Klein expects that UCD will be hiring about 100 faculty per year for the next five years, whereas during the last three years it has hired an average of 53.

Two Overarching Goals

Across UC's campuses, administrators and Senate leaders uniformly voice the view that the coming wave of faculty hiring should produce two outcomes: a UC faculty that at least retains the academic distinction it has, and a UC faculty that is more diverse than it is at present. "An opportunity such as this presents itself only once in a generation, at most," says statewide Senate Chair Lawrence B. Coleman. "We need to make the most of it."

In addition to common goals, campuses across the system face a number of common problems in addressing faculty hiring. (UC campuses may also share a common advantage. See "What Matters to Young Faculty?" on this page.) Two of the biggest problems are providing adequate facilities for new-hires and coming up with sufficient "start-up" money to equip the labs of new science and engineering faculty. Much of the

capital money that UC currently gets is devoted to the seismic retrofitting of its current buildings and it is not clear that much more capital money will be available in the future.

Funding Start-Up Costs

With respect to start-up costs, UC Riverside has noted that start-up offers in its College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences are expected to average \$264,000 this year. Meanwhile, UC Santa Barbara just put up \$3 million to land star materials scientist Shuji Nakamura of Japan. UCSB obtained most of this money through private-sector fund-raising; the mere existence of such start-up sums, however, raises the question of how campuses are going to find the money to fund the labs of top scientists. "Are we scheming on how we are going to do it? Yes, indeed we are" says Riverside Executive Vice Chancellor David Warren. One approach UCR is adopting, he says, is to economize on start-up costs by investing in equipment that can serve clusters of faculty, rather than just individual researchers.

Salaries are another potential problem. Administrators and Senate leaders alike note that the "comparison-eight" group used to fix UC faculty salaries is made up

of four top public and four top private institutions. The problem? Salary increases at elite private institutions have been outpacing those at public institutions for years. UC's salary-setting methodology has left UC faculty salaries in a kind of statistical island between the two groups: higher than most quality publics but a good deal lower than the elite privates with whom UC competes.

"There is no way the University of California is going to be the salary leader in terms of faculty hiring in the coming years," says Robert May, chair of the Senate's University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW). "Given this, our committee is trying to see how the rest of the compensation package we offer could improve — indeed, how it could become the best package in the industry." To this end, UCFW has recently put forward proposals for UC-subsidized child-care on each campus, for UC tuition fee-waivers for University employees, and for full equality in the benefits UC provides for domestic partners. (See story, page 1.)

One compensation problem that has no ready answer, however, is that of housing. May's own campus, UC Irvine,

(Continued on next page)

What Matters to Young Faculty?

When it comes to recruiting younger faculty, UC's concerns about such things as the salaries it can offer and the perks it can extend may be overblown. What matters to top young scholars when they are choosing an institution? Location, location, location, according to a study about to be published by the Harvard Graduate School of Education's Project in Faculty Appointments.

Project researchers surveyed first- and second-year faculty in various disciplines in 25 top academic programs across the country, with "top" defined as those ranked in the *U.S. News & World Report* ratings. They also surveyed doctoral students in these programs, getting feedback from students who either had entered the academic career market or who were about to. Some 700 faculty and 2,000 students responded to the internet-based survey. Respondents were presented with a number of factors that might figure in their choice of an institution, includ-

ing salary level, the balance of research and teaching responsibilities, the prestige of the institution, whether the job was tenure-track or not, the ranking of the department, and geographic location. The result, across the board for both groups, was that the location of the institution trumped all other factors.

"We found that location was, in all instances, always the most important of the factors" in the decision-making process, said Cathy Trower, a senior researcher in the Faculty Appointments Project. Acknowledging that the study's results are "definitely counterintuitive," Trower's reading of the responses is that "younger people who have chosen to go into academe are also very much interested in the quality of life." If so, UC, whose campuses sit in many of the most desirable locations in the country, may have a leg up on the competition in the coming struggle to recruit top-quality faculty.

Faculty Hiring

(Continued from previous page)

has been successful in building on-campus housing, but no other campus, he says, has anything that comes close to the scale of UCI's University Hills project, nor is any campus likely to in the future. There simply is not much available land on most campuses. UC has a faculty housing program that provides low-cost loans, but the essential problem, May says, is not one of loan rates but rather of home prices — at least the prices of homes within some reasonable distance from a campus.

Hiring as an Opportunity

UC may have its share of difficulties in the coming wave of faculty hiring, but many campus planners — particularly on UC's developing campuses — look at the upcoming hiring not as a problem but as a golden opportunity. Nowhere is this more the case than at UC Riverside, whose student body is expected to nearly double in the years ahead (from 10,600 students this year to 19,900 in 2010-11). If UCR held its proportion of ladder-rank faculty constant in this period (which it will not), it would need to hire about 800 ladder-rank faculty in the coming 12 years, whereas at present it has about 450 such faculty. Given such numbers, there is no doubt that UCR will effectively be remaking itself in the next decade.

"There has never been in our history an opportunity such as the one we have now to reach the very highest levels of academic excellence," says UCR's Executive Vice Chancellor Warren. "It's just a wonderful thing to be sitting where I am now and play a role in this process."

A report a UCR task force prepared on hiring makes clear that the campus is looking at the coming recruitments as an exercise in what might be called academic ecology: UCR will seek to fill academic niches based on its strengths relative to the competition, using its hiring ability to expand into areas that seem most promising. What kinds of considerations is the campus taking into account in this effort? Consider some of the elements in the campus task force report "A Faculty to Grow On" (available on the web at <http://ucr2010.ucr.edu/cp/tg/report/faculty.htm>). UCR's relatively small size may give it an advantage in moving into academic areas that are "up for grabs," the report says, as UCR has not "committed" as many of its faculty as has the competition. UCR might capitalize on subjects, such as urban sprawl and

(Please See: Faculty Hiring, Page 6)

Notes from the Chair: Hiring the 21st-Century Faculty

As a page-one story in this issue of *Notice* makes clear, the University of California now anticipates having to hire more than 7,500 ladder-rank faculty in the coming 12 years. This is a large number of faculty in absolute terms, but the figure's real significance becomes apparent in a comparison: This is more faculty than the University currently employs on its general campuses. Add to this the fact that faculty careers last for 30 or 40 years and a clear conclusion begins to present itself: The cohort of faculty that UC hires over the next decade will *be* the University of California for the first half of the 21st century. How important is it that we hire well? It is difficult to think of a more important task confronting us.

This is a task that all faculty will shoulder in some ways, as it is faculty who sit on the search and selection committees, and faculty who populate CAP and the ad hoc panels. But the size of the coming endeavor, and its concomitant importance to the University, mean we must go beyond the "usual" responsibility in this area — that of examining individual candidates — and take a look at the bigger picture as well. The combination of faculty growth and faculty retirements UC will experience means that we have the opportunity to rethink the disciplinary balance of our campuses, schools, colleges, and departments. We must take this time to think seriously and broadly about where our disciplines are going and how we want to reshape our academic plans. This is not a call for "out with the old, in with the new." It is a call to think carefully about how the University of California can best advance scholarship in the 21st century. Solid academic planning must precede faculty hiring.

We must also use this opportunity to increase the gender, ethnic, and cultural diversity of the faculty. Positions must be advertised broadly. In bringing openings to the attention of our colleagues, we must ask specifically for names of women faculty and scholars of color who may be of interest; we must "act affirmatively" to attract a diverse pool of candidates. Whenever possible we should hire at the junior level, where the candidate pools are the most diverse.

In creating our 21st-century faculty, we must be willing to think creatively. Provosts and deans must make it clear that FTE slots provided to departments will remain with those departments until the highest quality faculty can be attracted to them. The increased number of faculty positions will allow us to be innovative in creating offers that will attract top scholars; I hope that provosts, deans and departments will be willing to pool and "mortgage" positions so that cluster or spousal hires are possible.

As in all challenges of this magnitude, there will be problems. Many of ours will be related to resources. New faculty will need space, meaning both offices and laboratories; staff support, which entails both salaries and space; and start-up packages, which in the lab sciences can run to hundreds of thousands of dollars for assistant professors and millions for senior faculty. Our responsibility under shared governance is to work with the campus administration to meet these resource challenges.

All things considered, we have quite a task in front of us, but then, what an opportunity we have as well! To hire faculty who are *better* than we are; to recruit faculty who are more diverse than we are; to remake UC for the coming century. How did we get so lucky?

—Lawrence B. Coleman, Chair
Academic Council

Arnold Leiman

(Continued from Page 2)

shared governance. Leiman brought to the chair's position a renowned wit that served him well. (He once quipped that the men's clothing store at which he shopped was "so old-fashioned I had to inform them of the existence of the income tax.")

"Arnie Leiman was a terrific member of the Senate and the broader University community," said this year's Council Chair, Lawrence B. Coleman of Davis. "His efforts helped make UC a better institution." At its February meeting, the Council voted to submit to the Senate's Assembly a statement in honor of him.

Arnold Leiman is survived by his wife Lannon Leiman of Berkeley and two children, Timothy Leiman of Chicago and Jessica Leiman, a doctoral candidate in English at Yale. Donations in his memory may be sent to the Arnold L. Leiman Memorial Fund, UC Foundation, 2440 Bancroft Way 4200, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-4200.

Notice

is published four times during the academic year for the University of California faculty by the Academic Council of the universitywide Academic Senate.

Lawrence B. Coleman, Chair
Academic Council
12th Floor, 1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, California 94607-5200

David Krogh, Editor
(510) 987-0162
david.krogh@ucop.edu

Jeannene Whalen, Contributing Writer
jeannene.whelen@ucop.edu

Notice is available on the World Wide Web at: www.ucop.edu/senate/notice

Faculty Hiring

(Continued from Page 5)

earthquake fault-lines, that arguably can be better researched in the Riverside area than anywhere else. Then there are considerations about the type of faculty to hire. One route to academic prominence is to hire recognized scholars. But, the report warns, "a department seeking globally prominent faculty may find itself paying a premium to recruit faculty who are difficult to retain. Alternately, it may overpay for faculty a cut below the cutting edge, who then may be difficult to move."

What of the other overarching goal campuses have in faculty recruiting — that of diversifying their faculties? UC Davis' Barry Klein is upbeat about his campus' prospects for success in this area. First of all, he says, "I think an awareness of the importance of diversity has permeated the campus." In line with such thinking, the campus has implemented a number of changes aimed at increasing its proportion of women and minority faculty. Deans now allocate more money to recruiting itself, which allows the campus to cast a wider recruiting net. UCD now advertises in journals that have a high proportion of women and minority contributors, thus "sending a signal that we want to diversify the faculty," Klein says. And faculty recruiters now go to conferences that are likely to draw crowds of minority and women faculty.

UC administrators and Senate leaders do not seem greatly worried about the possibility of UC failing in the twin tasks it has set for itself in connection with faculty hiring. They are concerned about start-up costs and competition from other institutions, but they seem to regard hiring per se as a challenge that can be mounted — to great positive effect. "I don't think there's fear or trepidation about this," says UCR Senate Chair Irwin Sherman, "but I do think it's a major undertaking to recruit this many faculty."

Domestic Partners

(Continued from Page 2)

Security, this benefit is 25 percent of the employee's pension; for those not coordinated with Social Security, it is 50 percent of the pension. The benefit is free in the sense that, in order for the spouse to receive it, the employee does not have to take a reduced pension while alive. Meanwhile, an employee with a domestic partner would have to reduce his or her pension (typically by almost 8 percent) in order for the domestic partner to receive the equivalent continuation.

Beyond this, in the event that a UC employee who is eligible to retire dies prior to retiring, the spouse receives the pension that would have been provided had the employee retired, elected to provide a 100 percent continuation benefit to the spouse, and then died. By contrast, a domestic partner in this situation receives only a return of the employee's UCRS contributions — which no UC employee has made since 1990 — plus interest at 6 percent. In most cases, this will amount to less than one year's worth of the pension a spouse would receive.

This inequality then leads to another. Health benefits are continued only for annuitants who are entitled to a survivor or continuation pension benefit. In cases in which an employee dies before retiring, however, the domestic partner cannot receive such a benefit; hence all domestic partners in this group lose health coverage as well.

The Senate proposal on domestic partners is now undergoing review and analysis by the Office of the President. Early this year, UCOP Senior Vice President Wayne Kennedy informed the Academic Council that his office is carrying out consultation, data gathering, and a cost-analysis of the recommendation; it is unclear at present how long the administration's analysis will take.