

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE  
ON  
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL**

**2010-2011 ANNUAL REPORT**

**TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:**

The University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) had four meetings in Academic Year 2010-2011 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 135 to consider general policy on academic personnel, including salary scales, appointments and promotions, and related matters. The issues that UCAP considered this year are described briefly as follows:

**Faculty Salary Scales Plan**

Last year's joint committee of UCAP, UCPB and UCFW produced a report on the faculty salary scales and sent three recommendations to Council. The first two recommendations were endorsed by Council and the chairs of the three committees were asked to further discuss the third recommendation. UCAP discussed a revised recommendation for a range adjustment of 5%, applied to both base salaries and offscale increments. UCAP was in favor of raising faculty salaries in the context of the salary scales. In December, Council voted to (1) Support a merit-based increment added to the salary scales for persons who have received a merit in the past 5 years but not to apply raises to the off-scale increment.

**Downsizing by Attrition**

UCAP was asked to look at the impact of faculty downsizing. CAPs' duties may be affected if there is a decrease in faculty numbers. Teaching requirements may increase, and research output may suffer as a consequence. The evaluation of faculty would have to take such changes into account. UC may be unable to recruit and retain excellent faculty, both because of downsizing and because budgets may not allow competitive remuneration. UCAP supported the principle that faculty downsizing to the point needed to be competitive for a world class faculty may be necessary even at the cost of increasing the use of lecturers to cover the increased teaching duties.

**Post-Employment Benefits**

UCAP discussed the proposed changes to post employment benefits. This is an important contributor to UC competitiveness because the generous UC pensions have always been an essential component of the faculty compensation package.

**Senate Service in Personnel Reviews**

UCAP discussed the level of recognition and reward of Senate and non-Senate service in personnel reviews. One question is whether there should be more of an incentive for service. The expectation of participation in shared government should be made clear to faculty, and Chairs should emphasize such service in their letters when it occurs.

**Consideration of a Book in Academic Personnel Reviews**

The committee discussed the status of book publications in personnel reviews. The book-centered disciplines have seen many changes in the ways that books are published. Some presses have disappeared, online publications are more frequent. There is currently a lack of clarity in the criteria

to be used for promotion. UCAP urges the book disciplines to study the issue and formulate guidelines appropriate for the changing environment.

UCAP reviewed a report from the Center for Studies of Higher Education on peer review in academic promotion and publishing. This report concurs with the above comments: it concludes that in the Humanities it takes longer than five or six years to get a book published, Some campuses have never accepted a series of articles in lieu of a monograph, although this is becoming an increasingly frequent venue for publication. CAPs have been seen as very conservative and slow to recognize that the approach traditionally used will have to change. UCAP could acknowledge major shifts for book disciplines, especially for junior faculty, and encourage CAPs to take these changes seriously. It was noted that changes are occurring in all disciplines. The committee will continue to discuss this difficult set of issues.

### **Flexibility in Merit Reviews**

UCAP discussed issues of flexibility and integration over more than one review period in the reward system. While each CAP has a great deal of flexibility in its reward system, it is clear that all three legs of the stool, research, teaching, and service, must be apparent in all files to merit an advancement. However, it might be appropriate to recognize that there may be a review period where, say, teaching was exceptional and service lagged somewhat, or research was exceptional while teaching was not as good as in other review periods (but not absent or unsatisfactory). Such balances might be recognized in the reward system. On some campuses, exceptional service is rewarded with an acceleration if other components of the file are good. This includes service as department Chair but not other Administrative service, which is rewarded outside of the academic mechanisms.

### **Replacing "Above Scale" with "Distinguished Professor"**

UCAP discussed a proposal to replace the academic "Above Scale" title in all series to "Distinguished." Some campuses allow this already. All but one of the campuses agreed with this recommendation, and the proposal has gone forward to Academic Council (with the opposition of UCB noted) for consideration.

### **Campus-wide Online Teaching Evaluation System**

UCAP shared the concern of some campuses with online teaching evaluation systems. While these evaluations are an essential component in the merit and promotion process, it is not clear that they provide a reliable reflection of teaching quality. The added fact that in some cases these online systems are fully in the hands of the students adds to the unease. The Chair drafted a letter to CAPs reaffirming evaluation guidelines and highlighting best practices.

### **Consultation with the Administration**

Susan Carlson, Vice President, Academic Personnel, Janet Lockwood, Associate Director, Academic Personnel, Patricia Price Interim Director, Academic Advancement, and Jim Litrownik, Coordinator, Data Management, Academic Advancement served as consultants to UCAP. The committee was provided with regular updates about UC's budget and was kept abreast as plans to address the financial crisis were developed.

### **Other Issues and Additional Business**

In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, UCAP submitted views on the following:

- Proposed Revisions to APMs 010, 015, 530, 668, 670 and 710
- Report from the Task Force on Senate Membership
- Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs
- The Faculty Compensation Plan

### **Campus Reports**

UCAP devoted part of each regular meeting to reports about issues facing local committees and comparison of individual campus practices. In these discussions, UCAP members touched briefly on the status of searches; responses to outside offers; special accelerations for retention or other reasons; retention; efforts to streamline processes.

### **Survey of CAP Practices**

UCAP updated its annual survey of local CAP practices and experiences. The survey covers a wide range of topics, including the type and number of files reviewed by CAPs; CAP support, resources and member compensation; final review authority; CAP's involvement in the review of salary and off-scale increments at the time of hiring or in retention cases; and the use of ad hoc committees. UCAP considers the survey to be an important resource that helps the committee identify areas in which campus practices might be brought into closer congruence.

### **UCAP Representation**

UCAP Chair Ahmet Palazoglu represented the Committee at meetings of the Academic Council and the Assembly of the Academic Senate.

### **Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements**

UCAP benefited from regular consultation and reports from Janet Lockwood, Associate Director, Academic Personnel and Patricia Price Interim Director, Academic Advancement, who presented updates on the implementation of the salary scale plan and systemwide APM policies under review or being prepared for review, including possible policy changes to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan. Jim Litrownik, Coordinator, Data Management, Academic Advancement provided the committee with data analysis critical to UCAP's discussion about faculty salaries.

UCAP occasionally consulted the Academic Senate chair and vice-chair about issues facing the Senate and UC, and the Senate executive director about Senate office procedures and committee business.

Respectfully submitted,

Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair (D)  
 Katja Lindenberg, Vice Chair (SD)  
 Kathleen Komar (LA)  
 Dana Takagi (SC)  
 Thomas Harmon (M)  
 Julia Bailey-Serres (R)

John Lindow (B)  
 Kyaw Tha Paw U (D)  
 Henry Pontell (I)  
 Patricia Cohen (SB)  
 Richard Arneson (SD)  
 Paul Garcia (SF)

Daniel Simmons ((D); Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)  
 Robert Anderson ((B), Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex-Officio*)  
 Brenda Abrams, Senior Policy Analyst