

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (UCAP)  
2005-2006 ANNUAL REPORT**

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

In Academic Year 2005-2006, the University Committee on Academic Personnel met four times and held one teleconference meeting to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in [Senate Bylaw 135](#). The issues that UCAP considered this year are described briefly as follows:

**Synopsis of the Present Status of the UC Merit and Promotion System and Principles of and Recommendations for Faculty Salary Compensation**

In May, Provost Rory Hume joined UCAP to discuss concerns about UC's salary scale system and the use of off-scale salary increments. Provost Hume asked UCAP to consider how the University's salary scales could return to a more regulated, rational and equitable structure.

UCAP members discussed the issue internally and then with campus CAPs via their representatives to UCAP. UCAP submitted a report to Academic Council in June that presented a synopsis of the present status of the UC merit and promotion system and provided a set of five principles and three policy recommendations. UCAP's Principles maintained that the UC rank and step system must be fair, defensible and transparent; that UC must set as its highest priority the restoration of a competitive faculty compensation plan; that the salary schedule for merits and promotions should be subdivided into stipends by discipline area; that maintenance of faculty salaries – by discipline at market values – must be a top priority of University leaders in their annual negotiations with the State; and that off-scale salary increments should be phased out over time as rank and step salaries are raised to market rates through adjustments at regular merit and advancement reviews. UCAP's recommendations were for the University to implement a set of competitive salary schedules that partitioned the general faculty into cohorts by discipline, and to develop contingency plans in the event that University leaders were not successful in attaining the goals articulated in the Principles.

Academic Council voted to distribute UCAP's document – *Synopsis of the Present Status of the UC Merit and Promotion System and Principles of and Recommendations for Faculty Salary Compensation* – for systemwide Senate review and to establish an ad hoc working group – as proposed in UCAP's document – to begin work on implementation.

**Recommended Modifications to APM 220-18:**

In April 2006, Academic Council voted to discontinue formal review of several proposed amendments to APM 220-18b (4), which UCAP first submitted to Council in June 2005. Council referred the matter back to UCAP with a request that it advise Council about the need to revise the APM, taking into account the current APM language, Council's July 2005 position and all subsequent comments from the formal review. Council cited a "significant lack of consensus" among faculty across both Senate committees and divisions, particularly in regard to the question of how to denote the teaching criterion in APM 220. In February, during the formal review period, UCAP had responded to Council's July 2005 position by preparing a new revision that opposed Council's view of teaching criterion in the text based on current CAP practices on campuses.

In June, UCAP sent a new proposal to Academic Council with an enhanced justification for its proposed modifications, noting that taken as a whole, the proposed language strengthened Step VI requirements for teaching, as well as for research and service, and would make advancement review practices more consistent across all UC campuses. In June, Council voted to send a slightly amended version of UCAP's proposed APM 220 language for systemwide review.

### **The Role of Collaboration in Evaluating Research and Scholarship Achievements:**

UCAP reviewed a recommendation from the UCSF Collaborative Research Committee for new APM language for the Professor, Professional Research, and Project Scientist series that would provide clearer guidance to CAPs in their evaluations of academic personnel candidates who may have made important contributions to research projects as collaborators, but who did not demonstrate "independence" within the project as senior author or Principal Investigator. At the end of the year, a UCAP subcommittee was working on a formal proposal for new APM language.

### **On-campus Child Care**

In February, UCAP sent a letter to Academic Council recommending that the University increase resources for on-campus child care facilities in the interest of helping female academic personnel participate fully in university academic life. UCAP noted that from an academic personnel perspective, child care was both a recruitment and a retention issue affecting future junior colleagues as well as regular faculty. UCAP said additional spending for child care and lactation rooms should be a high budget priority as new funds from the Compact become available, and campuses should take advantage of matching funds earmarked by UCOP for the construction of on site child care centers. Academic Council endorsed UCAP's recommendation.

### **Consultation with the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity**

The chair and vice chair of UCAAD joined UCAP to discuss the potential role of campus CAPs in the implementation of revisions to APM 210, 240, and 245, which were originally proposed by UCAAD in 2004, and took effect for all faculty in July 2005. UCAAD and UCAP agreed that it would be essential to publicize the changes to faculty and to ensure that a structure was in place to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation. UCAP agreed that CAPs would consider how to value contributions to diversity in reviews, and that CAPs could help draw awareness to the changes by communicating to department chairs the shift in emphasis and CAP's expectation that the diversity issues in the modifications would be addressed.

### **Additional Business**

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

- **Proposed Revisions to Systemwide APM Policies related to paid sick leave, reasonable accommodation, medical separation and constructive resignation (APM 700, 710, 711 and 080)**
- **UCOL's Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 185**
- **Scholarly Communications Special Committee (SCSC) draft white papers - "Responding to the Challenges Facing Scholarly Communication"**

**Member Items:**

UCAP devoted part of each regular meeting to reports and updates from its members about issues facing local committees, and individual campus practices.

**CAP Survey Comparing Campus Practices**

UCAP surveyed local campus committees for information about CAP practices and experiences. The survey covered 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; the use of ad hocs; and recusal policy. UCAP considered the survey to be an important resource that would help UCAP identify areas in which campus practices might be brought into closer congruence.

**CAP Involvement in Salary and Off Scales**

UCAP discussed the role of CAPs in determining or reviewing salary and off-scale offers that had either a merit or a market component. Significant concern was expressed about wide variations in pay scales across fields and schools, a trend toward the disassociation of salary and merit, the arbitrariness of off-scales, and the lack of CAP involvement in many of these decisions. Some CAPs were satisfied with their current position—not commenting on salary—while others saw their involvement in salary matters as a vital part of shared governance. There was some discussion about UCAP making a statement recommending that CAPs as a minimum should be entitled to see salary and off scale information, if they so request it.

**Other Issues**

In its discussions, UCAP touched briefly on local efforts to creatively address salary lag, inequities, and rampant decoupling – including the use of “shadow” salary scales; the use of reserve CAPs on some campuses to review the cases of CAP members; career equity review guidelines; the personnel process at the National Labs, practices related to the review of endowed chairs; improving efficiencies in the personnel process; review candidates who decline to submit proper documentation; credit for electronic-only publications compared to print publications; the meaning of “international acclaim” and “collaboration”; mobility between classifications; and strategies that would help encourage an atmosphere of shared governance at UC Merced. UCAP also discussed CAP practices for reviewing files from Arts faculty where CDs and DVDs are provided; and how CAPs evaluate a merit increase in the Professor 1-5 range for faculty whose number of publications over a four or five year period equal that expected for a two or three year period.

**UCAP Representation**

UCAP Chair Tony Norman 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 Assistant Vice President for Academic Advancement Ellen Switkes and Director of Academic Personnel Myron Okada, who presented the committee with regular updates on systemwide APM policies under review and the

progress of collective bargaining negotiations, as well as other topics including benefit and compensation plans, salary scales, and a proposal to allow grant income to partially fund off-scale salaries for ladder faculty.

Also joining the committee as guests were UC Provost Rory Hume, and UCAAD Chair and Vice Chair Daniel Weiss and Gibor Basri. The Academic Senate chair and vice-chair occasionally updated the committee on issues facing the Academic Council and Senate, and the Academic Senate executive director spoke to UCAP about Senate office procedures and committee business.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony Norman, Chair (UCR)  
Mary Croughan, Vice Chair (UCSF)  
Allan Zych (UCR)  
Cynthia Brown (UCSB)  
Catherine Morrison Paul (UCD)  
Daniel Mitchell (UCLA)  
Margaret Peggy Walsh (UCSF)  
Susan Gillman (UCSC)  
James Hunt (UCB)  
Charles Ribak (UCI)

J. Hampton Atkinson (UCSD)  
J. Arthur Woodward (UCM-fall)  
David Ojcius (UCM-spring)  
Jack Talbott, (alternate-UCSB)  
Chris Calvert, (alternate-UCD)  
John Oakley, Academic Senate Chair (UCD)  
Michael Brown, Academic Senate Vice-Chair (UCSB)  
Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst