

**Attending:** Tony Norman, Chair (UCR)

Mary Croughan, Vice Chair (UCSF), James Hunt (UCB), Ambuj Singh (UCSB), Daniel Mitchell (UCLA), Catherine Morrison Paul (UCD), Charles Ribak (UCI), Margaret Peggy Walsh (UCSF), Allen Zych (UCR), Susan Gillman (UCSC), Ellen Switkes (AVP, Academic Advancement), Michael LaBriola (Senate Analyst)

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

UCAP made final revisions to its draft memo recommending a set of principles and policies to address deficiencies in the UC salary scales and faculty compensation. Members made specific suggestions for modifying the draft to enhance its clarity, accuracy and effectiveness.

Members discussed the gap between average UC and Comparison Eight salaries, which was 10% in 2005-06. It was noted that the University does not expect average salaries to decline faster than comparison institutions in 2006-07, but that without further adjustments, other than merits, that gap could increase to 12%. The committee agreed to note that the Comparison Eight should be revisited.

As Principles, UCAP noted that the UC rank and step system must be fair, defensible and transparent; that UC must set as its highest priority restoration of a competitive faculty compensation plan that is used systemwide; 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 made recommendations for the University to immediately implement a panel of competitive salary schedules that would partition the general faculty into a number of cohorts by disciplines, and develop contingency plans in the event that University leaders were not successful in attaining the goals articulated in the Principles.

**Action:** UCAP's memo will be finalized submitted to Council, along with a cover letter, in time for consideration at the June 21 meeting.

## **II. Proposed Modifications to Systemwide APM Polices 220-18-b (4)**

In April, Academic Council voted to discontinue formal review of several proposed amendments to APM 220-18b (4)—which were originally proposed by UCAP and modified by Council in July 2005—and referred the matter back to UCAP with a request that it advise Council about the need to revise the APM, taking into account all previous comments. During the formal review period in February, UCAP responded by preparing a new revision that opposed Council's view of teaching criterion in the text based on current CAP practices. UCAP decided to re-submit its February version to Academic Council with an enhanced justification for its proposed modifications, noting that taken as a whole, UCAP's proposed language strengthened Step VI requirements for teaching, as well as for research and service.

**Action:** UCAP's recommendation will be re-crafted to incorporate the ideas from the discussion and will be submitted in time for Council's June 21 meeting. UCAP's new advice to Council will be meticulous about describing and justifying the proposed changes.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 PM.  
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola  
Attest: Tony Norman