

COUNCIL ON FACULTY ISSUES AND AWARDS
ANNUAL REPORT, 2006-07
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of the Council: To study and make recommendations on any matter of interest and welfare of the campus community, and to reward excellence in research and teaching.

Highlights:

- Primary concerns of the Council on Faculty Issues and Awards during the 2006-07 academic year can be categorized into 8 main areas organized alphabetically into 1) Academic Freedom; 2) Awards; 3) Faculty Benefits; 4) Housing; 5) Salaries; 6) Station Q; 7) Parking and 8) Campus-wide issues.
- The Committee of Distinguished Teaching Awards and the Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer awarded faculty for excellence in teaching and research

Follow this link to see the full report

COUNCIL ON FACULTY ISSUES AND AWARDS
Annual Report 2006-2007

TO: the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

OVERVIEW OF MAIN AGENDA ITEMS

Primary concerns of the Council on Faculty Issues and Awards during the 2006-07 academic year can be categorized into 8 main areas, ordered roughly alphabetically:

1. **Academic Freedom:** A number of critical issues associated with academic freedom were considered by the Council. Issues included a discussion of policies regarding restrictions on funding (primarily tobacco) and policies regarding faculty-vendor relations. Other issues included a discussion of a UC-wide policy on Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry, review of a report on cross-system Institutional Review Boards and a discussion of a proposed Open Access Policy that provides greater protection for faculty scholarly work and greater freedom to distribute this work electronically.
2. **Awards:** While a critical responsibility of the Council is University awards, this element is typically handled by a subcommittee within the Council. However, in 2006-07 two broad issues were discussed and new policies formulated concerning two University awards, the Faculty Mentorship Award and Outstanding Graduate Student Teaching Awards.
3. **Faculty Benefits:** Similar to 2005-06, faculty benefits were not a major issue for the Council. Proposals to reinstate faculty contributions to the UCRP were not implemented this year because the state did not provide matching funds. However, faculty will have to begin contributing to retirement if the UCRP is to remain healthy. Furthermore, a major issue will be the balance between faculty and University contributions, in which reinstating faculty contributions should not result in a net increase in faculty salaries. Other issues discussed included the impact of separating the UC and Los Alamos National Laboratory retirement systems and adoption benefits.
4. **Housing:** Housing remains a major priority issue for faculty, but the Council believes excellent progress was made, most notably, the Coastal Commission approval of the North Campus housing project and the rapid progress that has been made in soliciting and selecting a developer. Other positive developments included the purchase of the Devereaux property and a proposal to establish an independent housing authority. A critical issue discussed by the Council that remains to be defined is how best to prioritize North Campus housing given faculty needs.
5. **Salaries and Compensation:** Inadequate faculty salaries remain one the most critical issues facing faculty at UCSB and other UC campuses. The critical condition of UC salaries was well described by a UCAP study that summarized UC-wide salaries and the growing use of off-scale supplements to compensate faculty. It is clear that the step system is in serious jeopardy. The Council reviewed several proposals to address this issue, including an excellent memo proposing an acceleration in the rate of salary increases and new policies regarding off-scale salaries and Above Scale appointments.
6. **Station Q:** The Council devoted a considerable amount of discussion of Station Q (Microsoft/UCSB collaboration), noting positive aspects of this proposal, but also expressing concerns regarding impacts on campus-wide planning, FTE, retirements and whether participants should be involved in instruction and graduate student supervision. A major concern of the Council was the manner in which Station Q was initiated, in which the faculty was not consulted until the program was already established.
7. **Parking:** Parking remains a potentially contentious issue on campus, with concerns raised regarding loss of parking due to construction and inadequate signage on campus.
8. **Campus-wide Issues:** The Council is routinely asked to comment on campus policies, draft campus plans and other issues. Specific evaluations will be discussed under the narrative below. The following discussion is listed in accordance with the numbered agenda items above.

COUNCIL ISSUES

1. ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The Council discussed several important issues that involved academic freedom. These could be roughly divided into policies that could restrict academic freedom, policies that will protect and enhance faculty rights regarding scholarly work, and policies to define better specific rights and responsibilities. These included:

- **Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry:** The University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) originally formulated a series of principles regarding student rights of expression that have undergone several reviews System-wide, but have yet to be adopted. Primary elements include clear definitions of the rights of students to express a wide range of viewpoints while also defining the rights of faculty to define course content, assign grades and otherwise structure and administer their courses. Major elements of disagreement System-wide include definitions of student intellectual rights and the role of graduate students and postdoctoral scholars as instructors. While these principles have not been adopted System-wide, several UCs were considering division-level publication, including UCSB.
- **RE89:** The Council reviewed RE89, a proposal to restrict University acceptance of funding from the tobacco industry. While the Council was in agreement that tobacco industry funding has had many negative aspects, it voted to reaffirm a general policy that supports the freedom of faculty to obtain funding from any source provided that it meets all other University ethical requirements. According to the UCSB representative to the UC Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF), 9 campuses voted against RE-89, with one campus abstaining.
- **Institutional Review Boards (IRB):** IRBs were originally established in academic institutions across the United States as a response to several well-publicized instances where human rights of privacy and human safety were violated during scientific studies. As such, IRB's represent an important element that protects the rights of subjects from abuse and are given the responsibility of authorizing research protocols funded by numerous agencies such as NIH and NSF with IRBs having the ultimate authority to disallow research even if it is funded. While the importance of IRBs is widely recognized, IRBs within the UC-system have recently come under criticism, as summarized by a report from the UCORP. This report included an overview of IRBs in the UC-system, including performance reviews and a summary of problems and recommendations for improvement. Several important weaknesses were identified in the report, including 1) a lack of coordination and training protocols across campuses; 2) a lack of communication of protocols; and 3) a general degree of under funding with too little faculty participation. A specific recommendation of the Council was to include more expertise in the social sciences on these boards, which seem to be oriented more towards medical reviews. IRBs, while not a major issue at UCSB, are still important in that they can severely limit some types of social research, especially in areas where anonymity is difficult to preserve.
- **Faculty-Pharmaceutical Vendor Relations:** The Council reviewed a draft proposal from UCOP to formalize a policy regarding faculty- pharmaceutical vendor relations. This draft included two parts, the first of which the Council chose not to express an opinion. The second part dealt with three additional proposed policies, including one excluding articles ghostwritten by vendors for faculty, "no strings attached" grants or gifts and publication of consulting agreements and unconditional grants on the internet. Overall, the Council was highly supportive of the first two components of the additional policies, which are consistent with broader guidelines in the Faculty Code of Conduct and are similar to recent guidelines published by Stanford University. The Council did not support web-based disclosure of specific faculty/vendor agreements as described in the third element. These responses were summarized in a memo to the Academic Senate in March, 2007.

- **Open Access:** The University of California is nationally recognized for the excellence of its scholars, yet lacks a policy that ensures ownership of digital materials, manuscripts etc. As electronic publishing grows, and the cost of paper media increases, ownership of digital forms of publication is becoming increasingly important. The Council was asked to review a draft policy on Open Access for the UC. This policy is designed to provide greater protection and rights to faculty scholarly works by developing formal agreements that will preserve a faculty's ownership of their intellectual products and a right to distribute these electronically. The Council was unanimous in its support, expressing this in a memo to the Academic Senate in March, 2007.

2. AWARDS

While teaching and mentorship awards are an important element of the Council, they have typically been dealt with in a sub-committee chaired by Craig Carlson Council Vice Chair in 2006-07. However, two important issues regarding awards were brought to the attention of the Council and discussed, resulting in specific recommendations.

- **The Graduate Mentorship Award:** On November 15, 2006, the Council received a Memo from the Chair of the Graduate Council, Omer Egecioglu, suggesting major revisions to the Graduate Mentorship Award, an award originally developed as a means of recognizing faculty who excel in mentoring graduate students. After consideration, the Graduate Council suggested a set of explicit revisions, including key definitions for excellence, procedures for nomination and requirements for the submission package. Overall, the Council was highly supportive of the revised description of Facets of Mentoring and efforts to clarify the award. However, the Council was also concerned that the new criteria are too mechanistic, relying more on quantity of mentoring, rather than the quality. Furthermore, the Council believed strongly that the intent of this award was to recognize mentoring excellence established at UCSB, and thus greater weight should be given to mentorship activities at UCSB, and not at other institutions. These concerns, in addition to a number of other suggestions were summarized in a response to the Graduate Council with a request that any new wording undergo further review by the Council.
- **Outstanding Teaching Assistant Award:** This year, the Council reviewed numerous complaints about this award. Many of these complaints originated from vague or out-of-date language that placed restrictions on the eligibility of Teaching Assistants. One of the greatest sources of confusion concerned Teaching Associates and Graduate Student Researchers (GSR) who were considered ineligible for the award if they were not a Teaching Assistant at the time of nomination, regardless of the quality of their teaching assistant activities in recent quarters. Thus a student, who was an excellent Teaching Assistant for several quarters, became ineligible if they were a Teaching Associate during the quarter in which they were nominated. In a similar fashion, a student who was a Teaching Assistant two quarters and GSR one quarter, would be ineligible if the GSR happened to land on the quarter of nomination, regardless of the quality of their teaching. In the revised language, the Council suggested that these limitations be modified to better reflect the changing nature of student funding, in which an excellent Teaching Assistant might be a GSR one quarter, a teaching assistant another or even a Teaching Associate. It was also clarified that the award should be based solely on performance as a Teaching Assistant.

3. FACULTY BENEFITS

Faculty benefits were not a major issue for the Council in 2006-07. However, important developments were discussed, including a proposal to reinstate faculty contributions to the UC Retirement Plan (UCRP), and issues related to the separation of the UC and Los Alamos retirement plans. Another element discussed was adoption benefits.

- **Faculty Contributions:** The ratio of liabilities to assets in the UC Retirement Plan has steadily declined over the past five years, decreasing from 138% in 2002 to 104% in 2006. In recognition of the critical importance of UCRP, the UC Faculty Welfare (UCFW) voted to support reinstatement of faculty contributions to UCRP, which were discontinued in the early 1990s. The exact date and form of reinstatement have yet to be determined. Reinstatement of contributions did not occur in 2007 because employer contributions were not included in the Governor's 2007

budget. The ratio of faculty to employer contributions is one of the most important issues that must be decided in the near future and is of major importance to faculty. It is the general stance of the UCFW that any increase in the cost of faculty benefits must be balanced by an increase in faculty salaries.

- **Adoption Benefits.** As a part of the UC Family Friendly Policies, the UC has come to appreciate the diverse forms of a family, including a greater recognition of the importance of adoption. In the past, this Council reviewed University policies regarding child-rearing and pregnancy. During this tenure, the Council reviewed a UCOP study on adoption benefits, which included a list of proposed benefit options, estimated costs to the UC (assuming a 0.1-0.2% utilization rate) and a survey of adoption benefits for the Comparison 8 institutions. Council Member D. Morgan suggested that it would be appropriate to implement a \$1,500-2,500 adoption benefit, with the rate varying depending on usage. This motion was supported unanimously by the Council.
- **Los Alamos National Laboratory.** LANL employees who were members of UCRP were officially subdivided into two groups on May 31, 2006, including one group that would remain in the UCRP and another who would transfer their benefits to a new retirement system (LANS). One major concern of UCFW was that this division did not result in a net decline in the quality of assets within the UCRP. The Council reviewed a UCFW report that evaluated the "Agreement on Terms for Transfer of Assets from UCRP to LANS" with Council member D. Morgan taking a lead in the discussion. Overall, the Council found the assessment very encouraging, in that it guarantees no erosion in UCRP assets and may even "enhance the funded status of the UCRP". This item was strictly informational, but included in the CFIA minutes of February Council meeting.

4. HOUSING

Faculty housing remains the Council's second highest priority. The Council believes that the University continues to make substantial improvements in this area and looks forward to continued progress. The Council looks forward to collaborative engagement with the Administration, especially through a representative on the Chancellor's Committee on Faculty Staff Housing, in which D. Roberts was a member in 2006-07. Specific issues for this year included:

- **North Campus Housing:** With the approval of the 172 units of North Campus housing by the California Coastal Commission in November 2006, a very important first step was made in improving the quality of faculty housing. The approval of an additional 151 units at Sierra Madre at the same time is also a major step forward. Coastal Commission approval has been followed by rapid progress, including an RFQ, RFP, and selection of a developer for the project. The Council looks forward to the successful phased completion of this project. However, the Council is also aware that many factors have yet to be finalized for North Campus Housing. One of the most critical elements is the development of a policy dealing with how best to prioritize faculty in need. One example of the challenge we face is how best to cope with faculty who are not on North Campus and West Campus waiting lists, yet have substandard housing in the area. As a part of this process, the Council reviewed a draft North Campus access policy and made some recommendations (through D. Roberts as a member of the Chancellor's Committee). The Council wants to remain closely involved in this process and will request continued representation on the Chancellor's Faculty/Staff Housing Advisory Committee. Another major issue expressed by many Council members is the potentially high cost of the units that may make it difficult for those faculty most in need to afford a house.
- **MOP Loans:** MOP loans are critical if new faculty are to be able to afford housing in the area. The Council investigated whether MOP loans were available to Lectures with Security of Employment (SOE) or Potential SOE (PSOE). According to Academic Personnel, MOP loans are offered to all incoming new members of the Academic Senate, including LSOE and PSOE and can be used in true retention cases. An incoming candidate is not eligible if the PSOE has less

than a 100% appointment, has been placed on the wait list for West Campus housing by the Dean, or already owns a house in Santa Barbara.

- **Other Housing Efforts:** Numerous developments are highly encouraging, including proposals to develop Ocean Road and the recent purchase of the Devereaux property. A proposal to establish an independent housing authority, perhaps modeled after the Irvine Campus Housing Authority (ICHA) is also encouraging.

5. SALARIES

The erosion of faculty salaries could be considered the most important issue discussed by the Council in 2006-07. In early fall, 2006, the Council proposed the establishment of a Working Group on Salaries, yet found this unnecessary given rapidly changing emphasis on salaries this year. Important developments included an excellent report from UCAP documenting the growing use of off-scale salaries, proposed amendments to academic policies concerning off-scale salaries and above-scale appointments, a memo from the Chair of the Academic Senate, Joel Michaelsen (Michaelsen Memo), and the UCFW report on "Total Remuneration and the 2007-2008 Budget", all of which emphasize the growing need for salary increases.

- **UCFW Report:** In October, 2006, UCFW representative D. Morgan reviewed a recent report, written by UCFW providing an *Analysis and Recommendation—Total Remuneration and the 2007-2008 Budget*. This report initiates with an overview of RE-61 that commits the UC to salary increases to reach market values within ten years. The report expands upon this policy to state the UCFW position—that UC cash salaries should be increased to ensure that they are not further eroded by an expected increase in the cost of UC benefits. Furthermore, the report provides estimates of a likely cost of living increase (COLA) required to keep UC pay competitive equal to "7% of salary up to the Social Security base" and "10% of salary above the wage base". These are far larger than the currently proposed 3% COLA and 2% allocation for faculty merits.
- **UCAP Report:** In November 2006, the Council reviewed a UCAP report, *Synopsis on the Present Status of the UC Merit and Promotion System and Principles of and Policy Recommendations for UC Faculty Compensation*. In general the Council was highly supportive of the overall goals and language of the document. This report directly addresses one of the most pressing concerns for the Council, namely salary erosion and growing disparities within the step system. While the Council was highly supportive of the overall goals of the document, it had some concerns, which were summarized in a memo to the Academic Senate. Specific concerns involved Principle 3, suggesting further subdivision of the step system and Principle 5, in which the Council was supportive of phasing out off-scale supplements, but expressed concerns about implementation.
- **Michaelsen Memo:** The Council was asked to provide feedback on a memo written by the Chair of the Academic Senate, Joel Michaelsen, in which he argues for an accelerated rate of increase in UC faculty salaries. This memo was partially inspired by the labor agreement between the state and California State University system, in which Cal State faculty will receive a 25% pay increase, over a four-year period. The Council was highly supportive of this memo, suggesting a few minor word changes.
- **Proposed Revisions to Policy on Off-Scale Salaries (APM 620)** The UCAP Report starkly illustrated continued erosion of the step system and the manner in which various units in the UC were compensating through the use of off-scale salaries. In May 2007, the Council was asked to comment on proposed revisions to APM 620. While the Council was highly supportive of any effort to improve faculty salaries and supportive of a general effort to simplify language in this policy, the Council also had concerns that major elements of the proposed revisions were preliminary and could leave departments without proper guidelines for dealing with outstanding merit cases. Elements that the Council supported included revised language removing the word "exceptional" from off-scale salaries and the proposal to incorporate salary ranges into each step.

However, the Council was opposed to major deletions that removed current guidelines without any replacement. These concerns were voiced in a memo to the Academic Senate in May, 2007.

6. STATION Q

Early in fall, 2006, the Council was asked to review a proposal for Station Q, a collaborative research effort between Microsoft and UCSB, in which top researchers in the field would be supported by Microsoft, yet housed at UCSB to research quantum computing. In its initial response, which was conducted by email in mid October, 2006, the Council was supportive of the general concept, but expressed some concerns regarding the late request for review and concerns regarding the potential impacts on benefits. These concerns were voiced in a joint memo to the EVC with the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP).

Following the initial review, the Council was asked to review a revised proposal with responses from EVC Gene Lucas in April 2007. Unfortunately, upon second review the Council was even more concerned about the potential negative impacts of Station Q. Specific concerns included the lack of Senate consultation earlier in the process, the lack of a well-defined policy for this type of relationship and the potential negative ramifications of having Microsoft employees teach and mentor students. Additional concerns included a lack of an existing model for appointments (0%/affiliated appointments only exist for current ladder faculty), a lack of consideration how Station Q might impact long-term campus planning and a lack of adequate consideration of the potential impact on benefits. For the latter, the Council suggested that Station Q follow the Howard Hughes Medical Institute model, currently used at many UC campuses. These concerns were summarized in two memos to the Academic Senate, one in October, 2006, the other in May, 2007.

7. PARKING

Parking remains an important issue to the Council, but was relatively quiet in 2006-07. D. Morgan remained as the liaison between CFIA and the Ratepayers Board. Issues that were discussed during this year included concerns raised regarding loss of parking due to the removal of lots 21 and 22 and general concern regarding poor directional signage on campus. The question was also raised regarding the feasibility of tracking open parking spaces in raised structures, which may be addressable with equipment that is in place in structures such as Mesa, yet has not been made operational.

8. CAMPUS-WIDE ISSUES

- **Draft Academic Plan.** The Council was asked to comment on the 2007 revision to the Draft Academic Plan. While the Academic Plan continues to improve, the Council also found a number of elements unsatisfactory, which were summarized in a response to the Academic Senate in January 2007.
- **Response to Draft Policies and Establishment, Review and Disestablishment of non-ORU Centers.** The Council on Faculty Issues and Awards met on January 10, 2007 and discussed the draft Policy and Procedure for Establishment, Review and Disestablishment of non-ORU centers. Overall, the Council was supportive of the major objectives of this policy and believed that it addressed a potential gap by establishing a formal policy where one currently does not exist, while retaining some of the flexibility these Centers require. However, the Council also questioned the necessity of the policy, wondering how many Centers it might impact and expressed concerns regarding the asymmetry of the policy that provided numerous details for the establishment, but few for the disestablishment of centers. These concerns were summarized in a memo to the Academic Senate in January, 2007.
- **Consensual relationships.** The Council was asked in April, 2007, to review a draft confidential document dealing with consensual relations. Overall, the Council had serious concerns regarding this document, believing that many components represented an unwarranted intrusion of the University in to private affairs and concerns regarding reporting. The Council also noted that the

most serious components, dealing with sexual harassment are already included in University policy.

COUNCIL COMMITTEES

Committee on Distinguished Teaching (C. Carlson, Chair)

The Committee on Distinguished Teaching met in early January, 2007. The first meeting was held to review selection committee procedure and answer questions. The second meeting was held for the Committee to choose this year's Distinguished Teaching Award recipients.

Committee on Emeriti (ae) and Retirement (E. Brownlee, Chair)

Committee did not meet

Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer (H. Giles, Chair)

The Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer consists of the previous five Faculty Research Lecturers. The Chair is the previous year's recipient. The Committee meets once in January to select the current year's recipient.

Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (P. Amar, Chair)

Committee did not meet

IMPORTANT ISSUES FOR 2007-08

Issues that the Council identified as likely to be important for the following academic year included:

- **Faculty Salaries.** UC faculty salaries continue to lag behind counterparts at other universities. In addition, there are growing inequities campus-wide, and increasing challenges to the step system. As a first step, the Council would be willing to research this problem, quantifying how pay varies across campus and compares to other universities and the extent to which disparities have grown in recent years.
- **Benefits.** While faculty benefits did not seriously erode in 2006-07, continued escalating health costs, renewal of contributions to the University pension and continuing discussion of a transition to a Defined Contribution plan are issues that are likely to be significant in 2007-08.
- **Workload.** This issue is critical, yet has been largely neglected over the past three years. The Council has been asked to nominate a member to this working group for two years, yet the work group has yet to meet.
- **Housing.** The Council will remain heavily engaged with the housing issue and anticipates a greater role in helping formulate policies on pricing and prioritization.

Acknowledgements: CFIA is grateful for the wonderful work of Stephanie Smagala, Council Analyst.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Amar, Law and Society
Hilary Bernstein, History
W. Elliot Brownlee, Emeritus, History
Craig Carlson, Vice Chair, Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology
Lisa Hajjar, UCAF Representative, Law and Society Program
W. Douglas Morgan, UCFW Representative, Economics
Vickie Scott, Theater and Dance
Sven Spieker, Germanic, Slavic and Semitic Studies

David A. Sprecher, Emeritus, Mathematics

Roberto Strongman, Black Studies

Mary Ann Jordan, Non-Senate Academic Representative, Molecular Cellular and Developmental Biology

Dar Roberts, Chair, Geography