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.

The concerns of the Council on Faculty Issues and Awards during the 2011-2012 academic year included the on-going issues of Academic Freedom, Faculty Awards, and Faculty Welfare, as well as the seven specific issues listed below.

Local Reviews:

1. Parking Services Proposal
2. West Campus Point Proposal

System-wide Reviews:

1. Proposed revisions Academic Personnel Manual (APM)
   A. APM 668: Negotiated salary program
   B. APM 010, 015, and 016 amendments
   C. APM 035 and 190 revisions
   D. APM 200 and 205 revisions
2. Faculty Diversity Report
3. Faculty Salaries Report
4. UC Protests
5. UCAAD Salary Equity Study

Four committees reviewed and deliberated over nominations for various Academic Senate awards for research, teaching, and mentoring.
MEETINGS

The Council on Faculty Issues & Awards convened for seven regularly scheduled meetings during the 2011-12 academic year (two in fall, three in winter, and two in spring). Between formal meetings, when appropriate, CFIA conducted regular deliberations and consultations via email.

COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

Gayle Binion (Chair and UCFW Rep)  Political Science
Daniel Blumenthal (Vice Chair and UCAF Rep)  Electrical & Computer Engineering
Peter Bloom  Film & Media Studies
Sharon Conley  Education
Simonetta Falasca-Zamponi  Sociology
Barbara Harthorn  Feminist Studies
Suzanne Jill Levine  Spanish & Portuguese
Bruce Lipshutz  Chemistry & Biochemistry
James Mattinson (Emeritus)  Earth Science
Mireille Miller-Young  Feminist Studies
W. Doug Morgan (Emeritus)  Economics
Stephen Proulx  Ecology, Evolution & Marine Biology
Carole Paul (Non-Senate Academic Rep)  History of Art & Architecture
Thomas Bell  Graduate Student Rep
Scott O'Halloran  Undergraduate Student Rep
LOCAL ISSUES

1) Parking Proposal

In winter quarter, the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards reviewed a proposal from Parking Services that sought to raise parking permit rates, and offered two options as to how to do so. CFIA objected to the proposed tiered parking fee scale with differential rates for access to more conveniently located parking lots. There were a variety of objections to this complicated proposal, including safety issues, differentiations based on ability to pay, etc.

Council agreed on the following points:
1. Any parking proposal should maintain equitable access for all permit-holders, and the current permit process which includes “A” stickers for faculty should be maintained.
2. Council objected to a system where one’s ability to pay determines where one can park.
3. Council expressed concern about a system where permits may be oversold.

Provided that Parking Services could sufficiently document that its financial condition justified an increase, Council was willing to consider slightly higher parking fee for faculty while retaining the current parking system, noting that parking rates have increased very little over the past decade.

Response: The Academic Senate’s Divisional response (which included input from the Council on Planning & Budget) was sent to Marc Fisher, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor on February 29. The Senate supported a parking permit fee increase of $1.50 per month, based on projected cost increases through 2012-13. The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services increased long-term and short-term parking rates effective July 1, 2012. Monthly permits for faculty and staff (“A” and “B” permits) increased from $36.00 to $37.50.

2) West Campus Point Proposal

In winter quarter, CFIA spent two meeting reviewing a proposed agreement between the UCSB campus and the West Campus Point Homeowners’ Association – first with proponents of the proposal and later in consultation with Academic Senate Chair, Henning Bohn.

While it was not clear to Council who should bear the responsibility of the costs associated with the renovation / remediation project, in CFIA’s estimate the proposal largely served the interests of the campus and the current residents of West Campus Point at the expense of future residents (of West Campus Point and North Campus).

To keep the costs down for West Campus Point residents (and its future residents), the plan called for costs to be spread across other faculty housing projects (i.e., North Campus). CFIA was very concerned about the ability of the University to sell all of the planned future units. It was noted that 22 units were built in the first phase of the North Campus project, and it was only recently that the last units were sold. With amortization of the proposed $7.1 million debt (plus interest) across the existing and future units, CFIA was very concerned about the impact this additional debt would have on the affordability of these units.

CFIA questioned the level of certitude that the plan set forth would fully, and permanently, remedy the problem, and Council wanted to see a more complete description of the reliability of such assurances. CFIA also requested more information on the alternatives. While the plan offered four options, it immediately discounted three of them. CFIA wondered if there other
possibilities that had not been fully examined. For example CFIA suggested that the “scrap and rebuild” option should at least be explored as a possibility, perhaps with a temporary relocation of current residents.

Response: The Academic Senate’s Divisional response included considerable input from the Council on Planning & Budget. Extensive comments were sent to Marc Fisher, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor, Administrative Services on April 3. The Senate was unable to endorse the proposal as presented, citing two primary concerns: the financial viability of the plan and the inherent unfairness of passing of costs to future homeowners. The Divisional response commented on the Senate’s difficulty with the review, noting that the situation “is deeply troubling with no easy or good solution.”

SYSTEM-WIDE REVIEWS

1) Proposed revisions Academic Personnel Manual (APM)

A.) APM 668: Negotiated salary program

The Council on Faculty Issues & Awards reviewed the revision to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM), the negotiated salary program (APM 668) in fall quarter. Council expressed a great deal of apprehension about this proposed policy. This proposal is based on a funding model that exists already in the health sciences. However, CFIA was not convinced of its relevance on a campus like ours without a medical school and was skeptical about how many faculty would even be eligible to participate. Council was uncertain how this policy would be implemented in light of funders’ rules and regulations that prohibit salary augmentation.

Council was greatly concerned about the potential impact that this policy could have on the integrity of the merit and promotion system, and CFIA was wary of possible unintended consequences of the policy (e.g. grantor stipulations on use of funds or restrictions on other duties). Council was also concerned that the policy may serve to exacerbate salary inequities that already exist between the colleges / divisions. Furthermore, CFIA was wary of a policy change that might start us down a path whereby faculty are asked (or even required) to raise part of their salaries from external sources. Council wholeheartedly advocated for preserving the meritocracy of the system and avoiding a promotion structure whereby salary advances are made merely due to access to funds.

Response: The Divisional response (dated December 5th) included broad consultation from a number of Senate councils and committees. All reviewing groups were unanimously opposed to its implementation, as proposed. The Santa Barbara Division’s opinion was that the negotiated salary program would, at best, benefit a minority of faculty but not solve any systemic problems. In fact, the disparity between salaries may become more pronounced, even though there may only be a small number of faculty who take advantage of such a program.

B.) Proposed amendments to APM 010, 015, and 016

The Council on Faculty Issues & Awards reviewed the proposed revisions to sections 010, 015, and 016 of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) in spring.

With regard to APM 010 and 015, CFIA supported the proposal to add “freedom to address any matter of institutional policy or action.” However, Council objected to the second part of the
proposed addition, which would specify that such behavior would be “when acting as a member
of the faculty whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional governance.” CFIA was
concerned with the overly-broad qualifications which are open to a great deal of ambiguity.
CFIA objected to language to cover the behavior of Deans or other faculty administrators.
These administrative positions are at will, and they hold no right to their positions. Their
conduct in these roles is not an issue of academic freedom.

Council also strongly objected to the addition of “policies” to APM 016. CFIA was concerned
about the nebulousness of this language. Any number of campus offices may implement their
own policies, and these are not on par with University-wide rules and regulations, which are
subject to institutional review, and once approved are promulgated. It is not appropriate that the
code of conduct should elevate “policies” to the same level as University rules and regulations.

Response: UCSB’s Divisional comments were sent to the systemwide Academic Senate on
June 18. The Divisional review included input from a number of Senate groups, including the
Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), Committee on Privilege & Tenure, and Committee
on Diversity & Equity. CFIA’s concerns regarding APM 010 and 015 were shared in the
Divisional response, while all but one of the other groups supported the changes. Given the
ambiguity of the language and the possible punishment of faculty that the proposal suggested,
the Division did not support the revisions to APM 016 as proposed.

C.) Proposed revisions to APM 035 and 190

In spring quarter, the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards reviewed the proposed revisions to
sections 035 and 190 of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM). The updates appeared to
conform to State laws and CFIA had no objections to the changes.

Response: UCSB’s Divisional comments were sent to the systemwide Academic Senate on
June 7. The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) and the Committee on Diversity & Equity
(CDE) also reviewed the proposed revisions. CAP had no formal comment and CFIA and CDE
both endorsed the revisions as proposed.

D.) Proposed revisions to APM 200 and 205

In October, the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards reviewed the proposed changes to the
Academic Personnel Manual (APM), including revisions to APM 200 and a proposed new APM
205, regarding the recall of retired academic appointees. The primary focus of the revision was
the cap of 43% time for recalled faculty, the intent of which was to ensure that Medicare be
maintained as the primary payer for health care claims made by Medicare covered employees.
CFIA had no objection to this change.

Two specific revisions were of concern to Council. The first was with regard to the section in
proposed APM 205 on Terms of Employment (205-20) dealing with Early Termination
(paragraph c). This section allowed for the University to terminate a recalled appointee “without
cause” prior to the end of the specified contract date. CFIA objected to this clause on the
grounds that it would violate faculty rights of due process. CFIA was also concerned with the
revision of APM 200 (200-0) which exempted Deans from the 5-year mandatory reviews. CFIA
opposed this exemption as it incorrectly suggested that academic administrators have ceased to
be faculty.
Response: UCSB’s Divisional comments – which included review by the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) – were sent to the systemwide Academic Senate on November 16. The Division shared significant concerns with the language exempting Deans from the five-year mandatory review, noting that Deans continue to be involved in scholarship while serving in administrative roles and the mandatory review should continue. CFIA’s additional concern was shared regarding the section in proposed APM 205 on Terms of Employment (205-20) dealing with Early Termination (paragraph e).

2) Faculty Diversity Report

The Council on Faculty Issues & Awards reviewed the report and recommendations of the Faculty Diversity Working Group (FDWG) in June. CFIA was supportive of the goals of the report and the efforts to hire and retain diverse faculty. Council enthusiastically endorsed the President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program and recommended that full funding be restored to this program. CFIA also agreed that Cluster hiring (defined in the report as "the practice of hiring small groups of faculty conducting research on topics related to underrepresented minority communities") could be an effective way of promoting a more diverse faculty. CFIA expressed concerns about the proposed Central diversity office and agreed that efforts should be taken to mainstream and reward diversity efforts within the existing categories of personnel review (Crediting contributions to diversity).

Response: UCSB’s Divisional comments – which included review by the Committee on Diversity & Equity (CDE), the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), and the Council on Planning & Budget (CPB) – were sent to the systemwide Academic Senate on June 19. Some of the recommendations in the report were endorsed by all groups and other recommendations drew a mixed response. The President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program was strongly supported on the campus and most groups recommended increasing the funding for this program, especially given the funding reductions over the past few years.

3) Faculty Salaries Report

The Council on Faculty Issues & Awards discussed the Report of the joint Administration/Senate Task Force on Faculty Salaries in April. The Faculty Salaries Scale Task Force Report recommended a two-part process for working on improved faculty salaries for UC. CFIA supported the plan insofar as it would mean an increase in salaries (and market competitiveness) for many, if not most, faculty. It appeared to CFIA that those who are currently off-scale may not get an increase, but at the same time they would also not lose anything.

However, CFIA posed several questions about the plan. First, CFIA questioned how much this would cost and where the money would come from. Council also questioned what the ultimate impact would be.

Response: The Divisional response (dated April 18) included comments from three additional Senate groups: Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), the Council on Planning & Budget (CPB), and the Committee on Diversity & Equity (CDE). The Academic Senate agreed that “the salaries of campus faculty are significantly below the Comparison Eight and this problem will continue to have serious consequences for the entire institution. It is an untenable situation that needs immediate attention.” The UCSB Division concurred with the statement made by CPB: “We strongly support any action to begin to improve the faculty salary levels, but insist that this not be done as an unfunded mandate from systemwide to the campuses. Any new action to increase salaries must be based upon new money to the campus via increased state funding, or
a combination of increased state funding and tuition increases.”

4) UC Protests

At the November 21 meeting, the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards endorsed the (November 20th) Academic Council memo to Mark Yudof regarding UC protests. CFIA wrote that it is essential within the University to maintain positive and respectful relationships among its administrators, faculty, students, and staff. The Council agreed that members of the University communities ought to be able to exercise their rights of free speech and peaceful protest without the threat or use of violence.

CFIA stated that expressions of free speech should be free from any threat of retaliation. Any members of the faculty who speak against such reprehensible actions, as have occurred at the Berkeley and Davis campuses, ought to be able to do so without fear that such objections might negatively impact their academic personnel records.

Response: In May, the University released a report by UC Berkeley law school Dean Christopher Edley and the UC vice president and general counsel, Charles Robinson, “Response to Protests on UC Campuses”.

5) UCAAD Salary Equity Study

At its November meeting, the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards reviewed the report on salary equity (Analysis of UC Pay Equity by Sex and, among Men, Ethnicity) by the University Committee on Affirmative Action & Diversity (UCAAD). Council was concerned by the findings: there exists a difference in salaries between men and women at the University at equivalent points in their careers, and the inequities vary by discipline and campus. CFIA suggested that deans (and department chairs) oversee an internal assessment and identify ways inequities can be eliminated.

Although Council agreed that further study may be useful to understand more fully the sources of the salary inequities, it nonetheless believed that resources would be better invested to develop ways to address the problem.

Response: The Division’s December 12th response included input from the Committee on Diversity & Equity (CDE) and the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). The memo shared mixed reactions to the data analysis; some groups (CFIA & CDE) believed that resources would be best spent in trying to address systemic inequities in salaries at the campus level while other groups believed that further analysis is warranted to correct statistical weaknesses, prior to any action (CAP).
ACADEMIC SENATE AWARDS

Committee on Distinguished Teaching Awards

The Distinguished Teaching Awards acknowledge the efforts of up to five Senate faculty members and one non-Senate faculty who have successfully united excellence in teaching with their creative and scholarly work. The award is intended to recognize the distinguished teaching accomplishments of the faculty, which may be exhibited at any time during a faculty member’s career.

This committee is typically chaired by CFIA’s Vice Chair; however, this year the vice chair was not able to perform this task. Instead, one of the council members volunteered to serve in this capacity. The committee was otherwise comprised of former recipients of the Distinguished Teaching Award:

- Mireille Miller-Young (Feminist Studies) Chair
- Tamara Afifi (Communication) 2009 recipient
- Elizabeth Digereser (History) 2008 recipient
- Mariane Mithun (Linguistics) 2007 recipient
- Simon Williams (Theater & Dance) 2010 recipient

The committee spent four weeks reviewing the files of the award nominees. The committee met the last week of February to make its final decisions on this year’s recipients:

1. Carla D’Antonio (Ecology, Evolution, & Marine Biology)
2. Jill Felber (Music)
3. Stephanie LeMenager (English)
4. Victor Rios (Sociology)
5. Timothy Sherwood (Computer Science)
6. Ann Bruice (non-Senate recipient) Theater & Dance

The recipients were honored at the April 26th meeting of the Faculty Legislature. Award recipients were given a framed certificate and an honorarium of $1,000.

Upon the completion of this process, it was recommended that in the future the chair of this committee should be a tenured faculty member.

Committee on Graduate Mentor Awards

This award was initiated in 2005 by the Academic Senate Graduate Council to encourage and reward excellence in mentoring graduate students on the Santa Barbara campus. The honor recognizes between one and three faculty members annually who meet the highest standards in graduate mentoring.

The Committee on Graduate Mentor Awards was chaired by Dar Roberts from the Department of Geography. Other committee members included former recipients as well as representatives from CFIA and the Graduate Council:

- Dar Roberts, Geography (2008 recipient) Chair
- Divy Agrawal (Computer Science) 2011 recipient
The committee was given four weeks to review the files of each of the award nominees. The committee met the first week of March to make its final decisions on this year’s honorees:

- Elizabeth Belding (Computer Science)
- Howard Giles (Communication)

The awardees were honored at the April 26th meeting of the Faculty Legislature. Award recipients were given a framed certificate and an honorarium of $1,000.

**Committee on Outstanding Teaching Assistants**

The Committee on Outstanding Teaching Assistants was chaired by Bassam Bamieh, of the Graduate Council. Committee members included three graduate students who were former award recipients:

- Bassam Bamieh, Chair (Mechanical Engineering) Graduate Council
- Laura Behymer (Classics) 2011 recipient
- Mario Guerrero (Political Science) 2009 recipient
- Jason Linn (History) 2011 recipient

The Outstanding Teaching Assistant Awards recognize the contributions of graduate students to the teaching and learning process of UC Santa Barbara. The committee was given four weeks to review the files of each of the award nominees. Each year, four recipients are honored. The committee met the last week in February to make its final decisions on this year’s recipients:

- Quentin Gee (Environmental Studies)
- Stuart Gray (Political Science)
- Alisa Hove (Ecology, Evolution, & Marine Biology)
- Sharalyn Sanders (Comparative Literature)

The awardees were honored at the April 26th meeting of the Faculty Legislature. Award recipients were given a framed certificate and an honorarium of $1,000.

**Committee on Faculty Research Lectureship**

The Faculty Research Lecturer is the highest honor bestowed upon a faculty member by his/her peers at UCSB. The Committee on Faculty Research Lectureship is traditionally chaired by the previous year’s recipient, with the remainder of the committee comprised of other former recipients. The make-up of this year’s committee was as follows:

- Linda Petzold, Chair (2011 recipient) Computer Science and Mechanical Engineering
- Tsuyoshi Hasegawa (2010 recipient) History
- Steven K. Fisher (2007 recipient) Molecular, Cellular & Developmental Biology
- Howard Giles (2006 recipient) Communication
The committee was given four weeks to review the files of each of the award nominees. The award guidelines were revised in 2010 to allow for candidate nominations to be reviewed for a period of three years (during which time they could be appended or withdrawn). The committee received two new submissions in addition to 11 previous nominations. The committee met in February to make its final decisions on this year’s recipient.

For the first time in its history, the award was given to a researcher pair who had been nominated jointly: Leda Cosmides (Psychological & Brain Sciences) and John Tooby (Anthropology). Professors Cosmides and Tooby were honored at the March 8th meeting of the Faculty Legislature. Their campus lecture is scheduled for November 7, 2012. They will share an honorarium of $5,000.

**Important Issues for 2012-13**

Issues that are likely to be important for the following academic year include:

- **Budget Challenges.** In light of the continuing budget crisis, the campus will be asked to find additional ways of making up for budget shortfalls. Various proposals are expected that may include scaling back services or the elimination of programs.

- **Faculty Salaries.** Salary equity issues will continue to be a concern of the council, including benchmarking to “Comparison 8” institutions. In addition, incentives / pressure for faculty to secure external funding will continue to be an issue.

- **Online instruction**

- **Parking rates.** Although a proposal was brought forth this year, it is likely that the structural budget deficits for Parking Services will continue and further increases may be proposed.

- **Academic freedom issues**

**Committees**

Committee on Faculty Welfare & Academic Freedom (G. Binion, Chair)
Committee on Emeriti(ae) and Retirement (D. Morgan, Chair)
Committee on Distinguished Teaching (Mireille Miller-Young, Chair)
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