

**COUNCIL ON FACULTY ISSUES & AWARDS**  
**Annual Report, 2012-2013**  
**September 30, 2013**

**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 2012-2013 academic year included the on-going issues of Academic Freedom, Faculty Awards, and Faculty Welfare, as well as the specific issues listed below.

**Local Reviews:**

1. Policy on Active Service – Modified Duties
2. Campus Course Scheduling Policy
3. Red Binder Revisions
4. Student-Initiated Democratic Education (SIDE) Program
5. WASC documents

**System-wide Reviews:**

1. Proposed revisions Academic Personnel Manual (APM)
  - A. APM 015: Faculty Code of Conduct
  - B. APM 241: Faculty Administrators
  - C. APM 430: Visiting Scholars
  - D. APM Section IV (600 series): Salary Administration
  - E. APM 700: Leaves of Absence
2. Negotiated Salary Trial Program
3. Open Access Policy
4. Rebenching Budget Committee Report

**Academic Senate Awards:**

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

1. Committee on Faculty Research Lectureship
2. Committee on Distinguished Teaching Awards
3. Committee on Outstanding Graduate Mentorship
4. Committee on Outstanding Teaching Assistant Awards

**COUNCIL ON FACULTY ISSUES & AWARDS  
Annual Report, 2011-2012**

Submitted to: the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division

**MEETINGS**

The Council on Faculty Issues & Awards convened for eight regularly scheduled meetings during the 2012-13 academic year (three in fall, two in winter, and three in spring). Between formal meetings, when appropriate, CFIA conducted regular deliberations and consultations via email.

**COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP**

Simonetta Falasca-Zamponi, Chair and UCFW Rep	Sociology
Stanley Awramik, Vice Chair	Earth Science
Debra Blumenthal	History
Sharon Conley	Education
Barbara Harthorn	Feminist Studies
Suzanne Jill Levine	Spanish & Portuguese
Bruce Lipshutz	Chemistry & Biochemistry
James Mattinson (Emeritus)	Earth Science
Mireille Miller-Young	Feminist Studies
Carole Paul, Non-Senate Academic Rep	History of Art & Architecture
Stephen Proulx	Ecology, Evolution & Marine Biology
Celine Parreñas Shimizu, UCAF Rep	Asian American Studies
Christian Van De Walle	Materials
Adil Yaqub	Mathematics
Kay Young	English
Sophia Armen	Associated Students Representative

## LOCAL ISSUES

### 1) Policy on Active Service – Modified Duties

In May, CFIA considered a request to review the UCSB policy on Active Service – Modified Duties (*UCSB Campus Policies and Procedures for Academic Personnel*, “Red Binder” section VI-5). While there is a UCOP systemwide policy on Active Service – Modified Duties (APM 760-28), each campus has discretion to develop its own policy as well. One of the specific differences between campus policies is with regard to having multiple children in one birth or adoption. UCSB’s policy makes no special accommodations for such an event, and any extension of the normal limits requires approval by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel. Other campuses (e.g. Davis) specify extended limits for multiple children in such circumstances, and no additional approval is required. CFIA unanimously recommended a revision of the policy on Active Service – Modified Duties, to be more equitable in cases of multiple children.

Response: The policy was also reviewed by the Council on Planning & Budget and the Committee on Diversity & Equity. As of this writing, no Divisional response is available.

### 2) Campus Course Scheduling Policy

In December CFIA reviewed a proposal for a campus policy on course scheduling. Council recognized that there are currently very significant problems with the course scheduling system, and acknowledged the need to rectify a difficult situation. CFIA supported the proposed policy as an appropriate way to move forward. However, CFIA also expressed concerns regarding the potential impact of the new policy. Council was specifically worried about the effects this may have on faculty in small departments, especially those with children or commuters, who may need to teach during “prime time” slots.

Response: Several groups reviewed the proposed policy, including: Council on Planning & Budget (CPB), Undergraduate Council (UgC), Graduate Council (GC), and the Faculty Executive Committees from L&S, COE, and CCS. All groups acknowledge that the proposed policy addressed a significant problem on campus in terms of course scheduling and available room space, and with the exception of the CCS FEC, all groups supported its full implementation.

### 3) Red Binder Revisions

CFIA reviewed proposed changes to the *UCSB Policies and Procedures on Academic Personnel* (“Red Binder”) over several meetings in winter and spring quarters. First, in March CFIA reviewed the sections dealing with additional summer compensation (Section VI). CFIA was unable to comment on the changes in the absence of any analysis provided by Academic Personnel. Council was unclear about the intent of the changes or the circumstances that prompted these revisions.

In April, CFIA continued its review of the Red Binder revisions. Council remained unable to comment on the changes and noted that the edits were proposed without providing any justification for the changes or rationale for why the changes were being made.

Then in June, CFIA continued its review and offered comments regarding changes to the evaluation process for excellence and senior lecturer reviews for both Unit 18 members and Lecturers PSOE/SOE (Sections II-10, V, and I-56, “Letters of Evaluation”). In both cases an allowance was made to substitute letters from extramural referees, which have traditionally

been solicited in such cases, with letters from UCSB Senate faculty, external to the department of the lecturer under review. CFIA expressed concerns regarding this change. One was that lecturers from neither unit were consulted about it and reviewing committees were given very little time to comment—and no explanation as to why it had occurred—before it was put in place. A second concern was that faculty from other departments would not have the discipline specific expertise required to carry out such reviews.

Response: In July CFIA's concerns regarding the evaluation of lecturers were forwarded to Jack Talbott, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, and Cindy Doherty, Director of Academic Personnel.

#### **4) Student-Initiated Democratic Education (SIDE) Program**

In February, CFIA reviewed the proposal for a Student-Initiated Democratic Education (SIDE) Program, which was put forth by Associated Students. Although some Council members expressed strong reservations about the programs, others were very positive, and the majority appreciated that the program could allow for the broadening of student areas of interest and could give students the opportunity to pursue directions about which they are passionate. Council stated that a few pedagogical and organizational issues need to be addressed before the program is implemented, and it deferred to the Undergraduate Council to tackle those issues. Council particularly objected to the statement in the proposal that discussed the need for the program to address the unavailability of classes. CFIA had several questions about the role of faculty in this program and wanted to see them clarified. CFIA was also concerned by the minimum GPA recommended for student instructors.

Response: The proposal received wide review by the Faculty Executive Committees and several groups in the Academic Senate, including: Undergraduate Council (UgC), Council on Planning & Budget (CPB), Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), Graduate Council (GC), Committee on International Education, and Committee on Diversity & Equity (CDE). Some reviewing agencies (UgC, L&S FEC and the CDE) were unequivocal and felt they could not support the proposal. Overall reactions indicated support for the idea in principle, yet the UCSB Senate, as a whole, was unable to support the proposal as presented.

#### **5) WASC Documents**

In spring quarter CFIA was invited to review two documents related to UCSB's reaccreditation by the Western Association of Schools & Colleges (WASC): the Educational Effectiveness Report and the Program Review Essay. In May, CFIA studied the WASC Educational Effectiveness Report and decided not to opine.

In June, CFIA reviewed the draft Program Review Essay. Council acknowledged that the purpose of the document was to show that UCSB takes its program review seriously and that there are real repercussions to the review process. However, Council noted that although seemingly inevitable, such changes are not necessarily agreed upon by those involved and they often come with a price. As an example, CFIA cited the elimination of the French PhD program as a considerable loss for the university.

**SYSTEM-WIDE REVIEWS****1) Proposed revisions Academic Personnel Manual (APM)**

## A.) APM 015: Faculty Code of Conduct

In January, CFIA reviewed an updated revision to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM 015) that would add a sentence to Part I of the code. CFIA reiterated its original concerns about this policy which were communicated in 2012 to Henning Bohn. CFIA continued to object to the additional language (“when acting as a member of the faculty whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional governance”).

Response: This revision to APM 015 received broad review by most Senate groups and the Faculty Executive Committees. With the exception of two groups, all groups either concurred with, or had no objections to, the proposed revisions to APM 015.

## B.) Proposed revision to APM 241: Faculty Administrators

In June CFIA reviewed a proposed revision to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM 241: Faculty Administrators) regarding the appointment of directors of Multi-campus Research Units (MRUs). The revisions were an attempt to bring APM 241 into conformance with Regents policy and with the Compendium. The proposal removed the authority of a campus Chancellor in appointing an MRU director, and gave the authority to the UC President. The proposed changes seemed reasonable, and CFIA had no objections.

Response: The UCSB had several groups review the proposed revision to APM 241. All groups were either in support of the proposed revisions or had no comment on them.

## C.) Proposed APM 430: Visiting Scholars

In November, CFIA reviewed a proposed addition to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM 430) regarding visiting scholars. CFIA agreed that it was important to regularize the classification of “visiting scholars” on campus in order to delineate the rights and benefits of such visitors. However, Council had several concerns and reservations about the proposal.

Council noted that there was a discrepancy between a description of the policy in Vice Provost Susan Carlson’s cover letter and the actual policy, which in CFIA’s estimate was overly broad and non-specific. CFIA suggested making a distinction between visiting students and visiting scholars. In addition, CFIA was concerned about the vagueness of the criteria for defining a visiting scholar as listed in the policy. Further, Council found the language in the “Authority to Appoint” section overly vague. CFIA suggested that an academic unit should be necessary as a campus sponsor for the appointment of a visiting scholar. Finally, Council was wary that such an appointment may be made in exchange for financial contributions or other non-academic purposes, and steps should be made to prevent this from occurring.

In April, CFIA reviewed a revised draft of APM 430 and continued to have concerns and reservations about the proposal. Council noted the revision incorporated a recommendation from its previous memo: to include a distinction between visiting students and visiting scholars. Nonetheless, CFIA remained skeptical about the need to include undergraduate students in this classification. Also, Council continued to take issue with the language in the “Authority to

Appoint” section and reiterated its suggestion that an academic unit should be necessary as a campus sponsor for the appointment of a “Visiting Scholar” or “Visitor.”

Response: The proposal for APM 430 was reviewed widely by several groups at the Santa Barbara Division. The campus review produced a mixed response on its first round in November, with several groups commenting that they were supportive of the concept and of the language as proposed, while other groups stated they were generally supportive of the concept and the proposed language, but were hesitant about the new section. For the final review, several groups had no further comment or declined to opine. The Council on Faculty Issues & Awards reiterated its reservations and concerns while the Graduate Council continued to object to the proposal.

D.) Revisions to APM Section IV: Salary Administration

In April, the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards reviewed the proposed revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM), Section IV (600 series) that dealt with salary administration. These changes appeared to be prompted by the systemwide adoption of the “UC Path” payroll / human resources system. To the extent that the changes were described in the documents, CFIA had no objection to the revisions.

Response: The proposed revisions to the APM 600 series were widely reviewed by the Santa Barbara Division. All groups had no objection or no comment on the proposed revisions, with the exception of the Education Faculty Executive Committee that indicated support for the recommended changes.

E.) Revisions to APM 700: Leaves of Absence

In November, CFIA reviewed the proposed revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM 700) regarding leaves of absence (“presumptive resignation”). After a comprehensive discussion and deliberation, there was no consensus. Some members of Council agreed that the changes appeared to be reasonable procedures for spelling out an academic employee’s presumptive resignation, in which the employee is absent without prior approval or notification. However, other members were skeptical of the proposed changes. First, CFIA was unsure about the need for the policy. Are such occurrences common enough that a policy is warranted? CFIA felt additional data would be useful to answer this question. Council also took issue with the phrase “absent from academic duty” (700-30). It was not clear to CFIA if this term was specific to teaching responsibilities, or if it included additional (if not all) duties of a faculty member.

In March, CFIA reviewed the updated revisions to APM 700. CFIA noted that the revisions were an improvement over the earlier draft of the policy that was reviewed in November, yet Council reiterated its aforementioned concerns. CFIA remained unconvinced of the need for the policy. No additional data was presented indicating that such occurrences are common enough that a policy is warranted.

Response: CFIA was the sole reviewing agency at UCSB of the final version of APM 700. UCSB’s Divisional response was sent in March. CFIA’s skepticism of the need for the policy was communicated, as was Council’s wariness of the potential for misuse and its expectation that the implementation of the policy would be rare.

## 2) Negotiated Salary Trial Program

In November, CFIA reviewed a proposal for a 4-year pilot Negotiated Salary Trial Program. When the program was originally discussed last year as a proposed revision to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM 668: Negotiated Salary Program), CFIA opposed the proposal. During this year's review, CFIA reiterated its wariness of a program that would further push faculty toward a budget model whereby faculty are encouraged (or even required) to raise part of their salaries from external sources.

Response: In addition to CFIA, the Negotiated Salaries Trial Program was reviewed by the Council on Planning & Budget (CPB), Graduate Council (GC), Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), and the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). These same groups reviewed the Proposed APM 668 last year. The Santa Barbara Division continued not to support or endorse the Negotiated Salary Plan Pilot in spite of the proposed changes in the proposal. Last year, the Division objected to the fundamental principles in the proposed model, and those objections continue to stand.

## 3) Open Access Policy

CFIA reviewed two versions of a proposed policy on open access put forth by the University Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC): first in fall quarter and then a revised version in spring. Through its review in December, CFIA withheld support and expressed a number of concerns and questions. Council was concerned about unintended consequences, such as additional fees that may be borne by faculty or impacts on the merit and review process. Council also wondered if this new system might limit the impact of where an article is published or the frequency it is cited. There were several aspects of the policy that CFIA found ambiguous (e.g. regarding the "opt out" default, the "final version" of the publication, and the ramifications of noncompliance). CFIA was particularly interested in the experience of state institutions that have already adopted OA, and requested a review of the implementation of open access at other universities.

In June, CFIA reviewed a revised version of the proposed policy and had several lingering concerns that were not sufficiently addressed in the revision. Furthermore, CFIA was concerned about potential obstacles that faculty may face in using the "*eScholarship*" web portal. Finally, CFIA suggested that at least one of the campuses considered for early adoption of the implementation tool include a "general campus" that does not have a large professional school associated with it.

Response: The Santa Barbara Division conducted a broad review of the proposed Open Access Policy, including a full distribution to all Senate faculty on campus inviting them to comment. In August 2013 it was announced that the University had adopted the Open Access Policy, ensuring that future research articles authored by faculty at all 10 campuses of UC will be made available to the public at no charge. While reviewing groups recognized that there is a problem with regard to the current process and costs of publishing scholarly work, there was a significant split on the campus between those groups who support the proposal and those who do not support it. The Academic Council eventually adopted the policy on July 24. Articles will be available to the public without charge via *eScholarship* (UC's open access repository) in tandem with their publication in scholarly journals.

**4) Report of the Rebenching Budget Committee**

In November, CFIA reviewed the report and recommendations of the Rebenching Budget Committee. CFIA wholeheartedly supported the aim of this systemwide committee to address the inequities in the amount of state funding that each campus receives per (undergraduate) student. Council noted that as compared to the other UC campuses, UCSB is at or near the bottom and is not receiving an equitable share of state funds. CFIA fully supported the recommendations of this report and suggested it be implemented without delay.

Response: UCSB's Divisional response, submitted in December, unanimously endorsed the report and the recommendations of the Rebenching Report.



**ACADEMIC SENATE AWARDS****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:

- Leda Cosmides, Co-Chair (Psychological & Brain Sciences) 2012 co-recipient
- John Tooby, Co-Chair (Anthropology) 2012 co-recipient
- Toshi Hasegawa (History) 2010 recipient
- Linda Petzold (Computer Science & Mechanical Engineering) 2011 recipient

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 4 previous nominations (including one resubmission). The committee met in February to make its final decisions on this year's recipient: John Bowers (Electrical & Computer Engineering). Professor Bowers was honored at the May 7th meeting of the Faculty Legislature; he was given an honorarium of \$5,000 and a framed certificate. He will present his campus lecture on October 3, 2013 at 4:00pm in Engineering Science Building room 1001.

**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 was chaired by CFIA's Vice Chair and was otherwise composed of former recipients of the Distinguished Teaching Award:

- Stanley Awramik (Earth Science) Chair
- Tamara Afifi (Communication) 2009 recipient
- Leila Rupp (Feminist Studies) 2008 recipient
- Timothy Sherwood (Computer Science) 2012 recipient
- Stefanie Tcharos (Music) 2011 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. Maria Isabel Bueno Cachadina (Mathematics and College of Creative Studies)
2. John Foran (Sociology)
3. Howard Giles (Communication)
4. Michael Gordon (Chemical Engineering)
5. Susannah Porter (Earth Science)

6. Janet Kayfetz (Computer Science and Bren School of Environmental Science & Management) *non-Senate recipient*

The recipients were honored at the May 7th meeting of the Faculty Legislature. Award recipients were given a framed certificate and an honorarium of \$1,000.

### **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 up to three faculty members annually who meet the highest standards in graduate mentoring.

The Committee on Graduate Mentor Awards was chaired by Patricia Cline Cohen from the Department of History. Other committee members included former recipients as well as a representative from CFIA.

- Patricia Cline Cohen, Chair (History) 2009 recipient
- Elizabeth Belding (Computer Science) 2012 recipient
- Aaron Ettenberg (Psychological & Brain Sciences) 2011 recipient
- Howard Giles (Communication) 2012 recipient
- Adil Yaqub (Mathematics) CFIA representative

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:

- Richard Church (Geography)
- Verta Taylor (Sociology)
- Kimberly Turner (Mechanical Engineering)

The awardees were honored at the May 7th 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 CFIA member Bruce Lipshutz. Committee members included three graduate students who were former award recipients as well as two representatives from the Graduate Council:

- Bruce Lipshutz, Chair (Chemistry) CFIA representative
- Lisa Jacobson (History) Graduate Council representative
- Karen Myers (Communication) Graduate Council representative
- Laura Behymer (Classics) graduate student recipient 2011
- Quentin Gee (Environmental Studies) graduate student recipient 2012
- Jason Linn (History) graduate student recipient 2011

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 first week of March to make its final decisions on this year's recipients:

- Katherine Kelp-Stebbins (Comparative Literature)
- Nicole Pacino (History)
- Elijah Quetin (Physics)
- Stephanie Robbins (Communication)

The awardees were honored at the May 30th meeting of the Faculty Legislature. Award recipients were given a framed certificate and an honorarium of \$1,000.

### **Important Issues for 2013-14**

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

- **Budget Rebenchmarking.** As the University's fiscal crisis wanes, new funding for the campus will require prioritization of goals.
- **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.** 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  
Committee on Emeriti(ae) and Retirement  
Committee on Distinguished Teaching