
Dear Lori,

The Academic Senate has reviewed the proposed revisions to Campus Academic Personnel Manual (CAPM), Sections 407.690, 803.620, 600.311, and 602.330. Our Committees on Academic Personnel (CAP), Faculty Welfare (CFW), and Planning and Budget (CPB) responded. The Senate is generally supportive of the proposed revisions with the inclusion of additional edits to include the Teaching Professor Series and some clarification regarding the potential reduction in off-scale salaries noted below, and sees this review as an appropriate opportunity to reactivate campus dialogue around the possibility of reintroducing Associate Professor, Step V.

You mentioned in your cover letter that the proposed revisions are intended to expand the level of allowable salary increases at barrier steps. Given the ongoing concern of UC Santa Cruz’s lagging salaries in comparison to our sister UC campuses, the Academic Senate is supportive of increases to off-scale salaries, and therefore supports the proposed modification of salary-increase-only options at the barrier steps from “a modest off-scale salary increase, such as a quarter or a half step” to “a modest off-scale salary increase of one-third or two-thirds of a step.” One committee noted that several members were additionally in support of allowing increases of one-third to a full step.

Our committees noted that the policies under review are in need of additional edits in order to appropriately include and address the Teaching Professor (Lecturer with Security of Employment) Series. CAPM 407.690 does not specifically include the Teaching Professor Series, and should. In addition, the header for CAPM 803.620.C.1 should be changed from “Professor Series” to “Professor and Teaching Professor Series.” As well, the reference to “all three areas of teaching, research, and service” in CAPM 803.620.C.1.a, should be changed to “three areas of review” in order to address the record of performance for both Professors and Teaching Professors.

CAPM 803.620.D states that “reviewers should consider the merits of the file during the review period to determine the appropriate salary recommendation, which may include a reduction or increase in an existing off-scale component, or an alignment to an on-scale salary.” The Committee on Academic Personnel questioned what mechanism would trigger a reduction in off-scale salary, and where this process is discussed in CAPM. The Senate recommends that the policy that outlines the qualifications and process for reducing existing off-scale be referenced in the final draft of this policy.

This review brought up numerous conversations in the Senate about the context and reasoning behind discontinuing Associate Professor, Step V on our campus. Concerns were raised about
the possibility of the current requirements for promotion to Full Professor causing disproportionate delays for faculty in certain fields and disciplines, thereby placing them on a potentially suppressed salary trend. In witnessing the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on research and overall progression through the ranks, it has become clear that the current climate is quite different from that which existed in 2012-13, when the discontinuation of Associate Professor, Step V was proposed in a CAPM update. As such, the Academic Senate would welcome the opportunity to reopen our conversation of Associate Professor Step V in order to determine what may be in the best interest of our campus.

We thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on these proposed revisions, and look forward to continued dialogue regarding Associate Professor, Step V.

Sincerely,

David Brundage
Chair, Academic Senate

cc: Stefano Profumo, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel
    Nico Orlandi, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
    Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
    Matthew Mednick, Director, Academic Senate