

March 5, 2025

LORI KLETZER

Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

**Re: Formal Review of Proposed Revisions to Campus Academic Personnel Manual (CAPM) 404.220 – Appointment, Reappointment, and Non-Reappointment and CAPM 410.220 - Promotion**

Dear Lori,

The Academic Senate has reviewed the proposed revisions to CAPM 404.220 and CAPM 410.220. Our committees on Academic Personnel (CAP), Faculty Welfare (CFW), Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CODEI), and Planning and Budget (CPB) have responded. Although CAP saw the proposed changes to be largely positive, the remaining responding committees raised a number of concerns about proposals to reduce the requirement for Ad hoc reviews, with concerns regarding consistency, oversight, and equity. The committee responses are attached and summarized below.

Concerns expressed fall into three basic categories. The first are general questions regarding process and background information provided. The majority of responding committees noted that additional information would have enabled the Senate to make a more informed assessment. Specifically the lack of any quantitative information regarding the current Ad hoc workload that the proposed changes aim to reduce, basic contextual information about current Ad hoc requirement processes, and most broadly the absence of any real discussion of presumed benefits versus potential drawbacks associated with the proposed changes. Committee responses also questioned whether the authority to approve Ad hoc committees lies solely with CAP, or if it also requires CP/EVC or administrative approval. Most broadly, these concerns could be summarized as a very poorly defined “problem” - responses expressed a desire for clarification about the overall rationale requiring the proposal.

Second, several committees raised concerns about potential unintended negative impacts of reducing the Ad hoc requirements, particularly with regard to equity. Ad hoc review offers an additional layer of review by peers with expertise in a candidate’s specific field of research and can be a valuable tool for ensuring overall equity, particularly for faculty who are subject to biases or other systemic inequities, or who might benefit from advocacy from an independent body beyond their department or Dean. While reducing workload and administrative burden is of course desirable, Ad hoc reviews represent a powerful tool to ensure fairness, transparency, and safeguard the university’s commitment to equitable review and retention of its faculty. As such, several reviewing committees raised concerns as to whether the proposed changes would degrade the high standards of the UCSC review process, and whether the goal of reducing a (non-specified) workload burden is worth shifting away from the current mechanism that ensures consistent checks and balances.


Finally, a set of specific suggestions were made indicating that one effective strategy might be to narrow the set of circumstances in which Ad hoc review requirement is eliminated. Specifically, concerns were raised regarding removal of the Ad hoc requirement for accelerations beyond two steps, for cases of initial appointment where there are department reservations, and for non-

reappointment cases of all kinds. Regarding actions of two or more steps , CPB suggests that CAP should have discretion over convening an Ad hoc committee for up to two step actions, however that anything beyond two steps should be considered “exceptional”- and as such should still require Ad hoc review. Regarding cases where initial appointments are not supported by the department, reviewers found this unclear: what and how many cases would represent an initial appointment when the department itself is not supportive? This suggests that revised clarifying language would be helpful here. Finally, in cases of non-reappointment files where neither Dean nor Department is supportive, reviewing committees felt that any case involving the potential separation of a faculty member from the campus should maintain the more stringent requirement of Ad hoc review.

Although CAP found the proposed changes to be mostly positive, the committee (as well as other responding committees) did acknowledge that moving to a discretionary system of Ad hoc review possibly requested on a case-by-case basis later in the review cycle might create delays in the processing of these files. Finally, CAP highlighted the importance of clearly preserving in any new language the memorialized right to request Ad hoc review, whenever the committee determines it is appropriate in order to ensure Senate oversight and equity in personnel review.

Overall, due to the unanswered questions and concerns raised herein, the Academic Senate is not able to endorse the proposed changes to CAPM 404.220 and CAPM 410.220 at this time.

Sincerely,



Matthew McCarthy  
Chair, Academic Senate

Enclosed: Senate Committee Responses (Bundled)

cc: Herbie Lee, Vice Provost, Academic Affairs  
Grace McClintock, Assistant Vice Provost, Academic Affairs  
Gregory Gilbert, Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel  
Susan Gillman, Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel  
Yat Li, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Kimberly Lau, Chair, Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion  
Raphael Kudela, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget  
Galina Hale, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure  
Eleonora Pasotti, Chair, Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections  
Matthew Mednick, Executive Director, Academic Senate

February 6, 2025

MATTHEW MCCARTHY  
Chair, Academic Senate


**Re: Divisional Review – Proposed Revisions to Campus Academic Personnel Manual  
(CAPM) 404.220 – Appointment, Reappointment, and Non-Reappointment and  
410.220 - Promotion**

Dear Matt,

During its meeting of February 6, 2025, the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) discussed the proposed revisions to CAPM 404.200 – Appointment, Reappointment, and Non-Reappointment, and CAPM 410.220 – Promotion. CAP sees the proposed changes as positive, minimizing the required use of Ad Hocs in all but divided recommendations on promotion-to-tenure cases. CAP notes that should the committee decide to request an Ad Hoc, this will in some cases create a delay in the handling of some personnel files, given that CAP is the last reviewing body before the final authority. However rare these cases may be, it is important to preserve CAP's memorialized right to request Ad Hocs whenever needed, to ensure Senate oversight and equity across files. CAP does not have any additional concerns with the proposed changes.

Thank you for the opportunity to opine.

Sincerely,



Susan Gillman  
Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel



Gregory Gilbert  
Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

cc: Yat Li, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Kimberly Lau, Chair, Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion  
Raphael Kudela, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget  
Galina Hale, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure  
Eleonora Pasotti, Chair, Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections

February 27, 2025

MATTHEW MCCARTHY  
Chair, Academic Senate

**Re: Divisional Review – Proposed Revisions to CAPM 404.220 and CAPM 410.220**

Dear Matt,

During its meeting of February 20, 2025, the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) discussed the proposed revisions to CAPM 404.220 – Appointment, Reappointment, and Non-Reappointment and CAPM 410.220 – Promotion.

CFW appreciates the intent behind the proposed revisions. However, there are concerns regarding whether these changes truly serve the best interests of our faculty and uphold the high standards of our review process. While the revisions aim to reduce workload, the actual volume of cases remains unclear. If the workload is not excessively high, the shift from a structured mechanism—which ensures consistent checks and balances—to a more individualized approach may not be justified. This lack of standardization, particularly with respect to non-reappointment cases, raises concerns about consistency and proper oversight. Above all, it is crucial to ensure that all faculty members receive fair and comprehensive evaluations.

Additionally, while the proposed changes do not eliminate CAP's ability to request an ad hoc committee, they may result in delays in file processing. CFW seeks clarification on whether the authority to approve the formation of these committees lies solely with CAP or requires CP/EVC approval. Further insight into this approval process would be helpful.

Thank you for the opportunity to opine.

Sincerely,



Yat Li, Chair  
Committee on Faculty Welfare

cc: Gregory Gilbert, Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel  
Susan Gillman, Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel  
Kimberly Lau, Chair, Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion  
Rafael Kudela, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget  
Galina Hale, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure  
Eleonora Pasotti, Chair, Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections

February 25, 2025

MATTHEW McCARTHY  
Chair, Academic Senate

**Re: Proposed Revisions to Campus Academic Personnel Manual (CAPM) 404.220 – Appointment, Reappointment, and Non-Reappointment and 410.220 - Promotion**

Dear Matt,

The Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CODEI) has reviewed the proposed revisions to Campus Academic Personnel Manual (CAPM) 404.220 – Appointment, Reappointment, and Non-Reappointment and 410.220 - Promotion. Our committee has the following questions and concerns.

The absence of an Ad Hoc review in the non-reappointment process at the Assistant level raises equity concerns that go beyond mere administrative procedure. Without an external committee to offer a balancing perspective, faculty who experience structural barriers or implicit biases remain vulnerable to one-sided administrative determinations with limited opportunities for appeal. The current structure grants the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) a significant degree of authority over reappointments at both the Assistant and mid-career levels, effectively diluting shared governance and weakening due process.

An Ad Hoc review provides essential rigor for faculty who may require advocacy or who are subject to disciplinary biases, institutional politics, or other systemic inequities. By incorporating peer perspectives, the process promotes more balanced and equitable outcomes. Decisions are evaluated through a collaborative, peer-review lens rather than in isolation, ensuring they are grounded in thorough deliberation and reflective analysis.

Removing that mechanism for review risks disadvantaging faculty who already face obstacles, whether tied to research focus, personal background, or other factors. Maintaining an Ad Hoc review does not simply introduce another bureaucratic layer; it underscores fairness, transparency, and the university's commitment to equitable faculty development and retention.

The Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion would therefore appreciate clarification regarding the rationale that led to discontinuing the Ad Hoc review. Evidence supporting this decision would be helpful, along with an assessment of the presumed benefits and potential drawbacks associated with the change. A clear articulation of these considerations would enable a more informed dialogue on how best to preserve fairness, ensure meaningful peer input, and uphold the principles of shared governance in faculty appointments.

Sincerely,



Kimberly Lau, interim Chair  
Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

cc: Greg Gilbert, Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel  
Susan Gillman, Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel  
Raphael Kudela, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget  
Roberto Manduchi, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure  
Yat Li, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Eleonora Pasotti, Chair, Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections

February 27, 2025

MATTHEW McCARTHY  
Chair, Academic Senate

**Re: Divisional Review of Proposed Revisions to CAPM 404.220 (Appointment, Reappointment, and Non-Reappointment) and 410.220 (Promotion)**

Dear Matt,

At its meeting of February 13, 2025, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) discussed proposed revisions to CAPM 404.220 (Appointment, Reappointment, and Non-Reappointment) and 410.220 (Promotion). The primary goals of these policy revisions are to reduce the number of instances where an Ad Hoc review committee is required by policy, and to address outstanding conforming changes.

During our discussion, members raised questions regarding several aspects of the proposed revisions. First, the committee felt the guidelines are not clear regarding application of Ad Hoc committees in appointment versus non-appointment files, particularly when a hire is considered despite departmental reservations. Specifically, what cases would fall under an initial appointment, e.g. when the department is not supportive? Second, concerns were expressed about removing Ad Hoc committees for promotions involving two or more step accelerations. While such cases are rare, members felt that, in particular, anything greater than two steps should be exceptional, and have thorough vetting. The committee felt that the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) should have discretion over convening Ad Hoc committees at two steps, with promotions beyond two steps requiring Ad Hoc review. Finally, the need for additional scrutiny was also highlighted in any case involving the potential separation of a faculty member from the campus. The proposed revisions suggest non-reappointment cases should not require an Ad Hoc committee, but CPB felt this requirement should be maintained.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposed policy revisions.

Sincerely,



Raphael M. Kudela, Chair  
Committee on Planning and Budget

cc: Greg Gilbert, Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel  
Susan Gillman, Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel  
Galina Hale, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure  
Kim Lau, Interim Chair, Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion  
Yat Li, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Eleonora Pasotti, Chair, Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections  
Melissa Caldwell, Vice Chair, Academic Senate  
Matthew Mednick, Executive Director, Academic Senate