

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
Annual Report 2010-11

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Summary

The 2010-11 Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)

- a) consulted on academic personnel reviews;
- b) provided recommendations to the EVC on UCSC faculty salaries;
- c) established best practices guidelines via two documents: Top Ten Tips for Faculty Members Preparing Personnel Files for Review and Top Ten Tips for Preparing Personnel Files for Deans and Departments; and
- d) issued a joint letter to all faculty with the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity and the EVC on evaluating diversity in the personnel process.

Duties

CAP is charged with providing senate consultation on faculty personnel cases. CAP makes recommendations to the deciding authorities, either Chancellor, Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor (CP/EVC), and/or the Divisional Deans, on appointments, promotions, merit increases, and mid-career appraisals for Senate faculty, adjunct faculty, and professional researchers. CAP is not a deciding authority. During the past year, CAP also continued to consult with the deciding authorities on faculty salary issues, and advised the Academic Senate and the administration on policy matters related to academic personnel issues.

This year CAP had one representative from Arts, one from Engineering, two from Humanities, two from Physical and Biological Sciences, and three from Social Sciences (including the chair).

CAP members found their service on CAP to be extremely rewarding, despite the heavy workload. Reading and discussing faculty files provide a fascinating glimpse at the outstanding work of our colleagues across the campus. We have been thoroughly impressed by our colleagues' ground-breaking research, dedicated and innovative teaching, selfless service to the campus and their professional communities, and inspiring contributions to campus diversity goals.

Workload

In 2010-11 CAP continued its established practice of meeting weekly on Thursday afternoons. The Committee had one orientation meeting in the fall, and met to review files 28 times during the academic year (6, 11, and 11 meetings, in fall, winter, and spring quarters, respectively).

CAP made recommendations this year on 253 personnel cases – 5 fewer than last year. The decrease in this past year is not surprising given that the continuing budget crisis severely limited new appointments in 2010-11. However, more than a third of the cases involved requests for accelerations and/or greater-than-normal salaries, which typically require more discussion than a normal merit review. As stated in the prior years' Annual Reports, our workload has increased significantly since the late 1990's, and yet our campus has a lower level of compensation than that offered to CAP members on other UC campuses.

In recent years, our CAP has reduced the use of Ad Hoc committees, bringing our campus more in line with practices on other UC campuses. This year, we continued the practice of CAP constituting itself as the Ad Hoc committee where allowable and appropriate. Out of 40 cases requiring Ad Hoc committees, 23 committees were formed; in other words CAP served as the Ad Hoc committee in 43% of the cases. Of the 23 Ad Hoc committees formed this year, all but two met to review tenure cases, where CAP is not permitted to constitute itself as the Ad Hoc committee. Of the remaining two Ad Hoc committees, one, an appointment with tenure, required an independent Ad Hoc; the other, a non-reappointment, strongly warranted an independent Ad Hoc. Therefore, CAP actually served as the Ad Hoc committee in 95% of the cases where it was allowable for us to do so. Typically CAP does not request an Ad Hoc committee for midcareer reviews, advancement to Step VI, appointments, or promotion to Professor, unless there is substantial disagreement at previous levels of review. However, when there is disagreement between department and dean or there are one or more “no” votes in a department, CAP is likely to err on the side of caution and request the additional perspective of an Ad Hoc committee.

As mentioned earlier, the number of appointment cases was minimal. In 2008-09 there were 51 (33 of which were ladder rank) appointments; in 2009-10 the number dropped precipitously to 18, only 6 of which were for ladder-rank positions. CAP reviewed 19 appointment files this year; however, in contrast to last year, 12 of the 19 appointments were ladder-rank. The number of retention cases was similar to last year, with 19 being reviewed in 2009-10 and 20 reviewed this year. Six of the retention files were for faculty members whose files were seen twice, having had a regular merit or promotion case in the same year. CAP also reviewed one Reconsideration request.

CAP's Recommendations Compared to Administrative Decisions

During 2010-2011 the number of cases for which the final administrative decision agreed with CAP's recommendation declined this year. The two concurred 87% of the time (220 out of 253 completed files), down from 90% last year and 89% the year before. Disagreements are of two major types: about rank/step and/or about salary. The overwhelming majority of cases involving a disagreement between CAP recommendations and administrative decisions are salary increments, typically in the range of ½ step.

Of the 33 disagreements, CAP disagreed with the final administrative decision about the appropriate step in 5 cases. Of these 5 cases, the CP/EVC or Chancellor offered a higher step in 3 instances and a lower step in 1 instance, and in 1 case, disagreed with CAP about appointment.

The remaining 28 merit, promotion, or retention cases involved disagreements concerning salary (10 with Dean's authority, 10 with CP/EVC's authority, and 8 with Chancellor's authority). In the Dean authority cases, CAP recommended a slightly lower salary in 3 cases and a higher salary in the remaining 7 cases. Of the 10 decanal authority cases, salary disagreements occurred with the Physical and Biological Sciences Dean in 4 cases, with the Social Sciences Dean in 3 cases, with the Humanities Dean in 2 cases, and with the School of Engineering Dean in 1 case. Of the 10 CP/EVC authority cases, CAP recommended a higher salary than was awarded in 7

cases and a lower salary in the remaining 3 cases. Finally, of the 8 Chancellor authority cases, CAP recommended a higher salary than was awarded in 4 cases and a lower salary than was awarded in the remaining 4 cases.

Consultation

During Spring Quarter CAP met with the chair of the senate Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) to discuss the implementation of APM-210 with regard to considering contributions to campus diversity goals as part of the personnel process. The two committees also collaborated with the CP/EVC on a letter to faculty highlighting the importance of diversity in the personnel review process and providing related resources. We plan to continue to invite the chair of CAAD to meet with CAP annually as a way to ensure that attention to diversity stays at the forefront of CAP's review of files.

CAP requested that CP/EVC Galloway, as well as the Deans and Chancellor Blumenthal, continue the practice of discussing all preliminary disagreements with the CAP Chair, and with the committee if deemed necessary. Our communication with the Deans, the Chancellor, and the CP/EVC was generally excellent throughout the year. A number of phone calls or meetings with the CAP chair were held, and on a few occasions the CP/EVC came to a CAP meeting to discuss a potential disagreement in person. CAP members had one in-person consultation with a Dean. CAP members believe that these discussions were extremely valuable in ensuring that the different views on the case were carefully considered before a decision was made. We look forward to continuing this practice in the coming year.

CP/EVC Galloway also met with CAP to discuss two major issues this year: retentions and the greater-than-normal program. The CP/EVC shared concerns about the impact retentions were having on the budget; a number of retentions requested 20% or greater salary increases and asked for guidance from CAP. CAP and the CP/EVC also analyzed the value of extending the greater-than-normal program, which was slated to end this year (see discussion under Faculty Salaries).

Throughout the year, when questions arose about policy issues, the CAP Chair consulted with Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel Pamela Peterson and with Professor Sandra Chung, Faculty Assistant to the CP/EVC for academic personnel. AVC Peterson and members of her staff occasionally joined CAP members to provide helpful policy information during meetings when particularly complex policy issues arose. APO staff also met with CAP to obtain input on upgrading Biobib.net and revising the short form, and provided training on the recently upgraded DivData software.

The CAP chair participated regularly in the Senate Executive Committee and the UC-wide Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP), as well as on a joint campus CAP-CFW-CPB task force on faculty salaries.

Case Flow, Ad Hoc Committees

Our campus continued to make progress this year in timely submission of personnel files to CAP. CAP saw few files in fall, even canceling two meetings. Winter Quarter, however, began with a very large number of files so that a number had to be carried over to the next two

meetings. After that, the workload was consistent, with full agendas most weeks. CAP members thank the Academic Personnel Office (APO) and the Divisional Personnel Coordinators for their effective reminders to departments about the deadlines and the encouragement and support they offered to help departments meet those deadlines. We are also very grateful to the departmental staff, who worked hard to put together personnel files and to meet the deadlines. There were only 2 cases on the 2010-11 call and one case from the 2009-10 call that did not reach CAP by the end of spring quarter, and were carried over to 2011-12. This is down from the 6 cases that were carried over to 2010-11.

Despite some myths on the campus, delays in the review of files are rarely due to CAP. With expert assistance from APO and the divisional coordinators, CAP's process involves a two-week turnaround from receipt of a file to submission of a recommendation letter to the staff handling the next step of review. Typically CAP takes one week to read, discuss, and vote on a file, and another week to allow CAP members to review a draft letter. The only exceptions are when an unusually large number of files come in at one time, in which case some files are delayed, usually no more than one week, or when a file requires further information or analysis. Pressing retention files are usually reviewed within a few days of receipt and letters are sent immediately. Files that require an Ad Hoc committee are seen by CAP twice; first, these files are held by CAP for about a week to review the file and recommend names for an Ad Hoc committee; then, when the Ad Hoc committee's letter is completed, the file is considered again in the normal two-week turnaround described above. It should be noted that CAP nominates members of these committees (typically 9 nominees), but the appointment of members and supervision of the Ad Hoc Committee review is the responsibility of the administration. In our view, the Academic Personnel Office has been very efficient in forming committees quickly and ensuring that the letters are finished and returned to CAP in a timely manner.

CAP members are indebted to the faculty members who served on Ad Hoc committees this year. During 2010-2011, 69 Senate members served as members of Ad Hoc committees with one member serving on two different committees. The academic personnel process cannot function without our colleagues' continued willingness to serve on Ad Hoc committees. Because the files that require Ad Hocs are also those that require outside letters, these committees are formed at a time of the year that is very busy for all of us. CAP thanks each and every Senate member who so served and encourages other colleagues to consider agreeing to serve when asked in the future.

Faculty Salaries

CAP continues to be concerned about the lower average salaries for faculty on our campus compared with the other UC campuses (as well as the larger problem of UC faculty salaries not being competitive with the salaries of the UC comparison-eight institutions). In 2010-11 we completed the final year of the three-year plan to increase off-scale salary that was begun in 2008-09. By way of background, we repeat here much of the information about this plan that was included in the 2008-09 annual report.

The off-scale salary plan began with the Senate-Administrative Joint Task Force on Faculty Salaries that met in 2007-08 and made a number of recommendations regarding low faculty salaries at UCSC compared to the other UC campuses. CAP spent many hours in meetings on

this issue during fall 2008, conferring with the Senate Executive Committee, the CP/EVC, the Deans and their Divisional Coordinators, the Academic Personnel Office staff, and also with UCAP. The major concern for CAP was the Task Force recommendation that CAP should recommend higher off-scale salaries for greater-than-normal merit increases (although the CAP chair also served on a subcommittee of the Senate Executive Committee to consider the other recommendations of the report). Our typical campus practice for many years had been to recommend an additional half-step of off-scale salary for faculty whose files were evaluated as “greater than normal” because they have exceeded expectations in some areas, and a full step acceleration for those faculty who are evaluated as having exceeded expectations in all areas (research, teaching, and service). Based on discussions with other CAP chairs at UCAP meetings, Chair Takagi believes our past off-scale practices are not likely to be directly responsible for our salary distribution differences from other campuses. (Other possible sources of the average salary discrepancy have to do with practices in applying COLAs to off-scale components as well as to base salaries, and differences in the proportion of appointments made at senior levels.) However, with former CP/EVC Kliger’s support, we took the recommendation very seriously as a way to begin to address the problem through adjustment of CAP salary recommendations.

With the help of the APO staff CAP used salary data from past years to examine several “what if” scenarios estimating what current salary levels would be if different off-scale amounts had been awarded in the past, and comparing these with the median salaries for each rank on the other campuses. Based on this data we developed a proposal to revise our practices in recommending off-scale salary levels. Former CP/EVC Kliger, the Deans, and the divisional and APO staff all discussed the proposals, and a consensus was reached. We began this revised practice in 2008-09, and carried it out consistently for all cases reviewed for the past three years, with the understanding that the same practice would remain in effect for at least three years and be reviewed at the end of the three-year period.

This plan involves the use of **two levels of off-scale salary increase** when a file is judged to be deserving of greater-than-normal advancement. As in the past, when a file demonstrates merit beyond the level of excellence required for a normal merit or promotion, it is classified as either a greater-than-normal (single step advancement plus an off-scale component) or an acceleration-in-step advancement. In the current practice, (1) greater-than-normal files that are closer to a normal merit are considered for an increase of one-half-step of off-scale salary, and (2) greater-than-normal files closer to meriting a full step acceleration are considered for an off-scale increase equal to \$100 less than one step. Further, (3) an **additional one-half step** of off-scale salary is often recommended **for accelerations to steps lower than Professor Step 6**. In other words, accelerations of two steps (below Step 6) often are accompanied by two-and-one-half steps of salary. While merit increases corresponding to these various levels have been used intermittently in the past, the intent was to systematically consider this suite of possible actions when strong faculty dossiers were discussed, and to develop consensus across the levels of review on appropriate recommendations. It is important to point out that when recommending an off-scale salary of one-half step, an off-scale salary of \$100 less than a step, or an off-scale addition of one-half step with an acceleration, this additional off-scale salary is typically ***added to any existing off-scale salary***. CAP strives for consistency in its recommendations, but every case is considered individually. We are reassured to see that CAP’s agreement levels with the

deans, CP/EVC, and Chancellor have been strong, suggesting that we have developed similar judgments about the types of files that fit these different levels of greater-than-normal salary recommendations. In 2010-11, 50% of the files reviewed had either a greater-than-normal and/or acceleration component.

Naturally, the question on everyone's mind is whether UCSC is "catching up" with the salaries of other campuses as a result of two years of this new practice. APO conducted a comparison last fall (after one year of our salary plan) and there was evidence that our salaries had moved up to be competitive at least with UC Davis. However, this is a moving target since other campuses are taking action to increase their faculty salaries as well. Using the same methodology this fall, a comparison by APO shows UCSC making gains at some ranks while remaining the lowest at others. Other analyses coming out of UCOP last spring showed that UCSC was still lagging behind the other campuses. There are also still questions about the most appropriate ways to make these comparisons.

The 2010-11 CAP extensively researched and analyzed the effect of the catch-up plan (based on two years of data) and made recommendations to the EVC. Special thanks are due to Professor Barry Bowman and Professor Maureen Callanan for consulting with CAP Chair Takagi on salary competitiveness matters in the 2010-11 academic year. EVC Galloway's plan, announced in May of 2011, to continue the temporary salary catch-up plan for a second three-year cycle of reviews, is appropriate and very much in line with the committee's assessment of data.

Other Policy Issues

CAP was asked to discuss and comment on a number of other policy issues throughout the year – either by the campus Senate chair, by the CP/EVC, or by UCAP. In particular, CAP commented on documents resulting from the CITRIS external review, on the proposed disestablishment of Community Studies, and on a number of FTE Transfer requests.

CAP also continued ongoing deliberation about such issues as the inherent difficulties of evaluating teaching across disciplines with different expectations, where impacts on scholarly activity are difficult to gauge. Another ongoing issue is recognition of the different cycles of research productivity in different fields, such as lab-based work, book-based work, and exhibition-based work. While it is an enormous challenge to balance across the many factors to be considered, we believe CAP is able to take inherent disciplinary differences into account. Because of this, CAP plays an essential role in maintaining equity across the disciplines.

We also continued to work very hard to consistently recognize faculty contributions to diversity, as mentioned above. We continued to be impressed by the variety of ways that our colleagues are making such contributions to diversity on the campus and in their disciplines. We will continue to highlight implementation of the diversity criterion of the APM next year, including continuing our practice of inviting the chair of the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity to the CAP fall orientation.

Retention

The loss of excellent faculty is a concern on our campus as well as across the UC system. CP/EVC Galloway follows a set of expectations (first enunciated by her predecessor EVC Kliger) regarding retention. CAP's goal in making recommendations on these cases is always to retain outstanding faculty, while also considering issues of equity with other faculty. The long-term goal is to improve salaries on our campus and across the UC system. The systemwide Academic Senate continues to seek remedies for the gap between UC faculty salaries and those of the "comparison 8 universities." A systemwide faculty salary increase is still being considered even under the burden of the current, and potentially increasing, budget cuts. Also,

Chair Takagi participated, along with Senate President Susan Gillman, CFW Chair Suresh Lodha, and CPB Chair Brent Haddad, in a senate working group on faculty salaries.

Number of retention files considered by CAP:

2010-11 – 20 files
2009-10 – 19 files
2008-09 – 6 files
2007-08 – 8 files
2006-07 – 12 files
2005-06 – 10 files
2004-05 – 2 files
2003-04 – 1 file
2002-03 – 1 file

Suggestions for Improving Personnel Files

In a memo dated May 27, 2009, CAP attempted to clarify some of the confusing issues regarding Bylaw 55 voting rights, especially the categories used to report votes on personnel actions. Please reference this memo (which is available on CAP's website: <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cap/>) should there be questions about such issues as when a vote should be counted as waived versus recused, what abstaining means, and a number of related issues.

In the paragraphs below we reiterate some of the advice given in previous CAP annual reports. In the past year we saw evidence of careful work in preparation of files from most departments, and evidence that past CAP advice had been heeded. For example, the number of excessively long department letters has declined. We thank the many faculty and staff involved in the personnel process for their hours of work and attention to detail. At the same time, we provide below a reminder of some of the tips that may make the process easier for all involved.

1. It is understandable that departments want to advocate for step and salary increases. However, the most effective letters contain a balanced evaluation of the performance during the period under review. For example, if the teaching evaluations contain a significant number of negative comments, or the rate of publication is lower than typically seen in that discipline, these issues should be addressed in the letter.

Although most departments do an excellent job with their letters, some could still be more concise and could include less jargon. *The best letters, even for significant accelerations, are*

typically three to five pages long. Keep in mind that long quotes from external letters are not helpful since we read the external letters as well. CAP members (and other reviewers) need a concise summary of the major focus of the work, and an assessment of the impact of the work. Some explanation of the nature of the work, in terms that non-specialists can understand, is always appreciated. Interpretation (rather than repetition) of the external letters can sometimes be helpful. Lengthy expositions can work to the disadvantage of the faculty member because key summary points are buried in pages of text that are skimmed through quickly.

2. If a department requests more than one step advancement they must specify the area or areas (research, teaching, and service) in which they judge the performance of the professor to be exceptional. Advancement of more than one step should be justified by a level of achievement that is clearly above the norm in all three areas: scholarship, teaching, AND service. Be specific about which publications and activities are new for the current period of review, and which have been considered in previous reviews. It is up to the faculty member to annotate the bio-bibliography appropriately so that new work is clearly marked. Please note that APO has offered to help faculty to set up their bio-bibliography on Biobib.Net, including the initial data entry.

3. Faculty are not expected to write lengthy personal statements. *Three to five pages will always suffice.* These statements are not required, but they can be useful for the department's preparation of the file and for later reviewers. For advancements that require letters from external evaluators, five or six letters are sufficient if at least three of these are solicited by the department, and not on the candidate's list. In the case of midcareer reviews, we are hoping to carefully evaluate campus use of midcareer external letters in the 2011-12 year. External letter writers really should be external; this is in the best interest of the candidate as well as in the best interest of fairness. Except perhaps in the case of a midcareer review, external letters from collaborators or former mentors are evaluated in a very different light than "truly" external letters.

4. For additional tips and suggestions, please refer to one or both of the following documents:

- a) CAP's Top Ten List for Personnel Files (for Deans & Chairs)
- b) Top 10 CAP Tips for Faculty

Both documents may be found on the CAP web page at <http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/index.html>

Acknowledgements

We wish to gratefully acknowledge the very hard work of the exceptionally strong staff of the Academic Senate and of the Academic Personnel Office. We are deeply indebted to Elizabeth Dane, Nancy Degnan, Susan Fellows, Joseph Johnson, Grace Little, Leslie Marple, Georgina Chang, and Linda Tursi, and especially to Senior Analyst Nancy Furber and AVC Pamela Peterson. This stellar group of professionals was always available and willing to explain subtle aspects of complex policy. We are also very grateful to all of the department managers and other departmental staff for the time they invest in faculty personnel issues, and we offer special thanks to the divisional coordinators for their unfailingly hard work, often behind the scenes, on the many files they process: Kathy Beattie, Ellen Borger, Anne Callahan, Jan Cloud, Pat Gross, Nicole Laird, Teresa Locatelli, Kristin Mott, and June Taylor.

Most importantly, we extend our deepest thanks to our new Senate Analyst Shari Skinner. Shari has done a remarkable job this year, learning the nuances of campus personnel and helping the committee to function smoothly. And, this year, since CAP took on several extra projects related to personnel, Shari's workload with respect to CAP was higher than would be expected in any given year. She managed an astounding workload of multiple senate committees with grace, efficiency, and readiness for the next challenge. Shari's hard work and careful attention to the details of personnel review was, and is, invaluable.

We have appreciated our positive working relationships with Deans Kamieniecki, Ramirez, Thorsett, Ladusaw, and Yager, with CP/EVC Galloway, and with Chancellor Blumenthal. We also thank Professor Sandra Chung, faculty assistant to the CP/EVC on personnel matters, and Associate Dean Carolyn Dean, in the Arts Division.

Finally, we once again thank all of our colleagues who have contributed to the personnel process in their departments and on Ad Hoc committees. The process works as well as it does only because of your hard work.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Donald Brenneis
Donka Farkas
Kathy Foley
Kirsten Silva Gruesz
Claire Gu
Rodney Ogawa
Christina Ravelo
Bruce Schumm
Dana Takagi, Chair

August 31, 2011