To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Duties

The Committee on Academic Personnel (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 (only for winter and spring quarters), 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 2009-10 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 29 times during the academic year (7, 11, and 11 meetings, in fall, winter, and spring quarters, respectively).

CAP made recommendations this year on 258 personnel cases – 14 fewer than last year. The decrease in this past year is not surprising given that the budget crisis all but halted new appointments in 2009-10. However, more than half of the cases involved requests for accelerations or greater-than-normal salaries, which typically require more discussion than a normal merit review. As stated in the last three years’ Annual Reports, our workload has increased fairly steadily 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 42 cases requiring Ad Hoc committees, 31 committees were formed; in other words CAP served as the Ad Hoc committee in 26% of the cases. While the number of Ad Hoc committees is up slightly from last year (in 2008-09, there were 23 Ad Hoc committees, and 23 cases where CAP served as Ad Hoc), 27 of the Ad Hoc committees this year met to review tenure cases, where CAP is not permitted to constitute itself as the Ad Hoc
committee. Therefore, CAP actually served as the Ad Hoc committee in 73% 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 cases, unless there is substantial disagreement at previous levels of review. Whenever there was disagreement between department and dean or a number of “no” votes in a department, CAP was 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 dropped precipitously this year, from 51 in 2008-09 (33 of which were ladder rank) to 18 this year, only 6 of which were for ladder-rank positions. In contrast, the number of retention cases went up this year, from 6 in 2008-09 to 19 in 2009-10. Nine of the retention files were for faculty members whose files were seen twice – eight of whom had a regular merit or promotion case in the same year and one of whom had two retention actions. CAP also reviewed 1 Career Equity review file this year (down from 2 in the previous year).

**CAP’s Recommendations Compared to Administrative Decisions**

During 2009-2010 the number of cases in which the final administrative decision agreed with CAP's recommendation continued on an upward trend. The two concurred 90% of the time (233 out of 258 completed files), slightly up from 89% last year and 81% the year before. While the other UC campuses all report agreements above 90%, it is gratifying to see that our CAP’s rate of agreement with the administration’s decisions is on an upward trajectory.

Of the 25 disagreements, 2 concerned new appointments. In one of these cases (Dean’s authority) the final salary was lower than recommended by CAP; in the other case (CP/EVC’s authority) the appointment was at a higher rank than CAP recommended.

In 3 promotion cases CAP disagreed with the Chancellor about the appropriate step. In each of these cases the final decision placed the faculty member at a lower step than CAP had recommended (in one of these cases, the step was lower than CAP recommended, but the salary awarded was higher than CAP recommended).

In 20 merit, promotion, or retention cases there were disagreements concerning salary (3 with Dean’s authority, 12 with CP/EVC’s authority, and 5 with Chancellor’s authority). In 2 of the Dean authority cases, CAP recommended a higher salary than was awarded, and in 1 case a lower salary. Two of these disagreements were with the Arts Dean and one was with the Humanities Dean. In 10 of the CP/EVC authority cases, CAP recommended a higher salary than was awarded, and in 2 cases CAP recommended a lower salary. In Chancellor authority cases, CAP recommended a higher salary on 4 cases and a lower salary on 1 case.

**Consultation**

During our fall orientation meeting 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. We plan to continue to invite the chair of CAAD each fall as a way to ensure that attention to diversity stays at the forefront of CAP’s review of files.
Also in fall quarter 2009, the CAP chair, together with CAP members from the appropriate divisions, met with Deans and department chairs of each division to answer questions about the personnel process. CAP also invited each of the deans, with their divisional coordinators, to attend one of the CAP meetings in the fall to discuss off-scale salary practices (see Faculty Salaries section below) and other personnel review issues.

CAP requested that CP/EVC Kliger, 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 several occasions the CP/EVC came to a CAP meeting to discuss a potential disagreement in person. 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 following this practice in the coming year.

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.

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 UCAP-UCFW-UCPB 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. As in 2008-09, we experienced a change from previous years, in that the caseload was more consistent across winter and spring quarters, rather than focused mainly in the spring quarter. Again, like last year, the workload in the last few weeks of spring quarter was quite light. CAP members are very grateful for this improvement, and we commend the Academic Personnel Office (APO) and the Divisional Personnel Coordinators for their very effective reminders to departments about the deadlines and 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. Still there were six cases on the call that did not reach CAP by the end of spring quarter, and were carried over to 2010-11. This is up from only three cases that were carried over to 2009-10.

Despite some myths on the campus, delays in the review of files are rarely due to CAP. Thanks to a well-running system brilliantly managed by our senate analyst Pamela Edwards, and to the 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. 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; files are held by CAP for about a week to review the file and recommend names for an Ad Hoc committee. 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 a function 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 2009-2010, 88 Senate members served as members of Ad Hoc committees. Five faculty members served on two different committees, and 83 people served once. 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 2009-10 we completed the second 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 our discussions with CAP members from other campuses on UCAP, we believe that 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 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 these data we developed a proposal to revise our practices in recommending off-scale salary levels. 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 two years, with the understanding that the same practice would remain in effect for at least three years.

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 2009-10, 65% of the files reviewed had final decisions of either greater-than-normal or acceleration. Next year, in 2010-11, it is our expectation that CAP will continue this same practice in recommending off-scale salaries.

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. We are grateful to Professor Barry Bowman, the previous chair of CAP and member of the Joint Salary Task Force, for his continued work to monitor the salary comparisons, and his pledge to work with APO and the CAP chair to derive the most appropriate methods for comparing our salaries to those of faculty on the other UC campuses. We expect a thorough campus review of the salary issue after the 3-year cycle is completed. Next year’s CAP will also review the latest salary comparison data and discuss with the new CP/EVC the possibility of continuing the current practice beyond three years, or implementing a new program to address the salary discrepancy.

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 the draft recommendations of the Committee on the Future, on the recommendations of the campus Academic Personnel Workgroup, on the report of the Humanities Division Advisory Task Force on Reconstitution, and on the report of the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force. We discussed retention issues with the CP/EVC. We commented on a number of proposed policy changes involving, for example, the Senior Management Group and Faculty Administrator policies.

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. We discussed these issues with the chair of the Committee on Teaching as well as in our own meetings. 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, CAP strove to find effective ways to take inherent disciplinary differences into account. Despite the challenges, we believe CAP plays an essential role in maintaining equity across the disciplines. We expect that these issues will continue to be discussed on CAP in the future.

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
As mentioned earlier, the number of retention files went up this year, and loss of excellent faculty is a concern on our campus as well as across the UC system. CP/EVC Kliger discussed his expectations regarding retention files with CAP. Our goal in making recommendations on these cases was 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 system-wide Academic Senate is very
actively seeking remedies to the gap between UC faculty salaries versus those of the “comparison 8 universities.” The UCAP-UCP-UCFW task force on which Chair Callanan served, along with CPB Chair Brent Haddad, has called for a system-wide faculty salary increase as well as a new program to both increase the competitiveness of our salaries and to adjust the salary scales.

Number of retention files considered by CAP:
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 you have 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.

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.

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 biobib appropriately so that new work is clearly marked. Please note that APO has offered to help faculty to set up their biobibliography on BiobibNet, including the initial data entry.

Faculty should not be 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. 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 mid-career review, external letters from collaborators or former mentors are evaluated in a very different light than “truly” external letters.
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