

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
Annual Report, 2003-04

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Duties

The Committee on Academic Personnel advises the Chancellor, the EVC, and/or the Divisional Deans on appointments, promotions, merit increases, and mid-career appraisals for Senate faculty, adjunct faculty, and professional researchers. During the past year, CAP made recommendations on Merit Equity files, and also advised the Academic Senate and the administration on other policy matters related to academic personnel issues. CAP advises; it does not decide.

In 2003-2004 CAP had eight members each quarter—one from Arts, one from Engineering, and two each from Humanities, Physical and Biological Sciences, and Social Sciences. Ten faculty members served at least one quarter on CAP during 2002-2003.

The members of CAP were repeatedly struck by the impressive quality of our colleagues' accomplishments. The overwhelming majority of personnel files, which we were privileged to review, were filled with evidence of fascinating research, dedicated teaching, and energetic service to diverse communities of scholars and citizens. In the vast majority of cases, UCSC faculty members carry out their jobs with exceptional skill and remarkable energy. We felt honored to have had the opportunity to learn of the extraordinary variety and outstanding quality of our colleagues' work. The accomplishments of this faculty are extraordinary, and we all feel privileged to have you as our colleagues.

Workload

In 2003-2004 CAP continued its established practice of meeting on Thursday afternoons. The Committee met 29 times during the academic year (7, 11, and 11 meetings, in Fall, Winter, and Spring Quarters, respectively).

CAP made recommendations on 252 personnel cases—10 fewer than in 2002-2003, 38 more than in 2001-2002, 27 more than in 2001-2002, and 20 more than in 1999-2000. It also sent the Executive Vice Chancellor proposed members for 28 ad hoc committees. CAP constituted itself as the ad hoc committee 28 times, 6 times for appointment files, 10 times for promotion to Professor, 6 times for Merit Increase to Professor, Step VI, once for merit to Above Scale, 3 times for Mid-career Appraisals, and 2 times for Merit Equity cases.

CAP reviewed 55 appointment files (69 total, including lecturer with Security of Employment, Researchers, and Emeritus Professors recalled; there were 55 appointments as Acting Assistant Professors, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors. CAP recommended appointment in all cases. CAP's recommendation was usually, although not always, at the same rank and step proposed by the Department. As of August 19, 2004, 36 candidates accepted, 14 declined, and 5 cases were pending.

In more detail:

Acting Assistants (10): 5 accepted, 3 declined, 2 unknown

Assistants (35): 26 accepted, 7 declined, 2 unknown

Associates (5): 3 accepted, 1 declined, 1 unknown

Professors (5): 2 accepted, 3 declined

Of the 14 who declined offers 12 gave the following reasons:

- 1) Accepted appointment in Paris due to family pressure to return to Europe.
- 2) Candidate stated not ready for faculty appointment (received PhD 6/2/04) candidate received a prestigious postdoc at JPL with the Mission to Mars and a postdoc salary greater than our offer.
- 3) Accepted appointment in Canada, partner is a French speaking Canadian.
- 4) Candidate felt there were not sufficient employment opportunities at UCSC for spouse (a research scientist).
- 5) Candidate did not state, but other offers included housing allowance plus greater salary and startup package.
- 6) Candidate accept offer at Duke. UCSC could not match the salary, startup and housing allowance.
- 7) Accepted counter offer at UCI.
- 8) Accepted offer at UCSD.
- 9) Went to private industry – IBM.
- 10) UCI matched our offer so they stayed.
- 11) Accepted counter offer, which included housing costs, at UCR.
- 12) Accepted offer at NYU.

Although we would, of course, hope to have a higher rate of acceptance, as the above data show, in a number of cases UCSC could not reasonably be expected to match competing offers, and, of course, our budgetary situation, and the local housing market, continue to work against us. Under the circumstances, we continue to do very well in attracting new faculty.

CAP's Recommendations Compared to Administrative Decisions

During 2003-2004 there continued to be a high rate of agreement between CAP's recommendation and the final administrative decision on personnel cases. The two concurred in 84.1% of the time (212 out of 252 files, which does not include the 6 carried over and 2 pending administrative decision).

The final administrative decision did not agree with CAP's recommendation in 40 cases. In the cases of disagreement for actions for existing ladder faculty, the typical pattern was for CAP to recommend a higher salary (occasionally step). The picture for appointment files is more mixed, with CAP recommending higher step or salary (or both) than the final decision in 6 cases, and less than the administrative decision in 11 cases. In the latter case, CAP agreed with the hiring department's recommendation 10 out of 11 times.

In more detail:

Appointments:

- In 4 cases, CAP recommended a higher salary (same step) than the administrative decision.
- In 1 case, CAP recommended a higher step than the administrative decision.

- In 1 case, CAP recommended a higher step and salary than the administrative decision.
- In 1 case, CAP recommended a lower step (same salary) than the administrative decision.
- In 10 cases, CAP and the departments recommended a salary less than the administrative decision.
 - Of these 10 cases, 6 were dean authority and 4 were EVC/chancellor authority.
 - In 1 case CAP's salary recommendation was higher than the department's and the administrative decision was higher than proposed by CAP.
 - In 1 case the administrative decision was higher than all previous review levels – dept, dean, ad hoc and CAP.

Promotion to Tenure

- In 2 cases, CAP's salary recommendation exceeded the salary granted by the administrative decision.
- In 1 case, CAP and all previous levels of review recommended a step and salary lower than the administrative decision.

Promotion to Professor

- In 2 cases, CAP recommended a higher salary than the administrative decision.
- In 1 case, CAP recommended a higher step than the administrative decision.
- In 1 case, CAP recommended promotion and the administrative decision was to not promote.

Merits

- In 1 case, CAP recommended a higher salary than the department and dean and the administrative decision agreed with the previous levels of review.
- In 9 cases, CAP recommended a higher salary than the administrative decision.
- In 3 cases, CAP recommended a lower step and salary than the administrative decision.
- In 1 case, CAP recommended a lower salary than the administrative decision.

Salary Increase

- In 1 case, CAP did not recommend an increase and the administrative decision was for less than the department's recommendation.
- In 1 case, CAP's recommended a lower increase than the department and the administrative decision was higher than the department's.

Consultation

In CAP's opinion, consultation and communication with Executive Vice Chancellors and Divisional Deans continued to be excellent. As you all know, the past year posed the challenges of the departure of EVC Simpson, his replacement by Martin Chemers, the appointment of Michael Hutchison as Acting Dean of Social Sciences, and then the departure of Chancellor Greenwood, which led to the appointment of Martin Chemers as Acting Chancellor, and the appointment of Margaret Delaney as Acting Provost/EVC. Throughout these transitions, CAP felt that all administrators did an excellent job of maintaining communication and the consistency of the personnel process, and we thank them for their efforts.

As in previous years, administrators did meet occasionally with CAP at the administrator's request to discuss cases where the administrator's assessment of the case differed from CAP's. We also discussed various policy issues with the EVC. The CAP Chair also visited the Council of Chairs for the Divisions of Humanities and Physical and Biological Sciences (visits to the Council of Chairs for the Divisions of Arts, Engineering, and Social Sciences took place during the previous academic year). The purpose of the meetings was to clarify CAP's procedures, answer questions, and listen to any concerns raised by Department Chairs.

Case Flow

CAP made recommendations for 21 cases in the Fall Quarter, 109 in Winter, and 128 in Spring. Six cases were held over to Fall Quarter. Five of these were appointment files, and one was a promotion case.

Ad Hoc Committees

During 2003-2004, 85 Senate members served as members of ad hoc committees. One person served 3 times, 7 people served twice, and 77 people served once. The academic personnel process cannot function without our colleagues' continued willingness to serve on ad hoc committees, and CAP thanks each and every Senate member who so served. We also thank previous CAPs for creating a database of faculty research specialties, which makes it much easier to constitute ad hocs now compared with the past.

As noted earlier, CAP constituted itself as the ad hoc committee 28 times during 2003-2004. We did this in order to relieve our colleagues of the burden of serving on ad hocs in cases where we felt that an ad hoc would add little new information. Given the ever-larger volume of cases as the campus continues to expand, we recommend that this practice continue. It is worth noting that UCSC is the second highest among all the UC campuses for number of ad hoc committees convened. Only UCLA (60 ad hocs) exceeds UCSC; UCSD, by comparison, convened only 13 ad hoc committees. We believe that ad hocs should be reserved for use *only* in those cases where the value of the additional information is likely to affect the final decision.

Assessment of teaching in the personnel process

CAP continues to discuss the best way(s) to evaluate teaching performance. Several issues emerge.

1. It is essential that the student evaluation return rate not be too low. In cases where the return rate is low, we have no basis on which to assess either positive or negative student comments. (Are they representative? Are they "outliers"? We can't tell.) We urge all faculty, and all Department Chairs, to take steps to ensure consistently high return rates on student evaluations. This situation has, we think, been improving over time, and we hope that this trend will continue.
2. Very occasionally, there is a discrepancy between the student evaluations and the Department letter's characterization of the faculty member's teaching. *At least one CAP member—and usually most members-- reads every single teaching evaluation.* CAP would much prefer a frank assessment of teaching to any (futile) attempt to paper over difficulties in teaching. *If there are teaching problems, evidence that the faculty member has taken them seriously (e.g., has been working with the Center for Teaching Excellence, has sought advice from stronger*

teachers in the department) can be very helpful for the candidate. Department letters should include such information. Department letters which seek to minimize problems in the file are unlikely to persuade.

3. One “best practice” followed by some Departments is to present a table in which the percentage of “very good to excellent” responses is given. Such summary information is very useful, and CAP is grateful to those Department’s which supplied such helpful information. Departments please remember: it is always in the interests of your members that it is easy for CAP members to see evidence of teaching excellence.
4. If there is any evidence other than student evaluations, (e.g., from presentations at professional meetings), such evidence should also be included in the department’s letter.
5. CAP continues to prefer to see teaching over a broad spectrum of the curriculum: lower-division, upper-division, and graduate courses. If the teaching is narrowly focused (particularly on the graduate level), it would be helpful if the chair’s letter explained the rationale for the course assignment.

Forms of Departmental Letters

1. Very long letters (e.g., 15 pages) are unhelpful. We recognize that Departments rightly wish to be thorough. However, we believe that this can be done without excessive length. One possibility is for the letter to include a “summary statement” for each of the three areas of research, teaching, and service in a letter of no more than 5 pages.
2. It is also unnecessary to evaluate each and every publication (when there are many of these). In such cases, it is more useful to group the work into areas of inquiry and then to evaluate the contribution which the research has made within such a sub-field. Please continue to remember that non-specialists are reading these letters.
3. In nearly all cases, six outside letters suffice to provide a representative perspective of how a candidate’s work is viewed in the wider community of scholars and/or artists. The additional value of still more letters is relatively slight.
4. *It would be very helpful if department letters were to explain negative or abstaining votes.* In some cases, CAP receives a department letter which reports a split vote (typically, a minority of negatives), but there is too often no explanation of these votes. In some cases, we have then sent the file back to the department, requesting clarification. This delays the process and could be avoided by a simple explanation of split votes in the original Department letter. We understand that in cases of secret ballot, it may not be possible for Department Chairs to explain negative votes, however.

Merit Equity Cases

The academic year 2003-2004 was the second year of the new ME process. CAP considered 1 Merit Equity file held over from last year and 7 new to this year. Many questions have been raised concerning this process. CAP approached these files in this way: we asked, “Given this faculty member’s career accomplishments, what rank, step, and salary seem most appropriate?” CAP is NOT in the business of making decisions about the equity—or lack thereof—of previous personnel decisions; such adjudication is, we think, the province of the Privilege and Tenure Committee. We can, however, assess relative academic merit; we do it in every case we see. Consequently, CAP adopted the perspective just articulated for assessing Merit Equity cases during 2003-2004.

The Administration has decided to put the Career Review Process “on hold” for the 2004-2005 Academic Year. Although the CAP Chair was advised of this decision shortly before CAP’s last meeting in a telephone call from Assistant Vice Chancellor Brogan, CAP did not receive an official notification in time to consider this decision. In fact, the notification came in the form of the CAP Chair’s being copied on a memo announcing the decision. This memo was dated June 10, 2004—the date of CAP’s last meeting for the year. There was, in short, essentially no CAP input into this decision by the administration.

Other Issues

1. *Criteria for advancement:* CAP continues to read the APM as creating two classes of faculty advancements: (a) those where demonstrated excellence in *all three* areas research, teaching, and service is required, and (b) those in which there is some “substitutability” or “fungibility” among the three categories—that is, for example, if a candidate’s service record is weak, excellent research and/or teaching may compensate for that weakness. Category (a) consists of: 1) Promotion to tenure, 2) Promotion to Professor, 3) Merit Increases from Professor V to Professor VI, 4) All Merit increases above Professor, Step VI, 5) Promotion to Above Scale, 6) All salary increases of “Further Above Scale”. Category (b) includes 1) all non-promotion Merit Increases for Assistant Professors, 2) all non-promotion Merit Increases for Associate Professors, and 3) all Merit Increases for Professor below Step VI. This interpretation is based on our reading of the APM, a reading with which the EVC agrees. Department letters should reflect this. [See e.g. <http://www2.ucsc.edu/ahr/policies/CAPPM/400220.htm>, H-4 (c)]
2. *Accelerations/GTRs:* In cases in which the Department is requesting an acceleration or a greater-than-normal increase, the Department letter should explicitly justify such an action.
3. *Personal statements:* Department Chairs would do well to advise candidates to write succinct personal statements. There is little point in such statements recapitulating what will be contained in the department’s letter. Personal statements should clarify issues and provide a context for the faculty member’s work. CAP believes that this can be done in 5 pages or less.

Memoranda for Action: 34 total

Endowed Chairs – 2

Bylaw 55 – 5

Divisional CAPs – 3

FTE Transfer – 3

Unit 18 – 2

Miscellaneous – 5

Policies, procedures, proposals, senate issues – 14

- Feedback to senate chair on Faculty Instructional Activities
- Biomolecular Engineering Department Proposal
- change in Process for Access Requests of Personnel Files pre September 1992
- UCAAD Proposed Revisions to APM 210, 240, 250
- Feedback to Brogan on Safety and Injury Management Policy
- Feedback to AHR on revised draft letter to ad hoc committee members
- APM 260 (University Professor)
- Feedback to Faculty Welfare & Academic Freedom Committees on Draft Resolution on the PATRIOT Act
- Feedback on possible changes to SCANTRON evaluation form
- Proposed Revision to Exemption to Academic Recruitment Policy
- Formal Review of Proposed Correction to the University's Policy on Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Term Appointment (APM 137)
- Formal Review of Revised Campus Procedures for Layoff and Involuntary Reduction in Time of Non-senate Academic Appointees (CAPM 004.145)
- Feedback to Brogan on Suggestions to Change CAP procedures
- Feedback to senate chair on Report of Professorial Step System Task Force Conclusion

None of the work of CAP would be even remotely possible without the very hard work of the exceptionally competent staff of the Committee and of Academic Human Resources. We especially thank Pamela Edwards for managing to maintain her sense of humor throughout the year (no mean feat!), and for her unfailingly swift responsiveness to any and all requests for information. We are also deeply indebted to Barbara Brogan, Breck Caloss, Michelle Brady, Leslie Clark, Nancy Degnan, Therese Doherty, Liz Fohs, Nancy Furber, Linda Petrakis, and Susan Swim. Their support, wisdom, and detailed, rigorous knowledge of the personnel process of UCSC made our lives much easier.

Finally, we once again thank all of our colleagues who have contributed to the personnel process. The process works as well as it does only because of your hard work.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Tom Banks (W, S)

Barry Bowman

Joyce Brodsky (F, W) (UCAP Rep, F,W)

Mark Franko (S)

Susan Harding

Emily Honig

Armin Mester

Joel Primack (F)

Anujan Varma

Alan Richards, Chair (UCAP Rep, S)

August 28, 2004