

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL Annual Report 2023-24

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

In this annual report, we discuss (I) CAP duties and workload, (II) how CAP recommendations have aligned with administrative decisions, (III) some of the major policy issues that CAP has commented on this year, and (IV) our advice to Senate faculty, including department chairs, regarding personnel files.

I. CAP Duties and Workload

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is charged with providing Senate consultation on faculty personnel cases, by making recommendations on appointments, retentions, promotions, merit increases, mid-career appraisals, and career equity reviews for Senate faculty, adjunct faculty, and professional researchers to the deciding authorities: Chancellor, Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor (CP/EVC), and Divisional Deans. In no case is CAP the deciding authority. CAP contributes faculty voices to the personnel review process and takes seriously its responsibility to carefully consider equity across divisions and departments and to ensure equitable recommendations are made that take inherent disciplinary differences into account. In addition to reviewing files, CAP also comments on policy issues relevant to the committee's purview.

In the year 2023-24, CAP had eleven representatives, two from Arts, two from Engineering, two from Humanities (including one co-chair), three from Social Sciences (including one co-chair), and two from Physical and Biological Sciences (including one Teaching Professor). The committee met weekly throughout the year.

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 their ground-breaking research and scholarship, dedicated and innovative teaching and mentoring, active service to the campus and professional communities, and their inspiring contributions to campus diversity goals.

On October 5, 2023, CAP voted to revert to the earlier practice of full recusal. CAP members vote at the department level and are recused from both the discussion and vote of their department files at the CAP level. Any CAP member can choose to be self-recused from any case. All CAP members sign the committee recusal policy.

CAP workload has continued to increase, and a substantial number of files were delayed beyond campus deadlines in moving from divisions to CAP. Files that did not reach CAP by the end of the academic year had to be carried over until next year. CAP members discussed possible strategies to address the heavy workload, including the suggestions made in the 2023 strategic plan, *Leading the Change*.¹ Next year CAP will continue these discussions.

¹ UCSC Strategic Academic Plan 2023, *Leading the Change*: <https://strategicplan.ucsc.edu>

As always, CAP worked collaboratively with several other Senate committees on a range of issues affecting faculty personnel actions, including the Committee on Faculty Welfare and the Senate Executive Committee (the request for reinstatement of the original Special Salary Program and Joint Working Group²), the Committee on Teaching (Personnel Review Teaching Tables in the Blue platform), and Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections (interpreting abstentions in personnel review³), and Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (discussions of how best to recognize diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) contributions to research/scholarship, teaching/mentoring, and service). CAP co-chairs also met regularly with VPAA Herbie Lee and AVP Grace McClintock. CAP co-chairs met with CP/EVC Lori Kletzer, Chancellor Cindy Larive, and several deans as needed to discuss differences in evaluation of cases. The CAP co-chairs also met with SCFA leadership to discuss policy issues relevant to both SCFA and the Senate.

II. How CAP’s Recommendations Align with Administrative Decisions

Because it takes some time to calculate how CAP recommendations align with final decisions, an addendum to the CAP annual report with full personnel review statistics is usually submitted to the winter Senate Meeting in the following year. Full statistics for 2023-24 will be submitted in winter 2025.

Considering the data from 2022-23, submitted in an addendum report in 2024⁴, CAP’s agreements with the administrative decisions are summarized in the following table:

CAP Recommendations Alignment with Rank/Step Decisions for 2022-23

	EVC authority	Chancellor authority	Dean authority	TOTAL
Rank/Step Agreements with CAP	96	16	86	198
CAP above Decision	14	2	1	17
CAP below Decision	2	1	0	3
TOTAL	112	19	87	218
% Agree	0.86	0.84	0.99	0.91

Excluding appointments and retention actions, this table shows that for 2022-23, CAP

² Senate Chair Gallagher to Chancellor Larive and CP/EVC Kletzer, 1/29/24, Re: Concurrence Letter of Support for the Reinstatement of Special Salary Program (SSP) and Joint Working Group

CAP Co-Chairs Callanan and Gillman and CFW Chair Sher to Chancellor Larive and CP/EVC Kletzer, 12/07/23, Re: UCSC Faculty Salary Competitiveness and the Special Salary Practice

³ CAP Co-Chairs Callanan and Gillman and CRJE Chair Pasotti to Deans, Department Chairs, and Department Managers, 4/24/24, Re: Interpreting Abstentions in Personnel Review

⁴ Committee on Academic Personnel, Annual Report Addendum, 2022-23: https://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/cap-annual-reports-folder/cap_annualreport_addendum_2022-23_scp2087.pdf

recommendations agreed with the deciding authority on rank and step in roughly 91% of the cases. In terms of salary decisions, however, CAP recommendations agreed with the deciding authority in approximately 78% of the cases reviewed; when there was disagreement, the CAP salary recommendation was higher than the final decision in more than 90% of the cases.

While the full data regarding 2023-24 cases will not be available until the end of fall quarter 2024, our preliminary records show that there were 38 cases on which the CP/EVC consulted the CAP co-chairs because of initial disagreement with CAP's recommendation. Approximately 16% of those cases were Merit to Associate Step IV, which we discuss in the next section of this report. Of the 38 cases discussed, only 3 involved disagreements about rank and step, all the rest concerned salary. Compared to CAP's recommendations, 84% of the final decisions were lower in salary, 3% were higher in salary, and 13% were changed after discussion to match CAP's recommendation.

III. Major Policy Issues Discussed by CAP

CAP continued discussions about time-sensitive issues, including: promotions from Associate Professor 3 to 4 in the context of campus policy on barrier steps; recommendations for A1 and beyond; incorporation of DEI and community engagement in the personnel process; new practices on COVID-impact statements by faculty members and departments; and a few other issues.

A. Associate Professor Step III to IV

A recurring problem with merit cases moving from Associate Professor Step III to Step IV has become more apparent this year. Associate Step IV (along with Assistant Professor V, Professor V and Professor IX) is a "barrier step" that requires a review which extends back to the previous promotion, the last major action in the career. As such, [campus policy](#)⁵ limits salary increases for faculty already at Associate Step IV to a maximum of a $\frac{2}{3}$ step equivalent. However, CAP has flagged the problem that the administration interprets this campus salary limit as also applying to faculty currently at the rank of Associate Professor Step III, when moving to Associate Professor, Step IV. Throughout this academic year, there were several cases with recommendations from departments, deans, and CAP for advancements to Associate Professor IV with salary increases equivalent to an additional step or more, based on outstanding records of research/scholarship, teaching/mentoring, and service. But in each of these cases, notwithstanding the level of agreement or degree of unanimity in the recommendations, the final decision was always for no more than a G2 advancement ($\frac{2}{3}$ of a step beyond Step IV), in accordance with the administration's interpretation of current campus policy. As such, campus policy, the official administrative interpretation of CAPM regulations, appears to be out of step with the interpretation of policy and developing practice at the various lower levels of review. At the end of June 2024, CAP and the administration were still consulting on proposed modifications for promotions to Associate Professor, with as-yet no solution to this particular problem. We continue to work with the administration on a compromise solution to this problem before the beginning of the 2024-25 personnel cycle season.

⁵ CP/EVC Kletzer and CAP Chair Westerkamp, 10/04/19, Re: Annual Memo on Academic Advancement - 2019: https://apo.ucsc.edu/news-events/campus_memos/10-04-19-provost-evc-cap.html

B. Beyond A1

As part of the Special Salary Practice (SSP), our campus has defined several possible types of advancement, up to A1 (acceleration with an additional $\frac{1}{3}$ step of salary). And yet, there have always been unusual cases where departments, deans, CAP, or the administration have recommended advancement beyond that of A1. The practice of recommending higher than A1 as part of the SSP is neither well-known nor well-understood on campus and should be more explicitly communicated to faculty and departments. A1 advancement is the highest level explicitly covered by campus guidance on the SSP. In the 2022 CP/EVC and CAP Annual Memo on Academic Advancement, the guidance describes A1 advancement as something appropriate in “rare and exceptional circumstances”.⁶

The fact that we see recommendations beyond A1 suggests that the 2022 CAP/EVC Annual Memo on the “exceptional” status of A1 appears to be out of step with developing practice. However, in cases where recommendations or decisions go beyond A1, following the rationale used to justify A1, G2, and G1, any recommendation beyond A1 would need to be justified with clear evidence of work that is “beyond outstanding” in more than one area. Since there is no written guidance on how precisely to evaluate anything beyond A1 and reach a recommendation, any such decision comes with unusual difficulty. CAP sees better campus communication as the preliminary solution until the expectations and standards for (rare but possible) recommendations beyond A1 have been fully memorialized in the annual CAP-EVC memo.

C. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Contributions in Personnel Review

CAP continues to work on clarifying how contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) goals are incorporated into, and distributed among, the areas of personnel review. Faculty statements and department letters generally follow two routes: either they address DEI separately in each relevant area or they include a separate DEI paragraph. Either way is appropriate. Increasingly, however, CAP is seeing a pattern in this year’s cases of letters that recognize DEI (and community engagement as well) in the overlap among scholarship, teaching, and service. Given that the total impact may be diluted or less visible when confining DEI to the relevant categories of the review process, CAP will continue to monitor best strategies for presentation and assessment. After some discussion with the chair of CODEI and the campus Senate Equity Advocate, one practice that CAP has been more mindful about this past year is to explicitly include DEI contributions in the summary recommendation paragraph of CAP letters in cases where DEI has been a significant part of the justification for evaluating work as beyond expectations. In this regard, CAP’s thinking intersects with one of the DEI goals identified in the 2023 strategic plan, *Leading the Change*: “The need to align personnel review with campus’s shifting mission, including rethinking or broadening the “buckets” of teaching, scholarship and service that impact the review process” (p. 25). Some areas for exploration are: how teaching inclusivity is multiply documented, assessed, and recognized; how to provide examples of invisible labor in how DEI shapes teaching-mentoring; consider adding “contributions to DEI” as a standalone fourth category in faculty review. (We note that

⁶ CP/EVC Kletzer and CAP Chair Profumo to Senate Faculty, 9/23/22, Re: Annual CAP-CP/EVC Memo on Academic Advancement - 2022: https://apo.ucsc.edu/news-events/campus_memos/09-23-22-cpevc-cap-annual-memo.html

this last suggestion would go beyond the jurisdiction of our campus and require a UC-wide decision.)

D. Community Engagement in Personnel Review

What have we learned from this year's systematic incorporation of community-engaged work in CAP's recommendations? Using the [2022-23 guidelines](#),⁷ we aimed to address all aspects of community-engaged scholarship, from advice on how faculty should incorporate their work as engaged scholars in the file, including the bio-bib and personal statement, to guidelines for departments on how to solicit external reviewers. Questions similar to those related to DEI have emerged specifically about where/how to give credit for community-engaged work, how to balance the individual areas of research/scholarship, teaching/mentoring, and service with the final, overall recommendation. CAP's practice to date is to value community-engaged *work* as a hybrid of scholarship, teaching, and/or service. This means *scholarship* in the sense that the translation of knowledge into terms that are accessible to the wider public and government policymakers is part of the academic enterprise, especially at a public university that explicitly acknowledges the significance in personnel review of institutional participation in the ongoing public dialogue on pressing social issues. CAP takes guidance on how public-facing, community-engaged scholarship connects with both teaching and service from an April 2017 UC Office of the President memo, ["The Pursuit of Collective Excellence in Research"](#): "[a]lthough research is typically evaluated separately from teaching and service, these three elements of UC's mission are, in fact, interdependent and can be synergistic...."⁸ In other words, instead of evaluating faculty performance separately in these three categories, research/scholarship, teaching/mentoring and service should be seen as integrally interwoven, particularly for faculty engaged in public-facing research and public service.

E. Teaching Professors

CAP supported the systemwide renaming of the Lecturer with Security of Employment series to Professor of Teaching series (APM 285), now official UC policy. As a reminder, the working title of Teaching Professor remains policy on this campus. CAP also opined on the critical issue of extending Bylaw-55 rights to our Teaching Professor colleagues, which stubbornly continues to be handled very differently across different departments and UC campuses. As Teaching Professors increase in numbers across our campus, it has become more apparent that UCSC personnel policies need to be systematically regularized in alignment with the consolidation of this critical group of Senate faculty. To that end, CAP updated its tips for faculty and department chairs to provide parallel information (as well as acknowledge differences) about the personnel process for faculty in the Teaching Professor series as compared to faculty in the Professor series. CAP notes that there remain key CAPM documents that need to be updated, including those governing service on Divisional CAP (DivCAP) committees and Ad Hoc committees for personnel actions. CAP feels strongly that Teaching Professors should be given an equal opportunity to serve on these committees.

⁷ CP/EVC Kletzer and CAP Co-Chairs Callanan and Gillman to Senate Faculty, Deans, Department Chairs, 8/11/23, Re: Campus Expectations for Assessing Community-Engaged Scholarship in Academic Personnel Reviews: https://apo.ucsc.edu/news-events/campus_memos/08-11-23-cap-cpevc-community-engaged-scholarship.html

⁸ The Pursuit of Collective Excellence in Research at the University of California, April 16, 2017: <https://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/collective-excellence.....final.pdf>

For DivCAPs where a large part of the workload is related to the personnel processes of Unit-18 lecturers, Teaching Professors are likely to be especially valuable additions to the committees. CAP advocates for an overall, comprehensive campus approach to updating aspects of policy to reflect the changing composition of Senate membership, rather than a piecemeal process. APO has taken the lead on that project, and CAP will provide advice as needed.

F. Variation in Departmental Teaching Load

CAP has noted the continuing problem that departmental expectations about teaching loads vary significantly across divisions, and sometimes even across departments within the same division. Taking seriously our role of considering equity in the review process, this inequity often raises questions, for example about how to evaluate what counts as “above expectations” in research for faculty who spend exceedingly different numbers of hours on teaching. One strategy that might be helpful is to ask departments to include, in all personnel actions, clear statements about their work-load expectations for teaching and mentoring. Even with this information, however, the persistent problem of inequity is one with which CAP will continue to grapple in the future.

G. Teaching Tables

Following the campus approval of revisions of the Student Experiences of Teaching Surveys (SETS), as well as the transition to the new SETS platform (Blue), CAP has continued to consult with COT on issues relevant to SETS. We note that there have been some difficulties in the implementation of “automated” teaching tables, despite that having been one of the criteria by which Blue was chosen as the campus platform. ITS staff have worked hard to simplify the process and have offered to help train department and division staff on the most effective way to download teaching tables for personnel actions.

H. Continuing COVID Impacts in Personnel Review

The campus officially extended the 2021-22 policy on COVID impacts, recognizing that the impacts of the pandemic on faculty research and scholarship may continue for several years. Faculty are encouraged to submit a COVID impact statement if relevant to their case. While departmental statements were helpful early in the pandemic, they are now much less useful and should be eliminated. Instead, department letters should address continuing COVID impacts case by case as appropriate.

I. Abstentions in Personnel Review

CAP was asked to consult with CRJE and to help clarify Bylaw 55 with regard to policies relevant to abstentions. Our joint memo⁹ clarified that Senate faculty have the right to abstain on personnel votes and cannot be asked to explain abstentions. Further, abstentions are recognized as neither positive nor negative and should not be counted when interpreting votes as recommendations. That is, recommendations are based solely on the tally of yes and no votes.

⁹ CAP Co-Chairs Callanan and Gillman and CRJE Chair Pasotti to Divisional Deans, Department Chairs, Department Managers, 4/24/24, Re: Interpreting Abstentions in Personnel Review

IV. CAP Advice for Personnel Review

Department letters are pivotal for all reviews. Letters should include the following information: the dates of the review; the kind of review; the department vote and, where known, an explanation of any “no” votes; the service, teaching/mentoring, and research/scholarship expectations; the achievements accomplished relative to expectations; a brief, non-specialist explanation of the topic of and approach to the teaching/mentoring and the research/scholarship. The most effective department letters explain the significance of the venues of publication (journals, conferences, book publishers, etc.) and/or exhibition, performance, or screening (museums, theaters, festivals, etc.). Community-engaged scholars and artists frequently address some of their work to specific, local communities or to national or international venues. For faculty who are engaged in community-engaged research/scholarship, the department letter should explain the community addressed by the research and their particular venues (e.g., a local school, a small-town museum, an archive of any kind, a news site of any size or coverage, policymakers in a particular field, etc.). It is important for the department to articulate the evidence-based specifics for the relevant disciplines (e.g., the importance of conference publications relative to book publication, the kinds of conference publications in the field, the protocols and timelines of publication and peer review).

Each year, CAP reminds departments that work submitted in any given review cannot be counted again in later reviews, except when that later review is a career review (mid-career review, tenure review, promotion to Professor, advancement to Step VI, or advancement to Above Scale). We strongly recommend, therefore, that work-in-progress *not* be submitted for a regular merit review (a review that is not a career review) and, instead, simply be held back for the next review. The exception is for books in progress, where policy encourages faculty in text-based disciplines to include evidence of progress on a project that will take multiple review periods to complete; this evidence can include chapter drafts of a book-length work in progress. Despite CAP’s yearly reminder, there are still faculty and departments continuing to submit work-in-progress. This practice makes it difficult to count the work accomplished in a given review period and can also jeopardize a full accounting in future reviews when the completed work is submitted.

All department letters and personal statements should be as clear as possible about the work accomplished during a given review period. To document research/scholarship, teaching/mentoring, and service, department letters and statements should include abbreviated counts of number of courses taught, number of doctoral students graduated, number of journal articles published, number of keynote addresses given, number of Senate committees served, length and type of service provided (e.g., 3 years department chair), professional organizations, granting agencies, and publishers served and in what capacity (e.g., served for 2 years as member, editor-in-chief), etc. It is not helpful to repeat the details of each of these components in the letter (e.g., journal titles, names of conferences) given that these are readily available in the biobib, although highlighting particularly important contributions is welcome. For many, the difficult circumstances of the last few years have made it hard to advance creative and scholarly work. CAP encourages candidates to submit abbreviated COVID-impact statements as needed to explain their accomplishment-relative-to-opportunity. For service expectations, see the guidance provided in the 2021-22 Annual Report.

CAP renews the strong suggestion, made repeatedly in our Top Tips for faculty and department

chairs, that personal statements and departmental letters not exceed 5 pages in length, unless absolutely necessary. For simple merit actions, 3 pages is preferred. Extremely long personal statements defeat the twin purpose of summarizing the major accomplishments of the review period and justifying the reasons for the departmental recommendation. Moving forward, CAP recommends that deans consider sending these files back to give candidates or departments an opportunity to revise excessively long personal statements or department letters.

Recommendations to Facilitate the Review of Files

The [Recommendations to Facilitate the Review of Files](#)¹⁰ is a list of CAP recommendations for file preparation, which includes information on service expectations, file composition, justification for appointment and retention salaries, expectations for external reviewers, and Teaching Professor expectations. The document may be found on the CAP page of the Academic Senate website.

Additional tips and recommendations may also be found on the [CAP webpage](#)¹¹:

- [Top 10 Tips for Faculty](#)
- [CAP's Tips for Department Chairs](#)
- [Best Practices for Personnel Reviews in Text-Based Disciplines \(Humanities Division and Social Sciences Division\)](#)

V. Acknowledgments

The academic personnel review process depends on the collective work of many hands. We acknowledge AVP Grace McClintock, Academic Advancement Manager Ibukun Bloom, and the extraordinary staff of the Academic Personnel Office. These knowledgeable, helpful, and hardworking staff are critical to the personnel review process, providing the information that CAP needs to get its work done. CAP acknowledges the work and skill of departmental and divisional staff in helping to prepare and process personnel review files, and is grateful for the dedicated divisional academic personnel coordinators and analysts.

In addition, we wish to note the successful collaborations with the Committees on Teaching (COT), Faculty Welfare (CFW), Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CODEI), and Rules Jurisdiction and Elections (CRJE), as well as with the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). Our deepest appreciation goes to Jaden Silva-Espinoza, our Senate Analyst, for her dedication and support to the work of CAP. We also thank Senate Director Matthew Mednick and Executive Assistant Michele Chamberlin for their assistance.

We would also like to express our appreciation for the many collaborative interactions with the divisional leaders—Dean Alinder, Dean Gaensler, Dean Mitchell, Dean Parreñas Shimizu, and Dean Wolf—and with campus leadership—VPAA Lee and CP/EVC Kletzer, and Chancellor Larive.

We consider it a great privilege to have served on CAP during 2023-24, and are grateful to our colleagues and all those who play a part in the academic personnel review process.

¹⁰ CAP Recommendations to Facilitate the Review of Files, Spring 2021 https://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/cap_recstofacilitatereviewoffiles_082021.pdf

¹¹ Committee on Academic Personnel Senate Webpage: <https://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/index.html>

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Zsuzsanna Abrams

Frank Bäuerle

Bin Chen

Lars Fehren-Schmitz (*W, S*)

Gregory Gilbert (*W, S*)

Nobby Kobayashi

Roberto Manduchi

Warren Sack

Ted Warburton

Maureen Callanan, *Co-Chair*

Susan Gillman, *Co-Chair*

August 31, 2024