

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL Annual Report 2022-23**

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

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, and mid-career appraisals 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.

In the year 2022-23, CAP had eleven representatives, two from Arts, two from Engineering, two from Humanities, two from Social Sciences, and three from Physical and Biological Sciences (including the Chair). The Committee laments the lack of representation of Teaching Professors, and strongly encourages the Committee on Committees to ensure in the future that at least one member of CAP be a Teaching Professor.

An addendum to this report with personnel review statistics and routine business will be submitted to the Winter 2024 Senate Meeting call.

### **I. Policies, Guidelines, and Recommendations**

In addition to providing recommendations and consultations that fall under the purview of CAP as outlined above, the Committee continued discussions about time-sensitive issues, including especially, this year, the framing of the new Salary Equity Review policy and the questions pertaining to policy on public-facing and digital projects in Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences in the context of the academic personnel review.

#### **Consultation with the Administration**

CAP appreciated the CP/EVC and Chancellor's continued willingness to consult with the CAP Chair on files where there is a possibility that their final decision would differ from CAP's. Additionally, in two instances this year, the administration consulted with the full CAP committee. The outcomes of such discussions were quite uniformly (with very few exceptions) in the direction of the final authority maintaining their initial decision. Nevertheless, CAP felt that those regular consultations with the CAP Chair, reported to committee members on a weekly basis, were useful in forming a continuing understanding of the final authorities' inclination and general interpretation of policy. CAP Chair Profumo also consulted with the divisional deans on a few occasions. CAP suggests that consultations with the CP/EVC and the deans be held at the beginning of each academic year as an additional tool for working toward shared metrics and approaches to evaluation.

#### **A. CAP Recusal Policy**

Continuing existing practice, in 2022-23 both the case presenter and second reader of the file were not faculty members from the candidate's department. Department members from the file being discussed were recused from voting and did not take part in the discussion specifically leading to CAP's recommendation votes. Department members were present for the general

discussion of the case, barring any other conflict of interest or personal reason to be recused, and had access to the entirety of the file, including letters added to the file after the departmental vote. Questions addressed to the department member by CAP were confined to standards in the discipline, e.g., which publication venues have greatest visibility, which fields are high profile, changing or emerging foci in the discipline, etc. The department member was recused and excused from the meeting if the department vote contained dissenting votes, or if there were any other questions or appearances of conflict of interest, as identified by the department member, the chair, or any CAP member. Any CAP member could choose to be self-recused from any case, including those from their home department. CAP continues to consider how to handle instances in which a personnel file contains confidential letters from the candidate, after the department's letter has been submitted, if one of the candidate's departmental colleagues is on the committee.

### **B. Waivers of Open Recruitment**

During this academic year, and similar to the previous academic year, the committee noted a significant and somewhat disproportionate use of Waivers of Open Recruitment, often without sufficient justification for such requests. This was especially a problem in connection with the requirement to provide “information explaining why an open recruitment cannot be conducted,” as specified in CAPM 101.000. In several instances, the Administration granted waivers despite unanimous contrary opinions expressed by the three Senate committees that opine in such cases (CAP, the Committee on Planning and Budget, and the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity). We hope that in the future such requests will be more soundly justified and that final decisions adhere more clearly with policy, faculty governance, and the general principles of openness and fairness in hiring processes.

### **C. CP/EVC Expansion of Exceptions for Retention Actions**

In response to a request from CP/EVC Kletzer of March 10, 2022,<sup>1</sup> CAP endorsed the general practice of allowing for nimble action in time-sensitive situations, and noted that in the past the campus has lost excellent faculty members due to our inability to respond quickly to retention issues. However, CAP continues to be concerned by the problems of working within the framework of “a serious, credible, and imminent threat of losing the faculty member,” which leaves that phrase open to interpretation. The entire process is weakened by a general lack of accountability and arbitrariness. In its response<sup>2</sup> to the CP/EVC's plan to expand exceptions for retention actions, CAP noted several problems with defining “a serious, credible, and imminent threat.” While formal offers and exact salaries would not always be necessary, a firm commitment that an offer is forthcoming, along with a salary range, would likely be sufficient to warrant a retention action. CAP interpretation of “a serious, credible, and imminent threat” goes beyond simply being short-listed in an open search, or having been invited to apply to interested departments; CAP insists that such “threats” should consist of, at least, an informal offer, or communication that an offer is definitely forthcoming.

The unintended negative outcome of a pattern of poorly justified retention cases could result

---

<sup>1</sup> CP/EVC Kletzer to CAP Chair Profumo, 3/10/22, Re: Expansion of Exception for Retention Actions

<sup>2</sup> CAP Chair Profumo to CP/EVC Kletzer, 4/12/22, Re: Expansion of Exceptions for Retention Actions

in higher salaries for those individual faculty and exacerbate already existing overall faculty salary inequities across divisions and departments on campus. So, more broadly, CAP continues to encourage the Administration to take action in the direction of systematically rewarding deserving faculty members, including with a boosted version of the current Special Salary Practice (SSP) and with access for all faculty to a salary equity review mechanism in the context of, as well as outside of, regular merit reviews.

#### **D. Campus Expectations for Assessing Community-Engaged Scholarship in Academic Personnel Reviews**

CAP worked throughout the year to review, codify, and communicate to the campus our policies and practices on assessing community-engaged scholarship in personnel reviews. Building on the guidelines and framework we developed last year (see [UCSC CAP Annual Report 2021-22](#)<sup>3</sup>), 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. Two of the highlights:

- 1) We participated in an April 19 event, Valuing Engaged Scholarship in the Tenure and Promotion Process, sponsored by the new center, Campus + Community (directed by Rebecca London, Sociology), in support of engaged scholarship across UCSC. For a recording of this event, see <https://transform.ucsc.edu/work/campus-community/for-faculty-2/>.
- 2) We partnered with CP/EVC Kletzer and VPAA Lee on a formal document, [Campus Expectations for Assessing Community-Engaged Scholarship in Academic Personnel Reviews](#)<sup>4</sup>, released on August 11.

Among the recommendations in this document for faculty whose work involves and are committed to public-facing scholarship, we would like to highlight here the following: When a file includes community-engaged scholarship, it is helpful for the candidate and the department to discuss the methodology underpinning the work, the quality of the scholarship, its significance/impact, and dissemination. The following criteria should be considered in the evaluation of a personnel file.

##### **1) Methodology**

- a. Community engagement processes that are built on trust and reciprocity.
- b. Collaboration that enhances the research process through community-engaged approaches with attention to the ethics of collaborative work, promoting and being accountable for inclusive, equitable, and respectful collaboration in research environments.

---

<sup>3</sup> Committee on Academic Personnel, Annual Report, 2021-22 [https://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/cap-annual-reports-folder/cap-annualreport-2021-22\\_scp2031.pdf](https://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/cap-annual-reports-folder/cap-annualreport-2021-22_scp2031.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> CP/EVC Kletzer and CAP Chairs Callanan and Gillman to Senate Faculty, Deans, and 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](https://apo.ucsc.edu/news-events/campus_memos/08-11-23-cap-cpevc-community-engaged-scholarship.html)

## 2) Quality

Because community-engaged, public-facing work frequently spans the three categories of research, teaching, and service, both the department and the reviewers should address this overlap where relevant. The **process** of being involved with the community in producing knowledge (as a parameter related to but distinct from the **output** of the collaboration) potentially brings in teaching and mentorship (undergraduate and graduate students and community roles), and service (public participation).

## 3) Significance/Impact

- a. Consider the potential or actual impact for the scholarship to advance knowledge and provide beneficial outcomes in the communities in which the scholarship is conducted. Examples might include influencing or shaping policy, changing practices, outlining problems that communities identify as critical to address, enhancing the local economy, and making progress toward social equity and/or systemic change that promotes the public interest.
- b. Contributions to knowledge in both the academic field and community. Such contributions might take the form of peer-reviewed academic publications, increased funding for further research, implementation of new programs, public exhibitions, reports, websites, and/or making a significant contribution to the discipline on issues relevant to external partners and the community.
- c. In files, where appropriate, external reviewers should be chosen who have expertise to assess community-engaged research contributions, and this review should be formally requested in the departmental External Reviewer solicitation letter.
- d. In some cases, faculty may request additional letters for their personnel files to assess the broader impacts of their community-engaged work.
- e. Enhancing the ability of public communities to benefit from the research, including students, community partners, policymakers, local leaders, and the general public.
- f. Impact through a focus on underserved communities, addressing disparities, or addressing the needs of California's diverse population.

## 4) Dissemination

The research must be presented in a form that can have influence beyond its immediate context, is accessible to the public and durable over time. Some examples of specific dissemination strategies include: community reports, newsletters, non-scholarly presentations, ongoing relationship building through regular communication webinars and digital training, plus other education and outreach activities—including and beyond social media (blogs, podcasts, other online forums).

In addition to community-engaged research, assessment of teaching and service shall also value community-engaged activities. Faculty should explain in their personal statement the extent of work done that may go beyond the usual effort in these activities, for example, a course based on community-engaged activity may need to be redesigned each year as the community partners change, and thus it may be a new course preparation for each offering. Development of community engagement shall be recognized in any area of research, teaching, and service.

## II. CAP Review and Evaluation

CAP outlined service expectations and examples in the 2021-23 Annual Report; in that report, CAP also emphasized the importance of contextualizing publications in personal statements and letters; finally, CAP continues to encourage candidates to submit COVID impact statements as appropriate.

CAP renews the strong suggestion that personal statements and departmental letters not exceed 5 pages in length, unless absolutely necessary. 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, rather than repeating every aspect of the file. Departmental letters that contextualize negative votes are also very helpful to CAP and other reviewers. Moving forward, CAP may consider sending back unusually long personal statements or departmental letters for revision.

### **Recommendations to Facilitate the Review of Files**

The [Recommendations to Facilitate the Review of Files](#)<sup>5</sup> 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](#)<sup>6</sup>:

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

### **Collaboration with Other Senate Committees**

This year CAP worked collaboratively with several other Senate committees on a range of issues affecting faculty personnel actions, including the Committee on Faculty Welfare (on the need to update the Special Salary Practice), the Committee on Teaching (on teaching tables), and the Committee on Planning and Budget and the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (on the justification for the use of waivers of open recruitment).

### **Teaching Tables**

CAP has worked with COT and CITL throughout the recent revisions to the Student Experiences of Teaching surveys (SETs), as well as the transition to the new SETs platform (Blue or Explorance). SETs were revised to remove the “overall teaching effectiveness” question which is known to increase bias. COT, CAP, and CITL agreed to replace teaching tables with that single question with teaching tables highlighting three different specific questions. Outgoing COT Chair Kate Jones summarized these changes in a recent memo and in an Appendix to COT’s 2022-23 annual report. The plan to move toward inclusion of teaching tables for the 3 replacement SETs questions in each file was spelled out in the [2020-21 COT Annual Report](#) (pp. 2-3). Part of the

---

<sup>5</sup> CAP Recommendations to Facilitate the Review of Files, Spring 2021 [https://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/cap\\_recstofacilitatereviewoffiles\\_082021.pdf](https://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/cap_recstofacilitatereviewoffiles_082021.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> Committee on Academic Personnel: <https://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/index.html>

reason for choosing Blue as the campus platform was the promise that it would be possible to produce teaching tables “automatically.” This process has turned out to be more complex than expected, but ITS staff have been working with department staff to learn how to download teaching tables for personnel actions and make slight modifications as needed.

### **Acknowledgments**

The academic personnel review process depends on the collective work of many hands. We acknowledge AVP Grace McClintock, Analyst 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, Faculty Welfare, Affirmative Action and Diversity, Planning and Budget, as well as with the Senate Executive Committee.

Our deepest appreciation also goes to Jaden Silva-Espinoza, our Senate Analyst, and to Senate Director Matthew Mednick and Executive Assistant Michele Chamberlin, who assisted CAP in spring 2023.

We would also like to express our appreciation for the many collaborative interactions with the divisional leaders—Dean Alinder, Dean Koch, Dean Mitchell, Acting Dean Bullock, 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 2022-23, and are grateful to our colleagues and all those who play a part in the academic personnel review process.

Respectfully submitted,

#### COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Zsuzsanna Abrams  
Maureen Callanan  
Gregory Gilbert  
Susan Gillman  
Doug Kellogg  
Roberto Manduchi  
Warren Sack  
Magy Seif El-Nasr  
Beth Stephens  
Quentin Williams  
Stefano Profumo, *Chair*

August 31, 2023