

Recommendations to Facilitate the Review of Files

Drafted by the Committee on Academic Personnel, Spring 2021

In 2020-21, the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) received a request from the Committee on Committees (COC) to clarify expectations for service at different ranks and steps. CAP values and encourages a workable balance between Teaching, Research, and Service activities at all levels, and offers the following recommendations to facilitate the review of files.

1. Service Expectations

Service should not encroach upon time used for teaching or research. CAP recognizes a series of distinctions in service expectations at different ranks.

Before achieving tenure, faculty are expected to have a relatively light service load, such as assignments to committees at the department level, and reasonable service to the profession, such as review and/or editorial service to journals and chairing or sub-chairing at conferences in one's area. Service (as a member but not a chair) on a department committee is a good way for junior faculty both to work with their senior colleagues and to begin developing a career record for campus service. It is important that junior faculty have a discussion with their department chair about the best ways to become involved in department governance.

After achieving tenure, faculty are expected to serve in positions of increasing leadership in the department, such as chair of department committees, and/or director of undergraduate/graduate programs. In addition, at this stage of their career, Associate Professors typically provide substantial service to the profession and/or the community as well as broader university service as members of Senate, divisional, cross-divisional, UC wide, and/or campus committees.

Full Professors are expected to serve in positions of leadership in the department and division with more responsibilities and larger workloads, such as chairing a department or a division committee, and serve as members or chairs of Senate committees, cross-divisional, or campus-level committees, and/or UC-wide service. In addition, faculty at this stage of their career typically provide extensive service to the profession and/or the community.

Professors above Step VI or Above Scale are expected to demonstrate leadership roles with significant university service as well as professional service outside of the campus that reflects their high rank.

CAP recognizes that the most important service assignments are those requiring more time, effort, and/or expertise. Personal statements can include short descriptions of the time and effort required for service.

2. Personnel File Composition

Candidates should pay close attention to the composition of their biobibliography (biobib). This includes careful annotation of materials to be reviewed as "new." As noted in the October 8, 2020

Annual CAP/EVC Memo on Academic Advancement,¹ submission of work in progress is generally discouraged, although long-term projects that span multiple review periods, like books or feature films, may be included as works-in-progress.

The definition of completion of a work may differ by discipline. “Completion” should be clarified in the personal statement if it does not obviously fall under the category of publication, public presentation, etc. If a work has been submitted and reviewed previously as “in progress”, the distinction between the completed work and the previously reviewed in-progress work also should be clearly described in the personal statement.

The biobib and the personal statement should align with and confirm each other. Both the candidate’s personal statement and the department’s letter should clearly distinguish the work to be considered for major actions (such as promotions spanning more than one review period) and minor actions (such as merits over one review period). This clarifies for all reviewing bodies the work to be considered for the UCSC Special Salary Practice, which is relevant to the most recent merit review period only.

3. Justification for Appointment and Retention Salaries

Proposals for appointment and retention salaries must often balance competing objectives -- being competitive with offers from other institutions while not being excessively above the salaries of current UCSC faculty of similar rank, step, and accomplishments.

For appointment salaries, particularly at senior ranks, departments should make an effort to present a data-driven argument for the proposed appointment salary. Single-sentence statements merely stating salary amounts offered at comparable institutions are not sufficient justification. A salary that is either inappropriately low or high can be damaging for morale in the department. In 2020-21, CAP reviewed several cases in which proposed appointment salaries appeared on the face to be much higher than the salaries of existing faculty, of similar or greater levels of career accomplishment, and in the same or similar discipline. For such cases, departments need to justify salaries, pointing out facts that might not be apparent to personnel reviewing bodies (e.g., a particular sub-discipline has a particularly high market salary, or the candidate has special experience qualifications for a particular leadership role).

For retention actions involving a salary increase, a formal written outside offer (with details of annual salary, rank, salary period, and effective date) must be part of the retention file to be reviewed. The salary of the competing offer is a logical upper bound for any retention offer. If the outside offer is for a salary period that is a different fraction of the year (e.g., 12 months instead of 9 months), the competing offer should not exceed the same monthly pay rate. CAP looks for careful justification of the counter-offer, including impact of the potential loss of the faculty member on the department/division/campus, reputation/standing of the competing department and institution, as well as potential equity issues within departments and divisions. (Please see CAPM 400.220.9.c.3² and the 5/31/11 CP/EVC memo on Ladder-Rank Academic Personnel Actions.³)

¹ Kletzer and Ito to Senate Faculty, 10/08/20, Re: Annual CAP/EVC Memo on Academic Advancement - 2020

² [CAPM 400.220.9.c.3](#) - Professor Series, Exceptions to Normal Eligibility or Procedures - Retention Action

³ [Galloway to Deans, Chairs, et al., 5/31/11, Re: Ladder-Rank Academic Personnel Actions](#)

4. Expectations for External Reviewers

The independence of the slate of external reviewers in promotion cases is critical to their standing. The file should always include a list of the candidate's and the department's suggested names, and the final slate should consist of 5-6 outside letters that represent either a majority from the department recommendations, or at most 50% from the candidate and 50% from the department. Furthermore, it is essential that a majority of the external letters are from individuals with no close professional relationship with the candidate (i.e. past or current close collaboration such as co-authors, co-editors, co-PIs, etc.) and at a rank comparable to or higher than the candidate and the promotion rank under consideration. External reviewers for Teaching Professors preferably include letters from other Teaching Professors at the same or higher rank. (Please see the 8/28/19 CP/EVC memo on Campus Expectations for Solicited External Letters in Major Advancement Actions.⁴)

5. Teaching Professor Expectations

In 2020-21, CAP's review of files for Teaching Professors followed the guidance provided in the October 8, 2020 CP/EVC and CAP Chair memo on the evaluation of Teaching Professors and the application of the campus Special Salary Practice⁵.

In its review, CAP considered the expectations for Teaching Professors, especially how they may differ from other ladder rank professors for each category. Because this is a relatively new title on this campus, further clarification and codification will be necessary as more cases come to CAP and other personnel reviewing bodies review more cases.

i. Professional Activity: According to the 10/08/20 memo, what would be assessed as "excellent" in research for a ladder rank would be "outstanding" for a Teaching Professor in "Professional Activity." This category includes a variety of products and materials, not all in written form and not necessarily publications. Although publications are not necessary to achieve excellence in research for Teaching Professors, some Teaching Professors may continue to do traditional research and may have such publications in their files. All of these materials should be listed in the biobib, and any written products should be attached as a file in the DivData tab "Scholarly/Creative Work" or in "Other Materials". Written products can include publications, conference proceedings, abstracts for conference talks, presentation handouts/slides, reports for grants, web sites, essays in popular venues, etc. Professional Activity can also include non-written products (i.e. talks, workshops, presentations, webinars, seminars, etc.) in one's department, on campus, at a UC wide event, at a conference, etc..

ii. Teaching: The bulk of the review of a Teaching Professor is in the teaching and mentoring category. The types of activities that are considered as teaching are the same as for ladder faculty and include "classroom teaching, formal and informal mentoring including independent studies

⁴ [Kletzer to Deans and Department Chairs, 8/29/19, Re: Campus Expectations for Solicited External Letters in Major Advancement Actions](#)

⁵ Kletzer and Ito to Senate Faculty, 10/08/20, Re: Guidance for Evaluation of Teaching Professors and for the Application of the Campus Special Salary Practice

and mentoring of Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs), course development, and pedagogical innovations applied to their own classes.” Some Teaching Professors also do mentoring/advising work (with undergraduates, MA and/or PhD students, TAs, and GSIs). Teaching work extends beyond the teaching of courses to designing new courses, revising courses, supporting other faculty in their department in improving their teaching, participating in Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning (CITL) or other workshops, designing workshops, etc. Some Teaching Professors may also do mentoring work with undergraduates, masters/doctoral students, and, in particular, Teaching Assistants (TAs); that mentoring work, including supporting the professional development of TAs, needs to be documented in the biobib and the personal statement.

iii. Service: Work in this category is reviewed in much the same way as for ladder rank faculty (i.e., it can include service in different settings such as department, division, campus, UC wide, and to the profession; quantity, depth and breadth vary according to rank, etc.). Some Teaching Professors work for a percentage of their time as program directors or other administrative positions, and that work is reviewed under Service. As with ladder rank faculty, any reduction in the amount of teaching due to a partial administrative or service position does not reflect negatively on the evaluation of the Teaching Professor’s teaching category.

CAP plans to develop a more detailed memo summarizing tips for departments in presenting files for Teaching Professors in 2021-22.

For additional tips and recommendations, please refer to the [CAP page](#) on the Academic Senate website, in particular, the following related links:

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