

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
1999-2000 Annual Report

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Duties

The Committee on Academic Personnel advises the Chancellor or her designated representative--the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor or a Divisional Dean--on appointments, promotions, merit increases, and midcareer appraisals for Senate faculty, adjunct faculty, and professional researchers. The Committee also advises the Academic Senate and the administration on policy matters relating to academic personnel.

CAP had eight members in 1999-2000--one from the Arts, one from Engineering, and two each from Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences.

Service on CAP offers its members a chance to appreciate at close range the University's intricate review process and the remarkable variety and quality of our colleagues' achievements. We members of the 1999-2000 committee are grateful to have been given this experience.

Workload

In 1999-2000 CAP continued its established practice of meeting on Thursday afternoons. The Committee met 34 times from September 23, 1999 to June 22, 2000.

The Committee made recommendations on 232 personnel cases--56 more than in 1998-9 and 34 more than in 1997-8. Given the current projections for campus growth, it seems likely that the number of cases seen by CAP will continue to increase. CAP also sent the Executive Vice Chancellor slates of proposed members for 66 ad hoc committees.

Among the cases considered were 46 appointment files. CAP recommended appointment in all cases, though not always at the rank or step proposed by the Department. As of September 1, 30 offers of appointment had been made in the Professor series, and 26 of these had been accepted. This rate of acceptance is comparable to that of prior years.

CAP's Recommendations Compared to Administrative Decisions

During 1999-2000, there continued to be a high degree of agreement between CAP's recommendations and the final administrative decisions on personnel cases. The two concurred in 93.2 percent of cases (= 207 out of 222 cases). This degree of agreement is testimony to the level of consultation between the administration and representatives of the Academic Senate on personnel matters.

The final administrative decision did not concur with CAP's recommendation in 15 cases:

- * In 1 case, a greater acceleration was granted than CAP was willing to recommend.
- * In 7 cases, more off-scale was granted than CAP was willing to recommend.
- * In 2 cases, advancement was granted despite CAP's failure to support it.
- * In 1 case, appointment was made at a lower level than CAP recommended.
- * In 2 cases, off-scale was recommended by CAP but not granted.
- * In 2 cases, a lower salary increase was granted than CAP recommended.

Statistics reporting the recommendations at various levels of review for the personnel cases considered in 1999-2000 can be found at the Academic Human Resources website (<http://www2.ucsc.edu/ahr>).

Consultation

It is customary for the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor, and/or Divisional Deans to meet with CAP to discuss cases in which the administration's evaluation of a personnel file differs significantly from CAP's. This year we were visited once by a Dean and several times by EVC Simpson, who also took the opportunity to discuss policy issues with us. In addition, the CAP Chair and selected CAP members met once with the Social Science Division's Council of Chairs, at their request, to discuss general issues relating to the academic review process.

Ad Hoc Committees

During 1999-2000, 2 members of the UCSC Academic Senate served on three ad hoc committees; 18 served on two ad hoc committees; and 85 served on one ad hoc committee. We heartily thank all these colleagues for their active scholarly participation. The independent evaluation supplied by ad hoc committees is crucial to shared governance in the academic review process. We are grateful for our colleagues' continued willingness to take on this responsibility. We especially appreciate their willingness to serve on ad hoc committees involving appointments, sometimes at short notice, thereby enabling timely offers of appointment to be made at the Associate Professor and Professor levels.

Policy Issues

A. Overlapping Steps and Off-Scale Salary Limits

In 1999-2000, as in previous years, CAP struggled with cases in which an Assistant Professor, Step 4 was on the CALL for advancement but not yet ready for promotion to tenure. According to CAPP 407.690B, in order to be advanced to the overlapping Steps 5 or 6, a candidate must have a record of accomplishment that clearly indicates that tenure is imminent at the next review.

According to the campus's policy on off-scale salary limits (CAPP 803.620B), except under extraordinary circumstances, the salary of an Assistant Professor should not exceed that of an Associate Professor, Step 2. For a few Assistant Professors at Step 4 off-scale whose off-scale

salary increment was already substantial, these two policies led CAP to recommend only a very modest salary increase.

CAP is very sympathetic to the predicament of Assistant Professors who are hired at advanced steps and/or with significant off-scale salary only later to encounter the ceilings imposed by the campus policies on overlapping steps and off-scale salary limits. But for reasons of equity to the faculty as a whole, we felt that as long as these policies are as stated, they must be respected. On various occasions we discussed the possibility that one or both policies might be revised. Some discussions were with EVC Simpson; others were among ourselves. The conclusion to emerge most clearly from these discussions was that any change will have broader ramifications for the complex structure of the rank-and-step system, ramifications which should ideally be fully understood before change is implemented. We note two developments at the systemwide level that are relevant to this issue. First, after extensive discussion, the University Committee on Academic Personnel declined to recommend any change in the APM language governing the use of overlapping steps, which states "Steps V and VI [at the rank of Assistant Professor] may be used in exceptional situations and with proper justification"(APM 220-18b(2)). Second, the Academic Council is now in the process of forming a systemwide commission to evaluate the current rank-and-step system and consider possible modifications.

B. Biobibliographies

In 1999-2000 CAP once again had to request clarification or additional information in a number of personnel cases. In some cases, the biobibliography submitted was not in standard format. In other cases, the biobibliography was not annotated to indicate which works had been submitted for a previous review--for instance, as works in progress, works submitted to a journal, or works in press. We struggled particularly with cases of the second type, since the absence of information that a piece of research or a creative activity has been reviewed previously could potentially raise troubling issues of equity with respect to the faculty as a whole.

The guidelines for preparation of biobibliography forms (Appendix 9 of the CAPPMM) state clearly that it is the faculty member's responsibility to ensure that his/her biobibliography is accurate, updated, and in standard format. It is also the faculty member's responsibility to insure that his/her biobibliography is annotated to indicate which research and/or creative activity is new and which was also submitted for a prior review. We urge our colleagues to review their biobibliographies in light of the guidelines, which can be found at <http://www2.ucsc.edu/ahr/CAPPMM/appen9.htm> .

C. Case Flow

CAP's caseload in 1999-2000 was lightest in the Fall, when approximately 50 cases were reviewed, and heaviest in the Spring, when approximately 125 cases were reviewed. The Committee's practice of limiting the number of cases discussed at each meeting made its workload manageable even during the Spring. This practice did not slow CAP's review process to any great extent: overall, fewer than 15 cases were delayed and no delay was greater than one week. CAP's review of personnel cases not involving an ad hoc committee is generally completed within two weeks. This year once again, informal inquiries suggested that there were delays at every level of the

review process prior to CAP, beginning with the candidate's submission of materials and the Department's review of those materials. (Statistics reporting delays at the different levels cannot be provided, because in 1999-2000 the relevant information was not consistently collected.) We urge our colleagues to make every effort to submit their materials by the deadline, and Departments to make every effort to meet the deadline for the forwarding of personnel files to Divisions. The 2000-1 deadlines can be found at: <http://www2.ucsc.edu/ahr/calendar.htm>.

D. CAP Membership

1999-2000 was the second year in a row during which CAP had one vacant position in the Spring quarter. Despite the best efforts of the Committee on Committees, no replacement could be found for a member on sabbatical. We recognize that CAP represents a significant service commitment. But we also believe that the Divisions are best represented when all eight of the Committee's positions are filled. We would like to invite our colleagues to consider experiencing the intensity and collegiality of CAP by serving as replacement members, if future opportunities to do so should arise.

E. Other Policy Issues Discussed

1. Revisions to Appendix 9 of the CAPP (Guidelines for Preparation of Biobibliography Forms)
2. Proposal for Firm Deadline for Candidates' Submission of Personnel Files
3. BM&E Salary Scale for Professional Research Series (Fiscal Year)
4. Proposed Technical Changes to the APM
5. UC Faculty Fellows Program
6. UC Faculty/Staff Partnership
7. Policy Guidelines for Target of Excellence Hires (CAPP 112.000)
8. Guidelines for Appointment of Research Professors

Conclusion

Staffing our Committee is a difficult job. The staff member must be accurate, reliable, efficient, and knowledgeable about the personnel process. Our heartfelt thanks to Pamela Edwards for her continuing efforts to meet these rigorous demands and for her positive attitude. We are also deeply indebted to Barbara Brogan, Director of Academic Human Resources, and to the AHR staff--Breck Caloss, Nancy Degnan, Therese Doherty, Nancy Furber, Linda Petrakis, Robin Allan, and Carla Rounds--for their wisdom, support, and impressive command of the academic personnel process.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Claude Bernasconi

Joyce Brodsky (S)

Raymond Gibbs

Diane Gifford-Gonzalez (F, W)

David Hoy
Leta Miller (F, W; UCAP Representative (F, W))
C. Leo Ortiz
Ira Pohl
Sandra Chung (Chair; UCAP Representative (S))

September 30, 2000