

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL  
2000-2001 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 2000-2001—one from the Arts, one from Engineering, and two each from Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences.

Service on CAP offers a chance to appreciate at close range the remarkable variety and quality of our colleagues' achievements. Members of the 2000-01 committee are grateful for this experience.

**Workload**

In 2000-01 CAP continued its established practice of meeting on Thursday afternoons. The Committee met 29 times from September 28, 2000 to June 7, 2001.

The Committee made recommendations on 225 personnel cases—3 less than in 1999-00, 49 more than in 1998-99 and 27 more than in 1997-98: see Table 1. Although these figures appear to reflect a lower case load in 2000-01 than in 1999-00, the data is misleading. More files actually entered the personnel process but they moved through the system more slowly, a problem CAP is working to rectify. As a result, 17 cases initiated in 2000-01 were held over until 2001-02 as opposed to only 7 in 1999-00. (See details under “Case Flow” below.) Given the current projections for campus growth, it seems likely that the number of cases will continue to increase. CAP also sent the Executive Vice Chancellor slates of proposed members for 55 ad hoc committees.

Among the cases considered were 63 appointment files. CAP recommended appointment in all cases, though not always at the rank or step proposed by the Department. As of September 1, 60 offers of appointment had been made in the Professor series: 39 accepted, 4 declined, 1 withdrew. For 16 cases, there has been no response at the time of this report. This rate of acceptance is comparable to that of prior years.

### **CAP's Recommendations Compared to Administrative Decisions**

During 2000-01, 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 91.1 percent of cases (185 out of 203 cases). This degree of agreement is testimony to the level of consultation between the administration and representatives of the Academic Senate, and an indication of shared values regarding professional development.

The final Dean or EVC decision did not concur with CAP's recommendation in 18 cases:

- \* In 2 cases, a greater acceleration was granted than CAP recommended.
- \* In 6 cases, more off-scale was granted than CAP recommended.
- \* In 4 cases, advancement was granted despite CAP's failure to support it.

#### **Appointments**

- \* In 2 cases, appointment was made at the salary recommended by CAP, but at a different step.
- \* In 2 cases, appointment was made at a higher salary than CAP recommended.
- \* In 2 cases, appointment was made at a lower salary than CAP recommended.

#### **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 Humanities' Council of Chairs, at their request, to discuss general issues relating to the academic review process.

#### **Case Flow**

CAP's caseload in 2000-01 was lightest in the Fall, when 21 cases were reviewed, and heaviest in the Spring, when 127 cases were reviewed (see Table 2a). At CAP's final meeting, 26 cases were considered—an overwhelming burden on the committee. Seventeen cases were not completed by the end of the year. In only one of these cases was the complete file received before CAP's final meeting. All other holdovers resulted from an incomplete ad hoc process: ad hocs had not met or had met but had not filed reports (see Table 2b). These delays resulted from earlier delays on the department or divisional level, or from difficulties in assembling ad hoc committees. CAP's review of personnel cases that did not involve an ad hoc report was normally completed in the week it was received. We urge our colleagues to submit their materials by the deadline, and hope that

departments will meet the deadline for the forwarding of personnel files to Divisions. The 2001-02 deadlines can be found at: <http://www2.ucsc.edu/ahr/Call0102.htm>.

### **Ad Hoc Committees**

During 2000-01, 1 member of the UCSC Academic Senate served on three ad hoc committees; 23 served on two ad hoc committees; and 111 served on one ad hoc committee. The independent evaluation supplied by the ad hoc process is crucial to shared governance. We are grateful for our colleagues' continued willingness to take on this responsibility. We especially appreciate their diligence in reviewing prospective appointments on short notice.

At the same time, the single biggest factor delaying files is the ad hoc process: constitution of the committees, scheduling of meetings, and writing of reports. CAP is seeking ways to increase efficiency and assure that the burden of ad hoc service is distributed more equitably. Early in the academic year, CAP sent a request to all departments requesting faculty to self-identify areas outside their specialties in which they have some expertise. We received responses from most departments and have established a database that allows us to tap more individuals for ad hoc service. We ask that any departments who failed to respond to this request do so as soon as possible.

CAP recognizes that ad hoc service places an extra burden on already overworked faculty. We therefore wish to emphasize the importance of agreeing to serve on committees so that no faculty member will have to perform this task more than twice in any one year. Most faculty readily agree to participate, but a few routinely decline or do not return phone calls or emails from AHR staff. CAP is consulting with AHR staff and EVC Simpson for solutions to this and other ad hoc committee issues.

### **Assessment of teaching in the personnel process**

CAP continues to discuss the most effective way to evaluate teaching in the personnel process. Three issues have arisen in various cases:

1. When the student evaluation return rate is too low, it is difficult for us to assess whether negative comments constitute a significant problem or are confined to a minority of outspoken students. *CAP members read the student evaluations and make an independent assessment of the quality of a faculty member's teaching. We therefore stress the importance of distributing and collecting student evaluations in all classes.*
2. In rare instances, we find discrepancies between the student evaluations and the department's characterization of these same documents. Rather than patching over perceived teaching problems, CAP would prefer a frank assessment and a discussion of remedies, including plans for follow-up guidance from the department.

3. If the department has additional evidence of teaching quality we would welcome its inclusion in the chair's letter.

### **Form of departmental personnel letters**

Since CAP members read so many files, our job would be simplified if departmental letters could be somewhat more standardized in length and content. Occasionally we receive extremely long letters (some up to 15 pages) with detailed descriptions of every publication and course; CAP prefers instead that department letters be shorter and more focused (4-6 pages is typical), providing *syntheses* of strengths and weaknesses. While we do not wish to dictate any formula for discussions of teaching and research in department letters, we did convey some broad suggestions to the deans, who were asked to share them with department chairs. These suggestions are reproduced below for the use by new chairpersons.

#### ***Teaching:***

CAP finds that the most helpful letters are not organized on a course-by-course basis, but rather in the following manner:

- a) A summary of the number of courses/students taught in the review period. Is this number normal? Appropriate?
- b) The level of courses taught. CAP prefers 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.
- c) A summary of points raised *repeatedly* in student evaluations (e.g., highly organized, inspiring, boring, late to class, energetic). *There is no need for direct quotes from the evaluations, since we read them ourselves.* Most helpful to CAP is an organization of these comments according to the levels described in b.
- d) An explanation of problem areas and clarification of factors that might be ambiguous (e.g., a low percentage of submitted evaluations)

#### ***Research:***

We also have a few requests to help us evaluate the research component of the file.

- a) Articles in journals. It is helpful if the chair's letter can provide data on the selectivity of the journal. Is it peer-reviewed? What percentage of submitted articles are accepted for publication?
- b) Conference papers. Is it possible to describe standards? What percentage of submitted papers are typically accepted?
- c) Multiple-authored papers. Could the chair's letter note whether the order of authors represents the degree of input? We realize that there are different traditions in

different fields, but normally we would consider the first author to have made the largest contribution.

- d) Work in progress continues to present problems. Please be sure to describe the status of each publication *at the previous review*. Remember that a publication only “counts” once. It is generally better to wait until an article is accepted or published than to forward a typescript of a “submitted” article still awaiting peer review. Many junior faculty need to be advised about this procedure.

### **Reporting of departmental votes on appointments**

It is sometimes unclear how CAP is to interpret split votes on appointments: do the “no” votes express dissatisfaction with the candidate or merely indicate that another candidate was first choice? Some departments move to make a vote unanimous once a decision is reached. For departments that do not follow this procedure, it would be helpful if the chair’s letter could address the issue, if only to comment that the departmental discussion did not provide any explanation for the negative vote(s).

### **Overlapping steps and off-scale salary limits**

On several occasions, CAP continued to struggle with cases in which an Assistant Professor, Step 4, was on the call for advancement but was not yet ready for promotion to tenure. According to CAPP 407.690B, a candidate must show a record of accomplishment clearly indicating that tenure is imminent at the next review in order to be advanced to the overlapping Step 5. If this criterion is not met, a salary increase at Step 4 may be recommended instead. However, the campus’s policy on off-scale salary limits mandates that the salary of an Assistant Professor not exceed that of an Associate Professor, Step 2, except in extraordinary circumstances. Issues of salary compression (particularly in engineering) also come into play in this regard. CAP is sympathetic to the predicament of Assistant Professors who are hired at advanced steps and/or with significant off-scale salary components. But for reasons of equity to the faculty as a whole, we felt that as long as these policies are in place, they must be respected. EVC Simpson has appointed a committee chaired by Professor Buchanan Sharp to study these issues. The committee completed its deliberations in the spring, but has not yet submitted its report.

### **Late submission of materials by faculty**

Occasionally CAP examined a case that had been substantially delayed because the faculty member was late in submitting his or her materials. While the issue did not affect the substance of our recommendation, we discussed whether such actions should be retroactive. The Sharp committee was asked to recommend in this matter; we await their report.

### **Other Policy Issues Discussed**

1. Instructional Workload Course Equivalencies, Unit 18
2. Recruitment Procedures – Proposal for Ongoing Lecturer Pools
3. Off-Scale Salary Limits
4. Salary Ceilings
5. APM025 Conflict of Commitment and Outside Professional Activities
6. Report of the Advisory Group on the UCSC Colleges
7. CAP Concerns About Teaching Evaluation
8. State Funded Summer quarter
9. External Letters for Midcareer Reviews
10. Department Chair Responsibilities and Compensation

### **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 meeting 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, Liz Crompton, Ann McCarty—for their wisdom, support, and impressive command of the academic personnel process.

Respectfully submitted,

### **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL**

Claude Bernasconi  
Ken Bruland  
Sandra Chung (F)  
Donna Haraway (WS)  
Catherine Cooper  
Peter Kenez  
Paul Lubeck  
Ira Pohl  
Leta Miller (Chair; UCAP Representative)

September 27, 2001