

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
Annual Report, 2004-05

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Duties

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) makes recommendations to the Chancellor, the CP/EVC, and/or the Divisional Deans on appointments, promotions, merit increases, and mid-career appraisals for Senate faculty, adjunct faculty, and professional researchers. During the past year, CAP also was called upon to make recommendations on several Merit Equity/Career Review files. In addition, from time to time, the Committee advises the Academic Senate and the administration on other policy matters related to academic personnel issues. As always, CAP makes recommendations; it does not make the final decision.

In 2004-05 CAP had eight members each quarter—one from Arts, one from Engineering, and two each from Humanities, Physical and Biological Sciences, and Social Sciences. Ten faculty members served at least one quarter on CAP during 2004-05.

As in past years, as the Committee deliberated and made recommendations on specific cases, CAP members repeatedly were struck by the extraordinary number and quality of our colleagues' many accomplishments. The overwhelming majority of personnel files that we reviewed contained evidence of fascinating scholarship and cutting edge research, records of extensive and dedicated teaching, and evidence of energetic service to campus colleagues, diverse scholarly communities, and many important public constituencies. The Committee's heavy workload was made lighter by the exceptional talent and remarkable energy reflected in the files we reviewed. The accomplishments of the UCSC faculty are truly extraordinary; the Committee feels privileged to have you as our colleagues.

Workload

In 2004-05, CAP continued its established practice of meeting on Thursday afternoons. The Committee met 28 times during the academic year (5, 12, and 11 meetings, in fall, winter, and spring quarters, respectively), and once in the summer. The CAP caseload has increased consistently over the last decade. In recent years, the Committee routinely has received between 75 to nearly 100 more cases per year than was typical in the mid-1990s.

In 2004-05, the Committee received 267 cases. We made recommendations in 251 of the 267 cases we received. There were 16 cases held over to the next year; they consisted of 15 cases in which Ad Hoc committee slates were in the process of being appointed, meeting, or finalizing their reports (things that could not easily be accomplished over the summer), and one request for additional information.

The number of cases held over and the need to hold a summer meeting were in large part the result of the unusually large number of files that were sent to us in the closing weeks of the academic year. At the Committee's last meeting in June, we made recommendations on all of the cases that were then complete. However, there were a number of late arriving files that needed

Committee on Academic Personnel

Ad Hoc committee slates appointed, and ones in which the Ad Hoc committees had been assembled without sufficient time to complete their reports before CAP's last meeting.

Appointments and Retention

CAP reviewed 57 appointment files overall, including 51 ladder-rank appointments to Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor. CAP recommended appointment in all cases except two. CAP's recommendation was typically at the same rank and step proposed by the Department. As of August, 2005, 39 candidates accepted, 12 declined, 1 case was pending (carried over), and 5 were concluded in some other way (see details below).

In more detail:

Acting Assistants (6): 3 accepted, 3 declined

Assistants (24): 17 accepted, 6 declined, 1 unknown

Associates (13): 7 accepted, 3 declined, 3 other

Other: 1 file was withdrawn before an offer was made; 1 file involved a denial of appointment by final authority (no offer made); and 1 file was carried over pending Ad Hoc committee review

Professors (most of whom were Research Professors) (14): 12 accepted, 0 declined, 2 other

Other: 1 appointment waiver was not approved so no offer was made; 1 denial of appointment by final authority (no offer made)

CAP continues to be aware of the difficulties that UCSC faces in recruitment and retention as a result of our budgetary situation and the local housing market. We have done our best not to contribute to or exacerbate these challenges. It is our practice to grant great deference to departmental recommendations, consistent with campus academic standards.

CAP's Recommendations, Administrative Decisions, and Consultation

During 2004-05 there continued to be a high rate of agreement between CAP's recommendation and the final administrative decision on personnel cases. The two concurred in 83.3% of the time (209 out of 251 files, which does not include the 16 carried over). The final administrative decision did not agree with CAP's recommendation in 42 cases.

In the Committee's opinion, our relationships with the various campus administrative units remained excellent overall. Just as in the previous year, however, changes in various parts of the administration posed special challenges. For much of the academic year, for example, three of the five Divisional Deans were "interim" or acting. In addition, there was a change in both the Chancellor and Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor positions on our campus. Nonetheless, throughout these transitions, CAP felt that all administrators did an outstanding job of maintaining communication with us and in ensuring the consistency of the personnel process. We thank them for their efforts.

As in previous years, administrators did meet occasionally with CAP—either with the Chair or the entire Committee—at the administrator's request to discuss cases where his or her assessment of the case differed from CAP's. There also were a few instances in which we discussed broader personnel-related policy issues with the CP/EVC.

Case Flow

In 2004-05, at the request of the CP/EVC, CAP took the unusual step of having a summer meeting. As noted above, the meeting was necessitated in large part because of the especially large number of cases that arrived in late May and early June. Many of them required Ad Hoc committee reports that were not completed by our last meeting in June. There were a total of 21 cases on our summer meeting agenda and we deliberated and made recommendations on all of them. Despite having a summer meeting, a total of 16 cases were held over to the next academic year because the files—primarily the Ad Hoc committee reports—were not finalized.

The unusual, unevenness in the flow of cases—a deluge at the end of the year greater even than the normal increase in our caseload—was problematic. It meant that our June meetings were unusually packed and, of course, it led to a summer meeting with a very long agenda of its own. It was difficult to identify the source of the problem. We would urge departments and other decision-makers in the process to try to process cases in a timely manner—especially those (such as tenure cases) that are time-sensitive and may require Ad Hoc committee reviews.

The issue of a regular summer meeting is one that the Senate and administration might consider. CAP recognizes that it is not necessarily a desirable practice. Summer schedules have to be accommodated and CAP members have to be compensated separately for their time. On the other hand, we are informed that, at most if not all of the other UC campuses, CAPs do meet as a matter of course over the summer. In addition to insuring that much less business is left to the next year's agenda, it is a practice that allows us to be more nimble in responding to pressing personnel matters that may come up between June and late September.

Ad Hoc Committees

In 2004-05, the Committee recommended slates to the Executive Vice Chancellor for 47 Ad Hoc committees (somewhat more than the year before but exactly the same number as in 2002-03). CAP constituted itself as the Ad Hoc committee 13 times (including 2 appointments, 6 promotions to professor, 1 promotion to tenure, and 4 Professor, Step VI actions). This practice—constituting ourselves as the Ad Hoc committee in what appear to be straight forward and unproblematic cases—is one we wholeheartedly endorse.¹ In fact, we would have used this practice more often if not for local campus policies that require separate Ad Hoc committees to be appointed in all mid-career and tenure cases.

From our perspective, the advantages of serving as our own Ad Hoc committee in unproblematic cases are significant. Ad Hoc committees are an essential part of the personnel process. However, because of the complexities involved in selecting Ad Hoc committees, and the practical difficulties encountered in arranging meetings and finalizing reports, we are convinced that they should be used only when absolutely necessary. The Ad Hoc committee component of

¹ In those cases where CAP is permitted to constitute itself as the Ad Hoc, the Committee follows a standard procedure in deciding whether to do so: In cases where there is substantial agreement in the department on the recommended action, and where there is agreement between the department and dean as to the basic recommendation, CAP votes. If we are unanimous that a separate Ad Hoc committee is not necessary, we constitute ourselves as the Ad Hoc and discuss the merits of the case at the following meeting.

Committee on Academic Personnel

the personnel process typically consumes the most time and is the one part of the process that is the most difficult (if not impossible) to expedite. In addition, Ad Hoc committee service consumes the valuable time of our colleagues (who, we have reason to believe, are pressed into service more often on our campus than on many others).

During 2004-05, 124 Senate members served as members of Ad Hoc committees. Five persons served 3 times, and 21 people served twice. We are deeply indebted to those persons who were willing to serve on Ad Hoc committees, and especially to those who served more than once. This is an essential part of the personnel process and we could not function without these contributions from our colleagues. That said, we will continue to constitute ourselves as the Ad Hoc committee in all cases where this seems appropriate. We would urge the Senate to consider expanding the category of cases for which this is possible (to include, for example, tenure cases).

Assessment of Teaching

As always, the 2004-05 CAP grappled with the evaluation of teaching performance. We have several suggestions in this regard:

1. In most cases, the return rate of student evaluations has been appropriate. Obviously, in cases where the return rate is low, CAP's ability to evaluate teaching performance is compromised. We hope all faculty, and all Department Chairs, will continue to ensure that the return rates on student evaluations remains high.
2. It is CAP's practice to have at least one member (and usually several) read every single student evaluation in a personnel file. At times—albeit rarely—we have noted a discrepancy between the content of the student evaluations and the Department's characterization of the faculty member's teaching. Ultimately, this is unhelpful both to us and to the faculty member whose case is being reviewed. A better practice is to provide us with a frank assessment of the strengths and weaknesses reflected in the file. In cases where problems have been identified, providing some discussion of the causes of those problems and, especially, some sense of whether and how the faculty member is addressing them is most useful.
3. Departments that provide us with some numerical indexing of teaching performance facilitate our reviews. A simple table that shows the percentage of “very good to excellent” responses on key dimensions of the student evaluations is very helpful. CAP members continue to read the narrative portions of the individual student evaluations, but summaries of the numerical ratings are useful in their own right. Obviously, the clearer the evidence of teaching excellence, the easier it is for CAP to give it appropriate weight in our reviews.
4. If there is any evidence other than student evaluations, (e.g., from presentations at professional meetings, the Department's view of the nature and quality of teaching materials such as syllabi used), such evidence should also be included in the department's letter.

5. CAP regards the distribution of teaching assignments (e.g., graduate versus undergraduate courses) to be a matter of departmental discretion. However, in cases where there is an unusual concentration of course assignments, it is helpful if the department's letter contextualizes this by providing a rationale.

Departmental Letters

CAP has no interest in requesting (and certainly not requiring) a particular form or template for personnel letters. Most departments follow standard practices and we have found their analyses of cases extremely useful and informative. However, we have a few suggestions intended to both simplify the review process and insure that the Committee is able to efficiently process all of the important information that is contained in the files.

1. Very long letters (e.g., 15 pages) are not especially helpful. Although we recognize that departments rightly wish to be thorough, thoroughness should be balanced against excessive length. Letters—especially in routine or straightforward cases—might include a “summary statement” for each of the three areas of research, teaching, and service in a letter of approximately 5 pages. More complex cases, of course, might require somewhat longer narratives.
2. In terms of the contents of the letters themselves, it is helpful to clearly state the period under review. It is generally not necessary to evaluate each publication, especially in cases where there are many of them. Articles might be grouped into particular areas of inquiry or concentration, with evaluations made of the nature of the contributions to each. Some explanation of the nature of the work, in terms that non-specialists can understand, is always appreciated. Biobibs should contain page numbers for publications.
3. In nearly all cases, no more than six outside letters are needed to provide the necessary perspective of how a candidate's work is viewed in the wider community of scholars and/or artists. The additional value of still more letters is relatively slight. As always, it is important to seek a balance between letters suggested by the candidate and those requested by the Department, and to try to avoid excessive overlap with dissertation advisors, post-doc supervisors, collaborators, co-authors and the like.
4. When possible, explaining divided or split votes is helpful. We realize that, given the secret balloting procedures followed in most departments, this is difficult to do. However, in those case where areas of disagreement or alternative points of view have surfaced in the discussion of the case that help to explain the divided vote, it is useful for us to know what they are.

Other File-Related Issues

1. *Criteria for advancement:* CAP continues to read the APM as creating two classes of faculty advancements: (a) those where demonstrated excellence in *all three* areas research, teaching, and service is required, and (b) those in which there is *some* “substitutability” or “fungibility” among the three categories—that is, for example, if

a candidate's service record is weak, excellent research and/or teaching may compensate for that weakness.

Category (a) consists of: 1) Promotion to tenure, 2) Promotion to Professor, 3) Merit Increases from Professor V to Professor VI, 4) All Merit increases above Professor, Step VI, 5) Promotion to Above Scale, 6) All salary increases of "Further Above Scale".

Category (b) includes 1) all non-promotion Merit Increases for Assistant Professors, 2) all non-promotion Merit Increases for Associate Professors, and 3) all Merit Increases for Professor below Step VI. This interpretation is based on our reading of the APM. Department letters should reflect this. [See e.g. <http://www2.ucsc.edu/ahr/policies/CAPPM/400220.htm>, H-4 (c)]

2. *Accelerations/GTNs*: Requests for accelerations and greater-than-normal salary increases have become more frequent on our campus. Nonetheless, in cases in which the Department is requesting an acceleration or a greater-than-normal increase, the Department letter should explicitly justify such an action.
3. *Personal statements*: Department Chairs would do well to advise candidates to write succinct personal statements. Personal statements should clarify issues and provide a context for the faculty member's work. There is little point in such statements recapitulating what will be contained in the department's letter. CAP believes that candidates should be able to do this in between 5-10 pages.

Merit Equity/Career Review Cases

The academic year 2004-05 was the third year of the new Merit Equity/Career Review process. CAP considered one Merit Equity file held over from last year and two new Career Review files this year. The Committee believes that this is an important component in the UC personnel process and we gladly assume the responsibility for making Merit Equity/Career Review recommendations. Yet, the issues posed in these kinds of cases present extremely difficult judgments for us to make, especially because they often involve disputes about factual issues that are long-standing and sometimes contentious. Our expertise is in evaluating the academic merit of the files we review; we are not especially well-positioned to serve as fact-finders (for example, deciding what did, or did not, happen many years ago) and certainly are not empowered to adjudicate disputes. Thus, we typically approach these cases by asking, "Given this faculty member's career accomplishments, what rank, step, and salary seem most appropriate?" We fully acknowledge that this question does not always yield a clear-cut answer.

Memoranda for Action

Each year CAP is called upon to review and/or comment on (and sometimes to vote on approval of) various personnel-related actions and policies proposed or under consideration by the campus administration. In 2004-05, there were 43 of these "Memoranda for Action." They included:

- Endowed Chairs – 5
- Bylaw 55 Augmentation – 6
- Divisional CAP memberships – 7

Committee on Academic Personnel

Proposed FTE Split – 1

Unit 18 Issues – 3

Miscellaneous – 6

Policies, procedures, proposals, senate issues – 15

1. Informal Review of Proposed Career Equity Review Guidelines
2. Formal Review of Revised Campus Procedures for Implementing University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline (CAPM 002.015)
3. Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Policy 340 – Continuing Educators
4. Informal Review of Proposed Career Equity Review Guidelines
5. Proposed Changes to Campus Procedures for College Provosts
6. Formal Review of Proposed Changes to Ad Hoc Review Committee Requirements
7. Proposed Revisions to Work and Family Policies
8. Demonstration of BiobibNet, On-line Faculty Biobibliography System
9. Review of Proposed Medical Separation (APM 080) and Leave Policies (APM 700 and 710)
10. Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics Proposal for Discussion on a More Scientific Approach to the Use of Teaching Evaluations
11. CPB's Request of CP/EVC for Information on Faculty Merit Funds
12. UCAP's Proposed Modifications to APM 220-18
13. Formal Review of Proposed University Policy on Use of Recordings of Course Presentations
14. Excision of a Portion of a Dean's Personnel Letter
15. By-Law 55 Voting Rights in Women's Studies

UCAP and General Personnel Policy Issues

As always, the Santa Cruz Chapter of CAP was represented on UCAP. In 2004-05, UCAP considered a number of personnel policy issues. Two inter-related issues were especially important.

1. *Clarification of APM Language Pertaining to Professor Step VI and Above Scale Merit Increases:* In response to long standing concerns over the wording

of portions of APM 220-18, UCAP undertook a review of the language describing the special merit advances from Professor Step V to Step VI and from Step IX to Above Scale. The Santa Cruz Chapter participated actively in this discussion and our Committee was instrumental in suggesting revisions that were designed to eliminate repetition and confusion. The proposed new language retained the basic high standards for advancement to each of these steps (for Step VI, distinguished scholarship, excellence in teaching and service; for Above Scale, sustained excellence including highest distinction in scholarship and teaching, and highly meritorious service), but simplified the wording by which those standards were expressed. The revised language has been forwarded to the Academic Council for further discussion and systemwide review.

2. *The Systemwide Nature and Effect of Professor Step VI Merit Actions:* In part in response to the “Report of the Professorial Step System Task Force,” that was issued in March, 2004, the Academic Council asked UCAP to initiate a systematic study of advancement to Professor Step VI, the so-called “barrier step.” In conjunction with the Data Management and Analysis section of the Academic Advancement Division of UCOP, UCAP conducted a longitudinal study of a cohort of 778 faculty who were at Professor Step V in the years 1996-97, and who remained at the University for at least six years so that their step in 2002-03 could be determined. There were two especially important findings. Women and underrepresented minorities did not appear to be disadvantaged in advancing from Step V to Step VI over this period. That is, women faculty advanced at approximately the same rate as men, and underrepresented minority faculty advanced at approximately the same rate as Whites (although, especially in the case of underrepresented minorities, the relatively small sample size may have compromised detection of true differences). However, there were significant differences between individual campuses in terms of the proportions of faculty that were advanced to Step VI (ranging from a low of 48% at Santa Cruz to a high of 83% at San Diego). In fact, there appeared to be a bi-modal split among the campuses, with Riverside, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz clustering at the low end of the distribution (averaging 59% of faculty passing to Step VI and beyond over the six year period under study), and the other campuses clustering at the high end of the distribution (averaging 73% faculty being advanced from Step V to VI).

In part in response to the “Report of the Professorial Step System Task Force,” the emerging UCAP data, and because of general concerns among faculty about the Step VI differentials on the Santa Cruz campus compared to other UCs, the Santa Cruz CAP and AHR undertook our own evaluation of the Step VI promotion history on campus. At least in terms of the last ten years for which data were readily available, there was no evidence that the Santa Cruz CAP had applied the Step VI criteria in an overly stringent or inappropriate manner. Indeed, the overwhelming majority of cases advanced to CAP for Step VI review during this period received positive recommendations from the Committee.

In addition, CAP participated in a Step VI workshop sponsored by Acting CP/EVC Peggy Delaney in which the criteria for Step VI were reviewed. The panel included the current and two previous CAP chairs, who discussed the changing history of Step VI and the fact that it was once at the very top of the UC step system, representing a genuine “barrier step” or, as the move from V to VI had been characterized in the past, the “big jump.” Some of the mythology that surrounded the step may persist (and perhaps more persists on the Santa Cruz campus than elsewhere). In any event, department chairs and faculty members were encouraged to review the current criteria and to initiate these actions in all appropriate cases.

Acknowledgment

None of the work of CAP would be even remotely possible without the very hard work of the exceptionally competent staff of the Committee and of Academic Human Resources. We especially thank Pamela Edwards for managing to maintain her sense of humor throughout the year (no mean feat!), and for her unfailingly swift responsiveness to any and all requests for

Committee on Academic Personnel

information. We are also deeply indebted to Barbara Brogan, Michelle Brady, Breck Caloss, Leslie Clark, Nancy Degnan, Therese Doherty, Susan Fellows, Nancy Furber, Pamela Peterson and Linda Petrakis. Their support, wisdom, and detailed knowledge of the intricacies of the personnel process helped to ensure its integrity and certainly made our lives much easier.

Finally, we once again thank all of our colleagues who have contributed to the personnel process. The process works as well as it does only because of your hard work.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Martín Abadi

Joyce Brodsky (F)

Edmund Burke

Kathy Foley

Susan Harding

Piero Madau (W, S)

Armin Mester

Leo Ortiz

Stan Woolsey (F)

Craig Haney, Chair (UCAP Rep)

November 3, 2005