

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL**  
**Annual Report, 2006-07**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

**Duties**

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) advises the Chancellor, the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor (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 made recommendations on Merit Equity files, and also advised the Academic Senate and the administration on other policy matters related to academic personnel issues. CAP advises; it does not decide.

In 2006-2007 CAP added a ninth member. The Committee initially had one representative from Arts, and two each from Engineering, Humanities, Physical and Biological Sciences, and Social Sciences. In the spring quarter we had one from Engineering and three from Physical and Biological Sciences.

With few exceptions CAP was impressed with the quality of our colleagues' accomplishments and by the heavy workload that they carry. The faculty continue to produce exciting research and scholarship, dedicated teaching, and energetic service to the campus, their professions, the state of California and the nation.

**Workload**

In 2006-07 CAP continued its established practice of meeting on Thursday afternoons. The Committee met 28 times during the academic year (6, 11, and 11 meetings, in fall, winter, and spring quarters, respectively).

CAP made recommendations on 287 personnel cases - 21 more than last year and an increase of more than 100 in the last 10 years. Furthermore a substantial majority of the cases involved requests for accelerations or greater-than-normal salaries. These cases typically require more reading and discussion. The increased workload needs to be addressed by increasing the compensation for CAP members to levels comparable to that provided on other UC campuses. This issue will be addressed later in the report.

Fewer Ad Hoc Committees were constituted this year – only 32. This brings our use of these committees more in line with practice on other UC campuses. Typically we did not use Ad Hoc Committees for Midcareer reviews or for advancement to Step VI, unless there was substantial disagreement at previous levels of review.

CAP reviewed 63 appointment files for tenure track positions. Increasingly, initial appointments are being made with significant off-scale salary increments to meet competing offers. As of September 2007, 45 candidates accepted, 13 declined, 4 withdrew and 1 case was pending.

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

During 2006-2007 there was a significant reduction in the number of cases in which the final administrative decision differed from CAP's recommendation. The two concurred in 84.1% of the time (238 out of 283 completed files) (CAP reviewed 287 files, 4 were carried over to 07-08). Most differences were very minor or procedural. Substantive disagreements occurred in 17 cases (6%).

Nearly half of the "differences" arose from setting salaries for new appointments. In a few cases the recommended salary was substantially off-scale, and CAP recommended a lower salary because of concerns regarding equity for comparable qualifications. CAP recommended a higher salary in several cases in which the appointments were made on-scale or with small off-scale increments. We note that the 1 October 2007 adjustment in the salary scales raised Assistant Professor Step II and Step III salaries by nearly \$6,000, in line with CAP's recommendations.

There were only seven cases in which CAP and the administration differed in step or rank, and these differences were generally small in terms of salary. In four cases CAP recommended a higher step, in three cases we recommended a lower step. The Chancellor and the CP/EVC consulted with the CAP Chair in all cases of disagreement and offered CAP the opportunity to reiterate its recommendation.

### **Consultation**

Last year's annual report from CAP stated "We regard the relative infrequency of meetings between CAP and the CP/EVC as an area of potential concern." To address this issue CAP met with CP/EVC Klinger in October and we agreed that all potential disagreements with CAP's recommendations would be discussed with CAP Chair Bowman, and with the committee if necessary. Either the Chancellor or CP/EVC Klinger contacted CAP about all potential disagreements within their authority. After further discussion, in some cases they concurred with CAP's recommendation, in other cases we agreed to disagree. Overall, we had excellent communication with the Chancellor and the CP/EVC. Consultation regarding final decisions made by Deans was uneven, an issue that we should address in 2007-2008.

The CAP Chair twice visited the Council of Chairs for the Division of Arts, and was invited to discuss salary and other issues with the Council of Deans. Throughout the year the CAP Chair met weekly with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, Pamela Peterson and Professor Sandra Chung, Faculty Assistant to the CP/EVC for academic personnel. The CAP chair was also a member of the Salaries Task Force convened by the administration.

### **Case Flow, Ad Hoc Committees**

The late submission of personnel files to CAP was a serious problem in 2006-2007. At the beginning of the spring quarter only 42.16% (121 out of 287 files) of the cases had been submitted to us for review. More than 93 cases arrived in the last six weeks of the academic year. The most likely explanation is that most of the Divisions had new Deans and that the large number of recruitment files was given higher priority.

We have occasionally heard that some faculty think CAP is the slow step in the review process. This is rarely true. All cases were reviewed within two weeks of receipt, and the letter from CAP was sent forward one week after the review. The average turnaround is two weeks for

actions not requiring an ad hoc (sign offs are in CAP as little as a week, files where CAP makes their recommendation in a letter are in CAP 2-3 weeks.) The only significant delay occurred when an Ad Hoc Committee was convened. It should be noted that CAP nominates members of these committees (typically 9 nominees), but the appointment of members and supervision of the Ad Hoc Committee review is a function of the administration. To our knowledge the Academic Human Resources office has been very efficient in their attempts to form committees and get the ad hoc report to CAP. In 2006, four cases requiring an Ad Hoc Committee were submitted in the final two weeks of the year. These cases were carried over to the fall of 2007.

During 2006-2007, 92 Senate members served as members of ad hoc committees. Seven people served twice and 85 people served once. The academic personnel process cannot function without our colleagues' continued willingness to serve on ad hoc committees, and CAP thanks each and every Senate member who so served.

#### Memoranda for Action (37)

Unit 18 rate card	4
Bylaw 55	6
Endowed chairs	7
APM policies	4
CAPM policies	1
FTE transfer	1
Time off the clock	2
Div. CAP changes	3
UC policy review	3
UCSC policy review	3
Miscellaneous	3

#### **Salary Issues**

After several years with no significant increase in faculty salaries the administration and the Academic Senate participated in a Task Force to address this issue. Proposals were also discussed at UC Office of the President (UCOP) with Senate participation. The first major issue has been the failure of UC salaries to maintain equity with salaries at other universities. (Comparison 8 institutions: University of Illinois, University of Michigan, University of Virginia, Harvard, Stanford, Yale, MIT, SUNY-Buffalo) At UCSC we have the additional problem that our salaries have been at the bottom of the range when compared to salaries at other UC campuses. The staff assisting the Salaries Task force generated useful data to show our relative ranking. The largest differences have been at the level of Assistant Professor and the first three steps of full Professor.

The second major issue has been the large increase in faculty with "off-scale" salaries. With more than 80% of UC faculty receiving off-scale salaries, we have been moving in the direction of effectively abandoning the use of the salary scale. On our campus more than 60% of advancements in 2006-2007 were for more than one step.

During the last year CAP strongly advocated for an increase in the salaries of newly appointed Assistant Professors. We supported the efforts at UCOP to significantly increase salaries and to raise the salary scales to a complete level. In September 2007 the Regents approved a

significant increase in the salary scale, effectively raising Assistant Professor salaries by the equivalent of nearly two steps. Large increases were made in all steps of the salary scale with larger percentage increases skewed to the lower ranks. A similar increase is proposed for 2008. Over a four-year period (2007-2011) the plan is to raise average salaries by 26%.

In the last two years our campus has had notable increase in the number of retention cases.

2006-07 – 12 files

2005-06 – 10 files

2004-05 – 2 files

2003-04 – 1 file

2002-03 – 1 file

### **Suggestions for Improving Personnel Files**

It is understandable that departments want to advocate for step and salary increases. However, the most effective letters contain a balanced evaluation of the performance during the period under review. For example, if the teaching evaluations contain a significant number of negative comments, or the rate of publication is lower than typically seen in that discipline these issues should be addressed in the letter.

Although most departments do an excellent job with their letters we continue to see some that are excessively long and written in the jargon of a particular discipline. In the majority of cases, none of the members of CAP are experts in the discipline of the professor being reviewed. The best letters, even for significant accelerations, are typically three to five pages long. Beyond that the letters tend to have extended abstracts or critiques of publications. In some cases excessively long letters contain pages of direct quotes from student evaluations or from the letters of external reviewers. CAP needs a concise summary of relative productivity and an assessment of the impact of the work. Lengthy expositions can work to the disadvantage of the faculty member because key summary points are buried in pages of text that are skimmed through quickly.

If a department requests more than a one-step advancement they must specify the areas in which they judge the performance of the professor to be exceptional. Advancement of more than one step should be justified by a level of achievement that is clearly above the norm. Be specific about which publication and activities are new for the current period of review, and which have been considered in previous reviews. Negative votes should always be addressed. Faculty who express negative opinions have the right to have their opinions reported by the department. It is also legitimate to simply state that there was no information to explain the negative vote(s).

Faculty should not be expected to write lengthy personal statements. Three to five pages will always suffice. In fact no such statements are required, but they can be useful for the department's preparation of the file.

For advancements that require letters from external evaluators, five or six letters are sufficient if at least three of these are solicited by the department, not the candidate.

### **Compensation for Service on CAP, Staff Support**

As our campus has grown the workload for members of CAP has increased significantly. However the compensation has not changed in many years. To attract the best faculty to serve on CAP it will be necessary to provide further teaching relief and/or research support. Except

for UC Merced, our campus provides the lowest amount of compensation. Other campuses typically provide one month of summer salary and grant members teaching relief for one course.

CAP Chairs typically get two months salary and relief from two courses. The workload on our campus is not obviously less. Only UCSC and UC Berkeley review all personnel cases - other campuses delegate many actions to Deans. Furthermore the staff support is significantly different, 1-2 FTE on other campuses, 0.45 FTE at UCSC. In very preliminary discussions the administration expressed an interest in discussing these issues, and we will pursue these matters in the 2007-2008 year.

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 information. We are also deeply indebted to Denice Barnes, Terilynn Bench, Cheri Cernokus, Elizabeth Dane, Nancy Degnan, Jonni Dungan, Susan Fellows, Nancy Furber, Leslie Marple, Pamela Peterson and Linda Tursi. Their support, wisdom, and detailed, rigorous knowledge of the personnel process of UCSC 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**

Claude Bernasconi (S)  
Shelly Errington  
Mark Franko  
Claire Gu  
Michael Isaacson (F, W)  
Norma Klahn  
Paul Roth  
Nirvikar Singh  
Peter Young  
Barry Bowman, Chair

August 31, 2007

## Appendix One: Agreements

### Administrative and Cap Agreement 2006-07

CAP agreed with the administration's decision on 238 out of 283 files (84.1%). CAP's recommendation did not agree with the decision on 45 files; 4 chancellor authority, 27 EVC authority and 14 dean authority.

- In 22 cases, CAP recommended a higher salary (same step) than the administration's decision.
- In 2 cases, CAP recommended a higher step than the administration's decision.
- In 1 case, CAP recommended a higher step and salary than the administration's decision.
- In 1 case, CAP recommended a lower step (same salary) as the administration's decision.
- In 16 cases, CAP recommended a salary less than the administration's decision.
- In 2 cases, CAP recommended a salary and step lower than the administration's decision.
- In 1 case it was split – CAP recommended higher step & administration decision for higher salary

2006-07	Agreement on 238 of 283 actions, 84.09% (48 disagreements: 15 dean authority, 33 EVC/chancellor authority)
2005-06	Agreement on 213 of 268 actions, 79.48% (55 disagreements: 11 dean authority, 44 EVC/chancellor authority)
2004-05	Agreement on 209 of 251 actions, 83.27% (42 disagreements: 8 dean authority, 34 EVC/chancellor authority)
2003-04	Agreement on 218 of 258 actions, 84.49% (40 disagreements)
2002-03	Agreement on 247 of 261 actions, 94.64% (14 disagreements)
2001-02	Agreement on 206 of 214 actions, 96.26% (8 disagreements)