

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL**  
**Annual Report, 2007-08**

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.

The Committee had one representative from Arts, one from Engineering, two from Humanities, three from Physical and Biological Sciences, and two from Social Sciences.

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 2007-08 CAP continued its established practice of meeting on Thursday afternoons. The Committee met 29 times during the academic year (6, 11, and 11 meetings, in fall, winter, and spring quarters, respectively, plus one meeting at the beginning of the summer term).

CAP made recommendations on 282 personnel cases—4 fewer than last year, but 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. As we stated in last year's report, the increased workload needs to be addressed by increasing the compensation for CAP members to levels comparable to that provided on other UC campuses.

In recent years CAP has brought our use of Ad Hoc committees more in line with practice on other UC campuses. Ad Hoc committees were convened for 40 cases, an average number for the past five years. Typically we did not use Ad Hoc committees for Midcareer Reviews, Promotion to Full Professor or for advancement to Professor, Step VI, unless there was substantial disagreement at previous levels of review.

CAP reviewed 75 appointment files for tenure-track positions. Even with the adjustments in the salary scales that were enacted in October 2007, most initial appointments are being made with significant off-scale salary increments to meet competing offers.

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

During 2007-08 the number of cases in which the final administrative decision differed from CAP's recommendation was similar to the number seen last year. The two concurred 86 percent of the time (242 out of 282 completed files). Of the 40 "disagreements" 11 concerned new appointments. In all of these cases the final negotiated salary was higher than the original recommendation. With a few exceptions, CAP did not, in fact, object to the higher salaries. In four merit/promotion cases the salary differences were \$200 or less, and were due to procedural issues. Thus, substantive disagreements occurred in 25 cases (8.8 percent).

In five cases CAP and the administration disagreed about the appropriate step—three in which CAP recommended a higher step, and two in which CAP recommended a lower step.

In 20 cases the disagreement concerned salary. In ten of these cases CAP recommended a larger salary, in the other ten cases, a smaller salary.

## **Consultation**

At the beginning of the 2007-08 CAP met individually with each Dean, usually accompanied by the Academic Personnel Coordinator for each Division. These meetings were informative and useful. We discussed expectations of each other regarding procedure and also discussed issues unique to each division.

CAP met with CP/EVC Kliger 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. With a few exceptions either the Chancellor or CP/EVC Kliger contacted CAP about 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. One concern is that the final decision letter for many cases was not completed until after the end of the academic year. For some of these decisions made in the summer CAP was not consulted.

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.

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

Timely submission of personnel files to CAP continues to be a problem, but was not nearly as bad as in the previous year. At the beginning of the spring quarter CAP had completed approximately 40 more files than in 2006-07. Remarkably the caseload actually declined in the last two weeks of the year. Nevertheless, many cases were submitted at least two months late. Four cases were not completed because they arrived at CAP in the last two or three weeks of the year and required an Ad Hoc committee. It is very difficult to constitute an Ad Hoc committee and obtain a completed reported in such a short time.

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 committee. The only significant delay occurred when such a committee was convened. It should be noted that CAP nominates members of these committees (typically nine 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 Personnel Office has been very efficient in their attempts to form committees and get the report to CAP.

During 2006-2007, 103 Senate members served as members of Ad Hoc committees. One person served on three committees, fifteen people served twice and 87 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: 38 total

Rate Card - 4

Division Committee on Academic Personnel - 4

Endowed Chairs - 7

FTE Transfer - 2

Bylaw 55 - 8

APM Policy Review - 4

CAPM Policy Review - 3

University Professor Nominations - 1

Time of Tenure Clock - 2

UC Senate Bylaw - 1

Miscellaneous - 2

**Salary Issues**

As we reported last year UCSC salaries have been at the bottom of the rankings when compared to salaries of faculty at other UC campuses. In October of 2007 a large upward adjustment was made in the salary scales, resulting in a significant salary increase for most faculty. Faculty whose salaries were on-scale got the largest percentage increase. Because the UCSC campus had the largest proportion of on-scale faculty we expected that salaries on our campus would move closer to equity with the other UC campuses.

The Academic Personnel Office compiled a complete set of data showing faculty salaries at each rank and step as of March 3, 2008, for each of the UC campuses. Analysis of the data shows that the position of our campus has not improved. Our salaries remain the lowest in the UC at virtually every rank and step, even lower than in the preceding year. The data also allowed us to see the rate at which faculty progress up the academic ranks. UCSC faculty were found to be promoted and advanced in step at the same rate as on other UC campuses. The big difference is that other campuses have a larger proportion of faculty with off-scale salaries, and the size of off-scale increments is much larger. As of March 2008, 39 percent of UCSC faculty had off-scale salaries, compared to 65 percent for the median of all campuses. The median off-scale increment at UCSC was \$3,400 while for all campuses the median was \$8,000.

As Chair of CAP, Barry Bowman served on the Salary Task Force. This group, composed of both faculty members and administrators, did an extensive analysis of the salary data and has

made several recommendations. Their report is available from the Santa Cruz Division Academic Senate website (<http://senate.ucsc.edu/>). We will not repeat that information here, but we do note that two recommendations in the report, if implemented, would make a significant change in current policy and practice. First, the report recommends that off-scale increments be significantly larger than the current typical increment of one-half step. Second, the report recommends that off-scale increments be of a similar size for all ranks. In other words, to match what we see happening on other campuses the reward for exceptional performance would not be an additional half step, but instead would be the same fixed dollar amount for Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors.

Given the current economic conditions it will be difficult for UCSC to rapidly increase faculty salaries. However, CAP strongly feels that the quality and performance of our faculty is at least as good as that seen on other UC campuses. Failure to change our status as the most poorly rewarded faculty can only hurt the future development of our campus.

### **Retention**

In the last three years the number of retention cases, although not large, have increased compared to the preceding three years.

2007-08 – 8 files  
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**

In the paragraphs below we reiterate the advice given in our previous annual reports. In the past year we did see improvement in the preparation of files by departments. For example, the number of excessively long letters did decline. However, there is great variation among departments, especially in the degree to which they successfully balance advocacy and objective evaluation.

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. Departments should be specific about which publications 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.

### **Acknowledgements**

We wish to commend the very hard work of the exceptionally competent staff of the Academic Senate and of the Academic Personnel Office. We are deeply indebted to Denice Barnes, Terilynn Bench, Elizabeth Dane, Nancy Degnan, Susan Fellows, Grace Little, Leslie Marple, Lorayn Tiffany, and Linda Tursi. Senior analyst Nancy Furber and AVC Pamela Peterson were always available with detailed information and good advice. We especially thank Pamela Edwards for managing to maintain her sense of humor throughout the year while carrying an exceptionally heavy workload. We also thank Cheri Cernokus and Tamara Blake from the Senate Office for their assistance with agenda preparation.

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

Maureen Callanan  
Shelly Errington  
Carolyn Dean  
Claire Gu  
Norma Klahn  
Thorne Lay  
Paul Roth  
Peter Young  
Barry Bowman, Chair

October 29, 2008