

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
Annual Report 2008-2009

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Duties

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) makes recommendations to 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 also made recommendations on faculty salary issues, and advised the Academic Senate and the administration on policy matters related to academic personnel issues. CAP's role is to provide senate consultation and to make recommendations on faculty personnel cases. CAP is not a deciding authority.

This year CAP had one representative from Arts, one from Engineering, two from Humanities, two from Physical and Biological Sciences, and three from Social Sciences (including the chair).

CAP members were very impressed again with the high quality of our colleagues' scholarly accomplishments, their dedicated and innovative teaching, and their heavy workload in valuable service. The most rewarding aspect of the committee's work is learning about the exciting new work of our colleagues and gaining appreciation for the full scope of their activities.

Workload

In 2008-09 CAP continued its established practice of meeting weekly on Thursday afternoons. The Committee met 31 times during the academic year (9, 11, and 11 meetings, in fall, winter, and spring quarters, respectively).

CAP made recommendations on 272 personnel cases – 6 fewer than last year, but an increase of about 100 in the ten years since 1998-09. Furthermore, almost half of the cases involved requests for accelerations or greater-than-normal salaries. These cases typically require more reading and discussion. As stated in the last two years' Annual Reports, this increased workload is combined with lower levels of compensation than that offered to CAP members on other UC campuses.

In recent years our CAP has reduced our use of Ad Hoc committees, bringing our campus more in line with practices on other UC campuses. This year we reduced the number even further – with a total of 23 Ad Hoc committees formed this year – reduced from 40 in 2007-08. Typically CAP constituted itself as the Ad Hoc committee for Midcareer reviews and for advancement to Step VI, unless there was substantial disagreement at previous levels of review.

CAP reviewed 43 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 encouraged more consistency in starting salary offers across divisions than has been the case in previous years.

CAP reviewed 6 retention /salary increase files, and 2 Career Equity review files.

CAP's Recommendations Compared to Administrative Decisions

During 2008-2009 the number of cases in which the final administrative decision differed from CAP's recommendation was up slightly compared to the numbers in recent years. The two concurred 89% of the time (243 out of 272 completed files), up from 81% last year though still a bit lower than for the other UC campuses (which all report agreement above 90%). Of the 29 disagreements, 7 concerned new appointments. In 4 of these cases the final negotiated salary was higher than the original offer, 2 resulted in lower salaries than CAP had recommended, and one hire was at a higher step than CAP had recommended.

In three merit or promotion cases CAP disagreed with the CP/EVC about the appropriate Step – two in which CAP recommended a lower step, and one in which CAP recommended a higher step.

In 22 merit or promotion cases there were disagreements concerning salary (7 with dean authority, 13 with CP/EVC authority, and 2 with Chancellor's authority). In 3 of the dean authority cases, CAP recommended a higher salary than was awarded, and in 4 cases a lower salary. In 12 of the CP/EVC authority cases, CAP recommended a higher salary than was awarded, and in 1 case CAP recommended a lower salary. In Chancellor authority cases, CAP recommended a higher salary on 1 case and a lower salary on 1 case.

Consultation

At the beginning of the 2008-2009 academic year the CAP chair together with CAP members from the appropriate divisions met with Deans and department chairs of each division. The CAP chair also attended two group meetings with department chairs and department managers arranged by the CP/EVC's office, one in the fall and one in the spring. CAP met with all of the deans and divisional coordinators in the fall to discuss off-scale salary practices (see Faculty Salaries section below).

CAP met with CP/EVC Kliger early in the year and we agreed that all preliminary disagreements would be discussed with CAP Chair Callanan, and with the committee if deemed necessary. The same arrangement was made with the Deans, and with Chancellor Blumenthal, for the cases on which they were the deciding authority. Our communication with the Deans, the Chancellor, and the CP/EVC was excellent throughout the year. A number of meetings with CAP were held and the discussions were very useful in ensuring that the different views on the case were carefully considered before a decision was made. We look forward to following this practice in the coming year.

Throughout the year the CAP Chair consulted with the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, Pamela Peterson and with Professor Sandra Chung, Faculty Assistant to the CP/EVC for academic personnel when questions arose about policy issues.

Case Flow, Ad Hoc Committees

Timely submission of personnel files to CAP continued to improve this year. The caseload was more consistent across winter and spring quarters than in previous years and things were uncharacteristically uncongested toward the end of spring quarter. We commend the Academic

Personnel Office (APO) and the Divisional Personnel Coordinators for their work in reminding departments of the deadlines and encouraging them to meet those deadlines. Still there were some cases submitted quite late. Three cases were carried over to 2009-10 – two of these did not reach CAP by the last meeting of spring quarter, and the third was sent back for additional information.

We have occasionally heard that some faculty believe CAP to be the rate-limiting step in the review process. This is rarely true, although there was one exception in Fall 2008 when CAP held back a number of recommendations until we had reached an agreement on new guidelines for off-scale salary recommendations (see Faculty Salaries section below). We regretted this delay but felt it was necessary to ensure that consistent recommendations were made across all cases being considered during the year. Other than this period in the fall, however, all cases were reviewed within two weeks of receipt, and the recommendation 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 other significant delays 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. In our view, the Academic Personnel Office has been very efficient in their attempts to form committees and get the report to CAP.

During 2008-2009, 60 Senate members served as members of Ad Hoc committees. Six people served twice and 54 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.

Faculty Salaries

The Senate-Administrative Joint Task Force on Faculty Salaries that met in 2007-08 made a number of recommendations regarding low faculty salaries at UCSC compared to the other UC campuses. CAP spent many hours in meetings on this issue during fall 2008. We conferred with the Senate Executive Committee, the CP/EVC, the Deans and their Divisional Coordinators, the Academic Personnel Office staff, and also with UCAP (who had the Joint Task Force report on their agenda throughout the year). The major concern for CAP was the Task Force recommendation that CAP should recommend higher off-scale salaries for greater-than-normal merit increases (although the CAP chair also served on a subcommittee of the Senate Executive Committee to consider the other recommendations of the report). Our typical campus practice for many years has been to recommend an additional half-step of off-scale salary for faculty whose files are evaluated as "greater than normal" because they have exceeded expectations in some areas, and a full step acceleration for those faculty who are evaluated as having exceeded expectations in all areas (research, teaching, and service). Based on our discussions with CAP members from other campuses on UCAP, we believe that our past off-scale practices may not be directly responsible for our salary distribution differences from other campuses. However, with CP/EVC Kliger's support, we took the recommendation very seriously as a way to begin to address the problem through adjustment of CAP salary recommendations.

With the help of the APO staff we used salary data to examine several “what if” scenarios estimating what current salary levels would be if different off-scale amounts had been awarded in the past, and comparing these with the median salaries for each rank on the other campuses. Based on these data we developed a proposal to revise our practices in recommending off-scale salary levels. CP/EVC Klinger, the Deans, and the divisional and APO staff all discussed the proposals and a consensus was reached. We began this revised practice in 2008-09, and carried it out consistently for all cases reviewed that year, with the understanding that the same practice will remain in effect for at least three years.

The change in recommendations for greater-than-normal merit increases and accelerations involves the use of two types of greater-than-normal salary increases. As in the past, when a file demonstrates merit beyond the level of excellence required for a normal merit or promotion, it is classified as either a greater-than-normal (single step advancement plus an off-scale component) or an acceleration-in-step advancement. What changes in the current practice is that two levels of off-scale amounts are used. In particular, while greater-than-normal files that are closer to a normal merit will be considered for an increase of one-half-step of off-scale salary, files that are closer to meriting a full step acceleration will be considered for an off-scale increase equal to \$100 less than the next step. Further, recommendations of accelerations in step, to steps lower than Professor Step 6, can be considered for an additional off-scale component beyond the full step, usually an additional one-half step. While merit increases corresponding to these various levels have been used intermittently in the past, the intent was to systematically consider this suite of possible actions when strong faculty dossiers were discussed, and to make appropriate recommendations. CAP strives for consistency in its recommendations, but every case is considered individually, and some exceptions were made to what was otherwise a suite of standard recommendations.

We expect to continue to monitor the faculty salary data for our own campus as well as the other UC campuses. UCAP plans to request regular monitoring of the median salaries across the UC campuses as well as monitoring UC-wide salaries versus our comparison universities (where UC has been steadily falling as well). And CP/EVC Klinger has requested careful monitoring of our salaries relative to other UC campuses as we evaluate the new off-scale system.

Other Policy Issues

CAP was asked to discuss and comment on a number of other policy issues throughout the year – either by the campus Senate chair or by UCAP. In particular, CAP commented on the UCOP proposed furlough and emergency powers policies in the spring and added our voice to the Senate’s concerns about the procedures by which this policy was implemented. We expect that the furloughs will raise a number of policy issues that will be discussed by CAP and UCAP in the coming year. CAP also discussed the issue of evaluation of teaching across disciplines and will continue discussions in the coming year, including consultation with the chair of the Committee on Teaching.

In spring 2009 CAP was also asked to comment on the report of the campus Academic Personnel Work Group regarding potential changes to the personnel review system. A number of changes in delegation of authority have been made in recent years, with the Deans being delegated more

types of personnel cases. The work group recommended further delegations, and this year's CAP will be meeting with APO staff to discuss the possibility of these further changes to policy.

CAP also discussed a number of issues that came up through our deliberations. We worked very hard to consistently recognize faculty contributions to diversity, and were impressed to find the variety of ways that our colleagues are making such contributions to diversity on the campus and in their disciplines. We will continue to discuss implementation of the diversity criterion of the APM next year, including a discussion with the chair of the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity as part of the CAP fall orientation.

One other area of consideration for CAP throughout 2008-09 was our many discussions regarding how to treat faculty from all divisions and departments uniformly, while also recognizing the vast differences in how they carry out their work. We spent a great deal of time considering, for example, the patterns of productivity for faculty from disciplines focused on articles vs. books vs. exhibitions, and other types of scholarly pursuits. While it is an enormous challenge to balance across the many factors that we consider, the strong intention was always to make equitable recommendations that take inherent disciplinary differences into account.

Retention

The number of retention cases was down slightly this past year, although they have been slightly more common in recent years. The administration has asked CAP to comment on some possible best practices for retention; we expect to engage in further discussion on this topic in the coming year.

2008-09 – 6 files
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 a memo dated May 27, 2009 CAP attempted to clarify some of the confusing issues regarding Bylaw 55 voting rights, especially the categories used to report votes on personnel actions. Please reference this memo (which is available on CAP's website <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cap/>) should you have questions about such issues as when a vote should be counted as waived versus recused, what abstaining means, and a number of related issues.

In the paragraphs below we reiterate some of the advice given in previous CAP annual reports. In the past year we saw evidence of careful work in preparation of files from most departments, and evidence that past CAP advice had been heard. For example, the number of excessively long department letters has declined. We thank the many faculty and staff involved in the personnel process for their hours of work and attention to detail. At the same time, we provide below a reminder of some of the tips that may make the process easier for all involved.

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, some could still be more concise and could include less jargon. The best letters, even for significant accelerations, are typically three to five pages long. Keep in mind that long quotes from external letters are not helpful since we read the external letters as well. CAP members (and other reviewers) need a concise summary of the key focus of the work, and an assessment of the impact of the work.

Some explanation of the nature of the work, in terms that non-specialists can understand, is always appreciated. 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 in all three areas: scholarship, teaching, AND service. Be specific about which publications and activities are new for the current period of review, and which have been considered in previous reviews.

Faculty should not be expected to write lengthy personal statements. Three to five pages will always suffice. These statements are not required, but they can be useful for the department's preparation of the file and for later reviewers. 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. External letter writers really should be external – except perhaps in the case of a mid-career review, external letters from collaborators or former mentors are evaluated in a very different light than “truly” external letters.

Acknowledgements

We wish to commend the very hard work of the exceptionally strong staff of the Academic Senate and of the Academic Personnel Office. We are deeply indebted to 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 about subtle aspects of policy. We are also very grateful to our Senate Analyst Pamela Edwards for keeping our work moving so smoothly, and for taking on her exceedingly heavy workload with grace and good humor. We also thank Senate Administrative Assistant Tamara Blake for her able assistance with agenda and file 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

Carolyn Dean

Margaret Fitzsimmons

Peter Kenez

Thorne Lay

Glenn Millhauser

Paul Roth

Dana Takagi

Manfred Warmuth

Maureen Callanan, Chair

October 16, 2009