Meeting Call for Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division  
**Friday, March 8, 2012 at 2:30 p.m.**  
Stevenson Event Center  
ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Approval of Draft Minutes  
   a. Draft Minutes of October 19, 2012 (AS/SCM/303)

2. Announcements  
   a. Chair Konopelski  
   b. Chancellor Blumenthal  
   b. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Galloway

3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (none)

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports  
   CONSENT CALENDAR:  
   a. Committee on Academic Personnel (AS/SCP/1721) p.1

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees  
   a. Graduate Council  
      i. Report on Aspirational Graduate Growth at UCSC (AS/SCP/1719) p.9  
   b. Committee on Faculty Welfare  
      i. Report: Update on Faculty Salaries (AS/SCP/1722) p.11  
   c. Committee on International Education  
      i. The Parlous State of International Education at UCSC (AS/SCP/1720) p.18

7. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair  
8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President  
9. Petitions of Students (none)  
10. Unfinished Business (none)  
11. University and Faculty Welfare  
12. New Business
February 27, 2013

Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

Dear Colleagues:

I write to inform you of the winter meeting of the Academic Senate on Friday, March 8, 2013, 2:30-5 PM at the Stevenson Event Center. The agenda may be viewed at:


Highlights of the meeting include:

- The 2011-12 Annual Report from the Committee on Academic Personnel
- Graduate Council Report on Aspirational Graduate Growth at UCSC
- Committee on Faculty Welfare Update on Faculty Salaries
- Committee on International Education Report on the State of International Education at UCSC

I urge everyone to become acquainted with the issues as presented in the call.

It has been some time since we have come together as the Senate and much has transpired between mid-October and late February in the life of UCSC: the passage of Proposition 30, UCSC’s nascent involvement with Coursera and Professor of Astronomy Sandra Faber’s National Medal of Science award to name just a few.

Hope to see you on the 8th!

Sincerely,

Joe Konopelski, Chair
Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division
PROPOSED CORRECTIONS TO THE MINUTES
October 19, 2012 Senate Meeting

The draft minutes from the October 19, 2012 Senate meeting was distributed via email on February 26, 2013 and will be presented for approval at the Senate Meeting on March 8, 2013. After being approved, these minutes will be posted on the Senate web site (http://senate.ucsc.edu/senate-meetings/agendas-minutes/index.html).

Senators are asked to submit any proposed corrections or changes to these draft minutes to the Senate Office in advance of the next meeting, via EMAIL or in WRITING. All proposed changes will be compiled in standardized format into a single list for display at the next meeting.

This approach gives Senators an opportunity to read and review changes before being asked to vote on them, gives the Senate staff and the Secretary time to resolve any questions or inconsistencies that may arise, and minimizes time spent on routine matters during meetings. While proposed changes may be checked for consistency, they will not be altered without the proposer's approval. This approach complements, but does not limit in any way, the right of every Senator to propose further changes from the floor of the meeting.

To assist the Senate staff, proposed changes should specify:
1. The location of the proposed change (e.g. item, page, paragraph, sentence…)
2. The exact wording of existing text to be modified or deleted
3. The exact wording of replacement or additional text to be inserted
4. (Optional) The reason for the change if not obvious

Please submit all proposed changes to arrive in the Senate Office no later than 12 p.m., Thursday March 7, 2013. They should be addressed to the Secretary, c/o Academic Senate Office, 125 Kerr Hall or via email to senate@ucsc.edu.

Judith Habicht-Mauche
Secretary, Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

February 26, 2013
Meeting
A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, October 19, 2012 at the Namaste Lounge, College 9/10. With Parliamentarian Donald Potts present, Chair Joe Konopelski called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes
The minutes of May 18, 2012 were approved as written.

2. Announcements

a. Chair Joe Konopelski
Chair Konopelski welcomed Senate members to the first Senate meeting of the 2012-13 academic year and his first meeting as the Senate Chair.

There are 18 new faculty members on campus for this 2012-13 academic year. Sarah Latham was welcomed as the new Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services (BAS). Also welcomed was the new Academic Senate analyst Matt Robinson.

Last year we heard a lot about Rebenching as Senate Chair Susan Gillman and Chancellor George Blumenthal were on the Systemwide Committee on Rebenching. That committee has issued a report that is now being reviewed on all 10 campuses. Rebenching is the term given to the revision of the policies governing the distribution of State funds to the campuses with the goal of providing a more transparent and equitable methodology than was previously utilized. Rebenching is currently in effect and the funds are to be distributed over six years although this first year was not fully funded.

Additional funding is built into the rebenching calculations for the ‘aspirational growth’ of academic Ph.D. students, in recognition of the importance of these students to the health and vitality of a research institution. The target is defined as the ratio of Ph.D. students to undergraduates, and is set at 12%. UCSC is currently below that number. This is a funded mandate from Office of the President (OP). However, it is only partially funded as no UC campus receives adequate State funding to cover the true cost of educating any of their graduate or undergraduate students. This is an historic opportunity and the Senate has wasted no time having already begun consultations last academic year and continuing now to create a plan to produce results. Graduate Council (GC) will be at the center of these efforts with the involvement of the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) and the Committee on Research (COR).

There are two new joint Senate/Administrative Task Forces underway and we expect one or both of them to have a forum to discuss the issues and seek input from the entire UCSC community later this quarter. Both Task Forces arose from the discussions at the Senate-sponsored Forum on the Future of the Curriculum held last Spring as well as various comments made in Senate
committee consultations. One task force is on Pedagogy and the other is on Academic Structures and Strategic Planning at the campus level. Chair Konopelski urged Senate members to stay informed and respond to any calls for comments and input.

The results of the ballot measures from the election being held in a few weeks will have an impact on the UC system and Executive Vice Chancellor Alison Galloway will have more to say about that.

b. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Alison Galloway

Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) Alison Galloway announced that Chancellor Blumenthal was away trying to raise money for the campus.

UCSC is in the top three for “research impact”, a huge achievement for a relatively young campus, and speaks to the quality and adventurousness of our faculty. This is our second year earning this honor. We ranked seventh in survey of campuses under age 50. Bettina Aptheker and Karen Yamashita won the UC Presidential Chair. Alexander Sher won a Pew Scholar from Biomedical Sciences. Ruby Rich got the 2012 Frameline award from the San Francisco International LGBT film festival. Bill Friedland was named a Distinguished Rural Sociologist from the Rural Sociological Association. James Estes received the Heart Merriam Award from the American Society of Mammalogists. The entire Psychology Department was honored by the American Psychological Association for their public service.

We have 18 new faculty, a record compared to our average of six in recent years. This is a shift for us and we expect to see about the same amount coming in next Fall as well.

There are three new graduate programs online with Ph.D. programs in Feminist Studies and in Latin American and Latino Studies as well as an M.A. program in Theater Arts.

Notable losses include the passing away of Aaronette White and Eugene Cota-Robles.

Move-in for new students was smooth with about 5,100 new students and we now house about 8,500 students on campus.

The State of the Campus speech and the Founders Day event were both successful.

This year we will be conducting a search for a new Vice Chancellor for Research.

There is a lot that we don’t know at this point about the budget. With mandatory costs rising, there will be a $16 million short fall this year. We are filing in with one time money this year to avoid permanent cuts, but it is almost guaranteed that we will have a similar short fall next year that will require permanent cuts, even if Proposition 30 passes. We only just received an allocation letter from UCOP receiving a portion of the Rebenching money. $1.9 million from the $15 million set aside for the five most impacted campuses and we are setting it aside to pay for FTE that we released last Spring.
The results of the election on November 6th with Proposition 30 will determine which of two budgets that UCOP is working on will be implemented. These budgets will be presented at the Regents meeting in November. If Prop 30 passes then we will have dodged a bullet though we will still have cuts due to mandatory cost increases including negotiated salaries, merit for faculty, increased contributions to the retirement plan, utility costs, and health care costs. However if Prop 30 does not pass or if it passes at a smaller margin than Prop 38, then we will see two things come into play immediately. One is trigger cuts of $250 million to the system which translates to another $12 million in cuts to this campus plus a buyout of the tuition increases that were scheduled this year. There will be an additional $125 million dollars added to the $250 million equaling a $375 million dollar cut to the system if Prop 30 doesn’t pass. That is equivalent to more than a 20% tuition increase if those funds were to be made up solely on the tuition. Some things might mitigate that including the possibility that the state could step in and not push through all of the trigger cuts or may agree to provide additional funding towards tuition. UCOP may be able to absorb some of the burden, with debt restructuring or changing the STIP TRIP long-term investment payouts.

Students have been extremely active, out at every move-in and event getting students, staff and faculty registered to vote. This campaign also needs to get people out to vote in addition to just registered. The last day to register to vote is Monday October 22nd and voting takes place on November 6th.

We are in the last year of the quiet phase of the comprehensive campaign hoping to move ahead out of the silent phase next October. In the 2011-12 academic year we got $24 million in gifts and pledges, a 10% increase over the previous year, which was a 10% increase over the year before that. Alumni-giving has nearly tripled from $2.5 million up to $7.3 million thanks to great efforts by many faculty and staff. We had more gifts over the $100,000 level and several over $1 million, and a $5 million bequest which is the largest we have ever received. Most of this has come from Alumni. This year is critical with a goal of reaching $150 million by next October from our current level of $102 million.

Replying to a question from the floor to elaborate on the $16 million short fall, EVC Galloway replied that we put out a request last year for an $8 million cut to the various units distributed as we had previously to safeguard a portion of the academic divisions. We reduced the cuts to the academic divisions and increased the cuts to the other areas. This year we will need to work through more complicated discussions about permanent cuts because there is nothing left that we could cut easily and quickly. The Administration will be working with units to see if the cuts proposed last year are the cuts they will make. Negotiations may be necessary.

In response to an inquiry as to what the total amount of cuts to a typical division would be, Galloway replied that it would typically be anywhere from $400,000 to $800,000 per division. This often comes out of retired faculty lines, however we can’t sustain losing faculty without replacement at this rate.

Chair Konopelski added that TAs have been cut hard as well but this goes against the idea of increasing our Ph.D. numbers.
EVC Galloway announced that there would be a budget forum with the students on October 23rd and that soon after the election there would be a webcast/streaming question and answer session with the EVC, Senate Chair, the Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget, and a representative from the Staff Advisory Board.

There was a question from the floor if the campus allocation formula for TAs to the division has been cut or if these are divisional decisions to cut TAs. Chair Konopelski replied that these are decanal decisions and there is variability of TA losses among the academic divisions.

A question was asked about the $1.9 million of Rebenching monies that came to the campus. If it was targeted to cover recruitments that are already approved, what is left to fund aspirational graduate growth? EVC Galloway replied that there are both permanent funds and one time money and it is the one time money that will be used to fund the aspirational graduate growth. Since we need faculty to educate the students we must consider both parts.

It was asked how many undergraduates we have and how many non-hollowed FTE faculty we have to which Chair Konopelski replied that there are about 550 filled faculty, 124 hollowed FTE and 16,000 students.

Asked to elaborate on the process for reviewing the Office of Research considering that the Vice Chancellor for Research would be returning to the faculty, EVC Galloway replied that the self-study is currently being written and is expected soon. Office of Research is conducting a survey that may be utilized as well as an external review committee. They are going through a typical review for administrative units that mimics departmental reviews.

Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications Chair Roberto Manduchi reminded everyone that there is a proposed Open Access Policy currently being reviewed by the Senate. It is an important policy that will align the UCs with other universities worldwide. UCSF has already unanimously approved an Open Access Policy. The policy encourages control of one’s own copyright and maximum dissemination of works. The hope is that it gives a clear sign to publishers that the “fee for access” model is not economically sustainable anymore. Chair Manduchi is meeting with the Senate Executive Committee next week to discuss the policy, and encourages everyone to educate themselves on the topic. For more information, go to: osc.universityofcalifornia.edu

3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (none)

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

CONSENT CALENDAR:
- Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (AS/SCP/1702)
- Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (AS/SCP/1703)
- Committee on Computing and Telecommunications (AS/SCP/1704)
- Committee on Educational Policy (AS/SCP/1705)
- Committee on Emeriti Relations (AS/SCP/1706)
- Committee on Faculty Welfare (AS/SCP/1707)
g. Committee on International Education (AS/SCP/1708)

h. Committee on the Library and Scholarly Communications (AS/SCP/1709)

i. Committee on Planning and Budget (AS/SCP/1710)

j. Committee on Preparatory Education (AS/SCP/1711)

k. Committee on Privilege and Tenure (AS/SCP/1712)

l. Committee on Research (AS/SCP/1713)

m. Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections (AS/SCP/1715)

n. Committee on Teaching (AS/SCP/1714)

o. Graduate Council (AS/SCP/1716) NA

Chair Konopelski asked if there was any discussion on any of the reports. Hearing no requests the consent calendar was adopted by voice vote.

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees
   a. Committee on Educational Policy

   i. Amendment to Regulation 9.1 – Grades, Evaluations and Transmission of Records (AS/SCP/1717)
      Without discussion, the amendment passed by voice vote.

   b. Committee on Research

   i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.27 (AS/SCP/1718)
      Without discussion, the bylaw amendment was passed by voice vote.

7. Report of the Student Union Assembly (none)

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President (none)

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business (none)

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00p.m.

ATTEST:
Judith Habicht-Mauche
Secretary

December 17, 2012
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
Annual Report, 2011-12

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Summary
The 2011-12 Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP):
a) Consulted on academic personnel reviews;
b) Discussed faculty salaries with the EVC in the context of budget cuts to the campus;
c) Formulated a CAP Working Group tasked to recommend best practices in personnel reviews for scholars in text-based disciplines or interdisciplinary fields;
d) Formally requested that beginning in 2012-13, a copy of the annotated bio-bibliography from the candidate’s last personnel action be included in review materials;
e) Commented on several campus and system-wide policy and protocol reviews.

Duties
CAP is charged with providing senate consultation on faculty personnel cases. CAP makes recommendations to the deciding authorities, either Chancellor, 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. CAP is not a deciding authority but issues recommendations to the Deans, the EVC and the Chancellor.

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 found their service on CAP to be extremely rewarding, despite the heavy workload. Reading and discussing faculty files provide a fascinating glimpse at the outstanding work of our colleagues across the campus. We have been thoroughly impressed by our colleagues’ ground-breaking research, dedicated and innovative teaching, selfless service to the campus and their professional communities, and inspiring contributions to campus diversity goals.

Workload
In 2011-12 CAP continued its established practice of meeting weekly on Thursday afternoons. The Committee had one orientation meeting in the fall, and met to review files 27 times during the academic year (4, 11, and 11 meetings, in fall, winter, and spring quarters, respectively, as well as one meeting during the summer of 2012).

CAP made recommendations this year on 248 personnel cases, 5 fewer than last year. Roughly sixty-one percent of the cases involved requests for accelerations and/or greater-than-normal salaries, which typically require more discussion than a normal merit review. As stated in the prior years’ Annual Reports, there are workload and compensation issues when we compare our local situation to other UC Campuses. Compensation issues include course relief and research funds and we hope the Senate will consider addressing such issues in the future.

In recent years, our CAP has reduced the use of Ad Hoc committees, bringing our campus more in line with practices on other UC campuses. This year, 4 cases required Ad Hoc committees.
Of the four Ad Hoc committees that were formed, two met to review tenure cases, and two to review promotion cases. Typically CAP does not request an Ad Hoc committee for midcareer reviews, advancement to Step VI, appointments, or promotion to Professor, unless there is substantial disagreement at previous levels of review. However, when there is disagreement between department and dean or there are one or more “no” votes in a department, CAP is likely request the additional perspective of an Ad Hoc committee.

The number of appointment cases increased significantly since last year. In 2008-09 there were 51 (33 of which were ladder rank) appointments. In 2010-2011 the number dropped precipitously to 18, only 6 of which were for ladder-rank positions. This year CAP reviewed 40 appointment files, 17 of the 40 appointments were ladder-rank. The number of retention cases decreased from last year, with 20 being reviewed in 2010-11 and 5 reviewed this year. Three of the retention files were for faculty members whose files were seen twice, having had a regular merit or promotion case in the same year. CAP also reviewed two reconsideration requests.

**CAP’s Recommendations Compared to Administrative Decisions**

During 2011-2012 the number of cases for which the final administrative decision agreed with CAP's recommendation declined this year. The two concurred roughly 85% of the time (209 out of 245 completed files), down from 87% last year. Disagreements are of two major types: about rank/step and/or about salary. The overwhelming majority of cases involving a disagreement between CAP recommendations and administrative decisions are salary increments, typically in the range of ½ step.

Of the 36 disagreements, CAP disagreed with the final administrative decision about the appropriate step in 10 cases. Of these 10 cases, the CP/EVC, Chancellor, or Dean offered a higher step in 7 instances and a lower step in 3 instances.

The remaining 26 merit, promotion, retention, and appointment cases involved disagreements concerning salary (11 with Dean’s authority, 13 with CP/EVC’s authority, and 2 with Chancellor’s authority). In the Dean authority cases, CAP recommended a slightly lower salary in 6 cases and a higher salary in the remaining 5 cases. Of the 11 decanal authority cases, salary disagreements occurred with the Arts Dean in 2 cases, with the Physical and Biological Sciences Dean in 2 cases, with the Social Sciences Dean in 1 case, with the Humanities Dean in 1 case, and with the School of Engineering Dean in 6 cases. Of the 13 CP/EVC authority cases, CAP recommended a higher salary than was awarded in 7 cases and a lower salary in the remaining 6 cases. Finally, of the 2 Chancellor authority cases, CAP recommended a higher salary than was awarded in 1 case and a lower salary than was awarded in 1 case.

**Case Flow, Ad Hoc Committees**

Our campus continued to make progress this year in timely submission of personnel files to CAP. CAP’s workflow was typical of prior years. CAP members thank the Academic Personnel Office (APO) and the Divisional Personnel Coordinators for their effective reminders to departments about the deadlines and the encouragement and support they offered to help departments meet those deadlines. We are also very grateful to the departmental staff, who worked hard to put together personnel files. There were only 3 cases from the 2011-12 call that did not reach CAP by the end of spring quarter, and were carried over to 2012-13. This is down from the eleven cases from the 2009-10 call that were carried over to 2011-12.
Despite some myths on the campus, delays in the review of files are rarely due to CAP. With expert assistance from APO and the divisional coordinators, CAP’s process involves a two-week turnaround from receipt of a file to submission of a recommendation letter to the staff handling the next step of review. Typically CAP takes one week to read, discuss, and vote on a file, and another week to allow CAP members to review a draft letter. The only exceptions are when an unusually large number of files come in at one time, in which case some files are delayed, usually no more than one week, or when a file requires further information or analysis. Pressing retention files are usually reviewed within a few days of receipt, and letters are sent immediately. Files that require an Ad Hoc committee are seen by CAP twice; first, these files are held by CAP for about a week to review the file and recommend names for an Ad Hoc committee. Then, when the Ad Hoc committee’s letter is completed, the file is considered again using the normal two-week turnaround described above. 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 the responsibility of the administration. In our view, the Academic Personnel Office has been very efficient in forming committees quickly and ensuring that the letters are finished and returned to CAP in a timely manner.

CAP members are indebted to the faculty members who served on Ad Hoc committees this year. During 2011-2012, 18 Senate members served as members of Ad Hoc committees. The academic personnel process cannot function without our colleagues’ continued willingness to serve on Ad Hoc committees. Because the files that require Ad Hocs are also those that require external letters, these committees are formed at a very busy time of the year. CAP thanks each and every Senate member who so served and encourages other colleagues to consider agreeing to serve in the future.

**CAP Working Group – Post Tenure Best Practices**

In 2011-12, a working group was tasked to recommend best practices in personnel reviews for scholars in text-based disciplines or interdisciplinary fields.1 The result of the Working Group was a list of recommendations shaped by a fundamental principle of peer review in the personnel process: a balanced and flexible approach in which department-based peer review evaluates a candidate’s scholarly contributions (including a candidate’s eligibility for merit advancement) without exclusive reliance on or simply echoing evaluations by external reviewers.

The following guidelines were designed by the Working Group to help CAP and other levels of review evaluate both incremental and major accomplishments in research.

1) In all disciplines, *productivity* is key for scholarly advancement. Productivity is evaluated on the basis of steady, engaged and cumulative contributions to an active and well-defined body of scholarship. We view an active and well-defined body of scholarship as addressing a significant researchable problem and having an identifiable pipeline of planned and expected research activities and scholarly communications. Faculty are expected to have a clear statement of how the research contributes to a scholarly (or creative) field(s). We recommend that faculty in text-

---

1 The Working Group included co-chairs Dana Takagi and Gail Hershatter, Donald Brenneis, Sharon Kinoshita, Maureen Callanan, and Pat Zavella.
based disciplines have a clear, brief discussion in their personal statement spelling out short-term and long-term accomplishments for scholarly and creative activity, including defining the final and incremental forms of their scholarship (e.g. research period of xx years, participation in conferences and workshops, plans for articles in various venues to pilot ideas, data, theoretical orientations. In general, we do not view a plan without any evidence of research activity as sufficient for merit advancement. A book is not required for a good body of scholarship, but explaining the likely final form of the project—a book, a series of major essays, etc.—will help make the plan comprehensible to on-campus and outside reviewers).

2) **Peer review** is the basis for evaluating the quality (and quantity) of productivity in scholarship. In text-based disciplines and interdisciplinary fields, peer review takes many forms, including publishing in peer-reviewed outlets (encompassing but not limited to disciplinary and inter-disciplinary journals, books published by university or commercial presses, conference proceedings/poster sessions, and peer-reviewed digital media). For the text-based disciplines in particular, evaluation and peer review standards in evaluating digital scholarship should be explicit considerations in personnel reviews. It is crucial for scholars and departments to identify, contextualize and evaluate the level and forms of peer review being used to measure and assess scholarly productivity.

3) **Scholarly advancement** in research is indexed by scholarly achievements and expected benchmark accomplishments (as defined by the department, peer review expectations, and the candidate’s research agenda) of an active and well-defined research trajectory. The shape and quantity of research accomplishments and overall productivity are likely to vary depending on the timing, stage, and placement along the arc of a faculty member’s body of scholarship. Productivity in the early, inaugural stages of a research agenda is likely to be different from that in the finishing stages of a project. We emphasize that **normal expectations** will vary from discipline to discipline, in interdisciplinary fields, and within sub-fields of disciplines. It is vital that the department be or become knowledgeable about and clear in explaining normal expectations for faculty members’ research fields.

4) **Merit and Promotion.** A) **Merit advancement (including the current GT1, GT2, and Accelerations)** should be keyed to normal (and “greater-than-normal”) expectations of progress and completing incremental steps of a scholar’s active and well-defined research agenda. B) **Promotions should be geared toward major or final accomplishments of the research agenda.** In the text-based disciplines and interdisciplinary fields, major or final accomplishments of a research agenda should be roughly equivalent to the heft and scholarly significance of a peer-reviewed book. For some scholars, **producing and publishing a book** may be the sole or principal arc of work that anchors both the incremental stages and the final product of a research agenda. For others, **a book project will be one, but perhaps not the principal, focus** among different trajectories of a research agenda. And for others, a **significant set of articles and essays (but not a sole-authored book), the sum of which is commensurate with the quality and coherence of sustained intellectual engagement that characterizes a peer-reviewed book, define the culmination of a research agenda.**
Request for Additional Information for Senate Personnel Reviews (Biobib)

Faculty are required to submit an updated cumulative bio-bibliography as part of the personnel review materials. In May 2012, CAP wrote to department chairs stating that effective with reviews taking place in 2012-13, CAP requests that an annotated bio-bibliography from the last personnel review that resulted in advancement (excluding retention-only actions) also be included as part of the review materials. For example, if a faculty member is on the call for merit or promotion in 2012-13, CAP will expect a copy of the annotated bio-bibliography from the candidate’s previous personnel action, as well as the current bio-bibliography.

As it is not always clear what work is new and what work has already been reviewed, this additional information will assist CAP and other levels of review, in assessing the record of accomplishments during the review period.

Shadow CAP

In the spring of 2012, procedures were drawn up for the formulation of a shadow Committee on Academic Personnel. The members and chair of this group, selected and assigned by the Committee on Committees (COC), are former members of CAP charged with reviewing the files of current serving CAP members who are on call for review. Shadow CAP members agree to serve for two consecutive years, with at least one meeting per year. The first Shadow CAP meeting was held in May, 2012.

Other Policy Issues

CAP was asked to discuss and comment on a number of policy issues throughout the year – either by the campus Senate chair, by the CP/EVC, or by the Office of the President. This year, CAP commented on the system-wide review of proposed new policy APM-668 – Negotiated Salary Program (November 2011), the campus formal review of proposed revisions to CAPM 512.280 – Adjunct Professor (March 2012), the campus formal review of proposed revisions to CAPM 408.220 – Mid-Career Appraisal (March 2012), the Silicon Valley Initiative (April 2012), the Faculty Climate Survey (May 2012), the Proposal to Increase the Number of Class Time Slots (May 2012), System-wide Draft Open Access Policy (May 2012), the Faculty Climate Survey (May 2012), and the system-wide review of proposed revisions to APM 010,015, and 016 (June, 2012).

Retention

The loss of excellent faculty is a concern on our campus as well as across the UC system. CP/EVC Galloway follows a set of expectations (first announced by her predecessor EVC Kliger) regarding retention. CAP’s goal in making recommendations on these cases is always to retain outstanding faculty, while also considering issues of equity with other faculty. The long-term goal is to improve salaries on our campus and across the UC system. The systemwide Academic Senate continues to seek remedies for the gap between UC faculty salaries and those of the “comparison 8 universities.”

Number of retention files considered by CAP:
2011-12 – 5 files
2010-11 – 20 files
2009-10 – 19 files
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 should there be 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 heeded. 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.

1. 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 major 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. Interpretation (rather than repetition) of the external letters can sometimes be helpful. 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.

2. If a department requests more than one step advancement they must specify the area or areas (research, teaching, and service) 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. It is up to the faculty member to annotate the biobibliography appropriately so that new work is clearly marked. Please note that APO has
offered to help faculty to set up their biobibliography on Biobib.Net, including the initial data entry.

3. Faculty are not 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, and not on the candidate’s list. In the case of midcareer reviews, we are hoping to carefully evaluate campus use of midcareer external letters in the 2012-13 year. External letter writers really should be external; this is in the best interest of the candidate as well as in the best interest of fairness. Except perhaps in the case of a midcareer review, external letters from collaborators or former mentors are evaluated in a very different light than “truly” external letters.

4. For additional tips and suggestions, please refer to one or both of the following documents:
   a) Top 10 CAP Tips for Preparing Faculty Files
   b) Top 10 Tips for Faculty Preparing Personnel Files
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February 22, 2013
GRADUATE COUNCIL
Report on Aspirational Graduate Growth at UCSC

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Despite its history of receiving one of the lowest shares of per-student funding of any of the University's ten campuses, UCSC has managed to evolve into a dynamic and well-respected institution that provides significant service to the region, state, and nation. The recent initiative to redress the State’s historical practice of providing less funding per student relative to our sister campuses (‘rebenching’) places this campus in a strengthened position to further its stature in the area of research and research-driven education. The increased funding has been tied formally, via conditions imposed by UCOP, to the goal of increasing the ratio of academic doctoral students to undergraduates to 12%, a significant increase relative to our current ratio of approximately 7%. The rebenching resources represent, in some sense, partial forward-funding, towards the “aspirational” goal of 12%, of resources associated with the higher cost of educating more Ph.D. students, leading to the use of the term “aspirational graduate growth” to refer to the increased focus on academic doctoral education in response to the rebenching incentive.

Our campus has as of yet received only a fraction of this anticipated relative funding increase. With the recent passage of Proposition 30 and the associated stabilization of UC funding, our campus might expect the remaining implementation to materialize roughly as proposed. It is of interest to the Senate to understand how rebenching resources that have already arrived on campus have been allocated, and to engage the discussion of how further rebenching resources will be allocated.

An analysis performed by the Division of Graduate Studies has explored the implications of reaching towards the 12% goal under a straw scenario that would grow Ph.D. enrollments in a way that would largely preserve the existing disciplinary and programmatic shape of the campus. While no constituency has espoused this as an optimal approach in the deployment of rebenching resources toward the goal of increasing Ph.D. enrollments and overall campus stature, the exercise provides an important benchmark in our development of an understanding of what will be required of the campus and its faculty, staff, and administrators in order to reach toward the 12% goal. Other possible principles for guiding the allocation of rebenching resources, demonstrably associated with but not explicitly indexed to achieving the 12% goal, have been mentioned. For example, the campus could use the resources to strive towards Association of American Universities (AAU) status; it might also focus a significant fraction of them in a coordinated effort to develop a new component of the campus’ instructional and research activity that would offer the prospect of significantly transforming the campus’ profile. Although such an initiative might be launched in any academic disciplinary area, an example of such an initiative is provided by the development of the Baskin School of Engineering over the past decade.

The Graduate Council report will begin with a presentation by VPDGS Miller on how existing rebenching resources have been deployed to date, and on specifics of the DGS analysis and planning mentioned above. The presentation will be followed by a discussion moderated by Graduate Council Chair Schumm.
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February 21, 2013
To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

In 2007 the Academic Senate began comparing the salaries of UCSC faculty with the salaries of faculty on other UC campuses. An analysis from 2008 showed that average faculty salaries at UCSC were $2,000 - $3,000 lower than those of any other campus, and far below the average for all campuses.

In 2008 the EVC and the Committee on Academic Personnel instituted a new policy designed to make UCSC salaries more competitive. In this report we will show that progress has been made, in that faculty salaries are now equivalent to those at UC Riverside and UC Davis. However, the average UCSC salaries are still significantly behind those of UC Santa Barbara, UC Irvine and UC San Diego, and far behind UC Berkeley and UC Los Angeles.

Last year, CFW did a detailed analysis of the “promotion growth” of faculty salaries in each department on our campus. That analysis showed great variability among departments in the rate at which faculty were advanced and in the rate of salary growth. These data are available at [http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cfw-committee-on-faculty-welfare/faculty-salaries/index.html](http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cfw-committee-on-faculty-welfare/faculty-salaries/index.html). (Click on “Faculty Salary Metrics Slides.”)

This year CFW has focused on comparing UCSC salaries with those of seven other UC campuses. The most recent data available provided salaries as of October 2012. The dataset we used included 4992 faculty on the “regular” salary scale, i.e. it excluded Professional Schools, Business and Engineering, and Economics. We also excluded data from UC Merced and UC San Francisco.

Faculty salaries are determined by three factors:
- A. The salary, rank and step at time of initial appointment.
- B. The rate of advancement in rank and step.
- C. The amount of “off-scale” salary awarded at each merit review.

**We look first at the rate of advancement**

Table 1 shows the number of years post-PhD versus rank and step. For example, typical Assistant Professors at Step 3 have had their PhD for five years, the average Professor at Step 9 is 33 years post-PhD. (Note that this is slightly different from saying it takes 33 years to get to Step 9. The cohort of faculty at Step 9 will include people who have been there for multiple years.) Fig. 1 presents the same data in graphical form. In general, the rate of advancement is remarkably similar on all campuses. For ten of the 14 steps UCSC is like the other campuses, perhaps a year faster (P3, P4) or a year slower (P6, P7). However, our campus has a significant number of faculty who have longer years of service at Associate Professor 1, Professor 1, 2, and 5.
Because of this slowly advancing cohort, the average UCSC faculty member is 0.8 years behind the UC average. This is approximately 30% of a step and translates into an average salary difference of $1,500 - $2,000.
In Fig. 2 the average rate of advancement for all UC campuses is compared to the “standard” rate, i.e. the rate predicted if the faculty member advances every two years until reaching Professor Step 1 and every three years afterwards. The data show that accelerated advancement typically does not occur until after reaching Professor Step 1. Faculty at Professor Step 9 have been accelerated an average of 6 years (two steps).

**A comment on “median” versus “average” salaries**

In the last several years, the Academic Personnel Office (APO) has issued reports on the competitiveness of UCSC faculty salaries. Most recently, APO reported that “UCSC’s median off-scale amount exceeds the 7-campus median for all ranks except Assistant Professor” (APO Annual Report of Faculty Salary Competitiveness – March 2012, p. 3). In the past there has been disagreement as to whether “median” salaries are an appropriate comparison. The distribution of salaries at any rank does not fall on a bell-shaped curve. Indeed, most of the variation in salaries is in the size of the off-scale increment received by those individuals who are above the median. This is illustrated by a set of real salaries for Professor Step 3 at UCD and UCSC. (This particular data is three years old.) As shown below it is possible for the median at UCSC to be higher, while the average salary is actually much lower. By using average salaries we get a more accurate estimate of how salaries compare between campuses.
Analysis of the “effective” salary scale
Although all UC campuses in principle use the same salary scale, only 19% of faculty had an “on scale” salary. For UCSC 17% of faculty were “on scale.” The lack of state funds for salary increases has led to an increasing use of “greater than normal” salary increases, with
considerable variation in the size of the increase on different campuses. The result is that each campus has developed its own operational salary scale. Table 2 shows the average salary, at each rank and step, for each campus. The calculation was done as in the following example for four hypothetical faculty:

Professor #1. $90,000 on scale  
Professor #2. $90,000 on scale  
Professor #3. $93,000 ($3,000 off-scale)  
Professor #4. $95,000 ($5,000 off-scale)  

Average Salary $92,000 ($2,000 off-scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table - 2</th>
<th>Average salaries (Oct 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As 3</td>
<td>$69,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As 4</td>
<td>$75,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As 5</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac 1</td>
<td>$76,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac 2</td>
<td>$80,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac 3</td>
<td>$80,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac 4</td>
<td>$85,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof 1</td>
<td>$89,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof 2</td>
<td>$93,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof 3</td>
<td>$101,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof 4</td>
<td>$105,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof 5</td>
<td>$114,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof 6</td>
<td>$124,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof 7</td>
<td>$132,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof 8</td>
<td>$140,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof 9</td>
<td>$152,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof 10</td>
<td>$180,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg all steps</td>
<td>$104,541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the salaries at individual steps across campuses we see that the data are a bit noisy, i.e., for Assistant Professor Step 3 the average salary is higher at UCD than at UCSC, but at Step 4, the UCD salary is lower that at UCSC. If we take the average salary at all steps we see that the eight campuses sort into four tiers:

Tier 1. UCLA Average salary is $124,000  
Tier 2. UCB “ “ $119,000  
Tier 3. USB, UCI, and UCSD “ “ $107,400 +/- $600  
Tier 4. UCSC, UCD and UCR “ “ $104,200 +/- $400
It is important to point out that in Santa Cruz the cost of living, especially housing, is more similar to that of Santa Barbara or San Diego than it is to Davis or Riverside. In addition we have the most expensive average health care costs because a high proportion of our faculty have stayed with Health Net HMO (PAMF).

Another useful way to look at the data (Fig. 3), is to compare the amount by which the average salary is off-scale (calculated as in the example above). The data show that for the other seven campuses the off-scale amount increases modestly as faculty rise in rank and step. The average Assistant Professor has a salary roughly $12,000 off-scale, while Professor Step 7 may be $14,000 off-scale. At UCSC the average off-scale amount decreases modestly at higher rank and step. The average Assistant Professor has a salary roughly $8,000 off-scale, while Professors at Steps 7, 8, and 9 are $6,500 off-scale. UCSC faculty receive lower salaries at all ranks and steps but the discrepancy is larger for longer-serving faculty. In part this is likely due to the fact that Assistant Professor salaries tend to be set at near-market rates. The bargaining power of older faculty is limited unless they receive an offer from another university.

One other interesting fact emerged from the analysis. Unlike previous years, this dataset included our most senior distinguished faculty, those “Above Scale.” The data showed that UCSC salaries at this rank were comparable to those at most other campuses, including UCB. UCLA, as usual, was the outlier, with an average Above Scale salary $18,000 above other campuses.
Conclusions

1. The salary gap has shrunk by $2,000 - $3,000 in last five years. Thus the salary boost program is having a positive effect.
2. Rate of advancement at UCSC is approximately 0.8 years slower than at other campuses (equivalent to $1,500 - $2,000).
3. Because of lower off-scale amounts, UCSC salaries are $3,200 below UCSD, UCSB and UCI and $5,900 below the average of all seven campuses (UCSD, UCSB, UCI, UCR, UCD, UCB, and UCLA).
4. Off-scale limits are rarely exceeded at UCSC, while other campuses are more flexible. Example – No Step 9 Professor at UCSC is above this limit. On other campuses 25% of Step 9 professors are above limit.
5. Differences grow larger at higher ranks and steps. (Except – Above Scale salaries are similar to all but UCLA.)
6. Providing salary data to faculty may help to address inequities within and between departments.

Recommendations

Continue the salary boost program and apply it to all ranks and steps. A reasonable goal is to increase UCSC salaries to at least the level paid at UCSB, UCI and UCSD.

Recognize that off-scale salary limits are frequently exceeded at other campuses, and grant exceptions when needed to maintain competitive salaries.

Department Chairs should make the data in this report available to their faculty, so that faculty have comparative data which can be used in formulating recommendations for merit increases.

The Committee on Academic Personnel should consider investigating why advancement through the ranks slows down near the Barrier Steps.

The committee plans to briefly summarize its findings at the March 8 Senate meeting and open the floor to Q&A.
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Executive Summary

While the numbers of international students seeking an education in the United States are rising to record highs, international enrollment at UCSC has fallen to an embarrassing low. We rank last among the UC campuses, with international students comprising less than 0.3% of our undergraduate population. This tiny proportion of international students deprives our campus not only of valuable exposure to diversity, but also of much needed funds from nonresident supplemental tuition. Our campus loses millions of dollars each year by not reaching the nonresident enrollment targets established by UC Office of the President.¹

Chart 1: UC Percentages of Undergraduate International Enrollments 2002 to 2011²

This financial loss compounds the budget crisis already threatening so many areas of campus, particularly our ability to send our own students abroad to study. Our students’ desire to study abroad has increased sharply, and cuts in staffing and support for our International Education Office (IEO) have led to unreasonable workloads for staff and low levels of support for these students. Faculty-led programs abroad and financial aid for students participating in independent study abroad experiences have also been cut.

Serious action, upfront investment, and change in admissions practices are necessary. The Office of Admissions’ “Non-Resident Recruitment Plan 2012” touts the hiring of a new International Recruiter³, but in December 2012 that recruiter, frustrated with the approach UCSC
was taking to international recruitment, resigned her position. This international recruiter was a “canary in the coal mine.” When the canary dies, one does not simply hire another canary and keep working. One must investigate the toxic gas that caused the loss of the canary. Simply refilling this international recruiter position will not address the serious shortfalls in international enrollments at UCSC. A larger structural change is necessary.

UCSC’s current low international enrollment is primarily an admissions problem. In the absence of firm targets for international enrollment and adjustments to the applicant review process, our campus has let the yield rate for international applicants fall to startling lows. Since 2009, UCSC has received the second lowest number of international applications of all the UC campuses. In those five admissions cycles, we received a total of 5,968 applications; UCR received 6,221 and the next lowest, UCSB, received 15,646. Despite the low number of applications, UCSC also has the third lowest average admission rate for international students since 2009, and the only two campuses with lower rates of admission are UCB and UCLA, who receive so many more applicants that their low admissions rates still garner those campuses over 500 more international students per year than at UCSC. The UCSC Office of Admissions believes that an increase in the number of international applicants for fall 2013 (2,480 applicants up from 1,485 for fall 2012) is indicative of success in this area, but much more must be done.

The burden of the problem is distributed throughout our campus. CIE looks forward to the forthcoming recommendations of the International Recruitment and Graduation Committee, formed by VPDUE Richard Hughey in March of 2012. In exploring different components of the international education system at UCSC, CIE recommends a series of possible solutions, in a holistic manner:

**Recommendations for improving the state of international education at UCSC:**

- Consider reform of the architecture of international engagement at UCSC. Several UC campuses have high-level faculty, such as a Vice Provost, leading their overseas research, collaboration, recruitment and study abroad.

- Hire more staff to support the ‘import’ of students from abroad and ‘export’ of students to excellent and affordable abroad experiences.

- CIE recommends that Senate adopt the CAFA suggestion that 100 international students be enrolled this year. This is still a small proportion of 2,480 applicants, a number that can readily be justified by applicant qualifications, and one the campus could readily support. Further investigation is required to explain the low enrollment yields for international students.

- Restore summer programs to provide language and cultural support for foreign students enrolled at UCSC.

- Build a centralized database of existing international links current UCSC faculty have, and mobilize these networks for student recruiting and exchange.
CIE is aware of the ethical questions about increasing the number of students from generally wealthy families. As increased international enrollments bring revenue to campus, CIE sees a number of justifiable liens on these funds and offers the following:

**Recommendations for the use of additional funds brought to campus through increased international enrollment:**

- Use a portion of the nonresident supplemental tuition from international enrollment to support low income students from California and overseas, through scholarships and other creative means.
- Support the internationalization of UCSC by bolstering the study abroad options and scholarships for undergraduate students.
- Restore staffing levels at the International Education Office (IEO) to facilitate faculty-led programs abroad.
- Bolster current support systems for international students on campus and explore new ways to adequately care for a more internationalized student body.

The benefits to the campus are clear. Two of Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) Alison Galloway’s “5 for 2015” initiatives—financial stability and increase nonresident student enrollment—can be achieved by increasing the number of international students attending UCSC. Ultimately, success in international recruitment will create a series of positive feedback loops not only bringing in much needed funding to campus, but also enhancing UCSC’s global reputation.

**International Enrollment at UCSC**

The number of international students in the U.S. has increased by 40% since 2001 to reach a total of 764,495. California hosts more international students than any other state, with 102,789 in 2011-12, boasting a 6.5% increase from the previous year. But enrolling international students has been a struggle at UCSC for many years.

Contrary to national trends, UCSC’s undergraduate international enrollment percentage has been decreasing since 2004-05. At our height in the last decade, 2004-05, we had 172 international undergraduate students enrolled, representing 1.3% of total undergraduate enrollment. In 2011-12, we had 40 international undergraduate students enrolled, representing less than 0.3% of total undergraduate enrollment. This percentage did not improve with the incoming frosh of 2012-13. UCSC and Merced are the only UC campus with shrinking international enrollment. (See Chart 1)

The downward trend in international enrollment at UCSC is troublesome not only in comparison to other UC campuses but also in comparison to universities around the country. Based on data from the 2011-12 academic year, US News and World Report listed over 230 institutions with international enrollment percentages of 1.0% or higher. Among the top U.S. institutions hosting international students are the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign (#2), Purdue University (#4), Northeastern University (#7), Indiana University Bloomington (#11), University of
We feel strongly that UCSC, with its research credentials, beautiful campus, and advantageous geography has as much if not more to offer than these universities currently attracting higher numbers of international students.

The Admissions Problem

Enrollment is a process of four phases: (1) application; (2) admission; (3) submission of Statements of Intent to Register (SIRs); and, (4) enrollment. Looking at these phases at each of the UC campuses from 2009 to 2012, our main obstacle to the enrollment of more international students appears to be in the second phase: selection of admitted students from the applicant pool. If we consider only those UC Campuses that received on average less than 3,000 international applicants for 2009 to 2012, UCSC is the only one that rejected over 50% of these applicants. UCSC rejected over 60% of international applications in fall 2012, admitting only 589 students compared to 2,137 admitted at UCD, 2,488 admitted at UCI, 865 admitted at UCR, and 2,102 admitted at UCSB. CIE suggests that the applicant review process be reexamined and procedures established for international applicants to receive a fair opportunity for admission to UCSC.

There is also a problem with the first phase: we currently attract too few applicants. The UCSC Office of Admissions points to an increasing number of international applicants as a measure of success, but the numbers remain relatively small. UCSC saw an increase in international frosh applications for fall 2013 admission (2,480), but this is still less than half the applications of comparable UC campuses (UCSB, UCD, UCI) and less than a quarter of others (UCSD, UCB, UCLA). Moreover, applications numbers are not an adequate measure of progress. UCSC received 473 international applications for fall 2011 and enrolled only 8 students. In 2012, we received 1,172 international applications and we enrolled 15 students. If this current yield rate of less than 2.0% persists, the class of 2013 will have only 36 international students. This is unacceptable.

The final phases of the enrollment process, SIRs and enrollment, are yet another struggle for UCSC. From 2009 to 2012, UCSC admitted 1,518 international applicants (from a pool of 3,488). Of those admitted, only 83 provided a SIR. Our average SIR percentage from 2009 to 2012 was only 5.7%. This SIR percentage is lowest of all UC campuses. UCSC is losing not only to the universities listed in the section above but also to our own sister campuses. CIE refuses to believe that UCSC cannot compete with the other UCs for international enrollment. If we would just get into the game of effective recruitment and enrollment measures for international students, then we would see the success that others have seen.

Why International Enrollment Matters

International enrollment provides a unique opportunity to increase tuition receipts and generate revenue for various campus ventures. 2012-13 undergraduate nonresident supplemental tuition is $22,878. Since 2007, when the UC Office of the President established nonresident enrollment targets for each campus, UCSC has fallen short of our target each year. Failing to reach these targets, which are assumed as a part of our base budget, results in millions of dollars in shortfall annually, and nearly $4 million in 2010-11. International education is an investment, not a cost. Our campus lost over $3.5 million dollars in 2010-11 because of under-
enrollment of nonresident students. Surely an investment of $0.5 - $1.0 million in staffing to increase our international enrollment will yield that missing $3.5 million and more.

There can be no question about the educational benefits of bringing qualified international students to campus. The National Association for College Admission Counseling (NACAC) provides a concise summary of the benefits of boosting international enrollment:

*Increasing the number of international students on campus can add cultural diversity to college communities, boost tuition receipts, and stimulate regional economies. During the 2008-09 academic year, foreign students and their dependents contributed approximately $17.6 billion to the US economy.*

Increasing the number of international students on campus is an important way to embrace the first two of UCSC’s Principles of Community: diversity and openness. In 2011-12, 96.2% of all students on campus, undergraduate and graduate, were from California; 98.6% were United States citizens. In a globalized world, our campus cannot be considered diverse and open with this makeup.

The problem of low international enrollments contributes to the larger problem of low nonresident enrollments at UCSC. In 2002-03, UCSC boasted 5.7% nonresident undergraduate enrollment (733 students), on par with the UC average of 6.0%. Since then, however, the nonresident population has plummeted, comprising only 2.2% of undergraduate enrollment (348 students) in 2011-12, compared to the UC average of 8.4%. On November 17, 2011, the UCSC Office of Admissions produced its “Non-Resident Recruitment Plan 2012,” detailing many of the efforts being made to improve nonresident enrollment. Unfortunately, the report lacked definitive targets and admitted that “we do not have an effective way to measure specific efforts throughout the cycle…we are another year or so away from a position to effectively measure outcomes.”

UCSC is missing out on more than the diverse backgrounds and opinions brought to campus by international students. Increasing international enrollment will increase nonresident enrollment, bringing in valuable nonresident supplemental tuition. We currently have the lowest percentage of international students of all UC campuses (see Chart 1). If we aimed low, and made it our goal to just become the second lowest and surpass Merced, the 0.7% increase in international enrollment would result in tuition revenue of over $2.7 million. *For comparison, this is a larger amount of funds being brought to the campus by Rebenching.* Part of this revenue can be held centrally to be used throughout the campus and part can be earmarked to help recruit more international students and support them when they are on campus.

### CIE Recommendations for Use of Nonresident Supplemental Tuition Revenue

There are ethical questions about increasing the number of students from generally wealthy families. These questions can be addressed by using some proportion of the money, perhaps 10%, in creative ways that support low income students from California and overseas, and to support faculty and student engagement with low income communities overseas.
In 2011, international students comprised around 18% of the freshman class at the University of Washington. This represented a 16% increase from 2005, and was accomplished with minimal recruiting. The additional revenue generated from nonresident supplemental tuition at UW is used to aid low-income Washington residents in affording their higher education.

Also in 2011, the State University of New York (SUNY) announced its plan to increase its international enrollment to 32,000 students over five years. This would represent a 75% increase over the 2011 enrollment of nearly 18,000 systemwide. The plan includes explicit goals for the use of the supplemental tuition revenue from increased international enrollments. According to the university announcement, “If objectives are met, within five years SUNY will be able to offer more than 3,000 study abroad scholarships per year, 125 faculty internationalization grants, and fund many other campus internationalization activities.”

Revenue generated from nonresident supplemental tuition can be used to make the prospect of an international education—through programs abroad—a reality for any UCSC student that is interested. UCSC students’ interest in studying abroad has been steadily increasing over the past three years. The major avenue to study abroad is the UC Education Abroad Program (EAP). Looking at the numbers of EAP participants (not just applicants) we find that UCSC has emerged as a programs abroad leader.

**Chart 2: Percentage of Undergraduate Population Participating in EAP by UC Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UC Campus</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Average</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **Staffing Crisis in the International Education Office (IEO)**

The large number of applicants for programs abroad creates a strain on the depleted staff in the International Education Office (IEO). The office handles two distinct facets of international education: Programs Abroad (PA) and International Scholar and Student Services (ISSS). The ISSS component of IEO is responsible for facilitating and monitoring immigration compliance for international students, visiting students, visiting scholars, UCSC employees, and any dependents of someone in these categories. PA staff members assist with program selection and help incorporate study abroad into student academic plans. Currently, UCSC only has two FTE
dedicated to PA. The low staffing for the IEO at UCSC coupled with the fact that most EAP applicants fill out multiple applications means that our programs abroad staff must handle a much larger number of applications per staff member (~450) than on other campuses. The next highest are UCLA (~275) and Davis (~125).27

CIE called attention to the staffing crisis at IEO in 2006-07. In its annual report, the committee noted,

The UCSC Office of International Education (OIE) has suffered repeated financial crises during the past several years. OIE has been burdened with an unusually high workload in comparison to comparable offices on other UC Campuses. High workloads combined with low wage classifications have caused high staff turnover, adversely affecting the ability of the office to service UCSC...The current senior leadership of this office has been effective in dealing with the financial/staffing crises but cannot continue at their current level of effort.28

Since then, the office has been stripped to skeletal form. The recent addition of an International Student Adviser has been the exception. Since 2008-09, IEO has lost: 0.5 FTE Process Manager (in-house tech support); 0.5 FTE Education Abroad Program Academic Integration; and 1.0 FTE Office Administrative Support. Most alarmingly, the leadership structure of IEO has crumbled. Whereas the office used to function with an IEO Director, an Associate Director for ISSS, and an Associate Director for Programs Abroad (commensurate with IEOs at other UC campuses), UCSC IEO lost the Director and Associate Director for Programs Abroad positions, leaving the Associate Director for ISSS to serve as the interim director of the office. The interim director was appointed Director of International Education in January 2013, leaving the two Associate Director positions empty and collapsing all management functions into one position.

**Limited Study Abroad Options for UCSC Students and Faculty**

This loss of staff and failure to hire an Associate Director for Programs Abroad has had a devastating effect on UCSC’s ability to provide meaningful faculty-led study abroad experiences for students. UCSC has a long history of faculty-led programs abroad, involving education in areas such as Poland, France, Argentina, Costa Rica, and Mexico. In 2011, the only two remaining faculty-led programs were cancelled, including UCSC’s only international service learning program. In response, CIE initiated a call for faculty-led programs abroad proposals and ten faculty members submitted high-quality study abroad ideas. CIE recommended seven of these ten proposals to the administration, but the administration did not go forward with the implementation of any, again saying it lacked the staff needed to support these programs. Other UC campuses have enormously successful faculty-led programs. UCD, for example, is currently enrolling 41 programs in 26 countries with 44 faculty members who will provide a range of study options for students from the arts, literature and culture to science and engineering.29

The new director of UCSC Summer Session hopes to work with CIE to sponsor faculty-led programs abroad for 2014. Currently, IEO is far too understaffed to undertake the programmatic structure of faculty-led programs abroad and the university now prefers that such programs be run in partnership with third-party providers. In the absence of any formal structure for such partnerships, CIE is exploring services offered by third-party vendors with plans to offer faculty a simple path to taking their students abroad. Even with Summer Session equipped to handle
operational issues such as instructor contracting, stipends, and collection of student fees, IEO would still need at least one additional staff member in Programs Abroad to handle administrative issues including faculty preparation to lead programs, vendor and risk management, program marketing/outreach, advising, and pre-departure orientations for students.

This lack of UCSC faculty-led study abroad is inexcusable for a university seeking global standing. Currently, our students have only two options for study abroad, neither of which engages UCSC faculty: they can either select a program from the menu of options at UCEAP or they can undertake an independent study abroad experience—something that over 200 of our students did in 2011-12. However, in fall 2012, the UCSC Financial Aid Office decided to discontinue federal financial aid to students participating in independent study abroad programs, a decision that further imperils international education opportunities for our students. This aid must be restored at UCSC.

Conclusion

The state of international education at UCSC presents both a serious problem and a powerful opportunity. We have fallen woefully behind in international recruitment and enrollment, depriving students, faculty, and the Santa Cruz community of the many benefits that come from having international students on campus. At the same time, other institutions like SUNY and many of our own UC campuses have shown that now is the time for ambitious goals in the area of international enrollment. By increasing the presence of international students on campus and using part of the revenue from nonresident supplemental tuition to support the International Education Office and programs abroad, we have an opportunity to change the tide and move UCSC towards the top of the list for institutions with a global focus.

Respectfully submitted;
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
Peter Limbrick Tony Hoffman, NSTF Rep.
Rasmus Winther Jeff Sherman, GSA Rep.
Mark Cioc, ex officio
Ben Crow, Chair
February 21, 2013

1 More information on the Nonresident Supplemental Tuition Shortfall can be found in Appendix A
2 “UCOP Statistical Summary and Data,” Fall 2012 data for UCSC comes from UCSC Office of Enrollment Management
3 “University of California, Santa Cruz Non-Resident Recruitment Plan 2012” p. 5
5 “Student/Workforce Data” (see #4)
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Appendix A

UCSC
Nonresident Supplemental Tuition¹

Beginning in 2007-08, UCOP assigned campuses nonresident enrollment targets for undergraduate and graduate students. General funds were withdrawn from each campus with the expectation that this funding would be replaced with nonresident tuition revenue.

In addition to paying all the fees paid by resident students, non-resident students pay Supplemental Nonresident Tuition, as shown on the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-13 Undergraduate Fees</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Non-Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Fee</td>
<td>$ 972</td>
<td>$ 972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$11,220</td>
<td>$11,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Campus Fees</td>
<td>$1,224</td>
<td>$1,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Supplemental Tuition</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$22,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 13,416</td>
<td>$ 36,294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonresident Supplemental Tuition Shortfall
Campuses retain the nonresident tuition revenue generated by their own nonresident enrollments. They are also responsible for addressing any shortfall in nonresident tuition revenue that results from enrolling fewer students than the assigned non-resident enrollment target.

UCSC currently meets or exceeds its graduate nonresident target and does not meet its undergraduate nonresident enrollment target. The budget shortfall - shown below - must be made up from campus funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Nonresidents:</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Enrollment</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Enrollment</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>348.5</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Nonresidents:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Enrollment</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Enrollment</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Shortfall*            | -$530,000 | -$1,440,000 | -$1,988,000 | -$3,570,000 |

*The shortfall results in reductions in other areas. Income that exceeds the revenue target is available to address campus priorities

¹ UCSC Office of Planning and Budget, updated 1/13
May 27, 2009

Re: Department Votes on Personnel Actions and Bylaw 55 Voting Practices

Dear Department Chairs,

Many questions come to the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) regarding department votes on personnel actions. As you know, policy on the voting rights of senate faculty is governed by UC Senate Bylaw 55. My goal in this memo is to clarify the current CAP’s interpretation of some of the confusing issues regarding Bylaw 55, and to suggest some “best practices” regarding votes.

In particular, this memo comments on the following issues:

1) Rules regarding abstentions
2) Requests made by CAP annual reports regarding explaining no votes
3) The distinctions between waived, absent not voting, abstain, and recused
4) Specifying a period of time for decisions to be recorded as absent not voting
5) The distinction between extension of Bylaw 55 voting rights versus augmentation to the pool of voting faculty in a unit, and question of approvals for each
6) Some comments on “best practices” for recording of department votes

For your reference, here is the link for UC Senate Bylaw 55:
http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/manual/blpart1.html#bl55/

Abstentions
In some previous annual reports CAPs have asked for clarification of reasons for abstaining, however, as some faculty have pointed out, this was an error. UCSC Bylaw 13.4.4 states that “The Division shall not require or request explanation of voting abstentions by Senator who have the right to vote in any Divisional committee action including those involving UC Bylaw 55 actions by departments.” It is also clear that a decision to abstain is understood as neither a positive nor a negative recommendation.

Link to Santa Cruz Bylaw 13 (13.4.6 – 13.4.8):

No votes
In a number of CAP annual reports, requests have been made for departments to explain “no” votes on personnel actions. This has raised many questions from faculty, so I’d like to clarify. We certainly understand that it would be inappropriate to ask individuals how they voted or why. We interpret previous CAPs as requesting that departmental letters reflect substantive discussions that could contextualize mixed votes. If the department meeting contained discussion of issues that may help clarify the vote, then it would be helpful if those were included in the letter. If there is no such information available, it is perfectly reasonable to merely say so. (Including a simple statement is more helpful than not saying anything. For
example, a letter might say: “The vote was taken by secret ballot and there was no discussion that would illuminate the mixed vote.”

Waive vs. Recused vs. Absent not Voting vs. Abstain

There is often confusion about these different forms of non-voting. Bylaw 13 defines “recusal” as not voting because of “conflict of interest.” In contrast, as noted above, “abstain” is a neutral response from a participating faculty member that is taken as neither a positive nor negative vote. And Bylaw 13 clarifies the distinction between “waive” and “absent not voting.” One may waive the right to vote on all personnel actions for a specific period of time (for example, while on leave), and this period of time must be stated in advance. Alternatively, a faculty member is “absent not voting” if they do not attend the meeting or participate in the vote on a particular file. Further, a faculty member on leave may choose not to waive their vote, and may vote on some actions but not others. In this situation, on the cases that are not voted on, the faculty member would be listed as “absent not voting.”

For a vote taken in a meeting, faculty who are present but neither vote “yes” or “no” are generally counted as abstentions, while those who are not present are counted as absent not voting. For a vote that extends over a period of time after a meeting, only those who indicate that they want to abstain should be so recorded; the others who do not vote are generally absent not voting. Department faculty who are serving as administrators “waive” their Bylaw 55 rights within their department for the time period that they are serving as administrators for actions that they may act on in their administrative capacity, while CAP members on our campus vote on cases within their department, and are therefore “recused” from the CAP level discussion and vote.

Specified Time Period for Absent not Voting

Absent not voting usually applies when a faculty member does not participate in the discussion and/or vote on a file. However, many departments do allow faculty to review the materials and vote after the meeting. If this option is used, then the department’s extension of Bylaw 55 voting rights should include a departmental vote to determine a clearly defined time period (in calendar days) within which faculty must vote before being counted as absent not voting.

Extensions of Departmental Voting Rights vs. Augmentations

There has been some confusion about extensions vs. augmentations to voting rights, and about whether approval is needed for these. Extensions relate to Bylaw 55, where a “default” set of voting rights is listed in Section B, but Section C goes on to state that departments can extend voting rights differently than the default, with a 2/3 majority vote by secret ballot. For example, some departments extend voting rights to Assistant Professors that are not listed in Section B. Extensions remain in effect for at least 12 months and until a newer vote is taken. Changes to Bylaw 55 extensions become effective immediately upon the department vote. There is no approval needed, but these changes are forwarded to CAP, the office of record, and CAP provides copies to the Academic Personnel Office (APO) and the relevant dean.

In contrast, augmentations are temporary appointments to the pool of Bylaw 55 voting faculty of a department (usually a small and/or new department), described in the Campus Academic Personnel Manual (CAPM) 414.220. The Dean or Department may initiate a proposal to
augment voting faculty in a unit. Following a department vote, the dean forwards the proposal to CAP for review and comment. CAP then forwards it to the Executive Vice Chancellor for approval. Augmentations are effective upon approval by the EVC. The EVC provides copies of approved augmentation to CAP for verifying department votes on personnel actions.

Link for CAPM 414.220: [http://apo.ucsc.edu/academic_policies_and_procedures/cappm/414220.htm](http://apo.ucsc.edu/academic_policies_and_procedures/cappm/414220.htm)

**Recording Departmental Votes**

Decisions of voting members may be recorded in the following categories: Yes, No, Abstain, Waive, Absent not voting or Recused. When departments vote on more than one action (e.g., one step advancement as well as greater-than-normal advancement) CAP members find that it reduces confusion if each option is listed not just in terms of the number of “Yes” votes on that option, but also the number of “No” votes and non-voting actions (abstain, waiving, absent not voting, recusals) on that option.

I hope that this memo may help to clear up confusion about some of the issues regarding personnel votes.

Sincerely,

IsI

Maureen Callanan, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

cc: Deans
Division Academic Personnel Coordinators
Department Managers
AVC Pamela Peterson
CAP’S TOP TEN LIST OF TIPS FOR PERSONNEL FILES*

TIP ONE: Letters
- General: Be short, to the point, and use lay language wherever possible. Advocacy is no substitution for evaluation.
- Department Letters: Contextualize and evaluate as much as necessary.
- Decanal Letters: Should provide evaluation of information in the file not adequately covered by department letter or personal statement. Do not repeat or quote extensively from the APM, the department letter, or the candidate’s personal statement. If the dean’s recommendation differs from that of the department, explain the difference. An effective and compelling decanal letter is often achieved in one page, though controversial cases may warrant a slightly longer letter.

TIP TWO: Be explicit about rank, step, and salary recommendations: “We/I support a one-step merit advancement and an additional increment of salary (define increment) based on __.”

TIP THREE: Offer expertise to help readers at higher levels of review to understand the quality, quantity, significance, and impact of research and how these metrics compare to standards in your discipline.

TIP FOUR: Evaluate teaching and mentoring. Highlight student achievements and post-graduation trajectories for PhD and MA advisees. A quantitative chart summarizing teaching evaluations is very helpful. Provide context, such as standard teaching load, course relief, and buyouts.

TIP FIVE: Evaluate service contributions in light of the time commitment required and the overall value of those contributions to the constituencies they serve. Do not simply list committees!

TIP SIX: Evaluate contributions to diversity, as specified by APM 210, wherever appropriate.

TIP SEVEN: Evaluate external letters and the professional stature of the letter writers (address in the confidential list of letter writers to protect confidentiality). Be aware of the difference between tenure letters and letters for other levels of promotion.

TIP EIGHT: Big Steps reviews (i.e., promotion, advancement to step 6 or Above Scale) include everything since the last big step. No year is un-reviewed.

TIP NINE: Be clear and explicit in reporting department votes. Include as much information about split votes as possible.

TIP TEN: For regular merits, publications (published, in-press, under revision) are counted ONCE. Make sure you have advised the candidate so that their in-process research items are included in the file when they will have the greatest impact. It is appropriate to include a portion of an in-progress book, for example, to demonstrate ongoing work on a large project. However, subsequent reviews must clearly outline additional work completed since the last review. A statement should be included that outlines a candidate’s contributions to jointly authored works.

*Note: this list is for Department Chairs and Deans. Department Chairs may consider sharing these tips with faculty.

Updated October 2012
1. **Personal statements** are important and help reviewers understand your past accomplishments and your plans for the future. You should keep it short and to the point. The length of a personal statement does not necessarily correlate to the level of productivity and impact of the candidate’s work. Areas for discussion include Research, Teaching, Service and Diversity (if this is a feature of your file). Use layperson’s language to ensure that your explanations are understandable not only to your departmental colleagues, but to your Dean, CAP members across disciplines, and the EVC or Chancellor. Further information about what should be included in each section appears below.

2. **Research:** Place your research or creative contributions in context (e.g. scope, selectivity, and impact of publication or performance venue, citation information if available) to help reviewers accurately assess your contributions and impact on your field. If you received an award, do not assume that higher reviewers will recognize the name and nature of the award and the prestige attached to it in your field (short of the Nobel Prize!).

3. **New vs. resubmitted work:** You should refer to the campus guidelines for formatting your cumulative biobibliography. As stated in these guidelines, “All publications submitted to the department must be numbered and asterisked on the biobibliography. Forwarded items should be indicated with the letter “F”. A candidate must also indicate whether the item was previously submitted, and if it was, explain when and in what form. You should also ensure that titles are consistent. Be explicit and accurate in your accounting of the status of each item included in this review (submitted, accepted, in press, etc.), as well as indicating any items that have undergone change of status since the previous review. Work submitted for one review generally should not be submitted for subsequent reviews (no work should be “double-counted” by being reviewed in more than one period except for promotion or other major reviews). If you re-submit a work, you should clearly indicate this on your biobib, as well as include information in your personal statement that addresses why reviewers should consider it again. Discuss with your Department Chair or trusted mentor how the department views in-progress work (for example, portions of book manuscripts in progress that you plan to re-submit when published). While some evidence of in-progress work may be desirable, in such cases you will need to be very clear about the exact nature of the new work on this project you have done since the previous review.

4. **Co-authorship statement:** Co-authorship statements are important to help reviewers assess your own contributions to items submitted for review. Indicate by percentage or by qualitative assessment (e.g. “I designed the instrumentation…”). In the case of multiple co-authored articles, it is helpful for CAP to know the protocol of first author, corresponding author, etc. in your field.

5. **If you received external funding during the review**, list amounts and award dates, and whether you acted as a PI or co-PI for the application. If you are listed as co-PI, specify the amount generated by your ideas and effort if possible.
6. **Teaching:** Summarize course offerings, new preparations, innovative teaching practices, training grants, co-teaching, and mentoring of undergraduates and/or graduate students, in the context of expectations and needs in your department. Not everyone will have all of these elements in their teaching profile, but most faculty are likely to have some contributions *in addition* to their classroom teaching. For mentoring activity, be clear about which students completed their degrees during the review period and your role in their mentoring process—including, if possible, their later career trajectories.

7. **Service:** Assess your major service contributions to the department, campus, and profession at large, as well as any public service you performed, indicating which are particularly time-consuming, challenging, or significant. Do not simply list your service contributions.

8. **Diversity:** Contributions to diversity are considered in personnel reviews according to APM 210. There are many ways of contributing to diversity, including the mentoring of groups of students who are under-represented in your discipline. Be explicit about your contributions where appropriate.

For information about evaluating contributions to diversity, see the CAAD link:  

For language from the Academic Personnel Manual about contributions to diversity, see:  

For a listing of ways to engage in diversity on campus see:  
[http://diversity.ucsc.edu/resources/images/engaging_in_diversity.pdf](http://diversity.ucsc.edu/resources/images/engaging_in_diversity.pdf)

9. **Major Action Reviews** (Mid-career appraisal, promotion to Associate or Full Professor, advancement to Step VI or Above Scale): The review period for major actions include the entire period since last major action. For example, for promotion to Professor, the review period is since advancement to Associate Professor, including the year of that review. No year is un-reviewed. The actual materials you submit include all research since the last major action and teaching evaluations and service contributions since last merit advancement. If you are uncertain about what to submit for a major action review, consult with a trusted senior colleague, your Department Chair or Manager, or your Divisional Academic Personnel Coordinator.

10. **CAP letters** often contain useful feedback and information for faculty and are available on request. Ask for them! At the conclusion of your review, you have the right to request access to your file, which will provide you with copies of letters added to your file subsequent to the department review. These documents could include a dean recommendation, the CAP recommendation, and the ad hoc report, if applicable. To request access, complete the form located on the APO web site:  
[http://apo.ucsc.edu/forms_and_data/Access_Request_Form.htm](http://apo.ucsc.edu/forms_and_data/Access_Request_Form.htm)

The Academic Personnel Office Website:  
[http://apo.ucsc.edu/](http://apo.ucsc.edu/)

The CAP link on the Academic Senate Website:  
[http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/index.html](http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/index.html)