

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 Klinger) 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

2008-09 – 6 files
2007-08 – 8 files
2006-07 – 12 files
2005-06 – 10 files
2004-05 – 2 files
2003-04 – 1 file
2002-03 – 1 file

Suggestions for Improving Personnel Files

In a memo dated May 27, 2009, CAP attempted to clarify some of the confusing issues regarding Bylaw 55 voting rights, especially the categories used to report votes on personnel actions. Please reference this memo 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

Acknowledgements

We wish to gratefully acknowledge the very hard work of the exceptionally strong staff of the Academic Senate and of the Academic Personnel Office. We are deeply indebted to Georgina Chang, Cecilia De La Garza, Susan Fellows, Grace Harter, Chris Imai, Leslie Marple, Linda Tursi, and especially to Senior Analyst Nancy Furber who supplied CAP with numerous spreadsheets and statistics for this report, and Assistant Vice Chancellor Pamela Peterson. This stellar group of professionals was always available and willing to explain subtle aspects of complex policy. We are also very grateful to all of the department managers and other departmental staff for the time they invest in faculty personnel issues, and we offer special thanks to the divisional coordinators for their unfailingly hard work, often behind the scenes, on the many files they process: Jan Cloud, Anne Callahan, Kathy Beattie, June Taylor, Pat Gross, Kristin Mott, and Gillian McGuire.

Most importantly, we extend our deepest thanks to our new Senate Analyst Jaden Silva-Espinoza. Jaden stepped in mid-year and has done a remarkable job, learning the nuances of campus personnel and helping the committee to function smoothly. This year, since CAP took on several extra projects related to personnel, Jaden's workload with respect to CAP was higher than would be expected in any given year. She managed an astounding workload of multiple senate committees with grace, efficiency, and readiness for the next challenge.

We have appreciated our positive working relationships with Deans Yager, Ladusaw, Kamieniecki, Ramirez, and Koch, with Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Galloway, Chancellor Blumenthal, and Vice Provost of Academic Affairs Lee.

Finally, we once again thank all of our colleagues who have contributed to the personnel process in their departments and on Ad Hoc committees. The process works as well as it does only because of your hard work.

Respectfully submitted;
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
Carla Freccero
Claire Gu
Charles Hedrick
Piero Madau
Rodney Ogawa
Christina Ravelo
Nirvikar Singh
Shelley Stamp
Dana Takagi, Chair

February 22, 2013

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):

<http://senate.ucsc.edu/manual/santacruz-division-manual/part-one-bylaws/chapter-thirteen-committees/index.html>

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

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,

lsl

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-process, 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.*

CAP'S TOP TEN LIST OF TIPS FOR FACULTY PREPARING PERSONNEL FILES
May 25, 2011

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:

<http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/caad-committee-on-affirmative-action-and-diversity/Evaluating%20Contributions%20to%20Diversity%20APM%20210.pdf>

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

http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/caad-committee-on-affirmative-action-and-diversity/Recognizing%20Diversity%20in%20the%20Academic%20Personnel%20Review%20Process%20APM_05.pdf

For a listing of ways to engage in diversity on campus see:

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

The Academic Personnel Office Website: <http://apo.ucsc.edu/>

The CAP link on the Academic Senate Website: <http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/index.html>