

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL**  
**Annual Report, 2012-13**

To Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

**Summary**

The 2012-13 Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP):

- a) Consulted on academic personnel reviews
- b) Consulted with the Academic Personnel Office (APO) regarding future plans for online academic review
- c) Participated in an online academic review pilot program
- d) 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.

In the year 2012-13 CAP had one representative from Arts, two from Engineering, two from Humanities, two from Physical and Biological Sciences (including the Chair), and two from Social Sciences.

CAP members find their service on CAP to be very intense, time-consuming, and rewarding. Reading and discussing personnel files provide CAP members with a captivating perspective on the intellectual power and breadth of UCSC. CAP members are deeply impressed by our colleagues' distinguished scholarly achievements, their selfless and dedicated service to our campus and to their professional communities, their innovative and inspired teaching, and their creative contributions toward realizing campus diversity goals.

**Workload**

In 2012-13 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 29 times during the academic year (8, 10, and 10 meetings, in fall, winter, and spring quarters, respectively, as well as one meeting during the summer of 2013).

CAP made recommendations this year on 235 personnel cases, 13 fewer than last year. Roughly 56% of the cases involved requests for accelerations and/or greater-than-normal salaries, which typically require more discussion than a normal merit review.

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, six cases required ad hoc committees. Of the six ad hoc committees that were formed, five met to review promotion cases, and one to review a merit increase case. 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 to request the additional perspective of an ad hoc committee.

The number of appointment cases increased slightly since last year. In 2008-09, there were 51 (33 of which were ladder rank) appointments. In 2010-11, the number dropped precipitously to 18, only 6 of which were for ladder-rank positions. In 2011-12, CAP reviewed 40 appointment files, 17 of the 40 appointments were ladder-rank. This year, CAP reviewed 41 appointment files, 27 of the appointments were ladder-rank. The number of retention cases increased from last year, with five being reviewed in 2011-12 and eight reviewed this year. One of the retention files was for a faculty member whose file was 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 2012-2013 the number of cases for which the final administrative decision agreed with CAP's recommendation declined slightly. The two concurred roughly 82% of the time (192 out of 235 completed files), down from 85% 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 43 disagreements, CAP disagreed with the final administrative decision about the appropriate step in nine cases. Of these nine cases, the CP/EVC, Chancellor, or Dean offered a higher step in four instances and a lower step in five instances.

The remaining 34 merit, promotion, retention, and appointment cases involved disagreements concerning salary (12 with Dean's authority, 17 with CP/EVC's authority, and five with Chancellor's authority). In the Dean authority cases, CAP recommended a higher salary than was awarded in four cases and a lower salary in the remaining eight cases. Of the 12 decanal authority cases, salary disagreements occurred with the Arts Dean in five cases, with the Physical and Biological Sciences Dean in zero cases, with the Social Sciences Dean in two cases, with the Humanities Dean in three cases, and with the School of Engineering Dean in two cases. Of the 17 CP/EVC authority cases, CAP recommended a higher salary than was awarded in four cases and a lower salary in the remaining 13 cases. Finally, of the five Chancellor authority cases, CAP recommended a higher salary than was awarded in two cases and a lower salary than was awarded in three cases. CAP abstained from recommending a salary in six cases.

### **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 two cases from the 2012-13 call that did not reach CAP by the end of spring quarter, and five additional cases that were not completed (due to ad hocs, requests for more information, and pending authority decisions) that were carried over to 2013-14. This is up from the three cases from the 2011-12 call that were carried over to 2012-13.

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 roughly 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 nine nominees), but the appointment of members and supervision of the ad hoc committee review is the responsibility of the administration. In our view, APO 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 2012-2013, 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.

### **Online Review Pilot**

In 2012-13, CAP volunteered to participate in an online personnel review pilot project run by APO. UC Santa Cruz is moving towards an online review process that mirrors that of many UC campuses, where personnel action files are viewed online versus being viewed in hard copy. The pilot was an initial test using personnel files in the Baskin School of Engineering that were already being housed online. The pilot, which will continue through 2013-14, will enable CAP to provide feedback to APO to assist them with the creation of an online personnel review system for the UCSC campus.

### **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 revisions to APM 700 - Leaves of Absence (October 2012), the system-wide review of proposed new APM 430 - Visiting Scholars (October 2012), the system-wide Negotiated Salary Proposed Pilot Plan (October 2012), the system-wide review of proposed Open Access Policy (November 2012), the UCSC Faculty Salary Equity Study proposal (December 2012), the Office of Research Self Study (January 2013), UCSC Plagiarism Software License (February 2013), proposed new CAPM 500.205 - Recall of Academic Appointees (February 2013), systemwide review of proposed revised APM 241 - Faculty Administrators (May 2013), and the formal review of CAPM 514.285 - Lecturer with Security of Employment and 407.690 - Overlapping Steps (June 2013).

### **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 three consecutive years, with at least one meeting per year. This year's Shadow CAP meeting was held in May, 2013.

### **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 eight universities."

Number of retention files considered by CAP:

2012-13 – 8 files  
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**

Through the years, CAP has provided suggestions on how to improve the preparation of personnel review files. This year, we started requiring that the scholarly contributions portion of the biobibliography from the previous review period be included in the file, a practice that has been part of the personnel review process at other campuses in the UC-system. This addition was a tremendous improvement to the file, making it significantly easier to analyze a candidate's achievements within the relevant time period of the review.

At the end of the year (Spring, 2013), we decided to also request a table summarizing teaching evaluation scores, effective next year (2013-2014). We found that the style and depth of the analyses of teaching performance varies tremendously between departments, and that some departments were using teaching evaluation tables very effectively to support their analyses.

In the paragraphs below we reiterate some of the advice given in previous CAP annual reports regarding the preparation of departmental letters. Over the past years, we saw evidence of careful work in preparation of files from most departments, and evidence that past CAP advice had been heeded. 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.

### Tips for Department letters:

The most effective letters do not only advocate, but should evaluate and assess strengths and weaknesses. 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.

The most effective letters are concise and avoid jargon. The best letters, even for significant accelerations, are typically three to five pages long. CAP members (and other reviewers) need a concise summary of the major focus of the work, and an assessment that provides evidence for the impact of the work. Long quotes from external letters are not needed.

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. Accelerations should be justified by a level of achievement that is clearly above the norm in all three areas: scholarship, teaching, AND service. Greater than normal salary increases and accelerations should be justified mainly based on achievements since the last merit review.

For additional tips and suggestions, please refer to one or both of the following documents:

- a) Top 12 CAP Tips for Preparing Faculty Files
- b) Top 10 Tips for Faculty Preparing Personnel Files

Both documents may be found on the CAP web page at

<http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/index.html>.

### **Acknowledgements**

We wish to gratefully acknowledge the hard work of the exceptional staff of the Academic Senate and of the Academic Personnel Office. We are deeply indebted to Ijukan Bloom, Georgina Chang, Susan Fellows, Cecilia De La Garza, Grace Harter, Chris Imai, Leslie Marple, Linda Tursi, and especially to Senior Analyst Nancy Furber who supplied CAP with 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: Kathy Beattie, Jan Cloud, Anne Callahan, Pat Gross, Gillian McGuire, Kristin Mott, and June Taylor.

Most importantly, we extend our deepest thanks to our Senate Analyst Jaden Silva-Espinoza. This was her first full year as CAP analyst and she handled the workload and complexity of the job admirably. This year, there were changes to the personnel review process and 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**

Alexandre Brandwajn  
Carolyn Dean  
Charles Hedrick  
Phokion Kolaitis  
Piero Madau  
Armin Mester  
Nirvikar Singh  
Candace West  
Christina Ravelo, Chair

January 23, 2014