

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT, 2014-15
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of the Committee: Serves as a reviewing agency for all non-routine academic personnel actions and as an auditing agency for all other academic personnel actions; promotes a fair and equitable review of such actions, while upholding high-quality achievement, and recognizing diversity in all areas of review; provides advice on UC and campus issues pertaining to academic personnel.

Highlights:

Reviewed **386** academic personnel actions in 2014-15.

Provided advice to the Senate Chair, Executive Vice Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel and UCAP on a number of UC policy issues.

Made a number of recommendations to UCSB's Administration regarding the Red Binder policy, especially the Exception to Open Recruitment process.

Met and consulted with Deans, AVC, and the EVC on the academic personnel review process.

Continued the practice of waiving ad hoc review committees for promotion and career reviews where there was evidence of excellence in all four areas of review and agreement across all reviewing agencies, and little doubt advancement was warranted.

MEETINGS

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) met every week on Tuesdays, from October 2014 through June 2015, except for one week during the Thanksgiving holiday, three weeks in December before and during the holiday break, and one week during spring break. In addition, the Committee met every Thursday from February 2014 through June 2015, except for one week during spring break. In total, there were more than 50 CAP meetings through June 2015.

The Committee met during the fall quarter with Executive Vice Chancellor Marshall, Associate Vice Chancellor Jack Talbott and all of the deans to discuss academic personnel issues. The CAP Chair and/or Vice Chair met with AVC Talbott weekly to discuss cases and policy issues. The CAP leadership met several times with Academic Senate Chair Bhavnani on matters of mutual interest. The CAP leadership also made presentations at the fall quarter meetings for Department Chairs, each hosted by the Office of Academic Personnel. The Chair also made presentations at meetings for new department chairs (organized by the AP Office), and for faculty anticipating promotion to full Professor (organized by the Office of Research/Academic Personnel). The Chair represented CAP at two UCAP meetings in Oakland and remotely via teleconference call-in on two other occasions.

COMMITTEE WORKLOAD AND MEMBERSHIP

2014-15 was the 12th review cycle during which firm deadlines for the academic personnel process were observed and met. Consequently, CAP's workload during the fall quarter was steady, but comparatively light. It consisted of reconsideration requests, appointments, retentions, several non-

routine personnel cases, EOR considerations, endowed chair appointments, policy discussion, orientation for new and returning CAP members, and meetings with the EVC, AVC, and deans. The workload was demanding from early in winter quarter through late in spring quarter. Non-routine cases arrived at CAP from January through June, although the majority of the cases began arriving heavily in March and extending until the end of April, particularly in the areas of engineering and MLPS. The delay made it necessary to process many cases later than normal in the cycle. Once again, the committee successfully reorganized its workload to ensure that the July 1 deadline was met and forwarded all cases to the AVC before the end of June. Nevertheless, the uneven workload places an undesirable burden on CAP members that risks jeopardizing their abilities to review cases in a timely and careful fashion. CAP requests that the caseload be more evenly distributed to mitigate the heavy delivery of cases to CAP concentrated at the end of the academic year. CAP met several times during the summer of 2015 to review appointment and retention cases and requests for Exception to Open Recruitment (EORs).

REVIEW OF ACADEMIC PERSONNEL ACTIONS

CAP devoted most of its work to reviewing appointments, non-routine merit advancements, promotions, and formal appraisals. A total of **386** personnel actions were reviewed; a summary of the workload appears in Tables I and II attached to this report. CAP members recused themselves from cases from their own department(s), when they had a conflict or the potential for perceived conflict of interest with the candidate. The deans continued review of routine merit advancements and appointments of at the rank of Assistant Professor at Steps II and III at starting salaries within a defined range, when the recommendations of deans and departments agreed. CAP audited all routine merit cases following the actions of the deans. CAP also deferred to the Associate Vice Chancellor the final decisions on salaries when the differences between the recommendations of the respective dean and CAP were \$2,000 or less. CAP continued to act as its own ad hoc review committee in promotion to tenure cases in which both deans and departments recommended tenure. In addition, CAP also acted as its own ad hoc review committee on all promotions to Professor and advancements to Professor VI and Professor Above Scale cases in which the department(s) and dean(s) both recommended advancement.

CAP continued its practice of closely examining performance in teaching and mentoring of students in all personnel cases. CAP enthusiastically supports the campus policy requiring systematic evaluation of teaching by candidates for all Senate-approved courses. CAP continues to recommend strongly that departments submit both written student comments and faculty self-assessments, together with analyses of these documents. However, so that reviewing agencies do not become overly reliant on these forms of evidence, CAP encourages candidates to include course syllabi in their dossiers and to address the following issues in their teaching self-assessments: instructional epistemology, pedagogy, teaching innovations, and skill building. In addition, departmental letters should include discussions of the contribution of candidates' courses to the departmental curricula, unusual challenges surrounding instruction in these courses, the effectiveness of candidates' teaching, and candidates' mentoring efforts beyond classroom instruction.

CAP strives to maintain equitability and fairness in properly crediting achievements during merit reviews. One area where departments and deans occasionally differ in their policies across the campus concerns how they treat candidates at Assistant Professor IV, Associate Professor III, and Professor V, who were being considered for advancement, though not across the respective barrier steps. CAP suggests that the Office of Academic Personnel remind department chairs and deans that

all evidence of creative or research achievements, along with other measures of teaching and mentoring, professional activities, and service performance, should be credited by reviewing agencies during the review period in which they are accrued.

CAP continues to be impressed by the high quality of UCSB faculty members. Reading colleagues' cases is one of the great pleasures of serving on this committee. Given its changing membership and cross-disciplinary perspective, CAP views some cases differently than other reviewing agencies. Nevertheless, CAP shares with all reviewing agencies the satisfaction of rewarding outstanding faculty performance and the need to ensure the fair review of faculty across the campus.

POLICY ISSUES

CAP memos on the following subjects can be consulted for comments and further details. During the 2014-15 academic year, CAP reviewed and commented or acted on a number of campus and system-wide policy issues, including proposed revisions to APM 080, APM 133-17-g-j, APM 210-1-c-d, APM 220-18-b, and APM 760-30-a. In addition, CAP participated in discussions concerning the campus' protocol for dispersal of funds aimed at addressing issues of exceptional merit, equity, compression, or inversion on faculty remuneration.

Comments on APM 210-1-d

Although APM 210-1-d was instituted in 2005, that policy's effort to better recognize diversity-related accomplishments among faculty has been difficult to implement, in part because the reporting of such activities have been often misunderstood and irregular. CAP suggests that this area be strengthened by the Office of Academic Personnel to provide guidance to faculty and department chairs concerning diversity-related achievements of candidates and especially their impacts.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND APPRECIATION

CAP appreciates the large amount of labor that department chairs and personnel committees expend each fall to ensure the smooth and timely working of the campus academic personnel review process. CAP also thanks the home departments of this year's committee for enabling our members to rearrange their workloads to be able to serve on such a time-consuming committee. CAP is especially grateful for the immensely valuable contributions made by Stephanie Smagala, Senior Analyst in the Academic Senate Office. Her unflagging efforts, extensive knowledge, and guidance were deeply appreciated by the committee's membership, and its leadership in particular.

2014-15 COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Sharon Farmer, History

M.P. Fumerton, English

John Gilbert, Computer Science

Wolf Kittler, Germanic, Slavic and Semitic Studies

David Low, Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology

Quyen Nguyen, Chemistry and Biochemistry

Matthew Potoski, Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management

Kenneth Rose, Electrical and Computer Engineering

Douglas Steigerwald, Economics

Barbara Tomlinson, Feminist Studies

Peter Sturman, History of Art and Architecture, Vice- Chair

Bradley Chmelka, Chemical Engineering, Chair and UCAP Representative

ATTACHMENTS:

Table I and II

Table III

Table IV Actions by Division

10-year Comparison Chart

**Table I Summary of All Personnel Actions Reviewed by CAP
2014-2015**

Appointments requiring CAP review (includes endowed chair appts)	27
Promotions (to Lecturer SOE, Associate Professor, Professor)	32
Merits requiring CAP review (Prof A/S, Prof VI, Accel Merits, Lecturers PSOE, SOE, Sr SOE)	207
Retentions	7
Formal Appraisals	8
Career Equity Reviews	2
Mandatory Reviews/No Change	21
Reconsiderations	3
Terminal Appointment	1
Exceptions to Open Recruitment	23
Post Audits	33
Tentatives	22
TOTAL PERSONNEL ACTIONS	386

**Table II Faculty Participation on Ad Hoc Review Committees
2014-2015**

Appointments requiring Ad Hoc Review	0
Promotions requiring Ad Hoc Review	1
Merits requiring Ad Hoc Review	0
Other Actions requiring Ad Hoc Review	0
Total number of Ad Hoc Review Committees	1

Table III 10-YEAR COMPARISON OF ALL PERSONNEL ACTIONS REVIEWED BY CAP

		Variance from prior year									
	2014-2015		2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08	2006-07	2005-06
Appointments requiring CAP review (includes endowed chair appts)	27	4	23	24	26	32	15	34	39	50	46
Promotions (to Lecturer SOE, Associate Professor, Professor)	32	-1	33	44	42	45	47	50	47	57	49
Merits requiring CAP review	207	10	197	187	159	201	154	158	158	172	153
Retentions	7	-3	10	9	18	18	16	16	14	14	18
Formal appraisals	8	6	2	10	14	17	12	6	16	20	14
Career Equity Reviews	2	1	1	4	2	1	1	1	2	10	5
Mandatory Reviews/No Change	21	-6	27	23	14	8	8	14	24	1	19
Reconsiderations	3	-2	5	4	3	4	6	2	5	18	7
Terminal Appointment	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	0	0
Exceptions to Open Recruitment	23	9	14	16	9	13	7	2	8	3	12
Audits	33	6	27	17	32	76	60	41	73	60	55
Tentatives	22	5	17	18	20	14	7	8	27	17	17
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP	386	30	356	356	341	430	334	334	413	440	395

Faculty Participation on Ad Hoc Review Committees

		Variance from prior year									
	2014-15		2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08	2006-07	2005-06
Number of ad hoc committees	1	1	2	0	11	14	6	16	18	21	29

TABLE IV Personnel Actions by Division/School 2014-15

CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	TOTAL
0	58	7	15	111	121	74	386
0.0%	15.0%	1.8%	3.9%	28.8%	31.3%	19.2%	100%
APPOINTMENT - NON-TENURED							
CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	5	1	1	1	5	5	18
APPOINTMENT - NON-TENURED							
CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	1	0	0	3	2	0	6
APPOINTMENT - ENDOWED CHAIR							
CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3
PROMOTION TO ASSOC PROFESSOR							
CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	3	0	2	5	5	1	16
PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR							
CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	1	0	2	4	2	4	13
PROMOTION - LECTURER							
CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	0	0	2	0	1	0	3
MERIT							
CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	16	3	5	36	29	26	115
ACCELERATED MERIT							
CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	4	0	0	2	2	6	14
MERIT - LECTURER PSOE, SOE, SR. SOE							
CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	0	0	1	1	6	0	8
MERIT TO PROF VI							
CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	2	0	1	11	6	0	20
MERIT WITHIN OR ADVANCEMENT TO PROF ABOVE SCALE							
CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	10	1	1	9	23	6	50
RETENTION							
CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	1	0	0	2	0	4	7
FORMAL APPRAISAL							
CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	0	0	0	4	2	2	8

CAREER EQUITY REVIEW

CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2

MANDATORY REVIEW/NO CHANGE

CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	3	0	0	10	5	3	21

RECONSIDERATION

CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3

TERMINAL APPOINTMENT

CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

EOR

CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	6	0	0	4	9	4	23

AUDIT OF ROUTINE CASE

CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	4	1	0	11	9	8	33

TENTATIVE TO CAP

CRST	ENGR	ESMS	GSED	HUFA	MLPS	SOSC	
0	1	1	0	7	11	2	22