

ANNUAL REPORT
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL - OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
2004-05

The Committee on Academic Personnel – Oversight Committee (CAP) advises the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel on promotions, appointments, terminations, multiyear accelerations within rank that involve skipping a step, high-level merit actions, third year deferrals, five-year reviews, and appraisals. CAP also recommends membership of ad hoc committees, which are appointed by the Vice Provost. Further, CAP advises both the Academic Senate and the Vice Provost on academic personnel matters as they arise. CAP appoints and directs the Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) that advise the Deans on redelegated personnel actions. See Appendix I for a list of CAP's principal tasks.

Faculty Advancement Criteria

CAP evaluates candidate files according to guidelines established in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM). CAP's mandate is to assure fair and equitable treatment of all faculty while ensuring that high standards of scholarship are maintained across the campus. Its goal is to apply fair, objective, and uniform standards of evaluation across the disciplines, recognizing the variability of measures of accomplishment and success from one discipline to another. Teaching, research or creative activity, service, and professional competence are evaluated.

CAP bases its judgments on documents provided in the formal personnel evaluation process, including documents contained in each candidate's dossier, evaluations by departmental faculty and the Chair, commentaries

from the Dean, and when appropriate, assessments from external evaluators. CAP may also get input from a three-person ad hoc committee appointed by the Vice Provost--Academic Personnel following CAP's recommendations.

The evaluation criteria are set out in the APM (APM-210, <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/sec2-pdf.html>). CAP's judgments are guided by the wording of the APM, according to which the "indispensable qualification" for advancement at all levels is "superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement." CAP typically recommends advancement of a faculty member after the normal period at rank and step on the basis of a record of balanced accomplishment in research and/or creative activity, teaching, and service. Alternatively, CAP might make a favorable recommendation when it judges the performance to be well above expectations in one category although it was below expectations in another, as appropriate to rank and step. Time spent on an activity is not considered to be a substitute for accomplishment. CAP does not use time in service (except for deferrals) or health or personal issues in judging merit advancements.

CAP's evaluation of research reported in peer-reviewed publications (and in other venues) and of creative work presented in many forms and venues is based principally on the originality, creativity, and impact of the work as judged by peers. CAP's primary criteria for the evaluation of teaching are effectiveness and impact, as well as the candidate's command of his or her subject, scholarly growth, and presentation of material in ways that help students to think critically, independently, and creatively. Advising and mentoring activities, and student evaluations are given substantial weight in judging teaching performance. CAP is also influenced by the amount, variety,

and difficulty of teaching. In evaluating service, CAP assesses the impact and outcome of the activities.

The files that were forwarded to CAP were mostly well prepared, but some files provided little balanced analysis or evaluative or critical insight (e.g., failing to state the goals and/or significance of the candidate's activity); sometimes the information was incomplete. Evaluations of the impact of service activity were frequently missing. Descriptions of administrative functions seldom came to CAP with sufficient documentation of effectiveness or impact to be useful.

Pace of Activity

During the 2004-05 academic year (September through August), CAP met 39 times and considered 427 personnel actions. CAP also provided advice on numerous other issues related to academic personnel. The normal turnaround time for agenda items remained two weeks.

Ad Hoc Committees

Review by a campus ad hoc committee may be required in cases of major advancements (promotion to the Associate Professor and full Professor level, and merits to Professor, Step VI, and Above Scale) and for appointments with tenure. A total of 190 cases fell into this category in 2004-05. CAP's membership reflects the variety of disciplines represented on campus; nevertheless, CAP looks to campus ad hoc committees for highly specialized expertise. CAP proposed ad hoc committees in 40 cases, and thanks the faculty members who served on at least one ad hoc committee for giving so

generously of their time and for the high quality and the objectivity of their evaluations and reports.

Observers

To acquaint new faculty with the personnel process, it has been policy to appoint Assistant Professors (Steps III and IV) as observers to ad hoc committees on promotions to Associate Professor or Professor. During the 2004-05 academic year, 35 assistant professors were appointed by the Vice Provost to serve as non-voting observers on ad hoc committees.

Academic Personnel Actions, 2004-2005

Table 1 provides a summary of CAP's deliberations by category for the past academic year. CAP considered 85 appointments, 103 promotions, 127 merit actions, 54 appraisals, and 58 other actions. Forty of these actions were referred to ad hoc committees (Table 2).

Appointments: CAP continued to streamline the personnel process without compromising the tenets of shared governance. Using a fast-track process, CAP reviewed 49 new appointments and made recommendations to the Vice Provost. This process helps the campus compete more effectively with comparable institutions in an increasingly competitive environment. In four cases, CAP recommended appointment at a step higher than that originally proposed in order to address any potential equity problems in advance. CAP believes this process is working well.

Promotions: With respect to promotions to Associate Professor, CAP recommended promotion in 44 of 56 cases (Table 3). In four of these cases,

CAP recommended a further acceleration of the candidate than was requested. In 47 cases, the faculty members were promoted by the administration. Two cases are pending (both supported by CAP).

CAP supported 34 of 47 promotion actions to full Professor (Table 4). In four of these cases CAP recommended a further acceleration than was requested at earlier levels of review. The administration promoted 39 faculty members to full Professor.

High Level Merit Increases: CAP considered 37 actions for advancement to Professor, Step VI and supported 31 of these cases for advancement (Table 5). The administration gave a merit increase to Step VI (or above) in 34 of these cases. There were a total of 14 requests for advancement to Above Scale (Table 6). CAP supported advancement in 12 cases. The administration granted advancement in these 12 cases. CAP recommended five of eleven proposed merit actions within Professor, Above Scale (Table 7). The administration granted eight merit increases.

Other Merit Actions: CAP also considered merit actions within rank at the Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor ranks. For the rank of Professor or Lecturer SOE, CAP considered a total of 35 actions (Table 8). CAP supported 29, including advancement in addition to that requested by the faculty member in 4 cases. The administration granted merit increases in 33 cases, with one case pending (which CAP opposed). At the Assistant and Associate levels, CAP reviewed a total of 18 proposed merit actions (Table 9). CAP supported all 18 actions, and the administration concurred.

Advancement to Associate Professor, Step IV: In previous years, it has been policy that a faculty member who had spent 6 years at the Associate

rank would be considered for promotion and would not be eligible for a merit increase to Associate Professor, Step IV except under special circumstances. This policy was revised. Departments may now ask the Vice Provost—Academic Personnel, for permission to submit a merit to Step IV in lieu of a promotion with strong justification. The request must clearly explain why recommending a merit to Step IV is appropriate even though the faculty member has already spent 6 or more years at the Associate rank. One justification for a merit to Step IV is that the faculty member is close to meeting the requirements for promotion – i.e., that submission of a promotion action will occur no later than 3 years hence. An example of when consideration for merit may be appropriate is when a submitted book manuscript only requires minor revision before it would be considered “in press”.

Career Equity Reviews: To address potential inequities at both the point of hire and/or during a faculty member’s advancement, a new program called *Career Equity Review* was initiated and implemented during the 2003-04 academic year. Career equity reviews consider the entire career record of the individual to determine if current placement on the academic ladder is consistent with faculty at equal and higher rank and step. If the candidate’s performance is substantially the same as that of the majority of compared faculty members holding the same rank and step, the review will indicate that the candidate is being treated equitably. If, however, the candidate’s performance is essentially equal or superior to the performance of the majority of compared faculty holding a higher rank or step, a recommendation for an appropriate accelerated advancement or equity adjustment will be made. Requests for career equity review can be initiated by individual faculty members, department chairs, deans, the Vice Provost—Academic Personnel, Faculty Personnel Committees or by CAP. CAP

conducted 12 career equity reviews that were initiated by faculty (Table 10). Out of these, CAP recommended an equity adjustment in five cases. CAP also routinely performs a career equity review for every major advancement.

Five-Year Reviews: CAP made 10 five-year reviews, recommending one “advancement,” seven “performance satisfactory, no advancement,” and two “performance unsatisfactory, no advancement.”

Initial Continuing Appointments: CAP reviewed and made recommendations on 17 initial continuing non-Senate appointments in 2004-05. CAP made favorable recommendations for an initial continuing appointment in 16 of these cases. The administration gave 16 initial continuing appointments, with one case pending (which CAP supported). Teaching excellence is a requirement for a continuing appointment.

Faculty Personnel Committees: Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) advise the deans with personnel actions redelegated to the deans. In 2004-05, these actions included: Appointment of Assistant Professor, Step I, II, and III; most normal and accelerated merit actions that do not skip a step up to and including Professor, Step IX, with the exception of merit increases to Professor, Step VI; most normal merit actions for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment; and Unit 18 actions (including appointments and reappointments of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers without Security of Employment). The FPCs reviewed 322 cases (Table 11). In addition, the Committees conducted 54 appraisals of junior faculty which were then forwarded to CAP for further evaluation.

CAP continues to believe that the interests of both the University and of individual Academic Senate colleagues require that confidentiality govern the

personnel process. At the same time, CAP believes that the process itself should be transparent to individual candidates for advancement and promotion. Such transparency is an integral part of peer review and helps ensure that these candidates understand the basis for decisions about their personnel actions. Accordingly, CAP reaffirms the importance of the principle (embodied in current policy) that each candidate for advancement or promotion automatically receive his or her own copy of the comments on his/her personnel action, whatever the outcome of the action. These comments include those made by CAP and the FPCs, along with the comments of Chairs/Directors, Deans, and ad hoc committees.

FPCs are appointed by CAP upon the recommendation of the Executive Committees of the colleges, schools, and divisions (Appendix II). CAP appreciates the dedicated efforts and hard work of the members of these Committees.

University Committee On Academic Personnel (UCAP): Anna Maria Busse Berger served as a member of the University Committee on Academic Personnel, which held several meetings throughout the academic year. The Office of the President, UCAP members, or other UC Academic Senate committees and officers bring issues to the attention of UCAP. A primary function of this systemwide committee is to facilitate the exchange of information among campuses. Accordingly, CAP was regularly informed of UCAP discussions and through its representative provided input into such discussions, when appropriate. UCAP addressed a broad range of issues, among which were discussions of the report of the Professorial Step System Task Force, discussion of electronic publication and scholarly communication, and amendments to the APM.

Other Policy Matters: During 2004-05, CAP commented on several campus or Universitywide policy matters. CAP made appointments to all of the School and College Faculty Personnel Committees based upon recommendations from Faculty Executive Committees.

CAP reviewed *criteria of scholarship* for the Chicana/o Studies Program. CAP reviewed voting procedures for the following departments: American Studies, Anthropology, Applied Science, Civil & Environmental Engineering, Electrical & Computer Engineering, Environmental Design, Physiology & Membrane Biology, Physics, Political Science, and Statistics.

CAP reviewed various other items, including the following:

- Safety and health policy
- Air Quality Resource Center
- Proposed revisions to the APM regarding sick leave, medical separation and leaves of absence
- Proposal to discontinue the undergraduate program in Civil Engineering/ Materials Science and Engineering
- Proposed revisions to APM 210-1-3-d, 240, 245, Bylaw 34, Bylaw 336
- Proposed amendment to Senate Regulation 600B
- Internationalizing the curriculum
- Proposed Science & Technology major
- Endowed Chair policy
- Proposed transfer of Design Program to HArCS
- Several requests to assess particular voting procedures in departments

Acknowledgments

We thank our staff assistant, Solomon Bekele, for his efficient and professional service, and Diana Howard for her efforts on behalf of ad hoc committees. We also thank the members of the Faculty Personnel Committees for their hard work, and the faculty who served on ad hoc committees this academic year. Their efforts are vital to the success of the review process.

Respectfully submitted,

Anna Maria Busse Berger
Edward Callahan
C. Chris Calvert
Irwin Liu
Chip Martel

Thomas Morrison
Catherine Morrison Paul
Philip Yager
Michael Maher, Chair

**Table 1. Personnel Actions Referred to CAP
2004-05**

Appointments	Total	Accelerations	Ad Hoc
Assistant Professor*	7	0	0
Associate Professor*	21	0	0
Professor*	17	0	0
Target of Opportunity, Excellence (TOE)	2	0	0
Partner Opportunity (POP)	2	0	0
Via Change in Title	11	4	0
Endowed Chair	2	0	0
Joint	5	0	0
Initial Continuing Non-Senate	17	0	0
Dept. Chair (reappointment only)	1	0	0
Total Appointments	85	4	0
Promotions			
Associate Professor*	56	12	13
Professor*	47	18	6
Total Promotions	103	30	19
Merit Increases⁺			
Sr. Lecturer, SOE	3	0	0
Assistant Professor*	3	3	0
Associate Professor*	15	2	0
Professor*	94	35	20
Total Merit Increases	115	40	20
Miscellaneous Actions			
Retroactive Merits	12	12	0
Career Equity Reviews**	12	10	0
Appraisals	54	0	0
Termination	1	0	1
Third-Year Deferrals	8	0	0
Five-Year Reviews	10	0	0
TOE Screenings	5	0	0
POP Screenings	9	0	0
Other Actions	13	3	0
Total Miscellaneous Actions	124	25	1
Total Personnel Actions	427	99	40

* Includes Acting, Clinical, In Residence, and Adjunct titles. ** CAP initiates equity reviews for all major advancements. These career equity reviews were initiated by faculty. + Excluding retroactive merits

Table 2. Actions Sent to Ad Hoc Committees

Actions	Number
Termination	1
Promotion to Associate Professor	13
Promotion to Professor	6
Merit Increase to Professor VI	6
Merit Increase to Above Scale	14
Total	40

Table 3. Promotions to Associate Professor

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		Ad Hoc		CAP	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	42	40	2	42	0	7	1	37*	5
Promotion approved at a lower step than proposed	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Promotion approved at a higher step than proposed	4	4	0	4	0	1	0	4**	0
Promotion denied, but a merit increase approved	5	5	0	3	2	0	1	1	4
Promotion denied	2	0	2	0	1+	0	2	0	2
Pending	2	2	0	2	0	1	0	2	0
Total	56	52	4	52	3	9	4	44	12

(*) one case is a career equity adjustment

(**) two are career equity adjustments

(+) one case had no Dean's letter

Table 4. Promotions to Professor

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		Ad Hoc		CAP	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	34	34	0	33	1	3	0	30	4
Promotion approved at a lower step than proposed	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Promotion approved at a higher step than proposed	4	4	0	4	0	0	0	4+	0
Promotion denied, but a merit increase approved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Promotion denied	8	8	0	5	3	1	2	0	8
Total	47	47	0	43	4	4	2	34	13

(+) 1 case is a career equity adjustment

Table 5. Merit Increase to Professor, Step VI

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		Ad Hoc		CAP	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	31	30	1	31	0	2	2+	28*	3
Merit approved at a higher step than proposed	3	3	0	3	0	0	0	3*	0
Acceleration to Step VI denied, but normal merit approved	2	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
Merit denied	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
Total	37	36	1	35	2	3	3	31	6

(+) One ad hoc was split (3 ways)

(*) One case was career equity adjustment

Table 6. Merit Increase from Prof. IX to Prof., Above Scale

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		Ad Hoc		CAP	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	11	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0
Merit approved at a higher step than proposed	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Merit denied	2	0	2+	2	0	0	2	0	2
Total	14	12	2	14	0	12	2	12	2

(+) Includes one split vote taken here as a negative

Table 7. Merit Increases within Professor, Above Scale

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		CAP	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	8	8	0	8	0	5	3
Merit denied	3	3	0	2	1	0	3
Total	11	11	0	10	1	5	6

Table 8. Merit Actions Concerning:

- **Skipping a step (4)**
- **FPC Members (11)**
- **Department Chairs (7)**
- **Associate Deans, Vice Provosts, etc. (9)**
- **Upper level Lecturers, SOE (3)**
- **Request by Vice Provost (1)**

By target level: P2 (1), P3 (6)^a, P4 (9)^b, P5 (7)^a, P7 (5), P8 (2), P9 (2), LSOE III (1), LSOE V (2)

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		CAP	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	25	25	0	20	0 ⁺	25 ⁱ	0
Merit approved but at a lower step than proposed	4	3	1	3	1	0	4
Merit approved but at a higher step than proposed	4	4	0	3	0 [*]	4	0
Merit denied	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
Pending	1	1	0	0	1	0	1
Total	35	34	1	27	2	29	6

(+) five actions lacked Dean's letter

(*) one action lacked Dean's letter

(i) one case treated as career equity adjustment by CAP

(a) includes one acceleration

(b) includes three accelerations

Table 9. Merit Increases Within Assistant and Associate Professor Ranks, including 4 Accelerated Actions

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		CAP	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	18	18	0	17	1	18	0
Total	18	18	0	17	1	18	0

Table 10. Career Equity Reviews

Outcome		Dept.			Dean		CAP	
		Yes	No	Split	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	7	6	0	1	5	2	5	2
Proposed action denied	5	2	1	2	4	1	0	5
Total	12	8	1	3	9	3	5	7

Table 11. Redelegated Merit Actions

	FPC Recommendation			Dean's Decision	
	Yes	No	Split	Yes	No
College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences	61	5	2	63	5
Division of Biological Sciences	12	5		13	4
School of Education	1	1		1	1
College of Engineering	38	7		41	3 ⁺
Graduate School of Management	1	0		1	0
Division of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies	35	1		36	0
Division of Mathematical and Physical Sciences	16	0	1	17	0
Division of Social Sciences	32	2		32	2
School of Law	5	1		5	1
School of Medicine	49	6		48	7
School of Veterinary Medicine	36	4	1	37	4
Totals	286	32	5	294	27

(+) one case pending

APPENDIX I

PRINCIPAL TASKS OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL – OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

1. Nominating faculty to serve on ad hoc committees which make recommendations for promotions, appointments, and upper level merit increases.
2. Reviewing the reports of ad hoc committees and independently evaluating the dossiers of the candidate under consideration.
3. Reviewing proposed accelerated merit increases, terminations, reconsiderations, third-year deferrals, five-year reviews, Chancellor Fellow and Endowed Chair appointments, and reappointments of department chairs.
4. Reviewing merit actions for department chairs, program chairs, associate deans, members of Faculty Personnel Committees (and their near relatives) and other individuals for whom such action has not been redelegated to deans.
5. Appointing faculty to serve on Faculty Personnel Committees.
6. Reviewing policy matters referred by the administration and by the chair or committee of the Academic Senate, as well as initiating new policies and changes in existing policies when appropriate.
7. Conducting an annual post-audit of the recommendations from the Faculty Personnel Committees.
8. Reviewing summaries of confidential files of individual faculty prepared at individual's request by the Vice Provost—Academic Personnel.
9. Approving departmental voting procedures.
10. Reviewing requests for Target of Excellence and Partner Opportunity Program positions.
11. Reviewing cases to ensure equity in the application of criteria for appointments, merits, and promotion actions.
12. Conducting career equity reviews and reviewing continuing appointments for Unit 18 Lecturers.

APPENDIX II

FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEES 2004 - 2005

College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences

Jan Dvorak (Agronomy & Range Science) - Chair
Adel Kader (Pomology)
Joy Mench (Animal Science)
Michael Barbour (Environmental Horticulture)
Richard Howitt (Agricultural & Resource Econ)
Kyaw Tha Paw U (LAWR)

College of Engineering

Bahram Ravani (Mechanical & Aero Engrg) - Chair
Jay Lund (Civil & Environ. Engrg)
Biswanath Mukherjee (Computer Science)
John Miles (Biological & Ag Engrg)
Ahmet Palazoglu (Chemical Engrg & Materials Science)

College of Letters and Science

Keith Widaman (Psychology) - Chair
Jacquelyn Gervay-Hague (Chemistry)
David Nutter (Music)
James Griesemer (Philosophy)
Evan Watkins (English)
George Roussas (Statistics)

Division of Biological Sciences

John Harada (Plant Biology) - Chair
Michael Sanderson (Evolution & Ecology)
Diana Myles (Molecular & Cellular Biology)
Carlito Lebrilla (Chemistry)
Andrew Ishida (NP&B)

Graduate School of Management

Peter Lindert (Economics) - Chair
Brad Barber (GSM)
Eitan Gerstner (GSM)

School of Law

Suad Joseph (Anthropology) - Chair
Edward Imwinkelried (Law School)
Joel Dobris (Law School)
Bruce Wolk (Law School)
Clarence Walker (History)

School of Medicine

John McGahan (Radiology) – Chair
Joseph Antognini (Anesthesiology)
Richard Maddock (Psychology)
Michael Holland (Biological Chemistry)
Ellen Gold (Epidemiology & Prev. Medicine)
Peter Franks (Family & Community Medicine)
Martha O'Donnell (Human Physiology)
Carroll Cross (Internal Medicine)
Anthony Stone (Urology)

School of Veterinary Medicine

Susan Stover (Anatomy, Physiol. & Cell Biology) – Chair
Mary Christopher (Pathology, Microbiology & Immun.)
Alan Buckpitt (Molecular Biosciences)
Peter Ihrke (Medicine & Epidemiology)

School of Education

Evelyn Silvia (Mathematics) – Chair
Jon Wagner (Education)
Barbara Merino (Education)