

ANNUAL REPORT
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL - OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
2005-06

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, as well as 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 effort, impact and outcome.

The files that were forwarded to CAP were mostly well prepared. Evaluations of the impact of service activity were usually absent. Descriptions of administrative functions seldom came to CAP with sufficient documentation of effectiveness or impact to be useful.

Pace of Activity

During the 2005-06 academic year (September through August), CAP met **41** times and considered **472** personnel actions. CAP also provided advice on numerous other issues related to academic personnel. The normal turnaround time for agenda items was 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 **212** cases fell into this category in 2005-06. 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 **21** 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 2005-06 academic year, **16** assistant professors were appointed by the Vice Provost to serve as non-voting observers on ad hoc committees.

Academic Personnel Actions, 2005-2006

Table 1 provides a summary of CAP's deliberations by category for the past academic year. CAP considered **79**¹ appointments, **116** promotions, **178**² merit actions, **43** appraisals, and **56** other actions. Twenty-one 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 **53** 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.

Promotions: With respect to promotions to Associate Professor, CAP recommended promotion in **48** of **60** cases (Table 3). Based on career equity reviews, CAP recommended a further acceleration of the candidate than was requested in four cases. In **54** cases, the faculty members were promoted by the administration. Three additional faculty received merit increases in lieu of promotion.

CAP supported **50** of **56** promotion actions to full Professor (Table 4). In one of these cases CAP recommended a further acceleration than was requested at earlier levels of review. The administration promoted **51** faculty members to full Professor.

¹ Includes via change in title, endowed chair, and initial continuing non-Senate faculty appointments.

² Includes retroactive, accelerated continuing lecturer and lecturer merits.

High Level Merit Increases: CAP considered **37** actions for advancement to Professor, Step VI and supported **32** of these cases for advancement (Table 5). The administration gave a merit increase to Step VI (or above) in **32** of these cases. There were a total of **16** requests for advancement to Professor, Above Scale (Table 6). CAP supported advancement in **12** cases. The administration granted advancement in **13** cases. CAP recommended **16** of **19** proposed merit actions within Professor, Above Scale (Table 7). The administration granted **17** merit increases, with **1** action pending decision.

Other Merit Actions: CAP also considered merit actions within the Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor ranks. For the rank of Professor, CAP considered a total of **53** actions (Table 8). CAP supported **36** actions as proposed, including advancement in addition to that requested by the faculty member in **2** cases. An additional **15** cases were supported by CAP for a lower step than proposed, among which eight received retroactive merit increases. The administration granted merit increases in **52** cases. At the Assistant and Associate levels, CAP reviewed a total of **30** proposed merit actions (Table 9). CAP supported **27** actions as proposed, and in **2** cases recommended a retroactive merit increase to a lower step. The administration concurred.

Advancement to Associate Professor, Step IV: In previous years, it has been policy that a faculty member who had spent six 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 six 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 three 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.” Two of the **22** cases that CAP reviewed involved skipping a step. CAP recommended favorably in all **22** cases and the administration agreed.

Career Equity Reviews: To address potential inequities at both the point of hire and/or during a faculty member’s advancement, *Career Equity Reviews* are

conducted. 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 **6** career equity reviews that were initiated by faculty (Table 10). Out of these, CAP recommended an equity adjustment in **5** cases. CAP also routinely performs a career equity review for every major advancement.

Five-Year Reviews: CAP made **15** five-year reviews, recommending **2** "advancements," **11** "performance satisfactory, no advancement," and **2** "performance unsatisfactory, no advancement."

Initial Continuing Appointments: CAP reviewed and made recommendations on **13** initial continuing non-Senate appointments in 2005-06. CAP made favorable recommendations for an initial continuing appointment in **11** of these cases. The administration approved all **13** initial continuing appointments. Teaching excellence, with a capital "E," is a requirement for a continuing appointment.

Accelerated Merits for Continuing Lecturers: CAP considered **9** cases of accelerated merit advancement for Continuing Lecturers. While CAP made favorable recommendations in all **9** cases, it recommended a further one-step accelerated merit increase beyond the normal two-step in **5**. Teaching excellence, course design and organization of teaching materials, contribution to curriculum and workshop development, student advising and mentoring, instruction-related service to campus and profession are some considerations that CAP looks upon favorably in making positive recommendations.

Faculty Personnel Committees: Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) advise the deans with personnel actions redelegated to the deans. In 2005-06, 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 **293** cases (Table 11). In addition, the Committees conducted **53** 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): Catherine Morrison Paul 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 on salary scales and off-scale salaries, assessment of the relationship of UC's faculty salary schedule to the merit system, proposed modifications to the language criteria for advancement to Step VI and above scale, comparison of CAP practices/differences on sister campuses, responding to challenges facing scholarly communication, role of research collaborators, and various amendments to the APM.

Other Policy Matters: During 2005-06, CAP commented on several campus or Universitywide policy matters. CAP made appointments of Faculty Personnel Committees based upon recommendations from Faculty Executive Committees. CAP reviewed voting procedures for the following departments:

Family & Community Medicine
Human & Community Development
School of Education
VM Surgical & Radiological Sciences

The Committee reviewed various other items, including the following:

- Cross-Departmental Searches Based on Campus Initiatives
- Disestablishment of Exercise Science
- Review of Faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series
- Proposed revisions to the APM regarding advancement to Professor, Step VI and advancement to Professor, Above Scale
- Proposed revisions to UC Davis Policy and Procedure Manual Sections 200-20 – Establishment or Revision of Academic Units and 200-25 – Establishment or Revision of Academic Degree Programs.

Acknowledgments

CAP would like to express appreciation to the Academic Senate staff, in particular Solomon Bekele for his efficient and professional service and Diana Howard for her efforts on behalf of ad hoc committees. CAP would also like to express appreciation to the Vice Provost—Academic Personnel, Barbara Horwitz and her staff. As the report will show, our recommendations and the ultimate decision by the administration almost always coincide.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Chris Calvert
Ines Hernandez-Avila
Chip Martel
Christopher Reynolds
Philip Yager, Chair

Catherine Morrison Paul
Irwin Liu
Jerry Powell
Steve Tharratt

**Table 1. Personnel Actions Referred to CAP
2005-06**

Appointments	Total	Accelerations	Ad Hoc
Assistant Professor*	11	0	0
Associate Professor*	21	0	0
Professor*	21	0	0
Via Change in Title	11		
Endowed Chair	2	0	0
Initial Continuing Non-Senate	13	0	0
Total Appointments	79	0	0
Promotions			
Associate Professor*	60	22	4
Professor*	56	15	4
Total Promotions	116	37	8
Merit Increases⁺			
Assistant Professor*	2	2	0
Associate Professor*	28	8	0
Professor*	125	60	12
Retroactive	13	13	0
Continuing Lecturer	9	9	
Senior Lecturer, SOE	1	0	
Total Merit Increases	178	92	12
Miscellaneous Actions			
Career Equity Reviews	6	6	0
Appraisals	43	0	0
Termination	1	0	1
Third-Year Deferrals	6	0	0
Five-Year Reviews	15	0	0
TOE Screenings	6	0	0
POP Screenings	6	0	0
Other Actions	16	0	0
Total Miscellaneous Actions	99	6	1
Total Personnel Actions	472	135	21

* 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	4
Promotion to Professor	4
Merit Increase to Professor VI	4
Merit Increase to Above Scale	8
Total	21

Table 3. Promotions to Associate Professor

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		Ad Hoc		CAP([∞])	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	49	49	0	47	2	1	0	44	5
Promotion approved at a lower step than proposed	1	1	0	0	1	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	3	3	0	3	0	0	1	0	3
Promotion denied	2	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	2
Candidate resigned; no decision	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Total	60	59	1	55	5	1	3	48	12

([∞]) These are CAP's recommendations based on original proposed action

Table 4. Promotions to Professor

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		Ad Hoc		CAP(∞)	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	47	47	0	46	1	2	0	46	1
Promotion approved at a lower step than proposed	3	3	0	2	1	2	0	3	0
Promotion approved at a higher step than proposed or retroactively	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Promotion denied, but a merit increase approved	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Promotion denied	3	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Total	56	56	0	50	6	4	0	50	6

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	29	29	0	28	1	1	0	29	0
Merit approved at a higher step than proposed	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	0
Merit approved at lower step than proposed	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Step VI denied, but normal merit approved to Step V retroactively	2	2	0	2	0	0	1	0	2
Step VI denied	3	3	0	2	1	0	2	0	3
Total	37	37	0	35	2	1	3	32	5

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	12	12	0	11	1	6	0	11	1
Merit approved at a higher step than proposed (includes retroactive action)	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Merit denied	3	3	0	3	0	0	2+	0	3
Total	16	16	0	15	1	6	2	12	4

(+) one ad hoc split 1-1-1

(∞) These are CAP's recommendations based on original proposed action

Table 7. Merit Increases within Professor, Above Scale

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		CAP(∞)	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	17	17	0	17	0	15	2
Merit denied	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
Pending	1	1	0	1	0	1	0
Total	19	19	0	19	0	16	3

Table 8. Merit Actions Concerning: @

- **Skipping a step (23)**
- **FPC Members (10)**
- **Department Chairs (11)**
- **Associate Deans, Vice Provosts, etc. (11)**
- **Request by Dean for CER (1)**

By target level: P2 (1), P3 (10), P4 (16), P5 (9), P7 (7), P8 (6), P9 (4)

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		CAP(∞)	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Action approved as proposed	35	35	0	28	0 ⁺	34	1
Merit approved but at a lower step than proposed	15	15	0	15	0	0	15*
Merit approved but at a higher step than proposed, including Dean's CER request	2	2	0	2	0	2	0
Merit denied	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
Total	53	53	0	46	0	36	17

(+) seven FPC member actions lacked Dean's letter

(*) eight of the lower step merits were awarded retroactively to 7/1/05 per CAP's recommendation

@ three candidates were in two categories, i.e., being an FPC member and skipping a step

(∞) These are CAP's recommendations based on original proposed action

Table 9. Merit Increases Within Assistant and Associate Professor Ranks, including 10 Accelerated Actions

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		CAP([∞])	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	27	27	0	27	0	26	1
Merit approved but at a lower step	2	2	0	2	0	0	2
Pending	1	1	0	1	0	1	0
Total	30	30	0	30	0	27	3

Table 10. Career Equity Reviews

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		CAP([∞])	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	5	5	0	5	0	5	0
Proposed action denied	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
Total	6	6	0	6	0	5	1

([∞]) These are CAP's recommendations based on original proposed action

Table 11. Redelegated Merit Actions+

	FPC Recommendation			Dean's Decision	
	Yes	No	Split	Yes	No
College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences	43	2		43	2
Division of Biological Sciences	18	4		19	3
School of Education++					
College of Engineering	38	8		41	5
Graduate School of Management	3	1		3	1
Division of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies	18	2		18	2
Division of Mathematical and Physical Sciences	26	1	1	27	1
Division of Social Sciences	42	1		41	2
School of Law	9	0		9	0
School of Medicine	41	4		41	4
School of Veterinary Medicine	28	3		31	0
Totals	266	26	1	273	20

(+) The figures do not include "first actions after promotion" in which the Dean makes decisions without FPC input.

(++) The School of Education had five "first actions" in which the FPC did not participate.

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 2005-2006

College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences

Joy Mench (Animal Science) - Chair
Adel Kader (Pomology)
Bryan Jenkins (Biological & Ag Engrg)
David Reid (Food Science & Technology)
Steve Brush (Human & Community Development)
Jan Dvorak (Plant Sciences)
Kyaw Tha Paw U on sabbatic leave 2005-06

College of Engineering

Ahmet Palazoglu (Chem Engrg & Materials Sci) - Chair
Jay Lund (Civil & Environ. Engrg)
Biswanath Mukherjee (Computer Science)
Greg Miller (Applied Science)
Steven Lewis (Electrical & Computer Eng)
Case van Dam (Mechanical & Aero. Eng)

College of Letters & Science

David Nutter (Music) - Chair
S. Mani Tripathi (Physics)
M. Cecilia Colombi (Spanish)
George Roussas (Statistics)
Timothy Cogley (Economics)
Louis Warren (History)

Division of Biological Sciences

John Harada (Plant Biology) - Chair
Michael Sanderson (Evolution & Ecology)
Diana Myles (Molecular & Cellular Biology)
was on sabbatic leave 2003-04
Carlito Lebrilla (Chemistry)
Andrew Ishida (NP&B)

Graduate School of Management

Peter Lindert (Economics) - Chair
Robert Smiley (GSM)
Anand Swaminathan (GSM)

School of Law

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

School of Medicine

John McGahan (Radiology) - Chair
Joseph Antognini (Anesthesiology)
Richard Maddock (Psychology)
Michael Holland (Biological Chemistry)
Jerold Last (Internal Medicine)
Peter Franks (Family & Community Medicine)
Mary O'Hara (Ophthalmology)
Carroll Cross (Internal Medicine)
Robert Berman (Neurological Surgery)

School of Veterinary Medicine

Alan Buckpitt (Molecular Biosciences) - Chair
Mary Christopher (Pathology, Microbiology & Immun.)
Richard Lecouteur (Surgical & Radiological Sci.)
Peter Ihrke (Medicine & Epidemiology)

School of Education

Suad Joseph (Anthropology) - Chair
Jon Wagner (Education)
Barbara Merino (Education)