APPENDIX II: SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Information considered by the Committee included publicly available written reports, web-sites describing personnel processes at other UC campuses, public and private communications from faculty, and numerous interviews.

Publicly available information and reports that we considered included:
2. The Davis APM and Divisional Bylaws.
3. Annual Calls for Personnel Actions (Office of the Vice Provost).
4. Annual Reports of the UC Davis Committee on Academic Personnel (Academic Senate).
8. Policies and Procedures used on other UC Campuses and available on web sites.
11. UCOP publication AP 13: Profile of the Professor Series by Discipline (Sex, FTE, Head count, Salary, Age, by Campus (General Campus and Health Sciences) for October, 1998.

In addition to publicly available information, the Office of the Vice-Provost provided confidential information summarizing all academic personnel actions during 1998-1999. Each personnel action was identified only by department and the action proposed, not by name of candidate. In order to preserve confidentiality further, only one member of the Committee had access to the information at that level of detail. All statistics were aggregated at the College or Division level for further discussion by the Committee and for inclusion in our report. The Office of the Vice-Provost also provided a separate data set giving information on department, current rank, and current step for all Academic Senate members in May, 2000. We thank Linda Bullard for assistance in providing this data.

Anecdotal information and formal interviews formed the remainder of the information on which we based our recommendations. Several members of our committee had conversations and e-mail exchanges with administrators and members of CAP at other UCs. They very kindly provided us with statistics and information on their policies. Faculty were invited to submit comments to SCAPP via e-mail address and such messages were archived in a secure web site accessible only to members of SCAPP. More than fifty such commentaries were received. Faculty were also invited to submit written comments and recommendations and we received well over a dozen thoughtful communications by this route. The Committee met personally with several faculty and held two public Town Hall Meetings.

We held formal interviews in which one to four members of SCAPP typically participated and that lasted no less than one hour. All department chairs were invited to be interviewed. Two department chairs requested private interviews, but two interviews were conducted with groups of ten or a dozen chairs. We also held formal private interviews with each of the ten Deans of the colleges, divisions, and graduate professional schools. We also interviewed representatives of appropriate campus committees. We had interviews with the current chairs of the local personnel committees and with the current and some former chairs of CAP. We obtained other perspectives by interviewing the chair of the Academic Senate Privilege and Tenure Investigative Committee as well as the combined members of that committee and the Faculty Privilege Advisors.
We had interviews with the Vice-Provost on three occasions. One of these interviews was a meeting with the entire Committee. Finally, we interviewed the chair of the Committee to Review the Office of the Vice-Provost.