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INTRODUCTION

On December 10, 1999, the Executive Council of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate directed the Special Committee on Academic Personnel Processes to review faculty salaries and all academic personnel policies, procedures, practices and outcomes on the Davis campus. The goals of these reviews are to understand why the Davis faculty has been among the lowest paid of those in the UC System and to make recommendations for improvements in the quality and efficiency of our academic personnel system. Appendix I contains the complete charge to this Committee together with brief responses to the questions posed in the charge. Appendix II describes the processes that the Committee used in its deliberations and includes a list of written documents consulted.

We affirm that the basic structure and philosophical underpinnings of the academic personnel process used at UC Davis are sound. Peer review of faculty performance is one of the foundations of academic excellence and shared governance at the University of California. It ensures equal treatment better than any system depending solely on administrative review. Multiple administrative and peer reviews provide checks and balances that are meant to serve the faculty and the institution well. Multiple merit steps within ranks help the faculty gauge their progress towards major promotions and, in principle, permit them the flexibility to emphasize teaching, research or service at various times during their career. Finally, the system is flexible enough to accommodate a wide range of interpretations and practices that suit the various needs of all UC campuses.

We have found abundant evidence, however, that our practices are placing the system under stress, that they cause widespread and unnecessary morale problems, and that they have caused injustice to individuals. Faculty dissatisfaction is not limited to those directly affected by negative decisions, but is also evident in the serious concern expressed by many successful faculty for those whom they believe have been treated badly. The practices that concern the faculty have contributed to a climate of mistrust, much of which is focused on the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). However, it appears to us that a more pervasive culture of mistrust has evolved that infects all levels of the personnel process and that this mistrust has led to an unnecessary and detrimental polarization of the campus.

The goal of this Committee is to recommend changes in our personnel practices that will help recreate a supportive environment that encourages academic excellence. We hope that, together, the faculty and administration can revive a spirit of generosity and mutual support. There are few faculty who undertake more burdensome service than those who serve on personnel committees and we owe these faculty an immense debt of gratitude. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that any improvement will occur if significant efforts are not made to change the procedures followed by our personnel committees and the ways in which they interact with and are perceived by the faculty. It is equally clear that our recommendations will require the faculty to re-establish their proper role in the University by taking increased and more effective responsibility for peer evaluation and shared governance.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our major findings and recommendations are summarized below. Brief responses to questions posed in the charge to the committee may be found in Appendix I. Additional findings and recommendations are listed in the Discussion section.

Salaries

Findings:
- a) Average salaries at UC Davis are among the lowest in the UC system.
- b) A significant fraction of faculty at Davis is not making normal progress and the average step of Full Professors at Davis is the lowest among all UC campuses.
- c) There is widespread support for increasing rewards for the very best faculty.

Recommendations:
1) The campus should adopt personnel policies that will create a positive and supportive environment in which excellent faculty will thrive.
2) The campus should adopt the policy of comparing our salaries with institutions whose reputations we wish to emulate.

Personnel Process

The Role of CAP

Finding:
- d) In order to create a positive and supportive culture in which standards are clear and faculty are rewarded appropriately, the role of Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) should be modified.

Recommendations:
3) The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) should endeavor to play a positive and supportive role in our personnel process.
4) CAP should evaluate personnel actions on the basis of recommendations and evidence provided by other levels of the review process.
5) Only in unusual circumstances should CAP undertake independent evaluations of review files or overturn unanimous or nearly unanimous recommendations of prior reviews. CAP should make every effort to reconcile conflicting recommendations by consulting with departments, deans, and ad hoc review committees, as appropriate.
6) CAP should consult regularly with the Executive Council of the Academic Senate on pending policy matters.
7) The Academic Senate should decide whether the duties of CAP should include "initiating new policies."
8) CAP should ask for guidance from the Senate in defining tasks beyond those explicitly stated in the by-laws.
9) CAP should be responsible for making recommendations about personnel actions in which the campus has a compelling interest such as appointments, appraisals of Assistant Professors, promotions and merit actions requiring extramural review. All other actions should be redelegated to the Colleges and Professional Schools.
Criteria for Evaluating Faculty performance

Findings:
e) The relative emphasis placed on research and teaching is appropriate for our campus.
f) Personnel decisions are not currently made with the flexibility mandated by the APM.
g) Academic leadership, especially by department chairs, is not appropriately recognized and rewarded.
h) Decisions reflect an insufficiently broad view of the nature of scholarship.
i) There is little consensus about appropriate rewards for some forms of research and creative activity and for some professional activities.

Recommendations:
10) Department and program chairs and others with significant service responsibilities should be compensated by paid administrative leave that is accrued at the same rate as, and in addition to, sabbatical leave.
11) Standards for evaluating faculty performance should be clarified.

Clarification of Standards

Findings:
j) The personnel system at Davis is the most rigorous in the UC system, as measured by denial rates for personnel actions that leave the department.
k) Faculty advance more slowly at Davis than at other UC campuses.
l) There is a lack of clarity in standards, as indicated by the frequency with which different decision-makers disagree on the same action.
m) The Committee on Academic Personnel overturns recommendations from lower levels at higher rates than on other campuses.
n) Davis is more conservative than other UC campuses and clarification of standards is needed.

Recommendations:
12) Each department should be requested to provide a written summary of the nature of scholarship within their academic discipline and their own criteria and standards for the evaluation of faculty performance. The goal of this exercise is to articulate the standards and practices of the department so that both candidates and persons evaluating the candidate have a clear view of performance expectations.
13) The Office of the Vice-Provost should organize an annual workshop on the academic personnel review process for chairs of programs, deans, members of local personnel committees, and members of CAP in order that the principals who participate in the decision-making process have the same information.
14) The Annual Call should be revised and greatly shortened in order to communicate concisely the essence of the review process and to announce and clarify new policies.

Efficiency of the Process

Finding:
o) There is almost unanimous support for streamlining the personnel system.

Recommendations:
15) All merit actions within rank should be re-delegated to the Colleges and Professional Schools.  
16) Documentation in review files should be reorganized and abbreviated.
Enhancing Fairness and Faculty Confidence

Findings:

p) Many faculty, including those making normal or better than normal progress, are dissatisfied with the personnel system due to perceptions of unfairness.
q) UC Davis CAP is perceived to work too closely with the administration.
r) The current climate of mistrust is not a recent phenomenon, but has evolved over many years.

Recommendations:

17) Ad hoc review committees should be expanded to five members, including a departmental representative.
18) CAP should adopt procedures by which members with a conflict of interest are recused.
19) The Committee on Committees should appoint a Shadow CAP to make recommendations on appeals of personnel actions and on actions involving members of CAP.
20) CAP should be housed with the Senate and all support for it and its staff should be included in the budget of the Academic Senate.
21) The state of the academic personnel system should be re-examined by the Academic Senate during academic year 2001-2002 and at regular intervals thereafter.

DISCUSSION

Salaries

A detailed analysis of salary information is presented in Appendix III: Comparison of Salaries at UC Davis with Other UC Campuses. Our analysis of salary and rank/step information demonstrates that:

• Salaries at Davis are among the lowest in the UC system.
• Salaries have decreased markedly relative to institutions with the best academic reputations.
• Salaries have decreased markedly relative to those at UCB, which are the highest in UC.
• Professors at UC Davis are essentially the same age, but at lower average step than at all other UC campuses, and 2 steps lower than at UCB.
• The lower average step of Professors at Davis explains most of the salary differences compared to UCB and other UC campuses.

Salaries at Davis are generally second or third from the bottom of the eight general UC campuses. Salaries at Davis also are, with two exceptions, significantly below the eight campus average when compared on the basis of discipline. Compared to salaries at Berkeley, the salary differential has increased significantly over the past 20 years, and the salary gap increases with increasing rank. Present salary differentials at the Assistant Professor level suggest that further separation can be expected in the future.

We have investigated several factors that could account for differences in salaries: campus reputation, initial appointment level, use of off-scale salaries, age of faculty, and rates of advancement. Neither policy statements nor data are available that would establish the significance of cost of living as a factor in the salary differential. Our analysis suggests that:

• Average salaries of the eight general campuses, the comparison eight universities and other research universities tend to reflect the order of academic reputation.
• Levels of initial appointment are lower at UCD than, for example, at UCB. This reduces the average salary of the campus because more faculty are at lower levels and take longer to reach the higher levels.
• Davis has the fewer faculty with off-scale salaries than the other UC campuses.
• The average age of faculty at each level varies only slightly among the campuses. Age does not appear to be a significant factor in the salary differential.
• The rate of advancement at Davis is slower than the normative time at every level and is most pronounced at the Full Professor rank.
• At the Full Professor level approximately 85% of the salary differential with Berkeley can be attributed to the differences in step distribution. Differences at the Associate Professor level are affected by both the step distribution and off-scale increments. At the Assistant Professor level, the off-scale component is the dominant factor contributing to salary differences.

We recommend that UC Davis adopt personnel policies that will create a positive and supportive environment in which excellent faculty will thrive. Salaries are lower than elsewhere, in large part, because faculty at Davis are both appointed at lower rank and advance more slowly than at other campuses. The comparative difficulty of advancing through the ranks at Davis is disturbing because our ability to compete for the best faculty is ultimately related to our attitude toward supporting their endeavors and rewarding them. This situation is within our power to change, as individuals, by taking steps to ensure that we are worthy of advancement, and collectively, by creating a culture in which standards are clear and faculty are appropriately rewarded for their efforts. Many of the recommendations we offer in the remainder of this report are designed to help create just such a positive environment.

We recommend that the campus adopt the policy of comparing our salaries with institutions whose reputations we wish to emulate. A recent report describes salaries at Davis as "fully competitive" (UC Davis: Growth & Academic Planning Opportunities & Challenges, The Office of the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, which may be found at http://provost.ucdavis.edu/presentations/growthandplanning/sld027.htm). In fact, the data we have consulted show that our salaries are among the lowest within UC and are much lower than at many highly ranked institutions. This is significant because we compete for faculty with many nationally ranked universities, most of which are not UC campuses. The responsibilities and goals of state and private universities differ. Nevertheless, if UC Davis aspires to be among the best of academic institutions, it must measure its progress against the very best, not against institutions that are struggling or that have fading reputations. Such a policy would send a very clear message about our goals and aspirations, about our focus on excellence, and about our determination to reward excellence on our own campus.
Personnel Process

The Role of CAP: Transforming the Culture

Our discussions and interviews lead us to find that:

- The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) should ask for guidance from the Senate in defining tasks beyond those explicitly stated in the by-laws.
- Any CAP, however constituted, will lack the expertise to make systematically sound, independent evaluations of scholarship for a faculty as diverse as at UC Davis.
- Research and scholarship should be evaluated as close to the source of disciplinary expertise as possible.
- The role of CAP should be to monitor and evaluate the evidence and recommendations presented by other review agencies. CAP should undertake totally independent review only in unusual circumstances.

We believe that CAP needs to be the voice of the faculty in the personnel process. It is, first and foremost, a committee of the Academic Senate that should seek advice from its constituency and be responsible to it. CAP should look for ways to reward our best faculty, to encourage all faculty to do their best work, and to support creatively those faculty who are struggling. When decisions are positive, it should be the role of CAP to offer congratulations on a job well-done. When previous reviews offer conflicting advice, it should be the role of CAP to reconcile the various parties to the review. Premature inclusion of the candidate in the reconsideration process should be avoided. When negative recommendations are unavoidable, CAP should specify, as clearly and unambiguously as possible, the grounds for the negative decision and, if appropriate, offer clear guidelines for a positive action in the future. If clear guidelines cannot be given, then perhaps personnel committees should reconsider their recommendation. In short, we imagine a CAP that plays a positive and supportive role in the personnel process.

For many years, CAP has interpreted its charge to include "independently evaluating the dossiers of the candidates under consideration." Indeed, such an activity is within the charge specified in Davis Division By-law 43 (B1): "To make recommendations to the Chief Campus Officer regarding ... promotions, merit increases, ... and related matters." Unfortunately, the way in which CAP is perceived to carry out this mission has caused significant controversy. The crux of the matter is that CAP has attempted on numerous occasions to form independent judgments of the quality of scholarship and the nature of appropriate scholarship, teaching, or service that differ from the advice of departments, deans, ad hoc review committees and/or external referees. We suspect, and many faculty are convinced, that serious injustices have occurred as a result. We believe that scholarship is best evaluated closer to the source of expertise than at CAP. In fact, it is unlikely that any CAP, however constituted, routinely can render sound, independent judgments about the quality of scholarship.

CAP has also interpreted their charge to include "initiating new policies and changes in existing policies when appropriate." In comparing the Systemwide and Davis Division Bylaws, it is clear that the major duty of the Systemwide CAP is to focus on policy issues. There is no language in the Davis Division Bylaws that suggests CAP may initiate new policies without seeking advice from their constituency. Certainly some changes in policy recommended by CAP, without adequate notice to the faculty, have caused significant hardship and controversy (e.g. merit reviews for Associate Professor, Step IV).

Other activities that have caused significant concern include penalizing candidates for the quantity or kind of their assigned teaching, professional activities, or administrative duties. The kind and amount of teaching, professional/clinical activities, and administrative duties undertaken by
a faculty member are assigned by a department chair or dean. The quality of such activities should be evaluated at all levels of personnel review, but the amount and kind of these activities are matters of policy that are negotiated with chairs and deans. Although CAP may properly disagree with a policy, it is inappropriate that any personnel committee criticize or penalize an individual faculty member for activities that have been negotiated with the responsible authorities within the University. In no circumstance should individual faculty be made to bear the burden of disagreements about policy between a personnel committee and the responsible administrators.

There is a widespread belief among faculty, chairs and deans that the comments returned to candidates by CAP and local personnel committees are destructive and create serious morale problems. Remarkably, even on positive actions, comments by personnel committees are commonly viewed as demeaning or insulting and it has been suggested that such comments have led to recruitment and retention problems. This issue is a particularly emotional one, and appears to represent an important source of dissatisfaction with the current merit and promotion system.

It is difficult to explain these perceptions or to recommend a solution. The problem has probably been exacerbated by the change in policy by which faculty now receive copies of the comments, rather than verbal summaries provided by their Chairs. Much of the problem may be that the comments are used for two incompatible goals: the comments need to provide useful advice to the candidate, but also need to be frank and honest in summarizing the case for the Chancellor. It appears that we as a campus have not yet achieved the difficult but necessary balance. Written comments should be straightforward, factual, balanced, and unemotional. Positive and negative aspects of the package should be given appropriate weight and discussion. Suggestions for changes in faculty priorities or conduct should be very clearly defined, but we note that no defined mechanism exists to insure that a future personnel committee will agree with those suggestions.

It is our view that the proper role of CAP is to supervise the personnel process in such a way as to ensure fairness and to ensure that the standards of review meet the criteria outlined in the Academic Personnel Manual. In doing so, we expect CAP to rely primarily on the evidence and recommendations provided by other review agencies: departments, deans, ad hoc review committees, and extramural referees. Only in unusual circumstances should CAP undertake its own independent analysis of the candidate's review package. If prior reviews provide conflicting advice, CAP should conduct joint discussions among the parties to the review in order to reconcile the different positions and reach the strongest possible decision. This approach contrasts with the present hierarchical procedure in which CAP substitutes its own recommendation for those with which it disagrees.

In order to preserve morale, a candidate should be asked for further information only if such reconciliation proves not to be possible. In general, we believe that the most appropriate role for CAP is to review the case for the proposed action that has been prepared by other review agencies. If CAP were to adopt this premise as the basis of its recommendations, we believe that the University and the faculty would be well-served.

We recommend that:

- The Committee on Academic Personnel evaluate personnel actions on the basis of evidence and recommendations presented to it by other review agencies.
- CAP undertake independent evaluations of review files or overturn unanimous or nearly unanimous recommendations of prior reviews only in unusual circumstances. CAP should make every effort to reconcile conflicting recommendations by consulting, as appropriate, with departments, deans, and ad hoc review committees.
- The Committee on Academic Personnel consult regularly with the Executive Council of the Academic Senate on pending policy matters.
- The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) ask for guidance from the Senate in defining tasks beyond those explicitly stated in the by-laws.
• The Academic Senate decide whether the charge to the Committee on Academic Personnel includes "initiating new policies."

There are no activities more important to the University than ensuring that it appoints and retains the best possible faculty and that it is meeting its obligations for research, teaching and outreach. Our personnel process should focus first, and foremost, on those steps that are most critical for ensuring the appointment and retention of the best possible faculty.

We recommend that CAP remain responsible for making recommendations for:
• Appointments above the level of Assistant Professor, Step III, as currently described;
• Fourth-year review of Assistant Professors
• Promotions to Associate Professor with tenure;
• Promotions to Professor, and merits to Professor, Step VI, and Professor, Above Scale.

It is essential that the Committee on Academic Personnel render the best possible advice to the Chancellor regarding these critical decisions. Our success in making recommendations on these actions will determine the future of the University and its ability to build a truly distinguished faculty that offers the best possible academic program in support of the missions of the institution. The appointments and tenure decisions are essential for attracting the best possible faculty and the higher level decisions will play a significant role in determining whether we are successful in encouraging and retaining our best faculty.

Criteria for Evaluating Faculty Performance

Criteria for faculty rewards are explicitly stated in APM 210-1-d (See Appendix IV) and include evaluation of faculty performance in the areas of: (1) teaching, (2) research and other creative work, (3) professional competence and activity, and (4) University and public service. Our investigation of the personnel process at UC Davis suggests that:

• The relative emphasis placed on research and teaching is appropriate for our campus.
• Personnel decisions are not currently made with the flexibility mandated by the APM.
• Academic leadership, especially by department chairs, is not appropriately recognized and rewarded.
• Decisions reflect an insufficiently broad view of the nature of scholarship.
• There is little consensus about appropriate rewards for some forms of research and creative activity and for some professional activities.

The criteria for faculty rewards are outlined in the Academic Personnel Manual and have served the faculty and the institution very well. "Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions." (APM 210-1-d). Although faculty opinion remains divided on the question of whether teaching is given too much or too little weight in the academic personnel process, we believe that the relative weights accorded research and teaching at Davis are appropriate for the mission, status and goals of the campus.

The APM (Section 210-1-d) also emphasizes the need to interpret the criteria flexibly, without relaxation of standards:
"In evaluating the candidate's qualifications within these areas, the review committee shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing when the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another....As the University enters new fields of endeavor and refocuses its ongoing activities, cases will arise in which the proper work of faculty members departs markedly from established academic patterns. In such cases, the review committees must take exceptional care to apply the criteria with
sufficient flexibility....Consideration should be given to changes in emphasis and interest that may occur in an academic career."

An eloquent statement of the need for flexibility in our interpretations of the criteria can be found in the Pister Report (Report of the Universitywide Task Force on Faculty Rewards, June 1991, Karl S. Pister, Chairman). Indeed, the language of the APM was modified to reflect virtually all of the recommendations of that task force (see Appendix IV: Analysis of the Pister Report).

There is widespread concern on our campus that personnel decisions are not made with appropriate flexibility. The lack of flexibility is manifested in several ways, the most obvious of which is the persistent failure to appreciate the role of academic leadership and to reward it appropriately. This has been especially a problem for department chairs, but also for others in leadership roles. A great University needs the academic leadership of faculty who are fully engaged in the intellectual life of their discipline and the University. In order to provide that leadership, a fully engaged member of the faculty necessarily must devote less time to the research and teaching that are the foundation for advancement within the University and for achieving distinction within their discipline. However, the APM gives explicit recognition to the concept of substituting temporary service for other activities: "...reduced activity in these areas [research and teaching] that results from active service as a department chairperson should be recognized as a shift in the type of academic activity pursued by the department chairperson rather than a shift away from academic pursuits altogether." (APM, Section 245-11).

Unfortunately, the bias against service in our academic culture is so strong that the faculty finds it difficult to encourage or to recommend rewarding effective service. This bias is recognized in the need for the campus to emphasize that academic leadership may be substituted for reduced research activity for [only] one merit cycle (see Annual Call, 1999). The very need for such a statement of policy denigrates the intellectual contributions of good academic leadership with an implicit presumption that there is no significant learning period required or that leadership does not have a significant scholastic component that may temporarily substitute for other scholarship. Most chairs would strenuously reject the notion expressed by faculty and even by former members of CAP that chairs are already compensated for their efforts because they receive a small stipend. It is not only appropriate, but a fact of academic life, that teaching and research should remain the principal criteria by which we are judged. However, it seems probable that our cultural bias against excellent service will never be overcome and that other remedies should be sought.

We recommend, therefore, that department and program chairs and others with significant service responsibilities should be compensated by paid administrative leave that is accrued at the same rate as, and in addition to, sabbatical leave. It is essential to the success of the research and outreach missions of the University, that we provide an additional mechanism by which our best faculty, who have devoted significant time to service, may restore the vigor of their research and creative activities. The current Faculty Development program and the possibility for minor administrative leave are useful, but simply inadequate. We suggest that a strong program of this sort would permit our best faculty to undertake heavy service and administrative positions with full confidence that they would be able to recover from the necessary delay of their scholastic endeavors. The University would be better for their service and for their efforts to restore their research activity.

The need for more flexibility in our personnel decisions is also evident in the lack of clarity of standards by which we evaluate research and creative activity and professional competence and activity. There are major differences of opinion throughout the academic community on such issues as: the role of clinical work in the academic setting; how best to evaluate integrative, interdisciplinary, multi-disciplinary, and applied scholarship; the appropriate way to evaluate new and emerging disciplines without infringing academic freedom; how best to compare faculty in the same discipline who have different emphases on applied and basic research. These differences of opinion are commonly manifested in the context of a particular personnel action. Indeed, policy is
sometimes made on an *ad hoc* basis by holding individual faculty responsible for disagreements between the deans, chairs, and CAP. This process fuels the perception that standards fluctuate from year to year as the membership of personnel committees changes. The Pister Report took an appropriately broad view of the nature of scholarship in recommending flexibility, but it is not clear that any such broad view governs our personnel process. We believe the faculty must re-examine and articulate the nature of their scholarship and the appropriate weights to be given to their mandated activities. Recommendations concerning this re-examination are considered below, together with other measures designed to clarify standards for advancement.

**Clarification of Standards**

Our findings about the personnel process and the ways in which decisions are made are based on analyses described in four Appendices:

- Appendix V: A Comparison of the Personnel Processes at UC Davis and Other Campuses;
- Appendix VI: A Comparison of Personnel Decisions at Davis and Other UC Campuses;
- Appendix VIII: Time in Rank and Step at UC Davis

- Faculty advance more slowly at Davis than at other UC campuses.
- Denials of personnel actions at UC Davis occur at higher rates than at other UC campuses. For example, UC Davis CAP denied 30 of 98 merit actions that it considered without an *ad hoc* committee, whereas at Berkeley only 5 of 400 merits were denied.
- All review agencies above the department level, except the Chancellor, contribute comparably to the overall rate of denial (19%).
- Rates of disagreement of 10% or more with the preceding step in the review are not uncommon.
- CAP overturns 19% of the recommendations made by the deans.
- The Chancellor overturns CAP recommendations at higher rates than at other UC campuses, usually in favor of candidates.
- These data suggest a tumultuous personnel process in which standards for advancement are unclear or interpreted differently by equally competent review agencies.
- Davis is more conservative than other UC campuses and clarification of standards is needed.

Faculty at UC Davis advance more slowly than at other UC campuses as reflected in rejection rates that are for the most part higher than at all other UC campuses (cf. Appendix VI). However, we are unable to determine the extent to which these differences may reflect differences in personnel practices at the department level, for which no data are available. As shown in Appendix VIII, most of the delay occurs in the Associate and Full Professor steps. Even after excluding faculty who have failed to advance to Professor and Professor, Step VI, the average Associate and Full Professor makes less than normal progress through the steps. This failure to make normal progress is troubling and may account for an important part of the salary differences with respect to UC Berkeley and the other UC campuses.

We believe that the high rates of disagreement found at all steps of the review process reflect a lack of clarity about appropriate interpretations of the standards for excellence in the APM. Faculty, department chairs, local personnel committees and deans all have registered concern about expectations that appear to fluctuate with unpredictable frequency and amplitude. This uncertainty about the interpretation of research, teaching, and service efforts is detrimental to the University, to effective personnel decisions, and to faculty morale. We believe that the campus must clarify the performance expectations of faculty and we outline below several ways in which we believe this can be accomplished. In order to be effective, any such clarification must begin with the faculty.
Re-examination of Personnel Practices. We recommend that each department or program be requested to undertake a re-examination and articulation of the nature of its scholarship and of its practices for the evaluation of faculty performance. The goal of this exercise is to articulate the standards and practices of the department so that both candidates and persons evaluating the candidate have a clear view of performance expectations. After appropriate discussions, we expect that the statements will become the basis for interpreting excellence as defined by the APM and will become the detailed standards for evaluating the performance of faculty. These statements should be statements of the nature of scholarship, which is a matter of academic freedom, and a summary of standards and practices for evaluating performance.

We recommend that this re-examination should take the following form:
- Each department should write a short two- or three-page statement that focuses on practices for evaluating faculty performance and scholarship.
- The statement should reflect the highest standards of the academic discipline, the standards of excellence outlined in the APM, and the flexibility mandated by the APM.
- The statement should outline criteria in each category used to evaluate academic personnel: teaching, research and creative activity, professional activity, and service. The statement should address especially those issues of departmental philosophy or expectations that have been controversial in the past. We emphasize that the purpose of this statement is to aid in evaluating faculty performance and should not impinge on academic freedom in any way.
- To insure fairness and consistency with University policy, these statements should be reviewed by the dean, with the advice of the local personnel committee, and followed by appropriate discussions between the dean and the department.
- We expect that CAP will use the departmental statements as a basis for protecting the academic freedom of (1) the departments and programs themselves and (2) individual faculty members to pursue their careers within the guidelines established for the evaluation of faculty performance.

Workshop for Participants. We recommend that the Office of the Vice-Provost organize an annual workshop on the academic personnel review process for chairs of programs, deans, members of local personnel committees, and members of CAP. The goals of this workshop are to educate the principals who participate in the decision-making process, to discuss recent problems that have arisen, and to enhance mutual understanding of the different perspectives that arise at each level of review. While we hesitate to recommend increasing the burden of meetings on any of the participants, we feel that such an educational activity is essential to restoring and maintaining faculty confidence in the personnel process. In order to be effective, such a workshop should be held early in the Fall term.

Annual Call. We recommend that the Annual Call be revised and greatly shortened. Presently, the document is unwieldy (41 pages) and ineffective as a mechanism for communicating with chairs. The new Annual Call should concisely communicate the essence of the review process and announce and clarify new policies. All other material should be kept as a permanent appendix, into which revised material may be substituted, available on the web and in all department offices. More detailed discussion and recommendations are presented in Appendix IX: The Annual Call.

Efficiency of the Process

Our communications with faculty and administrators on this campus and our analysis of how other campuses designed their personnel processes show that:
The need for increased efficiency of the process is recognized at all levels of the campus.
Review files are too complex for efficient review of either normal merits or promotions.
Some UC campuses use abbreviated procedures for evaluation of normal merit actions.
More re-delegation of personnel decisions is widely supported by faculty, deans, and other administrators.

We have proposed that CAP remain responsible for all promotions and special merit actions. However, the welfare of the institution does not require that advancement within ranks be reviewed with the same intensity as the major promotions, nor should such merit reviews require the same level of documentation. Nevertheless, the process of making such decisions plays a significant role in creating a positive and supportive environment in which the faculty make progress toward the major promotions. It is in the interests of the entire institution that merit increases in salary be determined more efficiently and that the recommendations be made near the sources of disciplinary expertise.

Re-delegation. We recommend that all merit actions within rank be re-delegated to the Colleges and Professional Schools. This recommendation specifically includes:
- All accelerations not involving a major promotion, for which CAP retains responsibility;
- All high level merit actions (currently Professor, Steps VII, VIII, and IX);
- Department chairs, members of local personnel committees, and associate deans.

This recommendation specifically excludes merits to Professor, Step VI and Above Scale, for which CAP has responsibility. This proposed re-delegation has two major advantages for the institution. First, the reduced workload of CAP will permit it to focus on the actions most critical to the institution. Secondly, the recommendations on merit advancement within ranks will be made by departments and local personnel committees most familiar with the scholarship and culture within which the faculty performs its duties.

We believe that there is no institutional imperative for keeping decisions on these actions at the level of CAP. Because the criteria are clear, local personnel committees should be just as capable as CAP of evaluating and rewarding candidates for multiple year accelerations and high level merits. There is no more need to have a cross-campus perspective on such actions than on any other action assigned to local personnel committees. In fact, there may be more consistency in the award of accelerations, if one-year and multi-year actions are considered by the same committees. With proper instructions and clearly stated guidelines, the issue of equity across Colleges and Professional Schools can be assured. The merit actions of department chairs, associate deans, and members of local personnel committees are also best accomplished at the College or School level. With appropriate guidelines and safeguards, no compelling issues about possible conflicts of interest should arise. Negative decisions on such cases can be appealed upward and positive decisions that might have been too generous will be reviewed again at the next major promotion action. Ultimately, we believe the strongest decisions on merit actions will be made by the peers who understand the scholarship and local academic culture. The campus is better served by a stronger decision and increased faculty confidence in the process than by protecting against too generous treatment in a minor personnel action.

Implementation of this recommendation will require, nevertheless, that departments, local personnel committees and deans, take increased responsibility for the evaluation of faculty and that additional guidelines be established.

We also recommend that:
- CAP continue to be responsible for making annual post-audits of all personnel actions.
- CAP and local personnel committees confer annually in an appropriate workshop prior to beginning the annual process of making personnel decisions.
• CAP and the local personnel committees be responsible to create a carefully written set of guidelines for interpreting campus criteria for advancement and accelerations as well as departmental statements of personnel practices.

• A Shadow CAP should hear any appeals by department chairs, members of local personnel committees, or associate deans (see The Appeals Process, below).

Streamlining the Review File. In addition to the re-delegation of selected actions, the review file should be improved so that it is more efficient and more effective in presenting the case for a candidate. Over the years, the requirements for constructing the review files have evolved to the point that actions are difficult to review efficiently and accurately. Because review of faculty performance is so important and by necessity consumes a significant part of our collective time and energy, the Committee felt an obligation to suggest ways in which the review process could be made more effective and the burden of preparation reduced.

Review files for merit increases and promotions are described in the UC Davis Academic Personnel Manual. The descriptions for the two kinds of actions differ mostly in the details of supporting documentation and whether or not extramural letters are required. Currently, the review file can consist of twelve major items, organized so that essential review documents and non-essential administrative forms are mingled. In addition, several essential items are presented in formats that are not effective, either for the candidate or the reviewing bodies. Consequently, it is recommended the process for routine merit actions be truncated and streamlined. The documentation for promotion and above scale actions could also be reduced without altering the integrity of the review process. In this regard, the following is recommended:

We recommend that review files for routine merit actions consist of:

1. A departmental letter of recommendation that normally is limited to two pages for routine merits and perhaps three pages for other actions.

2. A one-page teaching record summarizing the most important courses taught during the review period. Student evaluations should be summarized and tabulated in numerical format on this page.

3. The record of advising and curricular development activities.

4. A one-page research record that summarizes all publications or creative works offered for evaluation for the review period. If necessary or appropriate, this list may include work in progress. A list of grants or funding could also be included, if it is viewed by the candidate to be a vital part of the research record. The complete list of publications and any necessary reprints should appear in the supporting documentation.

5. A one-page service record for the review period in which service to department(s), the campus, the University, and professional organizations is summarized separately.

6. A one-page record of professional activities, if appropriate for review of Professional Competence and Activity.

7. All assurance forms and related administrative documents (Recommended Action Form, Disclosure Certificate, List of Annual Report of Professional Activities submitted, and Updated Biography Form). Those documents that are considered to be necessary for administrative purposes should be collected in one place in the file so as not to interfere with rapid and efficient review.

If an action is: (1) a normal, on-time, merit advance, (2) does not involve an off-scale augmentation, and (3) is clearly supported by the department, there should be no need to forward supporting documentation because, we emphasize, the candidate’s department should be viewed as the primary review body. Supporting documentation would be kept at the department, but available upon request. We emphasize that each record is meant to be brief by suggesting that most of these records can be limited to one page. Expanded descriptions of the various elements of the review file may be found in Appendix X: Comments on the Contents of Review Files.
We recommend that review files for appointments, promotions, merits to Professor, Step VI, and Above Scale, and fourth year review of Assistant Professors should include the previous seven items plus:

8. Candidate's statement (Optional).
9. Extramural letters, if appropriate.
10. All supporting documentation

Enhancing Fairness and Faculty Confidence

The charge to this Committee was prompted by a lack of confidence in our practices. Our investigations suggest that:

• There is increasing concern that small ad hoc review committees lack sufficient expertise to give good advice to CAP and lack sufficient size to mute the effects of undue influence by a single participant.
• Members of personnel committees sometimes participate in the review of close colleagues or others with whom they have a conflict of interest.
• It is not appropriate that appeals or reconsiderations of personnel actions return to the same committee that made the original decision.
• Appeals of procedural matters in personnel actions should be directed to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.
• UC Davis CAP is perceived to work too closely with the administration.
• On most UC campuses, CAP is housed with and supported by the Academic Senate.

Ad Hoc Review Committees. We recommend that the campus return to the practice of using five-member review committees for major personnel actions. The current practice of having three-person committees has been a temporary solution for the loss of numerous senior faculty during recent retirement programs. Faculty have expressed serious concern that such small committees may lack sufficient expertise to evaluate scholarship and that any undue influence of a single member is difficult to counter in such a small group. We note that CAP decisions in the absence of an ad hoc committee have a markedly higher rejection rate than any other kind of action and that there is some evidence for an increase in rejection rates when the campus changed to smaller ad hoc review committees. Our recommendation can only be successful, however, if more faculty are willing to serve on committees than is currently the case.

We recommend, therefore, that service on ad hoc review committees, and requests to serve on these committees, become part of the service record of individual faculty members and that this record be assessed by the department and the dean as a normal part of any personnel action. Some campuses have found that such a policy effectively encourages faculty participation on review committees. If we make five-person committees the norm, the faculty must feel that service is essential and that they may decline to serve only in unusual circumstances.

We also considered a proposal for four-person committees having one non-voting member from the department. This proposal was based in part on the idea that the goals of expertise and departmental information are best served by the presence of a member of the department, but that it is unfair for someone from the department to vote again as a member of the committee. We rejected that proposal because we believe that the dynamics of discussion and review in a larger committee result in a stronger recommendation that serves both the candidate and the campus better. In a five-member committee, a candidate cannot be disadvantaged by a negative vote from the single departmental representative because a negative vote from that representative would not change any positive recommendation from the other members of the committee. On the other hand, we believe
that the value to the University of departmental representation outweighs any possible undue influence of the departmental representative in favor of candidates.

**Conflict of Interest.** During our interviews with faculty, several examples were offered in which members of committees participated in the reviews of close colleagues or of faculty with whom they were known to have strong differences of opinion or other conflicts of interest. Although some committee members have recused themselves in such instances, there does not presently appear to be a uniformly practiced policy that assures the absence of possible conflicts of interest.

We recommend that the following procedures be adopted by CAP and local personnel committees:

- No member of CAP or a local personnel committee may participate in the review of an action before the committee concerning a colleague from the same department.
- No member of CAP or a local personnel committee may participate in the review of an action before the committee concerning any person with whom they may be perceived to have a conflict of interest.

**The Appeals Process.** Both CAP and local personnel committees are asked to reconsider negative recommendations. Although the committees view their action as a reconsideration of their judgment, candidates consider them to be appeals of decisions. In that context, if the appeal is considered by the same committee that made the original recommendation, it is difficult for the candidate to accept that the process is fair. This concern is widespread.

We recommend that:

- Reconsideration of CAP and LPC recommendations be undertaken by a Shadow CAP.
- A Shadow CAP composed of six members be appointed annually by the Committee on Committees. The charge to that committee should include considering and making recommendations on appeals of personnel actions and making recommendations on personnel actions involving members of CAP.
- Appeals of procedural matters should continue to be considered by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

**Committee on Academic Personnel.** We find widespread concern that the Committee on Academic Personnel and the Office of the Vice-Provost work too closely together. Although we affirm that a cordial working relationship may help to produce a good decision, the present close relationship has contributed to the evolution of an unnecessary and unproductive polarization between the faculty and both CAP and the Vice-Provost. The faculty seems to view CAP and the Vice-Provost as one, having similar roles and effects on personnel actions. Action by the Vice-Provost on appeals of CAP recommendations may be perceived as less credible because of this close relationship. On most UC campuses, CAP is housed either in its own space or with the Academic Senate. Likewise, the budget of CAP on most campuses belongs to the Academic Senate (See Appendix V). With no prejudice about the merits or effectiveness of the current close relationship, we believe that logistical independence would reinforce the perception that the Chancellor is receiving independent advice from the faculty.

We recommend, therefore, that the headquarters for the Committee on Academic Personnel be moved to a space contiguous with the remainder of the Academic Senate offices. We further recommend that all necessary support staff be responsible to and be supervised by the Academic Senate. Although the proposed move is largely symbolic, we believe that it is essential in order to reinforce the notion that CAP is a committee of the Academic Senate, that it offers advice to the Chancellor on behalf of the Academic Senate, and that it is responsible to the Academic Senate. It is equally important that the faculty perceive that CAP is their voice in the personnel process.
We recommend, if such a move were implemented, that there be a thorough and immediate review of the management structure and function of the merged staff. Such a review would best be undertaken by a committee appointed by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources and Risk Management with the goals of ensuring an efficient organization, a productive working environment, and an harmonious merger of the staffs.

Further Review. We recommend that the state of the academic personnel system be re-examined by the Academic Senate during academic year 2001-2002 and at regular intervals thereafter. Complete implementation of the changes recommended here requires a change in the culture of the Davis personnel system. This will not be easy as this culture, which we believe is different from that at many of the other UC campuses, has evolved over many years. After two years, it should be possible to detect whether useful changes are being made in the system and whether they are having the desired effect on the climate in which decisions are being made. We recommend such a reassessment.

CLOSING STATEMENT

It is clear that faculty at Davis advance more slowly than at other UC campuses. Rates at which personnel actions are denied appear to be as high or higher than on other campuses and Professors, on average, are at a lower step than in the remainder of UC. These observations lead us to conclude that Davis is more conservative than the other campuses in recommending advancement for its faculty. Our analysis suggests that salaries at Davis are lower than most of UC, in large part, because we advance more slowly through the system, and, in part, because we make less liberal use of off-scale increments and accelerations, and hire at lower steps than some other campuses.

In our view, the problems we face are not linked to a particular committee or administration, but reflect our campus personnel system and the climate in which it operates as they have evolved over many years. We are mindful of the legitimate need to apply high standards to all personnel actions, but the detailed standards for advancement are unclear, and our current practices are too divisive, fail to encourage academic freedom, and make poor use of our resources. In order to clarify standards and begin to reduce controversy, we propose that each department articulate the nature of its scholarship and its practices for evaluating the performance of faculty in a concise statement that will help campus decision-makers to evaluate personnel actions. Resources are better used by having CAP focus on promotions and major merits to Professor, Step VI and Above Scale, rather than on all routine merit actions. Academic freedom can be increased by rewarding a wider range of creative endeavors, professional activities, and academic leadership than is currently the case. Controversy and divisiveness can be further reduced by moving more decisions to those most knowledgeable, essentially those as close as possible to the individual's department.

We believe that the Committee on Academic Personnel can play a leadership role in renewing a spirit of generosity and creating an environment in which all faculty feel included in a flourishing academic enterprise that encourages academic excellence. The Committee can foster communication between the faculty and the administration, coordinate efforts to reconcile personnel recommendations while maintaining faculty morale, evaluate personnel actions on the basis of evidence presented by other review agencies, be aggressive in recommending that our best faculty be advanced rapidly, and consult regularly with the Academic Senate. If it does so, we are confident that the culture of our campus will become more supportive and academic excellence will flourish.
Respectfully submitted,
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