To be received and placed on file:

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) met on 37 occasions during the 1997-98 academic year. Meetings were approximately 4-5 hours in length. Most of the committee's activity focused on personnel actions. CAP also was asked to provide opinions on a variety of Senate matters and administrative directives. These are listed below.

I. PERSONNEL ACTIONS

CAP reviewed 225 personnel actions this year. Included are 159 merit/promotion files, 7 appraisals, 31 appointments, 12 deferrals, and 7 appeals. In addition, the Committee reviewed files of faculty at Professor V and above who have been at step for five or more years (2 files and one pending). This is in response to an August 12, 1991 directive from the Office of the President that all faculty must be reviewed every five years. CAP also continued the procedure for the review of an individual's career; 7 career reviews (one pending) were considered this year.

A summary of the Committee's actions is appended. A decision of the Chancellor's office is defined as different if it differs from the majority vote of the Committee on Academic Personnel. Of the 166 merit, promotion and appraisal actions considered, the decisions of the Chancellor's Office differed from the recommendations of CAP in 7 instances (4.2%). Of the 31 actions considered involving appointments, the decisions of the Chancellor's office differed from CAP's recommendation in one instance (3.3%). Additionally, the decisions of the Chancellor's Office differed from the recommendations of the CAP in zero instances concerning off-scale awards related to merits and promotions.

CAP continues to depend on ad hoc committees for detailed analyses of many cases by the procedures proscribed in the Academic Personnel Manual. For 1997-98 the Committee recommended ad hoc committees for appraisals, promotions to Associate Professor and Professor, advancement to Professor Above-Scale, merits within Professor Above-Scale, and appointments at the tenure level. 71 ad hoc committees were appointed in 1997-98, involving 138 faculty and 3 emeriti/ae, including 12 from other UC campuses. Of the 283 eligible campus full professors, 113 served on ad hoc committees, and of 118 eligible associate professors, 22 served. Of the 71 ad hoc committees appointed, there was disagreement between the ad hoc committee and the Committee on Academic Personnel on 10 occasions. The Committee on Academic Personnel expresses its appreciation of the work of colleagues on these committees. However, CAP is concerned at the high proportion of faculty who decline to serve on ad hoc committees. CAP is strongly of the view that faculty participation on ad hoc committees is an essential responsibility of all UC faculty and one which should be formally recognized as Service.

It appears that an unusually high number of files were delayed at some point in the process before reaching CAP. CAP recognizes how important it is that the schedules posted in The Call be adhered to at each level of the review.
II. DISCUSSIONS AND ADVICE

RECOMMENDATIONS PROPOSED AND IMPLEMENTED

• Proactive review procedures

This year we have continued some proactive measures to facilitate rewarding academic excellence for the faculty. These include carefully considered use of off-scale salaries and on occasion retroactive actions. The committee together with the Executive Vice Chancellor continued its efforts to bring the salaries of our most accomplished and dedicated faculty who have earned special recognition toward parity with those of other UC campuses.

• Shadow CAP

In order to avoid any conflict of interest, Shadow CAP continued to review the personnel actions on current CAP members and their spouses or partners. The Executive Vice Chancellor appoints this annual committee of 6 members from former CAP members of the past five years. This committee list is published and for 1997-98 it had the following members:

- Ross Parke (Psychology), Chair
- Francoise Forster-Hahn (History of Art)
- Eugene Anderson (Anthropology)
- Emory Elliott (Center for Ideas and Society)
- Benjamin Shen (Physics)
- John Trumble (Entomology)

After four years of experience with the Shadow CAP process, the committee is quite satisfied that this system is a fair one for evaluating CAP members.

• Announcements

Although a formal review has not been conducted, it appears from the viewpoint of the Committee that the new system of releasing personnel actions on a monthly basis is working well. On the whole CAP has heard fairly positive reactions to this change. We believe that, in general, this gradual release of decisions helps campus morale, as fewer faculty must wait until the end of the year to learn about decisions on them.

RECOMMENDATIONS PROPOSED AND PENDING IMPLEMENTATION

UCAP PARTICIPATION

• Proposal for step IX

CAP endorsed the recommendation of UCAP [University-wide Committee on Academic Personnel] that a Step IX be implemented in the Professorial ranks. This change has been submitted to the nine campuses by the Office of the President with the goal of implementing this change by July 1, 1999.

• Proposal on incompetent performance of faculty

UCAP continued to discuss the report on termination of gross incompetence. A task force considered the proposed revisions to APM 075, Termination of Faculty for Gross Incompetence. UCAP agreed that, in order for a faculty member to be found "Grossly Incompetent," incompetence must be demonstrated in both scholarship and teaching. However further consideration of this matter is currently pending in the President's Office.
OTHER

• CAP Advice to the Executive Vice Chancellor

CAP is concerned that there is not an official policy describing current policies relating to Target of Opportunity (TOP) recruitment and appointment procedures. Typically TOP appointments are made without an advertised search process. This past year, two TOP new faculty appointments were proposed by two departments and eventually approved by CAP; these individuals subsequently joined the UCR faculty. CAP is concerned that the general guidelines describing TOP procedures are not widely known. CAP discussed this topic with the EVC on several occasions and understands that a draft document of TOP now exists. CAP strongly urges that this document be finalized, forwarded to appropriate Senate committees and ultimately issued in a prompt fashion to the UCR academic community.

CAP, at the request of the EVC participated in discussion and analysis of proposed revisions to The CALL. Specific topics discussed included Teaching Evaluation Forms, Redesigned (abbreviated) Merit Files, Career Reviews, Principle of appeals on negative merit, accelerated merits, and responses to the CALL. A revised CALL was distributed in early June and discussed at a Chairs and Deans Meeting on June 8, 1998. As a consequence of the discussion at this meeting, the EVC issued on September 17, 1998 a brief document of clarification of some of the important issues. CAP concurs with the EVC in the imposition for files which have been preliminarily judged negative of a one time update of merit files reporting actions dated on or before March 31, 1999.

CAP provided advice to the EVC on the process of Career Reviews with particular attention to the wording of Draft Career Review Outside Letters.

CAP endorsed the proposal of recognizing UCR faculty Engagement of K-12 in the Merit and Promotion Review Process.

• CAP Advice to the Academic Senate

CAP brought to the attention of the Academic Senate some concerns pertaining to the relative relationship of CAP to the Administration & Academic Senate. CAP is of the opinion that the UCR Academic personnel review process is perceived by many faculty as being organized and administered principally by the administration. If this is indeed a correct perception, it may be appropriate to conclude that this is not an acceptable state of affairs.

In order to develop some understanding of how CAPs on other UC campuses operate, in January of this year a survey was taken by UCAP members to define how the CAP process worked on the nine UC campuses. The short summary of the answers to these questions is that the CAP process on the Riverside and Davis Divisions are closely aligned and managed by their administrations while the other seven campuses have their CAP process much more closely aligned with their Academic Senate. Thus Cap recommends that the UCR Academic Senate should play a more active role and participatory role in managing the CAP process. A summary of the issues and some possible solutions are proposed in the attached appendix to this Report.

CAP provided advice to the Academic Senate Chair or Chairs of Senate Committee on the following issues:

- Professor-in-Residence Series
- Faculty Retention
- Teaching Evaluations
- Proposal for a Free Standing Biomedical Sciences Division
Proposed Name Change of Department of Spanish & Portuguese to Hispanic Studies and Department of Soils & Environmental Sciences to Environmental Sciences

Formal Review of Academic Personnel Policies - Change in APM language

Target of Opportunity Appointments

Transfer of Faculty from Department A to B

Proposal for the use of non-19900 funding to support Ladder Faculty

Chair Members

CAP approved all recommendations for department chairs.

Special Remembrance:

CAP members were greatly saddened by the sudden and tragic loss of our colleague John Phillips in January of 1998. As the member of the Committee on Academic Personnel we have had the privilege to spend many, many hours with John in weekly meetings reviewing faculty files. Not only was John dedicated to the CAP process, he was also a master at articulating and succinctly summarizing the merits of various dossiers.

We all sensed and appreciated his personal spirit and love of life and, as well, his gentle humor.

We all miss John.

Robin DiMatteo
Anthony Huang
Michel Lapidus
Rodney Ogawa
Albert Page
John Phillips
Brian Smith
Georgia Warnke
Anthony Norman, Chair

October 14, 1998
APPENDIX TO COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL ANNUAL REPORT

TO: Irwin Sherman, Chair  
Riverside Division Academic Senate

FROM: Tony Norman, Chair  
Committee on Academic Personnel

RE: Relationship of CAP to the Administration & Academic Senate

Introduction:

The UCR Academic personnel review process is perceived by many faculty as being organized and administered principally by the administration. If this is indeed a correct perception, it may be appropriate to conclude that this is not an acceptable state of affairs.

According to the shared governance concept of the University of California the faculty, through Divisions of the Academic Senate and the administration share the responsibility of reviewing the faculty's performance with respect to their scholarly achievements, teaching performance and service to the department, university and profession, all according to procedures described in the Academic Personnel Manual. The faculty portion of the review is to be carried out by the Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) who provides an official vote and written summary of each file to the Chancellor/EVC for his/her final decision.

How does the CAP process work at UCR?

Currently all faculty files which ultimately are reviewed by CAP, after preparation in the department, are forwarded through the appropriate Dean’s office to the Executive Vice Chancellor’s (EVC) office in Hinderaker Hall. Here they are processed and tracked by an EVC directed staff of five full time individuals. Their responsibilities include all aspects of ad hoc committees, including contact with CAP nominated committee members, scheduling of the ad hoc meeting (usually in Hinderaker Hall), and typing of all ad hoc letters. In addition the EVC’s staff is responsible for scheduling all CAP meetings and typing all CAP minutes and other related correspondence. All CAP meetings are normally held in Hinderaker Hall.

Thus it is perhaps not surprising that UCR faculty perceive the academic personnel review process to be one that is largely an administration process.

How does the CAP process happen at other UC campuses?

In January of this year a survey was taken by the Senate University-wide CAP members of the following five questions which inquired into how the CAP process worked on the nine UC campuses.
Where does the money/budget come from for your senate resources that are dedicated to support of your CAP activities?

Who provides staff support for CAP activities? Senate office? Vice Chancellors office? Other?

Where is the CAP staff housed? In space assigned to the academic senate or space provided by the administration or other?

Is only one version of a CAP file used on your campus (same for both CAP and the administration) or are there separate senate and administration files?

How is your CAP constituted? Appointed or elected?

The short summary to the answers to these questions is that the CAP process on the Riverside and Davis divisions are closely aligned and managed by their administrations while the other seven campuses have their CAP process much more closely aligned with the Senate. A copy of the survey is attached to this memo.

Proposal:

The UCR Academic Senate should play a more active and participatory role in managing the CAP process.

It is not the purpose of this memo to propose a detailed solution; this could be worked out by discussions between the Senate and EVC offices. However elements of realignment could include the Academic Senate office being responsible for the following:

Scheduling all ad hoc committees and preparing their reports
Tracking and receiving all files from the Dean’s offices
Preparing files for review by CAP
Providing appropriate meeting space for CAP meetings
Handling all CAP related correspondence
Forwarding of files to the EVC for administrative review.

Without question there would need to be an increase of Senate staff to handle the substantial CAP related workload. This could perhaps be achieved by transfer of 2.0-2.5 FTE of the EVC’s team.

The current members of CAP have reviewed this memo and support forwarding it to the Chair of the Senate and its Advisory Committee for their consideration.

CC:    Senate Advisory Committee
       Executive Vice Chancellor Dave Warren
Addendum to UCAP Survey
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WHERE DOES THE MONEY/BUDGET COME FROM FOR YOUR SENATE RESOURCES, WHICH ARE DEDICATED TO SUPPORT OF CAP ACTIVITIES?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Office Budget</th>
<th>EVC/Vice Provost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[B] [I] [LA] [SD] [SF] [SC]</td>
<td>[D] [R] [SB]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHO PROVIDES STAFF SUPPORT FOR CAP ACTIVITIES? SENATE OFFICE? VICE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE? OTHER?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Office</th>
<th>EVC/Vice Provost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[B] [I] [LA] [SD] [SF] [SB] [SC]</td>
<td>[D] [R]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHERE IS THE CAP STAFF HOUSED? IN SPACE ASSIGNED TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE OR SPACE PROVIDED BY THE ADMINISTRATION OR OTHER?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Office</th>
<th>EVC/Vice Provost</th>
<th>Other Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[I] [SD] [SF] [SB] [SC]</td>
<td>[D] [LA] [R]</td>
<td>[B]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IS ONLY ONE VERSION OF A CAP FILE USED ON YOUR CAMPUS (SAME FOR BOTH CAP AND THE ADMINISTRATION)? OR ARE THERE SEPARATE SENATE AND ADMIN. FILES?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Only 1 Case File</th>
<th>Separate Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[B] [D] [LA] [R] [SD] [SF] [SC]</td>
<td>[SB]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Housed in the EVC office

HOW IS YOUR CAP CONSTITUTED? APPOINTED? ELECTED? OTHER?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointed by CoC</th>
<th>Elected by Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[B] [D] [LA] [R] [SD] [SF] [SB] [SC]</td>
<td>[I]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHERE DOES THE MONEY/BUDGET COME FROM FOR YOUR SENATE RESOURCES, WHICH ARE DEDICATED TO SUPPORT OF CAP ACTIVITIES?

BERKELEY
The Berkeley Budget Committee has a subbudget within the Berkeley Division, Academic Senate Budget. The Berkeley Division's budget falls under the Vice Chancellor and Provost's control unit. The Berkeley Budget Committee sometimes requests, through the Senate, temporary augmentations of funds, especially for computer equipment, because BC's budget comprises staff salaries and approximately $3,000 supplies and expense funds. The Chancellor's Office budget is the source of most of our supplies. Travel to UCAP meetings is charged to an R (Academic Council) system-wide account.

DAVIS
From the Vice-Provost. Individual departments essentially fund the released time for faculty, i.e. no money provided by the administration.

IRVINE
AT UCI the EVC's office grants a block of money to the Academic Senate for its affairs. The money for the CAP office, staff, etc., comes from this pot as a line item in the Senate budget. Hence there is control, but not immediate control, of the money by the EVC. The only thing it seems that comes directly from the EVC's budget is the summer stipends for CAP members (who meet through the summer, of course), which I think, for 9-month appointees at least, is 3K per person, a pleasant September surprise if the person is present at enough meetings.

LOS ANGELES
Campus administration provides money for the Senate, which in turn allocates money to CAP.

RIVERSIDE
The funds are supplied by the EVC's office.

SAN DIEGO
From the Academic Senate Office Budget.

SAN FRANCISCO
Money comes from the Vice Chancellor's office.

SANTA BARBARA
Money comes from the Vice Chancellor's Office.

SANTA CRUZ
All financial resources originate with the EVC. It comes in two kinds: that provided to the Academic Senate, and money supplied directly to the Divisions on campus (i.e. Natural Sci, Social Sci, Humanities, etc.). The second of these sources provides funds for course relief for Cap members.
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(2) WHO PROVIDES STAFF SUPPORT FOR CAP ACTIVITIES? SENATE OFFICE? VICE CHANCELLOR S OFFICE? OTHER?

BERKELEY
Permanent career staff support is budgeted in the BC s own account which is a subaccount of the Berkeley Division, Academic Senate. For casual, temporary staff support, we petition the Vice Chancellor and Provost for temporary funds, through the Senate.

DAVIS
Vice Provost, Academic Personnel

IRVINE
The Senate office supplies staff support for CAP, not the EVC.

LOS ANGELES
Chancellor s office? Other? The Senate provides staff support.

RIVERSIDE
The staff support (five individuals) is all part of the EVC office; they constitute the Academic Personnel Office. There is absolutely no support provided by the Academic Senate office.

SAN DIEGO
Senate Office provides staff support for CAP (currently, Sharon Jones, Administrative Analyst). [Campus ad hoc committees are responsible to the Senior VCAA and as such are handled as are all files through the Academic Personnel Office, 402 University Center.]

SAN FRANCISCO
The academic Senate Office provides staff for our CAP.

SANTA BARBARA
The Senate provides staff support.

SANTA CRUZ
Senate office and AHR (Academic Human Resources).
WHERE IS THE CAP STAFF HOUSED? IN SPACE ASSIGNED TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE OR SPACE PROVIDED BY THE ADMINISTRATION OR OTHER?

BERKELEY
The staff is housed in California Hall in permanent space that was designed specifically for the Berkeley Budget Committee. Other than the Budget Committee’s space, all other California Hall space is assigned to the Chancellor and various Vice Chancellors, and a library.

DAVIS
Vice Provost’s Office

IRVINE
CAP is housed in space assigned to the Academic Senate (right next to the Senate Chair’s office, in our case), not directly assigned by the EVC.

LOS ANGELES
Our current CAP staff space was provided by the administration. We meet in a Senate office meeting room.

RIVERSIDE
The Cap staff is part of the EVC office and is located in the administration building on campus (4th floor).

SAN DIEGO
CAP staff support is housed in the Academic Senate Office, 214 University Center.

SAN FRANCISCO
Our CAP staff member’s office is in the Academic Senate office.

SANTA BARBARA
The Senate provides the space.

SANTA CRUZ
In space provided by the Academic Senate. (Presumably, this space is provided to the Senate by the EVC.)
(4) IS ONLY ONE VERSION OF A CAP FILE USED ON YOUR CAMPUS (SAME FOR BOTH CAP AND THE ADMINISTRATION)? OR ARE THERE SEPARATE SENATE AND ADMIN. FILES?

BERKELEY
There is only one case file. However the Budget Committee keeps abbreviated career files in which the material duplicates a small part of the permanent personnel files kept in Academic Personnel. The BC keeps its files for the convenience of members working at night or on weekends when the Academic Personnel files are not available.

DAVIS
Only one version

Irvine
There is only one version of a CAP file on our campus. The individual files move back and forth the several hundred yards between CAP’s Senate office space and the EVC’s Academic Affairs office. We would object to the idea that there were separate files; sounds more like Stasi or KGB than UC.

LOS ANGELES
Only one version of the file is used.

RIVERSIDE
Only one version of the file is used by CAP; All CAP records are kept in the EVC office.

SAN DIEGO
Only one version of the file is used.

SAN FRANCISCO
There is only one file, which is shared between the Senate and Administration.

SANTA BARBARA
Separate files.

SANTA CRUZ
One file only at all times.
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HOW IS YOUR CAP CONSTITUTED? APPOINTED? ELECTED? OTHER?

BERKELEY
Appointed by the Berkeley Division s Committee on Committees.

DAVIS
Appointed by the Committee on Committees, which is the only elected committee on the Senate.

IRVINE
Our members of CAP are directly elected by the Senate. The Committee on Committees nominates two persons for each slot. Others can be (but never are) nominated by petition. 6 seats on CAP are allocated to the 5 largest schools (2 to medicine); the other 3 are allocated as a pool to the other 5 schools on campus. We recently settled a squabble about this (Engineering wanted an assigned seat, etc) to hold it where it is at 9 members, mainly for efficiency s sake.

In short, our CAP is distinctly a Senate affair; we cooperate very smoothly with the admin office of Academic Affairs. If there is any friction, it is between us and the EVC in person, not with the office over there.

LOS ANGELES
Our CAP is appointed by the campus Committee on Committees, which is elected.

RIVERSIDE
At Riverside the CAP members are appointed by the Committee on Committees.

SAN DIEGO
CAP membership is appointed by the campus Senate Committee on Committees.

SAN FRANCISCO
CAP members are appointed by Committee on Committees.

SANTA BARBARA
Appointed by the Senate s Committee on Committees. Normally 3-year terms. CAP chair and vice-chair also appointed by COC. The vice-chair attends UCAP meetings and normally becomes chair of CAP the following year.

SANTA CRUZ
CAP is appointed by COC (Committee on Committees). COC is itself elected by direct mail ballot of Academic Senate members.