



# Academic Human Resources Annual Accountability Report 2002-2003

## Executive Summary

This report highlights the progress Academic Human Resources has made during 2002-03 on the goals in our 10 Year Plan. Academic Human Resources has made progress in all areas, accelerating some projects that can create staff capacity or decrease costs. The mission of Academic Human Resources is to help the campus recruit and retain excellent and diverse faculty and academic appointees.

### 2002-2003 Highlights

- The percentage of offers accepted increased from 47% to 63% in 2002-03. The salary and housing costs continue to be factors for those declining offers. Candidates are turning to the web more to find faculty positions.
- UCSC continues to have the most **diverse faculty** in the UC system and maintained a **turnover rate of about 2%** for ladder rank faculty.
- The campus received \$350,000 in recognition of its success in hiring faculty during 2002-03 who met the criteria for the Faculty Diversity and Enrichment Program.
- A Diversity Awards program was established to recognize campus diversity efforts and \$15,500 was allocated to support department Diversity efforts.
- Streamlining of the Employment Bulletin resulted in savings of approximately \$3,500 for printing and postage.
- The **Faculty Relocation Assistance Program** (Faculty RAP) served 56 candidates and new faculty members (actual number of contacts with clients is approximately 200) to assist their families to relocate and make a home in the Santa Cruz area. In 2002-03, the program saw a 300% increase in clients seeking services.
- **The Dual Career Service** has served 78 clients (20% increase) since its inception in January 2000. This program allows UCSC to effectively address a significant recruitment and retention issue-- the career needs of spouses and partners of faculty members.
- AHR established **Northern California's Bay Area Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC)** in the Spring of 1999 to increase the campus' visibility as an employer and create a successful inter-institution collaboration including the development of a faculty recruitment web site. As a testament to HERC's success in 2002-03, the consortium has grown to over 18 area campuses, launched a joint web site [www.bayareaherc.org](http://www.bayareaherc.org), initiated a collaboration with the *Chronicle of Higher Education* which will net HERC over \$43,000 in free advertising space, and responded to a request from Southern California UC's to authorize coordinator time and use of the HERC web product for their benefit.
- A Department Manager module of **Div Data was successfully deployed to academic departments** in Arts, Engineering and Physical and Biological Sciences in 2002-03. Social Sciences and Humanities Divisions have asked for access to the shared database beginning in fall of 2004.
- Formal complaints have increased by 75% from 2001-02.
- The New Faculty Welcome expanded to include a series of workshops for all Assistant Professors on technology in the classroom, evaluating students, the tenure process, and benefits.

Following is a detailed report, including data, about AHR's role with Recruitment and Retention, Diversity, Advancement, Administrative Support, Complaint Resolution, Policy Review/Implementation, and Training and Development.

## Recruitment and Retention

### UCSC's Success in Recruiting Top Candidates

In 1999-00, the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare conducted a survey of department chairs concerning ladder rank recruitments. They studied data collected from searches over a three-year period; 1997-98 through 1999-00. Beginning in 2001-02, the Academic Human Resources Office (AHR) assumed responsibility for conducting this survey. The intent of this survey is to track UCSC's success rate in hiring top choice candidates, as well as to track the factors involved in a person's decision to accept or decline an offer from UCSC. With this data, the campus can be informed of critical issues that may help the campus improve its ability to hire top candidates.

### Leading Factors in Decision for First Choice Candidates Accepting Offer

The response rate from the survey was 58%, so the following represents feedback from only some of the disciplines surveyed. The most often cited factor for those accepting our offer is the academic excellence of our programs. The most often cited factors for those declining an offer are salary and housing costs. A summary by Division appears below.

In the **Arts Division**, the primary reasons cited by those who accepted include the academic excellence of programs, as well as teaching load, with secondary reasons including start up package, research support and housing assistance.

Only one of the top choice candidates did not accept an offer during the 2001-02 and 2002-03 recruitment cycles. That offer was made at a tenured level (all offers accepted were made at the untenured level). Reasons cited for the candidate not accepting included salary, housing costs and spousal employment issues.

In the **Engineering Division**, the primary reasons cited for those accepting an offer were academic excellence and research support. As for those who declined the offer, the most frequently cited reason was housing costs and campus location. Some comments received about location included candidates wanting to be near a large city or wanting to live in a less expensive area.

In the **Humanities Division**, the reasons cited for those accepting included academic excellence, salary, and start-up package. The reason cited for the candidate who declined included the perception by the candidate of a lack of support from some prospective campus colleagues.

In the **Physical and Biological Sciences Division**, academic excellence was the most often cited factor for those who accepted, and housing cost was cited on the only survey received for someone who declined.

The **Social Sciences Division** had the highest success rate of the divisions (85%). The primary reasons cited for those who accepted were academic excellence and research support. Secondary reasons included start-up packages, spousal employment opportunities, and the timing of the offer. As for those who declined, the reason cited most frequently was salary (from Economics candidates).

Although the low response rate makes it difficult to get a complete picture of the reasons candidates accepted or not, some patterns do emerge. The academic excellence of our faculty and of our programs is an important factor in attracting new faculty to our campus. The campus' past response to the high housing costs in the area by offering assistance via on-campus housing or loan programs has enabled us to attract some new faculty. However, housing costs and the high cost of living continue to be detrimental to our hiring success. This will continue to be a challenge given the difficult financial times the University is currently facing. The on-going efforts to assist faculty with housing is of vital importance in our recruitment efforts. Being creative with offering new faculty other incentives has also enabled us to attract faculty. For example, some departments have reported that being flexible in scheduling teaching assignments has resulted in some hiring success. The next couple of years will continue to present us with challenges and the campus must continue to be responsive in terms of salary and housing assistance.

Based on the survey, it is difficult to understand the change in our hire rate from 47% of offers accepted in 2001-02 to 63% in 2002-03 (Table 1). The Division with the highest variance in acceptances was Social Sciences (Table 2). In 2001-02, 57% of their offers were accepted, whereas in 2002-03, their acceptance rate increased to 85%. The most significant change happened in Economics. In 2001-02, no Economics offers were accepted. The primary reason stated for candidates not accepting the offer was competing offers with higher salaries from institutions with stronger reputations. However, in 2002-03, all Economics offers made were accepted, but there was no significant change in the nature of the offers made. The Department believes the job market is probably the most significant factor.

The percentage of first choice candidates has remained about the same, while the acceptance of second or third choice candidates has been increasing. The number of searches closed without a hire has almost doubled from 2000-01 to 2001-02 and continues to be high in 2002-03 (see Table 3 and 4).

**Table 1 - Percentage of offers accepted** (shows an increase in the campus' success in filling positions from the top three candidates during the past year.)

Recruitment Cycle Year(s)	Number of Searches*	Number of Offers Made	Percentage of Offers Accepted (top 3 candidates)
1997-98 through 1999-2000	25	35	56%
2000-01	44	59	62%
2001-02	28	36	47%
2002-03	40	41	63%

**Table 2 - Comparison of the hiring success rate by division**

Division	2001-02	2002-03
Arts	100%	86%
Engineering	35%	36%
Humanities	50%	50%
Physical & Biological Sciences	0%*	60%
Social Sciences	57%	85%

\*one offer made, still pending acceptance by candidate

**Table 3 - Outcome of Searches** (overview of the outcome of searches over the past six years.)

Recruitment Cycle Year(s)	Total Number of Searches*	Total Number of Offers Made	First Choice Candidates Accepting	Second/Third Choice Candidates Accepting	First Choice Candidates Declining/Withdrawing	Second/Third Choice Candidates Declining/Withdrawing	Offers Pending	Searches Closed Without Hire
1997-98 through 1999-2000	25	35	16 (48%)	3 (8%)	9 (26%)	4 (11%)		6
2000-01	44	59	32 (54%)	5 (8%)	16 (27%)	6 (10%)		9
2001-02	28 + 2 TOEs	36 2	13 (36%) 1	4 (11%)	12 (33%) 1	6 (17%)	1 (3%)	17
2002-03	40 +5 TOEs	41 5	19 (46%) 3	7 (17%)	14 (34%) 2	1 (3%)		16 1 in process

### Source of Applicants

The data confirms in Table 4 that professional journal and professional organization are the most productive sources. "Posted announcement" accounted for a high percentage, which supports the continued use of hard copy job announcements. As the use of websites increases, the categories will continue to be modified to test which websites are successful in attracting candidates. Little disciplinary differences were distinguishable, except that Engineering applicants seem to go to the web more often than applicants in other disciplines.

Because of the low percentage for "UCSC Bulletin" AHR discontinued mailing the full, hard copy bulletin and replaced it with a streamlined version. AHR is currently investigating eliminating the hard copy bulletin as our web posting of job announcements has expanded to include Workplace Diversity.com and HERC (Higher Education Recruitment Consortium). Data needs to be gathered correlating where serious candidates learned of the openings and concentrate on outreach and advertising that produces the most qualified candidates.

**Table 4 - 2002–03 Recruitment (Searches) Source Data** (where do applicants find out about faculty positions?)

Ranking	Source(s)	Percent of total responses
1	"Professional Journal"	25%
2 - tie	"Professional Organization" and "Chronicle of Higher Ed"	20%
3	"Other"	19%
4	"UCSC Web Site"	7%
5	HigherEdJobs.com	4%
6 - tie	"Posted Announcement" and "UCSC Bulletin"	2%

1,201 applicants returned data cards that included information about the recruitment source. Some applicants referenced more than one source, so the report lists 1,295 responses. When applicants specified what "Other" meant, many "Other" sources are web sites of professional organizations. The rest of "Other" sources, when specified, were some kind of personal contact, or a journal that was, perhaps, more interdisciplinary and therefore not seen as "Professional".

### Non-Senate Recruitments and Waivers

Ongoing pool searches allow departments to continually accept applications for short term, temporary positions and reduce the resources devoted to searches, while increasing the opportunity to attract qualified candidates. There was a 27% decrease in temporary searches.

**Table 5 - Non-Senate Searches and Waivers**

Year	Number of Temporary Searches	Number of Waivers	Number of Exemptions
2001-02	62 (21 were ongoing pool searches)	196	42
2002-03	45 (28 were ongoing pool searches)	170	86

## Diversity

### 2002-03 Faculty Statistics

- UCSC's faculty was approximately 35% women (all ethnicities) and nearly 25% ethnic minorities (men and women combined.)
- UCSC was successful in recruiting 7 women at the Assistant Professor level and 1 female tenured appointment. 5 of the 11 appointments at the Assistant Professor level were members of ethnic minority groups; 2 did not identify an ethnicity.
- 11 ladder rank faculty left UCSC, 2 woman and 3 were minorities (men and women combined): 6 retired, 5 resigned.
- Turnover rate in 2001-02 was 2.2%.
- The percentage of women faculty has increased from 34.4% in 2001-02 to 35.4% in 2002-03.
- The number of ethnic minority faculty increased from 116 in 2001-02 to 126 in 2002-03, but their percentage of Senate faculty increased slightly from 23% to 24%.

### 2002-03 Diversity Fund Awards: Helping to increase the candidate pipeline

The Diversity Fund program encourages longer-term efforts to increase the "pipeline" as well as specific support for faculty recruitments. Approximately \$15, 500 was provided to fund the program. Proposals were received from fourteen departments. The Senate Committee on Affirmative Action reviewed the proposals and forwarded recommendations to the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor. Ten of the fourteen proposals were awarded funding for 2001-02.

## President's Faculty Diversity and Enrichment Initiatives

The **Faculty Diversity and Enrichment Program** provides funding from UCOP to support start-up for recruitment of faculty who are both outstanding scholars and meet one of the three criteria outlined in President Atkinson's initiative of 2001-02. The campus received \$350,000 in recognition of its success in hiring faculty during 2002-03 who met the criteria for the Faculty Diversity and Enrichment Program.

The initiative to increase the hiring of President's Postdoctoral fellows provides an FTE and associated salary dollars for 5 years to departments that hire ladder rank faculty who have been a President's Postdoctoral Fellow since 1995. One hire in Humanities was made through this program.

## Dual Career Service and Faculty Relocation Assistance Program

In order to respond to spousal employment and relocation needs identified in the past by candidates for ladder rank appointments, UCSC launched the Dual Career Service in 1999 and the Faculty Relocation Assistance Program (Faculty RAP) in 2001. To date, both programs have served a total of 103 faculty families.

The **Dual Career Service** provides assistance and support during the employment searches of the spouse or partner of candidates and appointees for ladder rank faculty and senior management positions. Since its inception in January 2000, the Dual Career Service has served 78 clients (spouses or partners of faculty members). Of those, over 75% have received career assistance on multiple occasions that have involved: job search planning, resume/C.V. consultation, arranging networking opportunities with area employers, referrals, and interview practice. The number of actual contacts with clients is over 300.

The number of Dual Career clients served in 02-03 has increased 20% from 01-02 with 29 clients receiving services during 02-03. The Dual Career Service web site can be viewed at: <http://www2.ucsc.edu/ahr/dcs/>

In the winter of 2002, AHR launched the **Faculty Relocation Assistance Program (Faculty RAP)** to assist potential faculty by providing relocation resources and area information. Since its inception, the coordinator has met with 56 candidates or appointees for faculty positions. All in-person meetings have been followed up with a minimum of one email or phone contact and the provision of additional relocation resources. The number of actual contacts with clients is closer to 200.

The number of Faculty RAP clients served in 02-03 has increased over 300% from 01-02 with 45 clients receiving services in 02-03. This number is significant since recruitments only increased 25% from 01-02 to 02-03. This increase demonstrates both the need for such services and the excellent marketing efforts on the part of the coordinator, which have made this service available to many faculty families.

Additionally, the Faculty RAP program hosted 2 new faculty events, a hike and a dinner theater presentation that fostered community and collegiality among new faculty members. Another outreach vehicle to new faculty is *re:Location: The Newsletter for New UCSC Faculty Families* launched this spring. The newsletter contains information, resources, and tips for new faculty families and has been distributed widely to new faculty and the campus community. The Faculty RAP coordinator will launch a relocation web site this fall in time for the 03-04 recruitment season. It will be available at: <http://ahr.ucsc.edu/frap/index.htm>.

AHR established **Northern California's Bay Area Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC)** in the spring of 1999. HERC is comprised of over 18 area (up from 15 in 01-02) campuses that have worked together to facilitate up-to-date information resources, technology, networking, and outreach programs to be effective in recruiting and retaining a diverse and qualified faculty and staff. Members of the consortium include public, private, and community colleges drawing from the area bounded by Merced to the east, Monterey to the south, and Sonoma to the north. One particular interest of HERC's is finding effective ways to assist spouses and partners of our faculty and staff to secure area employment.

To that end, the consortium launched a web site [www.bayareaherc.org](http://www.bayareaherc.org) in April 2003 to bring visibility to employment opportunities on our respective campuses and to pool our shrinking recruitment resources for mutual benefit. HERC will be hosting a media event to unveil the site in October 2003 that will likely draw the attention of local, state and national audiences to member institutions.

In addition to the over \$60,000 the HERC project brings to the UCSC campus annually in membership dues, this year, HERC entered into collaboration with the *Chronicle of Higher Education* to consult with them about a new recruitment management system they hope to develop and in exchange will receive over \$43,000 in free advertising space throughout the 03-04 year.

Another sign of HERC's success is the attention from other colleges and universities. At the initiation of UC's southern California campuses, HERC has authorized the coordinator to consult with UCSD to help them launch a Southern California HERC. A contract is being finalized to allow them to utilize and customize the HERC web product. MIT and Harvard University have also expressed an interest in collaborating with Northern California HERC to form a HERC in their geographical area.

### Advancement Data

Improvements were made in the personnel review process that shortened the overall time for ladder rank reviews. Comparing the process timeline this year to last year, significant improvements were made in all areas. The median time for files requiring no ad hoc committee decreased by approximately 2 weeks (16 days) and the files requiring ad hoc review decreased by nearly a month (29 days). However, the most significant change was in the EVC authority holdovers, last year 41 files were not completed by the end of the academic year, this year only 10. Enforcement of the candidate's deadline to submit material to the department was the major factor in improving the time to complete the reviews.

**Table 6 - Number of Senate Actions by Year**

Year decision made	Number of Senate files	EVC Authority	Dean Authority	EVC Authority Holdovers	Appointment Reviews (Dean and EVC)
1998-99	154	83	71	17	25
1999-00	210	134	76	57	22
2000-01	207	107	100	31	60
2001-02	227	132	95	41	37
2002-03	231	149	82	10	47

#### Files without Ad Hoc Committee Review

On average it takes an extra two weeks (improved by two weeks compared to last year) to complete an EVC authority review without ad hoc committee, as compared to a Dean authority review. At the department level, EVC authority files seem to move somewhat more quickly, possibly because departments focus on completing them first. At the division level, EVC authority files take on average an extra three weeks (1 week longer than last year). This may be because the deadline to submit documents to the department was strictly observed. The enforced deadline brought more files in at one time, creating a bottleneck and a slight delay at the division level. However, the total process time was significantly reduced and all levels reported that the review process was contained to part of the year rather than taking up most of the year. Faculty reported satisfaction with earlier notification of the results of reviews.

**Table 7 - Dean Authority Files without Ad Hoc Committee 2002-03**

	Days in Dept	Dean Days in Div	Dean Days CAP	Dean Days Decision	Total Time
Median	79	14.5	22	8	195
Average	92	22	27	29	166
Max	393	82	111	121	218
Min	8	0	9	0	85

Number of files: 82

**Table 8 - EVC/Chancellor Authority Actions without Ad Hoc Committee 2002-03**

	Day in Dept	Days in Div	Days AHR to CAP no slate	Day CAP to AHR	Days AHR to Admin	Days Admin to Decision	Total time in AHR	Total Time	Change Total Days from Last Year
Median	96	36	5	14	4	7	7	211	-16
Average	114	48	7	21	6	14	12	211	-36
Max	268	201	132	130	36	217	146	261	-313
Min	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	161	-137

Number of files: 77

**Table 9 - EVC/Chancellor Authority Actions without Ad Hoc Committee 2001-02**

	Days in Dept	Days in Div	Days AHR to CAP	Days CAP to AHR	Days AHR to Admin	Days Admin to Decision	Total Days	Change Total Days from Last Year
Median	125	33	2	15	4	8	227	-51
Average	131	57	7	17	8	15	247	-31
Max	438	359	160	76	162	82	574	77
Min	1	1	0	4	0	0	24	-3

Number of files: 72

**Files with Ad Hoc Committee Review**

An ad hoc review previously added about 3 months to the review process. This year on average ad hoc review increased the total time by over 2 months (68 days). Overall, the process of emailing the slate members, and following up with a phone call has improved the efficiency of the process and shortened the delay caused by ad hoc formation. In general, the greatest delay in the ad hoc review process is the time it takes for the faculty to find available time to meet.

CAP acted as the ad hoc committee in 16 cases; 4 appointments, 10 promotions to professor and 2 merit to step 6. Last year CAP acted as the ad hoc committee 9 times.

**Table 10 - EVC/Chancellor Authority Actions with Ad Hoc 2002-03**

	Days in Dept	Days in Div	Days in Ad Hoc	Days CAP to AHR	Days AHR To Admin	Days Admin To Decision	Total Days	Change Total Days From Last Yr
Median	133	55	59	13	4	7	279	29
Average	149	59	74	12	5	10	306	-24
Max	349	200	319	56	25	37	587	-70
Min	8	3	0	0	1	0	168	-58

Number of files: 46

**Table 11 – EVC/Chancellor Authority Actions with Ad Hoc 2001-02**

	Days in Dept	Days in Div	Days in Ad Hoc	Days CAP to AHR	Days AHR to Admin	Days Admin to Decision	Total Days	Change Total Days From Last Yr
Median	144	21	77	17	3	10	308	33
Average	146	37	107	31	4	14	332	-8
Max	258	211	269	127	27	47	657	-109
Min	0	0	29	0	0	0	110	-47

Number of files: 45

**Administrative Services and Support**

**Academic Division Data Base (“Div Data”)** In 1997-98 we partnered with the academic divisions to develop the **Academic Division Data Base (“Div Data”)**, which automates and tracks the academic personnel review process, making it easier to analyze data concerning academic appointees. This database helps both divisions and central administration manage academic personnel processes in a more productive manner by reducing multiple shadow systems to one and automating the generation of contract required correspondence. “Div Data” provides one central repository for data on academic employees, from the time they first apply for a position until they separate from academic employment, and is supplemental to the UCOP Payroll/Personnel System (PPS).

In 2002-03 we completed a pilot project giving access to Div Data to department managers in three divisions – Arts, Physical and Biological Sciences and the School of Engineering. Humanities and Social Sciences divisions have requested access for their department managers in 2003-04.

In 2002-03, AHR has become known as being able to provide data and received over 100 information requests that required ad hoc report generation; monthly separation reports were provided to CATS, PPS, FIS, TAPS, EEO/AA, International Programs and the Library. There seems to be a trend for information requests to require combining data from multiple sources. This is perhaps because as more information becomes easily available the questions become more complicated. A future goal is to help other units learn how to access the campus data resources.

### **AHR Website**

In 02-03 AHR purchased Contribute, a content management tool from Macromedia. Use of Contribute has simplified maintenance of the web site and supports more frequent updating of information.

### **Formal Complaint Data**

AHR staffed the Charges Committee, an administrative committee that conducts preliminary investigations of formal complaints of alleged violations of the Faculty Code of Conduct on behalf of the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor. Following its investigation, the Committee makes a recommendation to the CP/EVC whether to move forward with a hearing on discipline or to dismiss the complaint.

The CP/EVC received 7 formal complaints in 2002-03, an increase of 75% from the previous year. The status of these complaints is as follows: One complaint was dismissed; one was forwarded to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure with a determination to discipline; one complaint was returned to the complainant with a request to modify it to comply with the written guidelines; and the remainder will carry over into 2003-04 pending further investigation.

### **Policy Review/Implementation**

Last year's work involved directives from UCOP to address system wide needs or unanticipated legislation and campus initiatives for policy revisions or implementations. Some of these initiatives are based on collaborative efforts, where AHR staff members have participated in the analysis and discussions to assess long-term impact and identify the appropriate course of action. Some changes are in response to legislative or new regulatory mandates. The following lists policy and procedure reviews or implementations during 2002-03

#### **Campus Initiatives**

- CAPM Lecturer with Security of Employment
- CAPM section on review procedures for Vice Provosts
- CAPM revision for Academic Coordinator Series
- CAPM revision for Outside Professional Activities
- CAPM revision for Biobib Guidelines
- CAPM revision to leave policy
- Implement START program
- Implement SB 1467
- Revise checklist to assure fairness
- UARC Proposal

#### **UCOP Initiatives, formal and/or informal reviews**

- APM 015 – Faculty Code of Conduct
- APM 137 – Term appointments
- APM 140 – Grievance procedures
- APM 145 – Layoff and reduction in time
- APM 150 – Corrective Action & dismissal
- APM 190 - Whistleblower Policy and Whistleblower Protection Policy
- APM 285 – Lecturer with security of employment
- APM 310 – Professional research series
- APM 311 – Project scientist series
- APM 390 – Postdoctoral scholar
- APM 715 – Family medical leave
- APM 740 – Sabbatical leave
- Proposal for improving retirement benefits for UC Health Sciences Faculty
- Salary continuation proposal
- Ownership of Course Materials
- Consensual Relationships-conflict of interest
- Military Leave Supplemental pay

## Development and Training

There is a growing need to orient and develop faculty administrators and leaders and division and department staff—as a consequence of campus-wide anticipated retirements, normal turnover; campus changes in complexity resulting from growth in size; risk management, budget reductions, and a variety of new programs.

There were approximately 340 attendees overall for AHR's training sessions in 2002-03. Attendees at these sessions appreciate not only the content, but also the opportunities to learn from and share ideas with their colleagues. The New Faculty Orientation, Campus Provost Workshops, and Review Process sessions receive consistently high ratings. The Department Chair program receives more mixed feedback with participants praising the time spent sharing with their colleagues. Staff trainings receive high ratings with requests to add more subjects.

Academic Human Resources sponsors a day long, annual New Faculty Orientation and Welcome event for incoming ladder-rank faculty. The program is designed to give new faculty a mix of campus history, student demographics, teaching and research resources, information about shared governance, and important time to network with each other and their divisional deans. The day concludes with a dinner event for new faculty and their families and provides an important time for socializing across divisional borders. The 2003 New Faculty Orientation was rated "excellent" by those who responded to a follow-up survey. A faculty panel entitled "Tips for New Faculty" that was added to this year's agenda was particularly appreciated by participants as was the family dinner event.

The Campus Provost Workshop series was inaugurated in 2002-03, presenting five workshops on topics of interest to new faculty and assistant professors. Topics dealt with technology in teaching, evaluating UCSC students and creating a record for tenure. These are opportunities to acclimate new faculty into the campus culture, to provide information about the resources and opportunities for enhancing performance, and to develop community across departments.

Briefings and workshops about the academic personnel review process are provided to department chairs and their managers to provide them with conceptual and operational tools to assist them in the faculty review process. In addition, sessions are offered each year that are specifically intended for assistant professors, to guide them through the midcareer/tenure review process, the various university leave policies, and to offer tips and resources for questions they may have during their probationary period. These sessions are highly rated by attendees. In all these sessions, there is the additional learning and benefit that takes place from the voicing of issues and concerns with the opportunity to clarify misunderstandings and to dispel rumors.

Information sessions were also provided for chairs, divisions and staff during the year on the campus budget, new University policies, and recruitment as well as training sessions on the campus payroll and the data systems used for recruiting academics and for management reports on the academic population. These sessions provide essential information about current concerns or issues, and tools to enhance productivity and efficiency.

- **Training sessions provided by AHR in 2002-03**
- **Department Chair Workshops**
- Focus groups -- designing a chair education program
- Campus Budget (3 sessions)
- Postdoctoral Scholar policy – information sessions
- Faculty Review Process for Department Chairs

### **Workshop Series for Assistant Professor and New Faculty**

- New Faculty Orientation and Welcome Dinner
- Tenure Review Process for Assistant Professors (2 sessions)
- Faculty in the Classroom
- Using the Student Performance Evaluation System
- Technology in Teaching
- Creating a Record for Tenure
- Managing Your Future – Financial Planning and Benefits

## **Recruitment**

- Ladder Rank Recruitment Strategies- with search committee chairs and staff by division

## **Staff Training**

- Personnel Procedures
- New academic personnel policy changes
- University leave policies
- Postdoctoral Scholar policy – information sessions

## **Information Management Training**

- Payroll Personnel System Training
- General Use of Div Data
- Recruitment Module
- Data Warehouse

Academic Human Resources also provides staff support for the Regents Lecturers and Professors program and oversees the allocation of resources for the Faculty Development Programs administered by the Divisions.