



# Academic Human Resources Annual Accountability Report 2005-2006

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report highlights the progress Academic Human Resources has made during 2005-06 on the goals from our 10 Year Plan. The mission of Academic Human Resources is to help the campus recruit and retain excellent and diverse faculty and academic appointees.

- Assignment of **responsibility for the Senior Management Group (SMG)** to AHR was not anticipated in the Ten Year Plan and required reassignment of significant resources within AHR resulting in delays or lack of progress in other areas.
- Several internal and external **audits of the Senior Management Program** required AHR to research detailed historical and current information on Senior Management Group (SMG) compensation and application of policies and procedures to current and former senior managers.
- AHR staffed 7 **executive level searches** (6 in SMG) for the positions of Vice Chancellor of Research, Vice Chancellor of Undergraduate Education, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Director of Lick Observatory, and Deans of Social Sciences, Physical and Biological Sciences, and Humanities, requiring AHR to reassign existing staff and add temporary staff to handle the workload.
- AHR participated on the third task force to review the issues surrounding **partner hires**, which produced a set of recommendations for consideration by the administration.
- AHR implemented a **pilot online bio-bibliography application, Bio-Bib Net**, a project suggested by the Executive Budget Committee (EBC) process and generating enthusiasm from early users.
- The move of the highly successful **Division Database** to a more robust platform has begun. "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). The Division Database has become an essential tool for departments, divisions, and central offices to manage academic human resource data and actions. Its security and functionality is essential for the management of human resource functions for academic employees.
- The **percentage of recruitments resulting in new faculty hires has increased** from 42% in 2001-02 to 83%. In 2005-06, 32 ladder-rank faculty have been hired to begin in 2006-07.
- UCSC continues to be one of the most diverse faculty in the UC system, however, the **diversity of the senate faculty has slightly decreased**, while other campuses are increasing in diversity. The **turnover rate** for ladder-rank faculty **decreased** to 2.44%.
- The **Diversity Awards program** recognized campus diversity efforts by allocating \$22,600 to support department's diversity efforts leading to long-term improvement of the "pipeline."
- The **Dual Career Service/Faculty Relocation Assistance Programs (DCS/FRAP)** coordinator met with 107 candidates during the 2005-06 recruitment cycle, a 180% increase from 2003-04! Of these, 16 partners/spouses were assisted by the Dual Career Service with their job search. Three of the 107 were faculty who had retention issues (e.g. a spouse who had decided to return to work after a lapse of employment). The DCS/FRAP website was updated in 2006 to improve functionality and to align with the AHR and UCSC templates.
- The Dual Career Service continues to work with the **Higher Education Recruitment Consortium** to advertise positions and network with other higher education institutions to assist transitioning faculty families with employment.
- The merit equity review process was revised and renamed the **career equity review process** incorporating several changes in the procedures.

- **Formal charges** of violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct **decreased** 80% from 2004-05.
- **Training and development opportunities had to be reduced** this year due to the reassignment of AHR staff to SMG issues. Nevertheless, basic workshops were held along with two additional topical workshops for department chairs.

//////////

The following is a detailed report, including data, about Recruitment and Retention, Diversity, Advancement, Administrative Support, Complaint Resolution, Policy Review/Implementation, and Training and Development.

## RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

### SMG and Academic Administrators

AHR staffed 7 **executive level searches** for the positions of Vice Chancellor of Research, Vice Chancellor of Undergraduate Education, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Director of Lick Observatory, and Deans of Social Sciences, Physical and Biological Sciences, and Humanities. AHR redirected existing staff and added temporary staff to assist with the heavy workload involved in conducting numerous executive searches simultaneously. The search for a Director of Lick Observatory, and MRU reporting to the Office of the President, involved numerous campuses. Each search was successful with all of the positions being filled.

Additionally, a search for the Vice Chancellor of University Relations was staffed by the Chancellor's Office. AHR was responsible for the formal appointment process.

### Ladder Rank Recruitment Success

During the 2005-06 recruitment year, the campus conducted 29 ladder-rank searches, a decrease of 65% from 2003-04. Of the 24 searches concluded, 3 were for multiple positions. A total of 48 appointments were reviewed with 32 faculty accepting positions to begin in 2006-07.

The percentage of successful searches has consistently increased, as noted in Table 1. The campus has continued to focus on improving outreach efforts and implementing new programs to assist in attracting top candidates to UCSC.

**Table 1: Ladder Rank Searches**

Year	# Of Searches	# Searches Filled	# Of Searches Closed without Hire	# Of New Hires
2001-02	31	13 (42%)	18 (58%)	13
2002-03	40	25 (63%)	15 (37%)	28
2003-04	44	31 (78%)	9 (22%)	39
2005-06	29	24 (83%)	5 (17%)	32

### Source of Applicants

Professional journals and professional organizations continue to be productive sources for attracting applicants. There has been a slight increase in applicants using the UCSC website and other websites to learn about openings. Professional journal ads continue to be the largest source of applicants. At this point we are unable to track where our most qualified candidates learned of UCSC opportunities. The Higher Education Recruitment (HERC) website contains all positions at higher education institutions in the northern California region, and may be useful for partner dual career issues, however, few candidates learn of UCSC opportunities there.

**Table 2: Source of Applicants (Where do applicants find out about UCSC jobs?)**

Source(s)	Percent of total responses	
	2003-04	2005-06
	1998 applicants reporting	2590 applicants reporting (70%)
"Professional Journal"	28%	31.2%
"Professional Organization"	15%	15.3%
"Chronicle of Higher Education" & Posted Announcement	14%	13.6%
"UCSC Web Site"	11%	13.5%
"Other (Please Specify)"	7%	2.6%
HigherEdJobs.com & "Other Web Site"	4%	6.5%
"UCSC Bulletin"	2%	1.9%
"HERC Web Site"	.44%	.1%
"Workplace Diversity"	.04%	0

Some applicants mentioned more than one source.

### 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.

**Table 3: 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
2003-04	57 (20 were ongoing pool searches)	181	100
2004-05	46 (36 were ongoing pool searches)	119	88
2005-06	53	140	91

### Dual Career Service (DCS) and Faculty Relocation Assistance Program (FRAP)

AHR provides the DCS and FRAP as recruitment tools to help the campus achieve its recruitment goals. The eligible clients are candidates or appointees who are members of the Academic Senate or who hold equivalent academic titles, and members of the Senior Management Group. Generally, the programs target new hires, but they have been used as retention tools as well.

DCS was launched in 1999 in order to respond to spousal employment needs identified in the past by candidates for ladder-rank appointments. It provides assistance and support during the employment searches of the spouse or partner of candidates and appointees. Some of the services the program offers are job search planning, resume/C.V. consultation, arranging networking opportunities with area employers, referrals, and interview practice. Also, the DCS provides a website which may be viewed at [ahr.ucsc.edu/dcs](http://ahr.ucsc.edu/dcs). The website was updated in 2006 to improve functionality and to align with the AHR and UCSC templates.

FRAP was launched in 2001 in order to respond to faculty relocation needs. Common areas of interest for relocating families are childcare/schools, community, housing, and benefits. The Coordinator provides customized assistance by directing families to the appropriate campus or community resource. FRAP has a website that may be viewed at [ahr.ucsc.edu/frap](http://ahr.ucsc.edu/frap). In 2006, the Coordinator integrated the FRAP and DCS websites to better communicate the relationship between the two programs.

The DCS/FRAP Coordinator markets the programs to the Academic Departments in the fall of each year. Departments are encouraged to schedule appointments with the Coordinator for their faculty candidates during the campus visits. This provides candidates a respite from hectic interview schedules as well as the opportunity to discuss issues that may not be considered

during the Departmental interview (childcare, benefits, housing, leaves, spousal employment, etc.) These meetings also establish a foundation for future client relationships.

Both programs have brochures that can be used by recruiting departments and are also included in the informational packets that AHR sends out to final candidates.

To date, both programs have served a total of 295 families. The DCS/FRAP coordinator met with 107 candidates during the 2005-06 recruitment cycle, a 180% increase from 2003-04! Of these, 16 partners/spouses were assisted by the DCS program with their job search. Three of the 107 were actually faculty who had retention issues (e.g. a spouse who had decided to return to work after a lapse of employment). The areas of interest of the candidates is well-balanced between the two programs

**Table 4: Usage of Dual Career Service and Faculty Relocation Assistance Program, 2005-06**

Division	Candidates	FRAP	DCS	Both	DCS Clients	New Hire	Retention
SMG	5	2		3	1	5	
ARTS	4	3		1			
ENGINEERING	4		2	2	2	3	1
HUMANITIES	7	2	1	4	3	7	
PB SCI	51	23	1	27	4	50	1
SOCIAL SCIENCES	35	19	3	13	6	34	1
OTHER	1						
Totals	107	49	7	50	16	99	3

### Partner Hire Task Force

The Academic Senate and the administration appointed a task force to review current policies and practices concerning partner hires. The Assistant Vice Chancellor served as a member of the committee and provided historical background and information concerning the policies and practices at other universities. The report was submitted to the Executive Vice Chancellor with specific recommendations for consideration.

### HERC

AHR established **Northern California's Bay Area Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC)** in the spring of 1999. HERC is comprised of 46 area 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. The program is now administered from UCOP.

Because of the success of the Northern California HERC, other regional HERC's have been formed following the founding consortium's model: Southern California HERC, New England HERC, Metropolitan New York/Southern Connecticut HERC, and upstate New York HERC. Plans are in the works to form a national job board to link all the regional HERC's.

The DCS/FRAP Coordinator attends the quarterly meetings of Norcal HERC as a resource for networking and for information on HR "Best Practices".

### Turnover

The turnover rate for 2005-06 was 3.10% with 17 ladder rank separations, a decrease compared to the last 3 years. The average turnover rate for the past 10 years is 2.87%.

Table 5: Ladder rank Turnover

Aca Year	Resign	Retire	Terminate	Deceased	Total Separations	Total Faculty	Percent Turnover	Percent Retire	Percent Resign	New Appts
95-96	7	1	1	1	10	395	2.53%	10.00%	70.00%	21
96-97	7	1	1	1	10	410	2.44%	10.00%	70.00%	23
97-98	5	1	2	1	9	422	2.13%	11.11%	55.56%	22
98-99	10	1	1	0	12	433	2.77%	8.33%	83.33%	20
99-00	6	5	1	0	12	445	2.70%	41.67%	50.00%	23
00-01	6	6	1	0	13	460	2.83%	46.15%	46.15%	27
01-02	4	6	0	1	11	486	2.26%	54.55%	36.36%	39
02-03	10	8	0	0	18	494	3.64%	44.44%	55.56%	19
03-04	8	7	0	1	16	508	3.15%	43.75%	50.00%	33
04-05	10	11	0	1	22	534	4.12%	50.00%	45.45%	42
05-06	9	5	1	2	17	548	3.10%	29.41%	52.94%	32

Note: Numbers are for Professor series appointees, Lecturer SOE are not included.

Note: Numbers are taken for entire year (e.g. any LR here between 7/1 and 6/30, even if not here for entire year)

Note: Appointments are counted in the year effective rather than in the year recruited or offered - Ladder rank only counted.

Table 6: Turnover by Ethnicity

Aca Year	White				Minority				Total	Total Minority	Total White
	Resign	Retire	Terminate	Deceased	Resign	Retire	Terminate	Deceased			
96-97	5	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	10	20%	80%
**97-98	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	8	25%	75%
98-99	9	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	12	17%	83%
99-00	2	4	0	0	4	1	1	0	12	50%	50%
00-01	4	5	1	0	2	1	0	0	13	23%	77%
01-02	2	6	0	0	2	0	0	1	11	27%	73%
02-03	4	6	0	0	6	2	0	0	18	44%	56%
03-04	8	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	16	19%	81%
04-05	7	10	0	1	3	1	0	0	22	18%	82%
05-06	7	4	0	2	2	1	1	0	17	24%	76%
Total	53	41	2	6	22	10	2	3	139		

\*\*In 97-98 one minority faculty member was not reappointed in the Acting Asst Prof title when she failed to complete the PhD

Table 7: Turnover by Sex

Aca Year	Female				Male				Total	Total Female	Total Male
	Resign	Retire	Terminate	Deceased	Resign	Retire	Terminate	Deceased			
96-97	5	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	10	80%	20%
**97-98	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	8	75%	25%
98-99	9	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	12	83%	17%
99-00	2	4	0	0	4	1	1	0	12	50%	50%
00-01	4	5	1	0	2	1	0	0	13	77%	23%
01-02	2	6	0	0	2	0	0	1	11	73%	27%
02-03	4	6	0	0	6	2	0	0	18	56%	44%
03-04	8	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	16	81%	19%
04-05	7	10	0	1	3	1	0	0	22	82%	18%



made				y			
1998-99	154	83	54%	71	46%	17	25
1999-00	210	134	64%	76	36%	57	22
2000-01	207	107	52%	100	48%	31	60
2001-02	227	132	58%	95	42%	41	37
2002-03	231	149	65%	82	35%	10	47
2003-04	218	139	64%	81	37%	12	53
2004-05	218	143	66%	75	34%	14	39
2005-06	239	177	74%	62	26%	14	46

Total number of files omits deferrals but includes appointments. Numbers include ladder-rank only, not Lecturers w/SOE. Files with retroactive effective dates are counted in the year the decision is made.

There was a significant increase in the number of actions involving a request for additional information or preliminary assessment: 27 in 2005-06, as opposed to just 6 in 2004-05.

### Timeline

As in the past, the time taken to complete a personnel action is correlated with the number of units reviewing the file. The median time taken to process a personnel action in 2005-06 was roughly 5 months (159 days) for actions decided by the Dean; 8 months (235 days) for actions decided by the EVC or Chancellor but not involving an *ad hoc* committee; and a year (356 days) for actions involving an *ad hoc* committee and decided by the EVC or Chancellor. The average time is the same as the median time for EVC/Chancellor authority actions that do not involve an *ad hoc* committee; it is about a month longer otherwise.

NOTE: For the timeline data, each process step is calculated separately, so total time is not a combination of the average or median time for each step. These numbers do not include deferrals or appointments. Files with retroactive effective dates are counted in the year the decision is made

### Timeline: Dean Authority Actions

The median time taken to process a personnel action decided by the Dean was roughly the same in 2005-06 as in 2004-05. The average time increased by about a month.

**Table 10: Dean Authority Files 2005-06**

	Days in Dept	Dean Days in Div	Dean Days CAP	Dean Days Decision	Total Time	Change Total Days from last year
Median	91	20	19	2.5	159	1 less day
Average	104	35	23	32	197	30 more days
Max	307	99	62	820	1002	741 more days
Min	6	0	5	0	77	6 fewer days

Number of files: 34

**Table 11: Dean Authority Files 2004-05**

	Days in Dept	Dean Days in Div	Dean Days CAP	Dean Days Decision	Total Time	Change Total Days from last year
Median	105	8	20	5	160	7 more days
Average	102	19	22	21	167	3 fewer days
Max	214	78	62	108	261	202 fewer days
Min	35	0	13	2	83	20 more days

Number of files: 51

**Table 12: Dean Authority Files 2003-04**

Days in Dept	Dean Days in Div	Dean Days CAP	Dean Days Decision	Total Time

Median	83	9	26	13	153
Average	102	17	28	24	170
Max	444	51	53	143	463
Min	36	0	11	1	63

Number of files: 42

### Timeline: EVC/Chancellor Authority Actions Without *Ad Hoc*

In 2005-06, the time taken to process a personnel action decided by the EVC or Chancellor but not involving an ad hoc committee was about a month less than in 2004-05. (Included in these figures are types of actions for which *ad hoc* committees are never formed, as well as 23 actions in which CAP constituted itself as the *ad hoc* committee.) Most of this decrease is due to more efficient processing of files within the Departments. On average, it took a Department 3 months (99 days) to process a file of this type in 2005-06, as opposed to almost 4 months (121 days) in 2004-05, and almost 4 months (113 days) in 2003-04.

**Table 13: Chancellor Authority Actions without Ad Hoc Committee 2005-06**

	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	85	70	2	13	4	8	5	235	26 fewer days
Average	99	75	4	20	4	9	7	232	31 fewer days
Max	283	223	43	126	35	48	47	720	159 fewer days
Min	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5 fewer days

Number of files: 97 (26 fewer files than last year, 7 files were holdovers from earlier years) CAP acted as the ad hoc committee in 23 cases

**Table 14: EVC/Chancellor Authority Actions without Ad Hoc Committee 2004-05**

	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	115	67	1	17	2	10	4	261	68 more days
Average	121	73	4	21	3	21	7	263	51 more days
Max	438	187	141	154	20	633	141	879	236 more days
Min	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	9	13 fewer days

Number of files: 123 (53 more files than last year, 8 files were holdovers from previous years) CAP acted as the ad hoc committee in 12 cases.

**Table 15: EVC/Chancellor Authority Actions without Ad Hoc Committee 2003-04**

	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
Median	91	41	2	16.5	4	8	9	193
Average	113	42	7	18	7	13	14	212
Max	529	98	93	45	43	136	93	643
Min	5	0	0	3	0	2	0	22

Number of files: 70 CAP acted as the ad hoc committee in 27 cases.

### Timeline: EVC/Chancellor Authority Actions With *Ad Hoc*

The time taken to process a personnel action involving an *ad hoc* committee took considerably longer in 2005-06 than in 2004-05. Much of the increase can be attributed to the *ad hoc* committee process itself. On average, it took 3-1/2 months (107 days) for the *ad hoc* committee to be formed, review the file, and write its report in 2005-06, as opposed to a month (27 days) in 2004-05, and almost 3 months (84 days) in 2003-04.

**Table 16: EVC/Chancellor Authority Actions with *Ad Hoc* 2005-06**

	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	143	52	86	20	4	8	356	76 more days
Average	157	61	107	27	4	10	402	127 more days
Max	369	182	283	84	20	34	768	119 more days
Min	0	0	42	7	0	0	167	79 more days

Number of files: 43 files (6 more files than last year)

**Table 17: EVC/Chancellor Authority Actions with *Ad Hoc* 2004-05**

	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	150	53	8	17	2	12	280	1 more day
Average	102	38	27	51	6	16	275	113 fewer days
Max	227	107	81	126	19	41	649	466 fewer days
Min	39	3	0	11	0	1	88	129 fewer days

Number of files: 37 (15 more files than last year)

**Table 18: EVC/Chancellor Authority Actions with *Ad Hoc* 2003-04**

	Days in Dept	Days in Div	Days in Ad Hoc	Days CAP to AHR	Days AHR To Admin	Days Admin To Decision	Total Days
Median	138	47	72	20	3	13	279
Average	185	61	84	20	10	16	388
Max	624	333	205	44	79	61	1115
Min	93	7	23	1	0	0	217

### Career Equity Review Process

AHR worked with the Senate to revise the merit equity process and issued the new career equity review process guidelines for 05-06 reviews. Highlights of the differences from the original merit equity process include:

- Creation of career advisors appointed by the Academic Senate to advise those who wish to apply for a CER
- Inclusion of the CER request in the review file so that all reviewers will understand what part of the record the candidate believes may warrant recalibration or may have been overlooked, undervalued, or had a delayed impact.
- Provision for the dean to be able to appoint a confidential *ad hoc* committee appointed by the dean to prepare the review file and make recommendations. Some faculty continue to express the need for a process for their review to be conducted outside of the department. The merit equity process allowed the dean to prepare the review, however, this was found to be difficult given the dean's commitments. The career equity process permits the dean to appoint an *ad hoc* committee to conduct the initial review. This preserves the candidate's ability to go outside of the department and allows the dean to use other expert faculty to do the review. Due to concerns about divisional workload, AHR will provide staff support for the dean's ad hoc committees.
- Simplification of the eligibility for a CER review so that tenured ladder rank faculty are eligible once at the associate professor rank, once at the professor rank prior to advancement to professor, step 6, and once after advancement to professor, step 6 up to professor above-scale.

There were 2 career equity reviews requested during 2005-06, which are still in progress.

## Administrative Services and Support

### Academic Division Data Base ("Div Data")

In 1997-98 AHR 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).

AHR has developed a beta automated bio-bibliography system, which currently has about 35 users spread over all of the divisions. The system benefits the faculty and departments by eliminating double data entry and allowing faculty to have more direct control over their bio-bib and provides the ability to reformat the bio-bib into a C.V. It also has provided AHR with expertise in handling personnel documents online, which will be useful in future, development of an online review process system.

A second project in development is to move Div Data to another more robust platform. Initial discussions with IT and other stakeholders concerning specifications and needs have occurred. Because Div Data is essential to the academic personnel function across the campus, functionality must be maintained during the project.

AHR was called upon to answer numerous data requests associated with the audits conducted by The Regents, the California Legislature, and outside consultants hired by the President. These requests point to the lack of necessary systems to track Senior Management data and compensation, along with conflicting policies related to faculty who are also Senior Managers. These deficiencies must be addressed in the near future.

AHR continued to provide other data and received over 100 information requests that required ad hoc report generation; and continued to provide standard reports to units across campus. The need to integrate data from multiple systems continues and requires continued development of technical expertise, not only in AHR but also in other offices on the campus.

## Formal Complaints of Violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct

AHR staffs the Committee on Charges, an administrative committee composed of Senate faculty. On behalf of the Campus Provost, the Committee on Charges reviews formal complaints filed against Academic Senate members charged with unacceptable conduct in violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct (APM 015) to determine whether there is probable cause to warrant the initiation of a disciplinary action by the administration. Following its review, the Committee writes a report to the Campus Provost, which includes the Committee's assessment of the complaint and the evidence submitted, a recommendation to dismiss the complaint or to initiate disciplinary action, and a recommendation of the specific disciplinary sanction proposed (from the list of authorized sanctions included in APM 016), if any.

There was one new formal complaint filed in 2005-06 (a significant decrease from recent years), which was dismissed based on the Campus Provost's determination that there was no violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct.

Following is a table summarizing formal complaint activity beginning in 2002-03:

Academic Year	Complaints Held Over from Prior Year	New Complaints Filed	Complaints Resulting in Initiation of Discipline
02-03		7	
03-04	4	4	4
04-05		5	
05-06	3	1	2

## Policy Review and Implementation

Policy reviews during 2004-05 involved directives from UCOP to address systemwide needs or 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. In addition, Academic Human Resources is in ongoing consultation with campus constituents including departments, deans, and the Committee on Academic Personnel regarding opportunities to save time and expedite decisions concerning academic personnel processes. It is anticipated that many SMG and academic personnel policies will be reviewed in the coming year due to Regental and Legislative audits that occurred during 2005-06.

The following lists policy and procedure development, reviews or implementations that occurred during 2005-06.

### **Formal Review and issuance of sections of the Systemwide Academic Personnel Manual:**

APM 260: University Professor

APM 340: Continuing Educator Series

APM 210-1-d: Provides that teaching, research, and service that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of the candidate's qualifications.

APM 240: Provides that Deans and Provosts are responsible for an affirmative action program consistent with University policies

APM 245: Provides that the Chair is responsible for maintaining a climate hospitable to diversity and for maintaining a department affirmative action program.

APM 760: Effective family accommodation policies for academic appointees are fundamental to an equitable and productive academic environment. The revisions express the University of California 's commitment to ongoing development of principles, institutional resources, and a workplace culture supportive of family care-giving responsibilities

### **Informal Management Reviews are in progress for the following APM sections:**

Proposed Revisions to APM - 700, Leaves of Absence/General

APM – 710 Leaves of Absence/Sick Leave;

Proposed new APM - 711, Reasonable Accommodation for Academic Appointees with Disabilities

Proposed new APM - 080, Medical Separation

- The proposed revision of APM - 710, Leaves of Absence/Sick Leave, provides guidelines for the amount of paid sick leave that may be granted to academic appointees who do not accrue sick leave and provides guidelines about how and when medical information should be requested in support of requests for periods of sick leave.
- The proposed new policy, APM - 711, Reasonable Accommodation for Academic Appointees with Disabilities provides guidelines for reasonable accommodation.
- The proposed new policy APM - 080, Medical Separation outlines the process for a medical separation of academic appointees who have exhausted sick leave and continue to be unable to work for health reasons and for whom reasonable accommodation is not possible.
- The proposed revision of APM 700 adds the concept of constructive resignation for faculty who are absent without approval or do not return to assigned duties after an approved leave of absence for non-health reasons.

### **UCSC Campus Academic Personnel Manual (CAPM) Reviews and Issuances:**

CAPM 508.260: University Professor

CAPM 314.245: Compensation of Department Chairs

CAPM 306.240: Compensation of College Provosts

CAPM 604.340: Continuing Educator Series

CAPM 900.700: Family Accommodations Policy

## **DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING**

Due to the necessary reassignment of resources to the SMG function in 2005-06, the training and development program had to be reduced. Hopefully, resources can again be committed to this area in the coming years.

### **Summary listing of offerings in 2005-06**

- CAP Orientation
- Recruitment sessions with faculty search committees (with each division)
- Retirement workshops in cooperation with the Academic Senate and Benefits Office

### **Training sessions provided for Department Chairs and Provosts**

- Faculty Review Process for Department Chairs
- New Hire Negotiations—Strategies for Success
- How to Survive Four Things that are about to Hit You: Student Retention and Graduation results, National Research Council rankings, Faculty Workload Reporting (TIE), Summer Session

### **Workshops for Assistant Professors and New Faculty**

- New Faculty Orientation and Welcome Event
- Explanation of the academic personnel review process (two sessions)

### **Briefing/Training Sessions for Staff**

- Payroll Personnel System procedures and academic policy (three sessions)
- Academic Division Data Base ("Div Data") training for divisions and departments (four sessions)

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.

Academic Human Resources sponsors a day long, 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 an informal event for new faculty and their families and provides an important time for socializing across divisional borders.

The Workshops for Assistant Professors and new faculty provide 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.

AHR also provides staffing for the Unit 18 Professional Development Fund.

## Conclusion

This was a challenging year for AHR with continued changes in campus senior leadership, increasing workload, staff turnover, and numerous audits of executive compensation. AHR remains dedicated to providing the campus with the highest level of service possible and will enter a time of reorganization while a new Assistant Vice Chancellor assumes leadership.

Priorities for the next year include:

- Recruiting and training qualified staff to fill open positions
- Determining where in the organization the SMG responsibilities should be assigned
- Completing the move to a new platform for Div Data
- Moving Bio-Bib Net from pilot to regular status
- Maintaining reasonable turn around time on recruitment and advancement actions

Areas in the Ten Year Plan for the future:

- Computer Based Training
- Mediation program
- Chair orientation
- Student intern/staff floater program