November 9, 2011

DEANS
DIRECTOR BOLTE
DEPARTMENT and PROGRAM CHAIRS

Re: Changes to Ad Hoc Committee Requirements and Updates to Academic Personnel Policies

Dear Colleagues:

As we start the 2011-12 academic year, I am pleased to inform you of two changes to campus procedures that are reflective of our ongoing efforts to reduce workload where possible and to increase our success in the timely review of faculty appointment and advancement actions while preserving the integrity of the review process. Corresponding updates will be made to the campus academic personnel manual (CAPM).

1. Ad Hoc Personnel Review Committee Requirements

Ad hoc review committees for academic personnel actions are at times convened to provide additional information for the Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) and the deciding authority. Following consultation, the administration and CAP agreed that where all levels of review concur on promotion, and significant acceleration is not involved, the additional layer of ad hoc review is unnecessary. Further, the campus will be in a stronger position in recruiting tenured faculty absent the delays that are created by the need to convene an ad hoc committee where all levels of review are in agreement. Therefore, the requirements for convening ad hoc committees were revised and are listed below, commencing with 2011-12 personnel reviews.

Promotion to Associate Professor and Promotion to Professor
Ad hoc committee review is only required if: 1) the department and/or dean recommend denial of promotion, or 2) the department and/or dean recommend acceleration of two or more steps (e.g., Associate Professor, Step 3 to Professor, Step 3; Assistant Professor, Step 4 to Associate Professor, Step 3).

Appointment to a Tenured Rank or Security of Employment
Ad hoc committee review is only required if: 1) the department and/or dean do not support the appointment, or 2) the department and dean differ in their recommendation on rank and/or step.

Additionally, in any personnel case where CAP or the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor or Chancellor deems that an ad hoc personnel review committee is necessary, current procedures involving nomination and approval shall be followed to convene a committee.

2. Department Augmentation for Bylaw 55 Voting Rights (CAPM 414.220)

The campus policy for temporary augmentation of Bylaw 55 voting faculty has been revised to allow augmentation for an individual academic personnel review action where the augmentation is made pursuant to a need for additional subject matter expertise. This includes a need to have
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faculty representation at a particular rank (e.g., participation of a Professor, Above Scale in a review involving that rank) that is deemed necessary to conduct a thorough academic personnel review. Previously, temporary augmentations were assigned for all departmental personnel actions in that review year.

3. Academic Personnel Policy Changes

Additionally, I want to highlight some of the several changes made recently to systemwide and campus academic personnel policies and/or procedures. These revisions are predominantly non-substantive or technical changes that were necessary to ensure consistency within, and between, the systemwide and campus academic personnel manuals, and to update campus procedures to reflect campus practice and changes to the Academic Student Employee (ASE) collective bargaining agreement. A summary of these revisions follows; a complete list of changes to the systemwide Academic Personnel Manual is available at: http://www.ucop.edu/acadpersonnel/apm/issuance.html.

Systemwide Academic Personnel Manual

- *Visiting Appointments* (APM 230) – Adds Project Scientist to the list of titles to which the visiting prefix may be attached.

- *Deans* (APM 240) and *Faculty Administrators/100% Time* (APM 246) – Clarifies that deans and full-time faculty administrators are covered by other additional compensation policies found in the APM, in addition to those sources of additional compensation noted in these two policies, and that appointees to these titles are required to submit annual reporting of compensated outside professional activities as per APM 025.

Campus Academic Personnel Manual

- *FTE Transfers of Senate Faculty* (CAPM 416.220) – Clarifies required proposal documentation and procedures; changes proposal submission point from the Academic Personnel Office to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs; adds that upon approval of an interdivisional FTE transfer, the candidate’s entire personnel file will be forwarded to the receiving dean’s office.

- *Professor Series* (CAPM 400.220) and *Promotion* (CAPM 410.220) – Conforms these policies to language in CAPM 100.500, *Overqualified Candidates*, that newly appointed Associate Professors are expected to undergo at least one positive review before being put forward for promotion (as is the case with newly appointed Assistant Professors).

- *Overlapping Steps* (CAPM 407.690) – Removes language involving Assistant Professor, Step 6, as this step is not used on the Santa Cruz campus; clarifies the use of salary increase in lieu of merit at overlapping steps.

- *Academic Student Employees* (CAPM 700.411) – Updates language regarding Childcare Reimbursement Programs to conform with changes to the collective bargaining agreement: Increases reimbursement to $600 per quarter during the academic year and adds Summer Session appointments as being eligible for coverage up to $600.
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- Sample Solicitation Letters (CAPM 401.220, Instructions for Soliciting Letters) – For consistency and clarity, and given that different actions may warrant the inclusion of different publications, sample solicitation letters have been changed to reflect that “selected” publications have been enclosed (previously read, “latest” or “recent”).

- Off-Scale Salaries (CAPM 803.620) – As previously announced in spring 2011, language involving the off-scale salary of a Professor, Step 9 (and other eligible titles at this level) changed to reflect that it shall not be higher than $100 less than the published salary scale for Professor, Step 9 plus 11 percent, barring exceptional circumstances (based on standard time at Step 9 of four years); adds language regarding salary increase in lieu of merit at Step 9 consistent with current language involving Step 5.

4. Looking Ahead

Coming up for campus discussion this year is whether there exists a need to solicit external letters for assistant professor mid-career appraisals. I encourage you to join this discussion.

Sincerely,

Alison Galloway  
Campus Provost and  
Executive Vice Chancellor

cc: Chancellor Blumenthal  
Academic Senate Chair Gilman  
VPAA Lee  
AVC Peterson  
University Librarian Steel  
CAP Chair Takagi  
APO Analysts  
Academic Senate Office  
Divisional Academic Personnel Coordinators  
Department and Program Managers