

February 24, 2014

MAUREEN STANTON

Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
 Mrak Hall, Fifth Floor
 University of California, Davis
 One Shields Avenue
 Davis, CA 95616

RE: REVISED: Academic Personnel Streamlining Implementation Workgroup Report

The Academic Personnel Streamlining Implementation Workgroup Report was forwarded to all Davis Division of the Academic Senate standing committees and Faculty Executive Committees from the Schools and Colleges. Responses were received from the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity, the Faculty Welfare Committee, and Graduate Council, as well as from the Faculty Executive Committees from the College of Letters and Science, the College of Agriculture, the College of Engineering, and the School of Medicine. The responses provided by these committees are attached to this letter.

Responses from Academic Senate committees were varied, but all should be carefully considered. Some of the concerns expressed in the responses I received have already been addressed by the revisions of the APSIW report dated January 14, 2014. Several other issues raised by the responses may result in further revisions of the proposal before implementation. A few other criticisms refer to important issues not germane to the proposal under consideration.

The main points raised by the responding committees are the following:

1. The impact of the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) changes is not clear. It is possible that department-level discrimination would be harder to catch without systematic higher review, but this is speculative.
2. The Faculty Executive Committee from the College of Agriculture posed two questions:
 - a. If there is going to be a change in the APM for professors, has there been consideration with ANR to track similar changes for the Specialists in CE?
 - b. If the JPC will have a reduced administrative role, similarly, would the APC have a reduced role?
3. The Faculty Welfare Committee noted that the proposal does not address the existing key problem, which is the erosion of the salary scales. Currently, faculty members have a strong incentive to accelerate, generating excess workload at every stage of personnel review. The proposed procedures try to address this problem with little regard to the underlying cause or the possible consequences on faculty advancement.

The specific concerns and questions of the committee are:

- a. The proposed system gives too much power to the Dean or Associate Dean, with no consultation of the FPCs, except post factum. The FWC opposes any change that effectively does away with peer review in the vast majority of actions.
 - b. Faculty with weaker records can end up with 0.5 step and remain there for 3 years. Over time, the new system might result in a two-tier faculty: the teaching faculty who get 0.5 steps every 3 years, and the research faculty who get 1+ steps. This outcome would radically change the nature of UC faculty. The FWC notes that UCSC's system does not have the 0.5 step as they want to maintain a research faculty, and they have the cash flow to remove the incentive to accelerate. The Workgroup does not seem to have consulted with the UCSC Senate to see how effectively the system works on their campus.
 - c. There is a question about the need for the lower advancement 0.5 step. Specifically, the FWC would like to see statistics over the past few years on the percentage of faculty (1) who postpone a normal merit review or (2) who are denied a merit, in order to justify the utility and desirability of a lower step option.
4. The Faculty Executive Committee from the College of Engineering noted that one aspect of the proposed system that seems to make the system more complex than needed is that faculty members will need to request the consideration of specific fractional step advancements (1.5 or 0.5), whereas the original streamlining concept was that any candidate requesting a 1 step advancement would automatically be considered for 1.5 and 0.5 steps, and that any one of the three outcomes (1.5, 1 or 0.5) would be viewed as "normal."

It is very hard to see why a faculty member would request consideration of a 0.5 step advancement, with a knowledge that, if it is approved, the faculty member would have to wait an entire review cycle, whereas after denial of a whole step advancement the faculty member could resubmit his/her case the following year.

It would also be useful if the conversion process from the current to the new advancement system could be outlined, as the new system needs to be examined carefully before committing to an implementation timeline.

5. In contrast, the College of Letters and Sciences Faculty Executive Council strongly endorsed the goal of streamlining the faculty evaluation process, as well as getting the new procedures into place quickly rather than continuing to discuss them.
6. The School of Medicine Faculty Executive Council surveyed the faculty and found that, while many are very supportive of the proposed changes, others were concerned that waiting three years to reward a full Professor for extraordinary accomplishments may prove problematic. Others were concerned that the language regarding "research" as the primary reason for a step plus advancement may thwart the advancement of those in series where clinical education is a major requirement. Finally, many faculty members were dismayed that the proposal seemed to be geared entirely to those in the ladder-rank series, which is only a small percentage of the faculty at the School of Medicine.

The Academic Senate agrees that the proposed academic personnel streamlining process has to potential to be beneficial and more efficient. The proposed step-plus system will likely provide more opportunity for equity, as, under the current system, faculty who go out of their way to schedule around one-year accelerations move up the ladder substantially faster than those who do not.

It is clear from the varied responses to the implementation report that we need to spend a good deal of time educating the faculty concerning the step-plus system in an effort to fine-tune the proposal and develop an effective implementation strategy.

Sincerely,



Bruno Nachtergaele, Chair
Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Professor: Mathematics

[Enclosure]

Davis Division Academic Senate

Request for Consultation Responses

REVISED: Academic Personnel Streamlining Implementation Workgroup Report

February 14, 2014

January 14, 2014 - A Revised Report with an memo explaining changes was received and distributed to committees. The previous version of the report has been replaced by the new version. In response to the STAPP (Simplifying the Academic Personnel Process) Special Committee Report and the Davis Division's recommendation for next steps, Vice Provost Stanton appointed the UC Davis Academic Personnel Streamlining Implementation Workgroup. The Workgroup's report, as well as the Division's recommendation action and a link to the full STAPP report are provided for feedback.

Affirmative Action & Diversity

February 5, 2014 1:55 PM

The Affirmative Action & Diversity Committee reviewed the Revised Academic Personnel Streamlining Implementation Workgroup Report and has the following response:

It seems like the proposed step-plus system will likely be beneficial from an equity point of view, since under the current system, people who go out of their way to schedule around one-year accelerations move up the ladder substantially faster than those who do not.

As far FPC changes, the impact is less clear. There may be the potential that department-level discrimination would be harder to catch without systematic higher review, but this is speculative.

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (AGRICULTURE)

January 21, 2014 6:10 PM

Response continued on next page.

Committee members discussed the proposal for a streamlined academic merit/promotion review process, currently posted on the Academic Senate Request for Consultation website. Two questions arose: a) if there is going to be a change in the APM for professors, has there been consideration with ANR to track similar changes for the Specialists in CE? and b) If the JPC will have a reduced administrative role, similarly, would the APC have a reduced role?

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (ENGINEERING)

February 10, 2014 10:40 AM

Response continued on next page.

Date: January 31, 2014

From: College of Engineering Faculty Executive Committee
Re: Academic Personnel Streamlining Implementation Workgroup Report

The comments address the revised report dated January 9, 2014 which includes several changes with respect to the original report issued in December 2013.

One aspect of the proposed system that seems to make the proposed system more complex than needed is that faculty members will need to request the consideration of specific fractional step advancements (1.5 or 0.5) whereas the original streamlining concept was that any candidate requesting a 1 step advancement would automatically be considered for 1.5 and 0.5 steps, and that any one of the three outcomes (1.5, 1 or 0.5) would be viewed as "normal." The concern that Deans might use the 0.5 step advancement as a punitive action is certainly warranted, but since FPCs will remain in place, if a Dean feels the advancement proposed by a Department is excessive, it might be possible to route the case through FPC for advice prior to final disposition by the Dean (pending of course a possible appeal). Otherwise it is very hard to see why a faculty member would request consideration of a 0.5 step advancement, with a knowledge that if it is approved, the faculty member would have to wait an entire review cycle, whereas after denial of a whole step advancement, the faculty member could resubmit his/her case the following year.

All these questions make clear that potential pitfalls of the new system need to be examined carefully before committing to an implementation timeline. It would also be useful if the conversion process from the current to the new advancement system could be outlined. Presumably, the date of the last approved advancement will serve as reference for determining the time of the next review of each faculty member.

Our committee supports the view expressed by the Academic Senate that Step VI letters should not be eliminated, since it appears difficult to establish international recognition without external letters, and since the need for external letters is in fact an important consideration in the decision to seek advancement to Step VI.

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (LS: SOC SCI)

February 7, 2014 10:31 AM

This was discussed by the L&S Executive Committee on Monday, February 3, 2014, and committee members very strongly endorsed the goal of streamlining the faculty evaluation process, and of getting the new procedures into place quickly rather than discussing them for several more years. The younger members of the committee stressed that it will be very important to explain to all faculty members how the new procedures work, because they are already frustrated by the ambiguities and time-wasting steps in the old process. --Phil Shaver, Chair

Faculty Welfare

January 26, 2014 7:54 PM

The Faculty Welfare Committee agreed that aspects of the proposed personnel review system were very beneficial and more efficient, in particular the introduction of the fixed review period in conjunction with the automatic evaluation of additional steps and the elimination of extramural letters for advancement to Professor Step 6. As a compromise, the majority of the Faculty Welfare Committee also supported making outside letters for promotion to Professor Step 6 optional so that departments can weigh the time-cost and burden to letter-writers versus fair and accurate evaluation of faculty records.

However, the FWC had serious concerns about this report. Specifically, it does not address the key problem, that is the erosion of the salary scales (especially with increased UCRP contributions). Currently, faculty have a strong incentive to accelerate, generating excess workload at every stage of personnel review. The proposed procedures try to address this particular problem with little regard to the underlying cause and the possible consequences on faculty advancement.

The specific concerns/questions of the committee are :

- (1) The proposed system gives too much power to the Dean or Associate Dean, with no consultation of the Faculty Personnel Committees (except post factum). The FWC opposes any change that effectively does away with peer review in the vast majority of actions.
- (2) Faculty with weaker records can end up with 0.5 step and remain there for 3 years. Over time, the new system might result in a 2-tier faculty: the teaching faculty who get 0.5 steps every 3 years, and the research faculty who get 1+ steps. This outcome would radically change the nature of UC faculty. The FWC notes that UCB's system does not have the 0.5 step (as they want to maintain a research faculty), and they have the cash flow to remove the incentive to accelerate. The Workgroup does not seem to have consulted with UCSC senate to see how effectively the system works on their campus.
- (3) There is question about the need for the lower advancement 0.5 step. Specifically, the FWC would like to see statistics over the past few years on the percentage of faculty (1) who postpone a normal merit review or (2) who are denied a merit, in order to justify the utility and desirability of a lower step option.

Graduate Council

December 13, 2013 9:02 AM

No response at this time.

RESPONSE TO THE REQUEST FOR CONSULTATION

February 14, 2014

Submitted by: Faculty Executive Committee, UC Davis School of Medicine

Subject: Streamlining the Academic Personnel Process (merits and promotions)

The School of Medicine Faculty Executive Committee reviewed the request for consultation regarding the streamlining of the academic personnel process and finds that it has considerable merit, and appreciates that the School of Medicine will still have the option of using a Faculty Personnel Committee in the future. We also surveyed the faculty and found that while many are very supportive of the proposed changes, others are concerned that waiting three years to reward a full Professor for extraordinary accomplishments may prove problematic. Others were concerned that the language regarding "research" as the primary reason for a step plus advancement may thwart the advancement of those in series where clinical education is a major requirement. Others were skeptical that the proposal would actual lead to any real streamlining. Finally, many faculty were dismayed that the proposal seemed to be geared entirely to those in the ladder-rank series, which is only a small percentage of the faculty at the School of Medicine.