September 5, 2011

DANIEL WILSON
Chair, Academic Federation

BARBARA HORWITZ
Vice Provost, Academic Personnel

RE: Academic Federation Administrative Series Personnel Committee
         Annual Report 2010-2011

The AF Administrative Series Personnel Committee (ASPC), with members Judith
Kjelstrom (Chair), Lou Bronzan, Jian-Jian Li, James Schaaf, and John Sherlock, met 19
times during the year. A total of 50 personnel actions were referred to the committee for
review. The actions under review were appointments, merits, and promotions of 10
Academic Administrators and 40 Academic Coordinators. In addition, the ASPC also
reviewed 15 position screenings and 1 departmental voting and peer review plan. A
summary table of the committee's activities for 2010-2011 is attached.

Issues
The committee notes that some issues appear repeatedly as we review personnel
actions and screen positions.

- **Academic Federation Streamlining Procedures**
  In July 2010, the Committee received a proposal from the Vice Provost Academic
  Personnel regarding streamlining Academic Federation personnel actions. The
  proposal stated that all normal appointments, merits, and promotions (except
  above scale actions) in the Academic Administrator, Academic Coordinator,
  Specialist, and Continuing Educator series would be delegated to the Dean. All
  actions will now be sent directly to the Academic Senate office. If the Dean's
  intended decision differs from the Academic Federation personnel committee
  recommendation, delegation would revert to the Vice Provost. In addition, the
  original dossier for all the title series above would be sent to the Academic
  Personnel office after the action is complete. The above delegations are for a
  three year trial basis and subject to periodic audit by Academic Personnel.

  The Committee reviewed several Academic Coordinator and Academic
  Administrator merit actions during the 2010-2011 academic year. Overall, the
  committee agrees that the academic personnel streamlining procedures seem to
  be working effectively for all units involved. However, the committee would like

to remind the units that letters from the Dean are not required and not necessary when sending redelegated actions to the Academic Senate Office for review. The Dean should refrain from making a final decision until after the dossier has been reviewed by the AFPC and a recommendation has been returned with the dossier.

- **Proposed UCD APM 365: Assistant/Associate University Librarian and Assistant/Associate University Law Librarian**
  The committee had the opportunity to review the proposed UCD APM 365. The new section of the APM covers Assistant and Associate University Librarians and Assistant and Associate Law Librarians. Overall, the committee supported the clear articulation of policy in regard to the Assistant and Associate University Librarian titles. The committee found the language used to describe the appointment, promotion, and salary guides for Assistant and Associate University Librarians, as well as the parallel series in the Law Library, to be a good deal looser, less precise, and more open-ended particularly regarding the salary ranges, than are the other administrative series the committee reviews. However, this has been the established case for some time in the existing systemwide APM 365 language.

  The current revised APM 365 standards, while different from Academic Coordinators and Academic Administrators, is not substantively different from existing standards. Given that both the University Library and the Law Library are currently under the direction of AULs serving as acting heads, and the order of things are necessarily a bit more meddled than normal, the committee hopes that a somewhat more substantive and substantial look at the procedures might be considered at some future and more opportune time.

- **Academic Coordinator Level Change**
  The Committee reviewed a Level Change action for an Academic Coordinator during the 2010-2011 academic year. This type of action is rare and therefore it was more difficult for the committee to evaluate. Level change actions take place when the complexity and scope for a specific job has changed significantly enough to warrant movement to the next level. Materials submitted in support of a change in level shall provide a comprehensive assessment of the candidate's qualifications and performance in the following areas: coordinator of academic programs, professional competence, and university and public service. In addition, this particular action also required a position description review. The Committee felt that the materials submitted did not provide sufficient justification to warrant a change in level. The Committee was not in favor of the proposed level for the revised position description. However, the final decision disagreed with the committee and approved the revised position description and new level for the candidate.

- **Accelerated Merits/Accelerated Promotions**
  The Committee reviewed requests for six accelerated merits and two accelerated promotions, which is a higher number compared to previous years. In some cases, the documentation provided was insufficient to justify an acceleration over

a normal action. Clear criteria for acceleration would give better guidance for the candidate and the department, and allow for an easier, more streamlined review by the Administrative Series Personnel Committee as well as the Dean or Vice Provost and will also preserve the integrity of the merit process. The Committee suggests that more detailed documentation and stronger justifications related to specified criteria for acceleration need to be provided for these actions. In addition, the Committee recommends that the collegial advice policies posted on the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs website be updated.

- **Academic Federation FAQs**
  The Committee recommends that the FAQs currently posted on the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs be moved to a location that is more visible to new Academic Federation members. The FAQs serve as a guide to preparing merit and promotion packets. Many Academic Federation members including ones that have been on campus for many years have no idea that such information is available. The Committee agrees that the information is very informative and helpful, but someone looking at the web site for the first time wouldn't be able to locate the information.

- **Service on Academic Federation Committees**
  The Committee agrees that committee service should be required for all Academic Coordinators and Academic Administrators. Currently, many actions being reviewed at the lower level in the Academic Coordinator and Academic Administrator series do not have a university and public service component. Each year the Academic Federation Committee on Committees has a difficult time finding Academic Federation members to serve on key committees. New Academic Federation members will especially benefit from the experience because they will learn about the Academic Federation in general as well as the personnel process including peer review, academic federation awards, research grants, etc. The Committee understands that university and public service is not currently required for all job titles, but feels that it is very beneficial to the candidate.

- **Guidelines for Appointment and Review of Law Librarians**
  The Committee was given an opportunity to review draft guidelines for appointment and review of Law Librarians. Currently, policies (systemwide or divisional) do not exist for the Law Librarian title because there are so few in the UC system. The Vice Provost's Office worked with all the Associate University Librarians (AULs) to come up with review criteria for this series. The guidelines include a description of what documents should be included for appointment actions as well as merit and promotion actions. In addition, the draft guidelines included information regarding terms of service and salary for the Law Librarian series. Overall, the committee supported the draft guidelines and looks forward to receiving a final version to use for future Law Librarian actions.

- **MyInfoVault (MIV) Demonstration**
  The Committee viewed a demonstration of the MIV system in January 2011. ASPC agrees that MIV could help streamline the process of reviewing personnel

actions in the future when all features of the system are fully implemented and all the titles that are reviewed by ASPC are properly trained on how to submit dossiers through the system. There are still many features of the system that are not fully developed and many enhancements that cannot be addressed for several years. As MIV is more fully developed and the adoption rate is improved, the ASPC will gladly reconsider using the MIV system for personnel reviews.

Other Committee Activities

Chair Kjelstrom met with the AF Committee on Committees to discuss issues related to the workings of the ASPC.

Chair Kjelstrom attended the Academic Federation Executive Council meetings.

The members of the Administrative Personnel Series Committee formed an outstanding team, actively participating in the academic review process throughout the year and always looking for ways to ensure the integrity of the reviews. We appreciated working with Kimberly Pulliam, whose excellent assistance supported our work and contributed to our effectiveness.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to serve in this critical role.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Kjelstrom, Chair

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ASPC FOR THE YEAR 2010-2011
(Period covering September 1, 2010 – August 31, 2011)

Title Series →	Academic Administrators		Academic Coordinators		University Librarians		TOTAL
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Appeal(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Appointments	3	0	12	0	0	0	**15**
Appointment(s) via Change in Title	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Conferral of Emeritus Status	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Merits	2	0	0	0	4	0	**6**
Accelerated Merits[1]	0	0	4	1	0	0	**5**
Redelegated Merits	5	0	17	0	0	0	**22**
Accelerated Promotion	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Promotions	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Position Description Review[3]	0	0	0	1	0	0	**1**
Reclassifications **(Level Change)**	0	0	1	0	0	0	**1**

TOTAL	10	0	34	2	4	0	**50**
Total per Title Series	**10**		**36**		**4**		**50**

[1]Accelerated Merits: The Committee voted against one accelerated merit for an Academic Coordinator. The documentation and materials submitted for two year review period did not provide enough evidence for an exceptional advancement. The Committee recommended a normal merit. The final decision was in agreement with the Committee's recommendation.

[2]Position Description Review: The Committee voted against one position description review for an Academic Coordinator. The unit was requesting a review of the position description due to changes in the scope and complexity of the position. The Committee felt that the documentation submitted did not justify a reclassification to the next level in the Academic Coordinator series. The Committee felt that the changes in the job duties were not significant enough to warrant reclassification to the Academic Coordinator III level. The final decision was not in agreement with the Committee's recommendation.

Voting Trend (including Final Decisions)

			VP Final Decision	
Committee Vote	**Vote**	**# Actions**	**Yes**	**No**
Unanimous	Yes	47	47	0
	No[1]	2	1	1
Split	Yes	0	0	0
	No	1	1	0
	Totals	**50**	**49**	**1**

[1]Of the one accelerated merit and one position description review that ASPC did not support, the final authority agreed with the ASPC recommendation in one of the cases. The Vice Provost agreed with the ASPC on (98%) of the total number of actions.

Position Screenings:

Title Series Proposed	Total	Accepted As Proposed	Accepted with Revisions	Rejected with Revisions
AA	1	1	0	0
AC[1]	14	12	0	2
TOTALS	**15**	**13**	**0**	**2**

[1]Three University Extension position screenings reviewed and accepted as proposed by ASPC is still pending final decision. In addition, one College of Biological Sciences (Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology) position screening reviewed and rejected by ASPC is still pending final decision.

Voting & Peer Review Plans:

Total Reviewed	Accepted as Proposed	Accepted Contingent on Revisions	Rejected with Required Revisions
1	1	0	0