

**FY 2011 – 2012 Academic Federation
Administrative Series Personnel Committee**

James Schaaf, Chair
Lou Bronzan, Judy Janes
William Jewell, Howard Schutz

September 19, 2012

ELLEN BONNEL

Chair, Academic Federation

MAUREEN STANTON

Vice Provost, Academic Affairs

RE: Academic Federation Administrative Series Personnel Committee
Annual Report 2011-2012

The AF Administrative Series Personnel Committee (ASPC), with members James Schaaf (Chair), Lou Bronzan, Judy Janes, William Jewell, and Howard Schutz, met 15 times during the year. A total of 39 personnel actions were referred to the committee for review. The actions under review were appointments, merits, and promotions of 2 Academic Administrators and 37 Academic Coordinators. In addition, the ASPC also reviewed 16 position screenings and 5 departmental voting and peer review plans. A summary table of the committee's activities for 2011-2012 is attached.

Issues

The committee notes that some issues appear repeatedly as we review personnel actions and screen positions. Some of these issues may have been resolved with recent revisions on the UC Davis: Academic Affairs web site.

- **Academic Coordinators and Teaching Responsibilities**

The Committee reviewed several cases for Academic Coordinators in which teaching duties were not being reported correctly and the candidate did not hold the appropriate dual title. In each of these cases the committee returned the file to the Dean's office indicating the teaching responsibilities should be removed from the candidate's position description and an appropriate second title be added. APM 375-4(d) clearly states that "The duties of an Academic Coordinator are primarily administrative. **Individuals in an Academic Coordinator title who are assigned research or instructional duties are required to hold a dual title.** However, Academic Coordinators may conduct occasional non-credit seminars or workshops without holding a faculty title. Academic Coordinators who also supervise candidates for a teaching credential shall hold an appropriate faculty title as a dual title." This is clearly a significant problem and not consistent on campus. ASPC recommends adding language on the Checklist for Appointments and Merits and Promotions for Academic Coordinators regarding the requirement for a dual title for teaching duties as stated in APM 375. ASPC also recommends adding the criteria to the Recommended Action Form so that departments and units are aware of the requirement.

Additionally, the committee would like clarification regarding how much teaching is required before someone in an Academic Coordinator position should also have a paid

teaching title rather than a WOS title. In most cases where Academic Coordinators are expected to teach or be listed as Instructor of Record; the department approves a dual Lecturer WOS title. In some cases reviewed by the committee the Academic Coordinator may be required to do so much teaching that they should have an appropriate paid teaching title.

Finally, the committee notes that the teaching requirement may be different for Academic Coordinators in University Extension. The committee is concerned that the teaching requirements in University Extension may not conform to APM 375. As stated above, the teaching requirement for Academic Coordinators should be consistent across all departments and units on campus and any teaching responsibilities for Academic Coordinators should strictly adhere to APM 375-4(d).

- **Approval of Academic Coordinator Redelegated Merits in University Extension**

The committee is concerned that the Dean of University Extension made final decisions on two Academic Coordinator redelegated merit actions without a final recommendation or vote from the committee. In both cases the committee requested additional information from University Extension in regards to the merit packages and never received a response. In reviewing Action Tracking, it is apparent that the Dean went ahead and made the final decision without providing further consultation or a response to the committee.

- **Extramural Letters**

The committee is concerned that there is an inconsistency across campus in the number of extramural letters required and the type of extramural letters required for Academic Coordinator and Academic Administrator appointment actions. The requirements stated in the Checklists and the Academic Affairs FAQ web site are in conflict regarding extramural letters and should be resolved.

- **Standard Review Timeline for Academic Coordinators**

The committee recommends that the standard review timeline for Academic Coordinators be clarified with examples in the annual call and the Checklists for Merits and Promotions for Academic Coordinators that is posted on the UC Davis: Academic Affairs web site. The review cycle and normal period of eligibility can be complicated depending on the candidate's appointment effective date. The committee received at least one case where it appeared that the candidate was coming up too early for merit. However, in this case the candidate was appointed after January 1 so the entire academic year did not count towards the merit review.

- **Accelerations for First Merit after Appointment**

The committee reviewed at least one merit action during the year in which the department/unit was requesting an acceleration even though it was the candidate's first review after appointment. In this particular case the candidate was only in the job title for approximately one year before the action was put together and submitted for review. The committee struggled with a metric to use to justify an acceleration since there was no previous action. The committee has concerns with these types of requests for acceleration as it is difficult for the department or unit to justify an acceleration when the candidate has only been in the job title for two years or less depending on the effective date of the appointment.

- **APM 500 and Request for Search Waivers**

The committee normally reviews several appointment actions throughout the year where the department or unit has requested a search waiver for the position. In at least one of these cases, the request for a search waiver and the corresponding approval were not clearly documented in the appointment package. In this case, the committee requested additional information and determined that a search waiver was in fact requested and approved by the Vice Provost. However, requesting additional information takes time and some appointment actions are time sensitive. The committee requests that in the future all requests and approvals for search waivers be clearly documented in the appointment package.

- **Academic Administrator Appointments in ORUs**

The committee reviewed at least one appointment action for an Academic Administrator in an Organized Research Unit on campus. UCD APM 370-4 states the following: "The Academic Administrator series is used principally in organized activities other than organized research units for appointees who administer programs that provide service closely related to the teaching and research mission of the University. The duties of an Academic Administrator are largely administrative, although teaching and research responsibilities may be assigned in accordance with APM 370(4)(c). Academic Administrators who administer departmentally based programs report to the department chair. In other cases, the Academic Administrator reports to an appropriate administrative officer, usually a dean or vice chancellor."

In this case the committee was concerned as not only was the candidate being proposed as an Academic Administrator in an ORU, but the reporting structure was not appropriate for an Academic Administrator. ASPC consulted with the Office of the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs and they emphasized the "used principally" language stated in UCD APM 370. The Vice Provost's office also stated that these types of appointments are not ordinary but accepted when warranted. Members of the ASPC agree that this language is not clear and would like to request clarification on how to apply the criteria during their review of Academic Administrator appointments in ORUs on campus.

- **Review of Accelerated Actions**

The committee reviewed four accelerated merit actions for Academic Coordinators. In some cases, the documentation provided was insufficient to justify an acceleration over a normal action. Clear criteria or guidelines for all the titles reviewed by ASPC (Academic Coordinator, Academic Administrator, and Associate University Librarian) would give better guidance for the candidate and the department, and allow for an easier, more streamlined review by ASPC 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 specific criteria for acceleration need to be provided for these actions. In addition, the Committee recommends that the FAQ and collegial advice policies posted on the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs web site be updated to include advice on accelerated action requests.

Also, to aid in these reviews, department letters could include the metrics they used to justify the accelerated action request.

Other Committee Activities

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

Chair Schaaf 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. In spite of initial discussions on some actions showing disagreement among members, consensus was found on the actions through a careful, collegial, and deliberate process.

All this work could not have been done without the excellent staff support from the Academic Senate office. We appreciated working with Kimberly Pulliam, whose stellar assistance supported our work and contributed to our effectiveness. She was always willing to help clarify any policies or procedures and give an unbiased historical perspective of the actions before the committee.

The committee also appreciated the opportunity to discuss with Vice Provost Stanton some of the above issues when we met early in the year.

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

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "J. Schaaf", is positioned above the typed name. The signature is fluid and cursive.

James Schaaf, Chair

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ASPC FOR THE YEAR 2011-2012
(Period covering September 1, 2011 – August 31, 2012)

Title Series →	Academic Administrators		Academic Coordinators			University Librarians		TOTAL
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	
Appeal(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Appointments	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	17
Appointment(s) via Change in Title	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conferral of Emeritus Status	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Accelerated Merits	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Redelegated Merits ²	1	0	14	0	1	0	0	16
Accelerated Promotion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Redelegated Promotion ¹	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Promotions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	2	0	35	0	2	0	0	39
Total per Title Series	2		37			0		39

¹Redelegated Promotion: The Committee requested additional information for one redelegated promotion for an Academic Coordinator in University Extension. The committee never received the additional information and never voted on the action. The Dean proceeded with approving the promotion without a recommendation and vote from the committee.

²Redelegated Merit: The Committee requested additional information for one redelegated merit for an Academic Coordinator in University Extension. The committee never received the additional information and never voted on the action. The Dean proceeded with approving the merit without a recommendation and vote from the committee.

Voting Trend (including Final Decisions)

Committee Vote	Vote	# Actions	VP/Dean Final Decision	
			Yes	No
Unanimous	Yes	37	37	0
	No	0	0	0
	Other ¹	2	2	0
Split	Yes	0	0	0
	No	0	0	0
	Totals	39	39	0

¹ASPC recommended additional information on one redelegated merit and one redelegated promotion for Academic Coordinators in University Extension. In both cases, the committee never received the additional information but the final authority went ahead and approved the actions without a recommendation or vote from ASPC. The Vice Provost agreed with the ASPC on (95%) of the total number of actions.

Position Screenings:

Title Series Proposed	Total	Accepted As Proposed	Accepted with Revisions	Rejected with Revisions
AA ²	2	1	1	0
AC ¹	14	9	3	2
TOTALS	16	10	4	2

¹One Academic Coordinator position screening from the Department of Neurobiology, Physiology and Behavior (Training Program in Molecular and Cellular Biology) and one Academic Coordinator position screening from the Center for Biophotonics Science & Technology (iAMSTEM Education Hub) are still pending final decision. Both position screenings were rejected by ASPC with proposed recommendations for revision and a request for additional information.

²In addition, one School of Education (CANDEL Program) Academic Administrator position screening reviewed by ASPC is still pending final decision. ASPC accepted the position screening with proposed revisions.

Voting & Peer Review Plans:

Total Reviewed	Accepted as Proposed	Accepted Contingent on Revisions	Rejected with Required Revisions
5	2	1	2