September 6, 2007

CATHERINE VANDEVOORT, Chair
Academic Federation

LINDA BISSON, Chair
Academic Senate

BRUCE WHITE, Interim Vice Provost
Academic Personnel

RE: 2006-2007 Annual Report of the Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC)

Please find enclosed the 2006-2007 Annual Report submitted by the Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC). The JPC finished another challenging and productive year. Besides reviewing 167 personnel actions, the JPC also reviewed 18 departmental voting group and peer review plans.

The workload on the JPC is extensive and the success of the Committee is dependant on the consistent contribution of all members. As Chair, I was impressed with the commitment and dedication with which my colleagues served. I am honored to have served with, and would like to express my sincere appreciation to, the following members:

Calvin Domier – Associate Researcher (Engineering Applied Science)
Bob Gilbertson – Professor (Plant Pathology)
Ken Giles – Professor (Biological and Agricultural Engineering)
Larry Godfrey – Entomologist in the AES/Specialist in CE (Entomology)
Tim Hartz – Specialist in Cooperative Extension (Plant Sciences)
Yajarayma Tang-Feldman – Specialist (MED: Internal Medicine)

I'm certain the committee's success will continue with Yajarayma Tang-Feldman as the 2007-2008 Chair.

Sincerely,

John Hess, Chair 2006-2007

Enclosure

cc: Jo-Anne Boorkman, Academic Personnel
2006-2007 Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee Members

Deans – Schools and Colleges

Annual Report: Academic Year 2006-07
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC)

Total Meetings: 22	Meeting frequency: weekly (sometimes bi-weekly)	Average hours of committee work each meeting week: 4-5

Total: 167 Actions Reviewed	Total # of reviewed or deferred from the previous year: 0	Total deferred to the coming academic year: 0

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:
none

Listing of committee policies established or revised:
none

Issues considered by the committee

1) As in past years, proposed appointments were often at an inappropriate level. The JPC did not support 57% of appointments as proposed (45 of 79). In 27 of the 79 appointments (34%), the JPC recommended a higher step than proposed.
2) The Committee had a difficult time reviewing higher level Project Scientists, as the criteria does not clearly outline the requirements for advancement at levels VI and above. This is in contrast to the requirements in other research titles, where typically candidates must show highly distinguished scholarship to advance beyond step V.
3) The JPC found that several actions were for candidates who seemed to have been appointed in the wrong series. This is problematic when the candidate seeks advancement, as the series criteria are inappropriate and irrelevant. The Committee spent a considerable amount of time discussing proper placement of candidates and comparing research titles.
4) a) As the time commitment has increased, it has become more difficult for those in self supporting positions to serve. One member of the JPC was forced to resign this year due to the large workload and required time commitment. The Committee is very concerned about the effect of service on future JPC members. b) In deference to the time commitment, the committee Chair was unable to personally compose an individual letter for each packet. Individual letters, containing representative comments were

written by the resource analyst and reviewed by the Chair before forwarding to the next level.

5) There were more than twice as many voting procedures submitted for review this year, as compared to last year. The Committee notes that while review of these procedures is important, personnel actions take precedence on committee agendas. Therefore, voting procedures are only reviewed at meetings with a relatively light agenda.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

none

Committee's narrative:

(Period covering September 1, 2006 – August 31, 2007)

The Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC) met 22 times during this period to review packets. Of the 167 personnel actions reviewed, information on the corresponding final decision was available for 134 actions. The JPC also reviewed 18 departmental voting group and peer review plans. Table 1 in the Appendix provides a summary of all actions per title series and the corresponding committee recommendation.

The total number of actions (167) is 14 less than the caseload from the previous year (181). Table 2 below summarizes the number of actions reviewed by the JPC and the corresponding recommendation.

TABLE 2	**JPC Recommendations**			
Actions	**Yes**	**No**	**Other**	**TOTAL**
Appointment	26	34	0	**60**
Appointment via Change in Title	8	11	0	**19**
Appeals	1	4	0	**5**
Conferral of Emeritus Status*	2	0	0	**2**
Accelerated Merits	2	1	0	**3**
Redelegated Merits	41	5	1	**47**
Normal Merits	12	3	0	**15**

Accelerated Promotions	0	0	0	**0**
Promotions	9	4	1	**14**
Appraisal	1	0	0	**1**
5-Year Review	1	0	0	**1**
TOTAL	**103**	**62**	**2**	**167**

* Conferral of Emeritus Status to two Specialists in CE

APPOINTMENTS and APPOINTMENTS VIA CHANGE IN TITLE
(referred to as "appointments" collectively in this section)

Once again, most of the actions reviewed were for the relatively new Project Scientist series (effective July 1, 2004) – with 40 proposed appointments plus 10 appointments via change in title. The combined appointments to this series accounted for 63% of all appointments reviewed by the JPC.

The JPC supported 34 of 79 (43%) of all proposed appointments as submitted. Table 3 below shows the percentage of proposed appointments on which the JPC and the final authority agreed on the appointment level.

TABLE 3: Breakdown of Recommendations on Appointments

		FINAL DECISION					Percent Agreement between JPC & Final Authority
Title Series/ JPC Recommendation		**Agree w/ JPC**	**Higher**	**Lower**	**Agree with Original Proposal**	***Other**	
Agronomist & ---in the AES							
Yes	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%
NO: Higher	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
NO: Lower	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
Professional Research							
Yes	10	4	0	1	0	5	80%
NO: Higher	3	1	0	0	2	0	33%
NO: Lower	2	0	0	2	0	0	0%
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
Project Scientist							
Yes	19	16	0	0	0	3	100%
NO: Higher	19	10	1	1	1	6	77%
NO: Lower	12	3	0	0	3	6	50%
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A

Specialist							
Yes	4	1	0	0	0	3	100%
NO: Higher	4	3	1	0	0	0	75%
NO: Lower	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%
Other	2	0	0	0	1	1	0%
Specialist in Cooperative Extension							
Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
NO: Higher	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%
NO: Lower	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
				Avg Percent Agreement			**63%**

*Includes actions where the final decision has not been made or the data is unavailable. Not reflected in agreement percentage.

For proposed appointments not supported by the JPC, Table 3 breaks down these cases to three distinct possibilities:

1. NO: Higher – This means the JPC recommended a higher step (and/or rank) than the level originally proposed. The JPC and the final authority agreed on 71% of these cases.
2. NO: Lower – This means the JPC recommended a lower step (and/or rank) than the level originally proposed. The JPC and the final authority agreed on 38% of these cases.
3. Other: On two Specialist cases, the JPC voted against appointment in the Specialist series. In both cases the JPC recommended the candidate be appointed in the Project Scientist series. However, in one case, the Vice Provost agreed with the original proposal and approved the appointment. The final decision has not been reported on the other case.

MERITS (including Accelerated Merits)

The JPC supported 55 of 65 (85%) proposed merits. Table 4 below shows the breakdown of the JPC's recommendations regarding these merits:

TABLE 4: ACCELERATED AND NORMAL MERITS

		FINAL DECISION			Percent Agreement between JPC & Final Authority
Title Series/ JPC Recommendation		**Agree w/ JPC**	**Agree with Original Proposal**	***Other**	
Agronomist or ___in the AES					
Yes	2	2	0	0	100%
No	0	0	0	0	N/A
Split Appointment					
Yes	6	5	0	1	100%
No	1	1	0	0	100%
Project Scientist					

Yes	14	12	0	2	100%
No	1	0	0	1	N/A
Professional Researcher					
Yes	18	17	0	1	100%
No	2	2	0	0	100%
Specialist					
Yes	4	3	0	1	100%
No	2	2	0	0	100%
Specialist in Cooperative Extension					
Yes	12	12	0	0	100%
No	3	1	1	1	50%
		Avg Percent Agreement			**95%**

*Includes actions where the final decision has not been made or the data is not available. Not reflected in agreement percentage.

Of the 9 merits which the JPC did not support, the final authority agreed with the JPC in 88% of the cases.

PROMOTIONS (including Accelerated Promotions)

The JPC supported 9 of 13 (69%) proposed promotions; the final authority agreed with the JPC on all of these promotions. In the 4 cases where the JPC voted against the promotion, the final authority agreed with the JPC in 100% of the actions. Table 5 below summarizes the JPC's recommendations on these promotions:

TABLE 5: ACCELERATED AND NORMAL PROMOTIONS

		FINAL DECISION			Percent Agreement between JPC & Final Authority
Title Series/ JPC Recommendation		**Agree w/ JPC**	**Agree with Original Proposal**	**Other***	
Agronomist & ---in the AES					
Yes	1	1	0	0	100%
No	0	0	0	0	N/A
Project Scientist					
Yes	2	2	0	0	100%
No	0	0	0	0	N/A
Professional Researcher					
Yes	6	5	0	1	100%
No	3	3	0	0	100%
Other**	1	1	0	0	100%

Specialist					
Yes	0	0	0	0	N/A
No	1	1	0	0	100%
Specialist in Cooperative Extension					
Yes	0	0	0	0	N/A
No	0	0	0	0	N/A
		Avg Percent Agreement			**100%**

*Includes actions where the final decision has not been made or the data is not available. Not reflected in agreement percentage.

1. **Other: On one Professional Researcher case, the JPC voted against promotion in the appointed series and recommended the candidate be transitioned to the Project Scientist series. The final authority agreed.

AD HOC COMMITTEE REVIEW

Ad hoc review was required in 42 of the 166 actions reviewed by the JPC. The JPC voted as a Committee of the Whole to waive ad hoc review for all of these actions.

CONFERRAL OF EMERITUS STATUS

The JPC received 2 requests for conferral of Emeritus status to two Specialists in Cooperative Extension. The JPC supported all requests; the final authority agreed.

POSITION DESCRIPTIONS

In general, position descriptions have improved. The primary problem this year was unclear definition of research responsibilities in the Professional Research series. Table 6 below shows the breakdown of recommended position description revisions per title.

Title Series	Revisions Recommended	% of Total Actions
Agronomist & ---in the AES	1	14%
Professional Researcher	9	5%
Project Scientist	5	Less than 1%
Specialists	2	12%

Specialists in CE	1	Less than 1%

VOTING GROUP & PEER REVIEW PLANS

The JPC reviewed a total of 18 voting group and peer review plans. This is a substantial increase from the previous year, when only 7 plans were submitted for review. The JPC's recommendations are summarized below:

Accepted	10
Accepted with Recommended Revisions	6
Rejected; requiring revisions	2

The JPC found that 10 of 18 (56%) submitted plans were acceptable without the need for revision, 6 of 18 (33%) were accepted contingent on revisions and 2 of 18 (11%) were returned for rewriting. This is similar to the results from the previous year.

Respectfully submitted,

John Hess, Chair
Members: Calvin Domier, Bob Gilbertson, Ken Giles, Larry Godfrey, Tim Hartz, Yajarayma Tang-Feldman

APPENDIX - TABLE 1: Committee Recommendations per Title and Action 2006-2007

Action Type	---in AES (Agronomist)			Split Appointments*			Professional Researcher				Project Scientist				Specialist in Cooperative Extension				Specialist			TOTAL
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Other	Total	Yes	No	Other	Total	Yes	No	Other	Total	Yes	No	Total	
Appointment	1	0	1	0	0	0	7	4	0	11	16	24	0	40	0	1	0	1	2	5	7	**60**
Appointment via Change in Title	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	3	7	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	**19**
Appeals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	**5**
Conferral of Emeritus Status	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	**2**
Accelerated Merits	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	**3**
Redelegated Merit	0	0	0	4	0	1	16	2	0	18	11	1	0	12	9	1	1	10	2	1	3	**47**
Normal Merits	1	0	1	2	1	1	2	0	0	2	3	0	0	3	3	2	0	5	1	0	1	**15**
Accelerated Promotions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Promotions	1	0	1	0	0	0	6	4	1	11	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**14**
Appraisal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	**1**
5-Year Review	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**1**
TOTAL	**4**	**1**	**5**	**6**	**1**	**7**	**36**	**12**	**1**	**49**	**35**	**32**	**0**	**67**	**14**	**7**	**1**	**22**	**8**	**9**	**17**	**167**