June 3, 2014


**LAURA VAN WINKLE**, Chair
Academic Federation


Dear Chair Van Winkle,

Please find enclosed the final report from the Special Task Force to Review the Academic Federation Peer Review Process. Please see below for responses to each of the Executive Council's comments on the draft report. The comments have also been addressed in the report.

- Comment 1: No response necessary

- Comment 2: Additional text has been added in the *Task Force Methods* section regarding additional interviews with Lecturers in the University Writing Program.

- Comment 3: *Member Education (Recommendation 1-3):* The Academic Federation should send emails out to the membership two to three times per year. For example, in September/October an email should be sent welcoming AF members back to campus and reminding them to check with their department/unit to find out if they are up for merit or promotion. In May/June, another message should be sent out to AF members reminding them that they should have heard back from their Dean/Department Chair regarding their merit or promotion. An additional email could be sent reminding members to be aware of APM rules and responsibilities with regard to their position and/or to update their CVs. New AF members should in addition be sent an email containing various points of information: AF web pages, APM section specific for their job title, APM merit and review process, AF FAQ pages, and so on.

- Comment 4: *Streamlining (Section 9):* Arm's length letters are still required for certain actions in the Project Scientist and Specialist series. Specifically, arms-length letters are required for appointment at Full rank, Merit to barrier steps (Full rank Step VI and Above Scale), and Promotion to Full rank in the Project Scientist series. In addition, arms-length letters are required for Merit to barrier steps (Full rank Step VI and Above Scale) and Promotion to Full rank in the Specialist series. Please refer to the recently revised *Extramural Letters and "Arm's Length" Requirements for Appointment, Merit and Promotion Reviews* posted on the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs web site.

- Comment 5: *Observations (Professional Researcher section):* The recommended recalibration would help remove impediments imposed by the JPC. AF members in the Professional Research title and those AF members serving on JPC need to educate themselves regarding the problematic issues with the independence clause in APM 310. *The text has been updated in the report.*

- Comment 6: *Observations (Librarians section):* The task force agrees with this correct comment. Normal merit reviews are reviewed at the Library level only and are not reviewed by the AFPC. *The text has been updated in the report.*

- Comment 7: *Task Force Methods:* Additional text has been added in this section. Multiple members of the University Writing Program were interviewed. In addition, Barbara Goldman was invited to a task force meeting to discuss the history of the AF peer review process and the Nash-Goldman report.

- Comment 8: *Task Force Methods:* Additional text has been added to the list of administrative officials interviewed.

- Additional AFEC Comments Posted on the ASIS Whiteboard:
    1. Additional text has been added in the first paragraph under *Member Education* regarding voting procedures.
    2. The typo in *Recommendation 8 (AF Review Committee Structure)* has been corrected.

Sincerely,

John Hess, Chair
Special Task Force to Review the Academic Federation Peer Review Process

# Report of the Special Task Force to Review the Academic Federation Peer Review Process

# Final Draft Submitted to the Executive Council
# June 2014

# Table of Contents

**Summary and Recommendations**

The Academic Federation (AF) Task Force on Peer Review unanimously agrees on the value of Peer Review for both its members and the University. The Nash-Goldman report of 1999 evaluated campus procedures for personnel reviews of academic federation titles and made a total 29 recommendations. As a result of the Nash-Goldman report, peer review of AF members was measurably and undeniably improved. This Task Force report marks the first comprehensive review of peer review in the Academic Federation since the Nash-Goldman report was issued. The Task Force respectfully offers the following recommendations and observations with the goal of improving AF Peer Review. The Task Force asserts that improving peer review will preserve the gains realized in the past, retain the "institutional memory" of longer-term employees, and enhance the benefit of the peer review process to both individuals and the University— all worthwhile goals for the AF and the University.

With few exceptions, peer review was universally conveyed to the task force as a valuable process on this campus. A critical goal in peer review is the career development of the academic personnel within the process, participating as both the reviewed and the reviewer. Based on our own discussions, an online survey of AF members and officers, and interviews with appropriate College-level and University administrators, the Task Force noted the general benefits of peer review, concerns specific to certain AF titles, and specific areas where Peer Review will benefit from modifications. In this report, we present recommendations, make observations, and provide additional information.

The Academic Federation includes 1500 members in 12 titles. More than half of our members (Lecturers, HSCP, Adjunct Professors) do not participate in peer review and therefore fall outside the charge to the Task Force. The Task Force believes that these members are missing out on many positive career development opportunities by not participating in peer review. We note that it continues to be important for the AF to develop peer review for these titles.

## Recommendations

With the primary goal of serving the members of the AF, the Task Force submits the following recommendations.

## 1. Member Education

**The Task Force encourages the Academic Federation to increase efforts to engage and educate its members with regard to the merit and promotions process.** As an organization, the AF is only as strong as its members. The Task Force recognizes that many AF members currently do not participate, or do not recognize their participation, in the peer review process beyond being reviewed. The Task Force sees an opportunity to contribute to improving our members through broadening participation in the peer review process, especially at the local (e.g. department or unit) level. It is important for AF members to be familiar with their departmental voting procedures. This would directly help the AF member and indirectly operate as a check to aid departments in following their approved voting procedures. Additional efforts to involve newer AF members to prevent "institutional memory loss" would also benefit the organization. To these ends, the Task Force suggests:

1-1) **the Task Force urges the AF and the University to continue to work for greater openness and transparency with regard to the peer review process**. The Task Force is concerned that some AF members are not provided with adequate instruction preceding dossier preparation. The Task Force is also concerned that Federation members are provided with varying degrees of feedback during and after the personnel process has concluded. The Task Force wishes to reinforce the idea that the peer review process is important. Equal access to preparatory information and conveyance of the results of each step of the peer review process is valuable to both the incumbent and the University.

1-2) **the AF consider establishing a formal mentoring system;**

1-3) **the AF establish a periodic schedule for the updating and reminding of AF members about Merits and Promotions**. The Academic Federation should send emails 2-3 times per year regarding the merit and promotion process. For example, in September/October, a message should be sent to the AF membership welcoming them back to campus and reminding them to find out if they are up for merit or promotion. In May/June, another message should be sent out reminding AF members that they should have received a response from their Dean or Department Chair regarding their merit or promotion action. An additional email could be sent reminding members to be aware of APM rules and responsibilities with regard to their position and/or to update their CVs. New AF members should in addition be sent an email containing various points of information: AF

web pages, APM section specific for their job title, APM merit and review process, AF FAQ pages, and so on.

1-4)   **communications from AF personnel committees should strive to provide more information; specific constructive criticism is valuable to the incumbent and more general comments about the review process are valuable for the incumbent and the University.**  Elaborating the strong points and weak points of either an appointment or merit (or promotion) packet increase the openness and transparency of the process.

1-5)   **to aid the performance of recommendation 1-4, the Task Force recommends that the AF work with the Administration to create an environment where all personnel in the review process can fully and freely participate without restraint due to fear.** The Task Force recognizes that providing substantive feedback, including constructive criticism, carries with it the potential for personal exposure to litigation.

## 2. Conflicts of Funding and Academic Merit Review

**The Task Force recommends that the AF and the University work together to find possible solution(s) to the natural conflicts that occur between funding and the merit and promotion process.**  These conflicts may include:

- reduction in percentage appointment with successful merit advances due to lack of funding;
- deferment of the academic merit review or advancement due to real or perceived lack of funding;
- appointment at title or step lower than academically warranted due to lack of funding or the need to obtain 100% effort as a visa requirement;
- appointment or accelerations to title or step higher than academically warranted in environments of adequate funding and high external competition;
- escalating job responsibilities that may result when individuals add responsibilities across an increasing number of grants.

One tool discussed in the Task Force was to loosen the tight coupling between academic merit steps and the salary scale.

## 3. Flexibility

**The Task Force recommends AF review committees exhibit a greater acceptance of changing and/or increased job duties by AF members. Flexibility during review would be especially valuable for AF personnel supported on varying funding sources.** The Task Force was informed of situations in which new opportunities and changing job circumstances were viewed negatively by peer review committees. These are not limited to one department or job title, but occur in multiple situations, from lecturers to bench researchers. All of these situations could be gathered into one category: "trying to help out and getting penalized for it". Rather than recognizing positive contributions to the University mission, personnel are criticized for not staying within the bounds of their title duties or worse are encouraged to change academic titles. The Task Force finds this unfortunate and finds the following language from APM 210-1 d particularly enlightening: *"The review committee must judge whether the candidate is engaging in a program of work that is both sound and productive. As the University enters new fields of endeavor and refocuses its ongoing activities, cases will arise in which the proper work of faculty members departs markedly from established academic patterns. In such cases, the review committees must take exceptional care to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. However, flexibility does not entail a relaxation of high standards."* The Task Force hopes that more flexible oversight will yield several benefits: greater productivity, greater morale and streamlining of the review process due to a reduction in "reactionary" responses resulting in reclassifications and appeals.

## 4. Merit Review Standards for Professional Researchers

**The Task Force recommends recalibration of the merit review standards imposed at UC Davis for review of Professional Researchers (PR).** The AF has long recognized the challenges faced by AF members in the PR series (as noted in the Provost's Working Group on the Role of the Academic Federation in Achieving the "Vision of Excellence" Report, dated May 28, 2013) and the Task Force encourages the AF to address these challenges by working with the Joint Personnel Committee and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs to improve the merit review of this title.

Perhaps the greatest fault in the current interpretation of the APM is with regard to the requirement of a PR to be, above all else, independent. This topic is discussed at length in the Workgroup Report. The interpretation of independence seemingly places a requirement on PRs that doesn't exist for Senate faculty. The Task Force feels the first step toward ameliorating the PR situation would be working toward the generalization that most research is

today conducted by collaborating groups and not individuals. APM 210-1 d 2 provides this guidance for evaluation of the research component of Ladder rank faculty: *"Evidence of a productive and creative mind should be sought in the candidate's published research or recognized artistic production in original architectural or engineering designs, or the like"*. Equivalent guidance provided by the AF and the University with respect to review of AF professional researchers in local committees and University level committees would be beneficial. The Task Force is aware that changing the guidelines for review of Professional Researchers could create more uncertainty as to the differences between the PRs and Project Scientists.  Nevertheless, the current situation requires action.

## 5. Merit Review Standards for Lecturers

**The Task Force recommends that the AF work with the University to create a more open and transparent merit and promotion process for Lecturers.**  The Task Force heard that many Lecturers are confused about job performance expectations, especially in terms of accelerated merits.  In addition, the Task Force is concerned that Lecturers and review bodies are operating under different rules/expectations; this situation is leading to poor morale and dissatisfaction.  The Task Force acknowledges that transparency is a shared responsibility, in which awareness and clear communication are essential. Lecturers must do their part to educate themselves regarding the University's expectations.  At the same time, the administration and the leadership of each department need to ensure that they are doing a good job of openly communicating their expectations regarding promotions and acceleration.

Recommendation #3 (flexibility) is one step toward remediation.  Excellent teaching is often directly related to excellent research. Many faculty are discouraged from including anything other than a textbook or teaching award in their merit packets.  However, innovative research often informs Lecturers' teaching practices, and it should be recognized as potential cause for promotion or acceleration.

Furthermore, the efforts of lecturers to participate in peer review as reviewers should be encouraged; this will improve the transparency of the process.  It's troubling that there appears to be no clear incentive for Lecturers to engage in peer review.  Departments should recognize the right of AF members to vote on their peers' merits and reviews.

### 6. Health Sciences Clinical Professors and Adjunct Professors

**The current peer review situation involving Health Sciences Clinical Professors (HSCP) and Adjunct professors must be examined.** Both Health Sciences Clinical Professors (HSCP) and Adjunct Professors are Academic Federation members with instructional duties. As a result, both job titles are routinely reviewed by the Academic Senate. The Task Force is concerned that there is no AF participation in review of these titles. Of equal concern to the Task Force is that the individuals in these titles do not participate in peer review.

### 7. Librarians and Peer Review

**The Task Force recommends the AF evaluate the impact on peer review of librarians considering the recent change of Associate University Librarians from the AF to staff positions.** The Task Force is concerned that the foundation of peer review, that is, review by one's peers, might not be maintained with the change from AF to Staff.

### 8. AF Review Committee Structure

**The Task Force urges the AF to study a possible restructuring of peer review committees or at the least, to study a way to mitigate the work load of the JPC.** The Task Force believes this to be necessary to successfully accomplish recommendation 1-4. The Task Force anticipates that the burden on AF peer review processes will only increase with the increasing numbers of students and faculty due to implementation of the 2020 Initiative. The impact of an increased committee workload is particularly troubling for AF members serving on the JPC, most of whom are paid from grant funds not designed to support non-research activities. Mitigation measures (not ranked) could include:

- stipends for committee members;
- splitting of the JPC responsibilities into two or more committees;
- recreation of AF Peer Review committees based on a more distributed, local committee structure.

The organization of the three campus-wide AF peer review committees appears to be based more or less on the three missions of the University: teaching, research, and service. Thus, the three AF personnel committee are the AFPC (AF Personnel Committee, which reviews Librarians, Supervisors of Physical

Education, Supervisors of Teacher Education, Continuing Educators, and University Extension Teachers), the ASPC (Administrative Series Personnel Committee, which reviews Academic Administrators and Academic Coordinators), and the JPC (the Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee, which reviews research titles such as Professional Researcher, Project Scientist, Specialist, Specialist in Cooperative Extension, and Agronomist). The JPC reviews many more actions than the AFPC and the ASPC combined, and its reviews are the subject of most of the angst expressed to the Task Force. While the obvious workload issues are within the JPC, reconstitution of only the JPC might be short sighted. It might make more sense to examine alternative ways to organize the three personnel committees.

## 9. Streamlining

9-1)  **The Task Force suggests eliminating the requirement for arm's-length letters for Specialist and Project Scientist titles.** The Task Force heard from several different sources that arm's-length letters are often of little benefit in reviewing these titles. Problems include difficulty obtaining arm's-length letters (cost of staff time and effort), difficulty obtaining letters which provide useful commentary; and the eventual inclusion of non-arm's-length letters due to a lack of arm's-length letters. The Task Force also heard that due to potential liability, many letters are not useful because they merely restate the details in the incumbent's CV. While this is likely to be partly true, the Task Force is not willing to recommend elimination of the requirement of letters for all title codes.

9-2)  **The Task Force urges discontinuing annual reappointment letters.** The Task Force was told that some units interpret APM 137 (*Term appointments*) as mandating that all individuals funded on grants be reappointed annually, despite being paid from multiyear grants. This represents an unnecessary expenditure of staff effort with possibly negative financial consequences for AF members (e.g., in obtaining credit).

## Observations

In addition to collecting information that led to the Recommendations, the Task Force became aware of a number of challenges that AF members face in the peer review process. We describe these challenges in the following observations without making specific recommendations.

### Time Required to Prepare Merit Packet

A frequent comment provided by AF members related to the time required to assemble the merit packet.  Some comments were pessimistic about the time "not being worth it" while others simply complained that it took too long.  The Task Force notes that some complaints might be related to a lack of understanding in the peer review process, and we hope that these will decrease through successful implementation of Recommendation 1.  Candidates who review merit packages, for example, develop skills in preparing their own package. Several comments were received from committee members and survey respondents about the suitability of MIV for entering information.  MIV appears to work best for research titles with fewer input requirement categories: publications and service. In contrast, the Task Force heard that Lecturers, Librarians and Supervisors of Teacher Education had difficulty using MIV to enter information essential for their peer review.

One suggestion that might lessen the time spent on packet preparation is to impose a page limit on either the entire packet or the personal statement.  While this might only marginally reduce the time spent by Federation members during packet preparation, it would reduce the time spent by the review committees simply reading the entire packet.  Pertinent to this discussion of page limits, the chair of the JPC advised the Task Force that personal statements should have a page limit, possibly 4 pages maximum.

### Teaching by AF Members in Non-Teaching Titles

By the Standing Orders of the Regents, responsibility for instruction in laboratory, clinical, or classroom settings is vested in the members of the Academic Senate (AS). But, AS members are not the only ones providing instruction at the University; various AF titles provide instruction and as a result, are reviewed by AS members.  Additionally, many AF members in research (e.g., Professional Researcher), Health Sciences Clinical Professor, or administrative titles (e.g., Academic Coordinator, Academic Administrator) provide instruction as part of their positions.

Members of the Task Force question appointments to a lecturer position at 0% effort for the sole purpose of legitimizing instruction.  The requirement for an appointment undermines both members of the AF who can instruct in a laboratory, clinical, or classroom setting and the University's goal of instruction.

Furthermore, any review of an individual appointed at 0% would appear to be a waste of time and effort

Teaching by Academic Coordinators is further complicated by variability between departments. The position as described in APM 375-4 is one of "administering academic programs that provide service closely related to the teaching or research mission of the University" and is not a teaching position. Nevertheless, the Task Force heard of Academic Coordinators for whom teaching comprises a regular and integral part of their position description. Some teach via a split appointment as an Academic Coordinator/Continuing Lecturer (which use different salary scales, thus disadvantaging the individual in this position; further, the split appointment results in the unreasonable situation of 4 personnel reviews in 6 years – in years 2, 3, 4, and 6); others teach as a component of "volunteer service"; others have a 0% Lecturer appointment.

## Professional Researchers

Peer review of AF Professional Researchers continues to be highly biased against individuals in this position, and the statistics indicate that the ranks of Professional Researchers are dramatically shrinking at UC Davis. Professional Researchers face institutional impediments such as initial hiring without start-up funds, research space or office space, continued systematic discrimination with regard to in-house grant opportunities, lack of authority to train graduate students as thesis advisors, and the inability to join graduate groups. Adding to the list of systemic, institutional disadvantages is the unfamiliarity of grant reviewers outside the University with the title "Professional Researcher" and the unwillingness of the administration to provide clarification. One Professional Researcher provided the Task Force with the following critical grant review comments:

> "He appears not to have dedicated lab space, but relies on the facilities of his former supervisor Dr. xxxx."
> "It is not clear whether the PI has established a network of intellectual colleagues and collaborators at Davis. His office is in the lab, which raises questions about scientific and academic independence. There is no evidence of institutional support."

Additional impediments imposed by the AF through the JPC should be remediated through the recalibration discussed in the recommendations section.

AF members should educate themselves regarding the problematic issues with the independence clause in APM 310 for Professional Researchers.   There remains a greater opportunity to improve the working environment and productivity of the Professional Researcher series.  Seemingly minor steps to alleviate these inequities might aid professional researchers in gaining grant funding, which of course, directly benefits the University.

## Academic Coordinators and Academic Administrators

Some Academic Coordinators and Academic Administrators are funded by training grants or other short-term funds. In many cases, the funding agency places strict limits on the monies that can be spent on administration with the result that an individual Academic Coordinator may be funded from as many as five sources and have job duties that increase in complexity and scope with each grant added to bring them to 100% time.  With each new funding source, these individuals revise their position description to reflect their added responsibilities.  In subsequent merit reviews, the revised position description with a higher workload is used.  Thus, the individual's performance is measured against a position description that may include 20% more work than the position description used in their previous review.  This positive feedback loop leads to a spiral of increasing expectations for the incumbent.

## Librarians

In our conversation with a representative of the Library administration, the question of duplication of effort within the Librarian peer review process came up.  Librarians are reviewed by CAPA (Committee of Appointments, Promotions and Advancement), which is the Peer review committee for LAUC-D (Librarians Association of the University of California, Davis).  Packets that are not standard merit reviews (e.g., accelerations, promotions, and contested actions) are subsequently reviewed by the AFPC. With this process, we find that there is no duplication between those two peer review groups; CAPA serves as the peer group at the pseudo-departmental level for Librarians.  Thus, the Librarian peer review process is consistent with the generalized AF review process of having a departmental level and University level AF peer group review.

## Lecturers

The University Writing Program (UWP) is structured differently than other programs at UC Davis in that its teaching staff is made up of 53 Lecturers and 5 Senate members.  The UWP faculty have been considering a number of issues

related to the peer review process; many of the questions they are asking apply to Lecturers in other departments and programs, across campus.

Starting with the most general issue: what, exactly, is a "peer"? (See also recommendation 7, regarding Librarians.) Are two people who teach in the same program, but who have different degrees (and were trained in different areas), really peers?  To cite one example, in the UWP this manifests as a division between faculty with degrees in Literature, and those trained in Rhetoric.  But this issue branches out into some other related questions:

- are pre and post-six lecturers peers?
- are members of the Academic Senate and the Federation peers?
- who should observe teaching? A "peer" in a narrow definition of the term? (In some programs, there are very few Lecturers.)
- should the people reviewing the files have a vote? One worry articulated by several members of the UWP is that Lecturers do the time-consuming work of reviewing the materials, but have no vote. Lecturers are concerned that Senate faculty do not review the merit and promotion materials as thoroughly and yet are the only ones allowed to vote.

The task force realizes that each of these issues is subject to additional complications as a result of union representation.  Nevertheless, the questions listed remain key to improving the peer review process for lecturers and other AF members.

## Task Force Methods

The Task Force queried AF members about their thoughts of the personnel process by way of an online survey.  AF members provided input concerning the local level review (department or ORU) and the University level review.  At the other end of the process, the Task Force interviewed administrative officials from the School of Medicine, School of Veterinary Medicine, School of Education, Office of Research, Shields Library, the College of Engineering, the College of Biological Sciences, the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences and the Division of Social Sciences.  These individuals provided mostly input with regard to the University level committees.  The following representatives were invited but not able to attend: Dean of the Division of Humanities, Arts, and Cultural Studies (HArCS), Interim Dean of the Division of Mathematical and

Physical Sciences (MPS), Associate Dean of Academic Personnel in the School of Law, and the Vice Chancellor for Research. The Task Force interviewed the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs, AF Chair and Vice Chair, and chairs of the three AF personnel committees. Multiple members of the University Writing Program were also interviewed. In addition, the Task Force invited Barbara Goldman to discuss the history of the AF peer review process and the Nash-Goldman report. At each point, the Task Force focused on the "value added" to both the incumbent and the University. The results of these approaches are presented below.

## AF Member Input

The members of the AF provided input concerning peer review and the personnel process via an online survey. A total of 353 individuals (approximately 25% of AF members) responded. The Project Scientist and Lecturer (or Senior Lecturer) title codes provided the most responses although replies were received from nearly every AF title code. The full survey results are provided in the Appendices.

Within the survey results, several topics were brought up more than others:

- "Transparency of the Process"
- Accelerations & Lecturers
- Recent changes in UWP review procedures
- Too much time is required for packet preparation
- Librarians wish for greater AF involvement
- Limited funding and merits resulting in decreased percentage of appointment
- Discrimination of Professional Researchers

Transparency of the process refers to concerns AF members had about the entire peer review process, from preparing a dossier to the final decision; recommendation #1 applies to these concerns. AF member input included remarks such as these: "…the implementation makes me suspicious whether Federation members are being fairly (and equally) evaluated by their peers"; "in my experience, the peer review process is meaningless. If peer bodies disagree with other recommendations, it seems that the peer bodies are usually (always?) overruled"; "because I hold a joint title; one with teaching and one without, I prepare 2 packets. This seems like unnecessary work."; "The review process is a waste of time. We review Senate faculty and our vote does not really count, so why bother?"; "…but the system for acceleration is hopelessly broken. Our dean

categorically rejects all non-teaching award acceleration requests and CAP seems happy to back her up."; "after 20 years, I just learned about official criteria for review, …"; "no one ever explained this to me. Have learned on the fly as each merit came up."; "I can no longer find the recommend (*sic*) guidelines for the merit review of academic federation members."

Comments about accelerations and lecturers refer to complaints the Task Force heard about the difficulty of obtaining accelerated merits. Lecturers feel that truly above average, highly distinguished performance is categorically denied acceleration as standard policy. A typical comment: "Lecturers in HArCS are routinely denied acceleration." Greater transparency in the process, relating to recommendation #1 could possibly allay some of these concerns. With greater transparency should come agreement between AF members and department AS members and University committees on the requirements for both normal merits and for accelerated merits.

The Task Force heard complaints about changes in the review process in the UWP, which at face value seem to indicate a lessening of peer review. One comment received was this: "in the UWP our personnel committee has been reduced to only 3 members. I don't see how they can evaluate over 45 lecturers with only 3 members" Again, greater transparency in the process, relating to recommendation #1, could possibly allay some of these concerns. In any case, the leaders of the UWP should make sure that its faculty, both AF and Senate, understand and agree on the peer review process in their program.

The time to prepare packets for merits and promotion was addressed by several comments. The most general comment was that it takes too much time. A corollary to this was that it's too much time and not worth it, due to a reduction in time that occurs if a merit is granted. One person thought (and was grateful for this) that the office staff spent far too much time entering data that would not be evaluated. Another was critical of the need to prepare 2 packets to accommodate review of split appointments. Greater transparency in the process, relating to recommendation #1 could possibly allay some of these concerns.

The Federation members in the Library occupy a somewhat unique position in that the University Library is not an academic department and is also represented by an outside agency. The Task Force heard about politics in the review process and "the only reason I have been successful as a librarian is library peer review is backed up by AF peer review." Another respondent made this remark: "Our peer group is CAPA (which I have served on) but librarians do

not see CAPA letters regarding their packet. We also do not see any feedback from the Academic Federation." Greater transparency in the process, relating to recommendation #1 could possibly allay some of these concerns. Recommendation #7 pertains to the library and the library is also discussed under 'observations'.

The impact of successful merits and promotions on percent effort in the time of limited grant funding was brought up several times. One comment was: "The process is completely disconnected from financial situations. It doesn't make sense to be giving raises if the group or program can't afford them." The most damning critique was three pronged: (1) serving on peer review panels is a waste of time, (2) as long as the University provides no salary support for researchers, merits come out of grants and lead to decreased time and percentage when merits are granted, (3) professional researchers are not given the independence afforded their AS "equals" because the Senate members are supplied with a salary. Recommendation #2 pertains to these comments.

The plight of Professional Researchers on campus was mentioned several times. The previous section brought up an interesting point about financial independence that results from the hard money salary support of AS members vs their "equal" AF counterparts. "Equal" because the equivalence between AF Professional Researcher members and AS members is in the APM only. Another respondent was blunt in pointing out: "all of these problems have been laid out before-years ago-by the Nash-Goldman report, yet nothing ever happened." Recommendation #4 pertains to these observations.

### Deans/Administration Input
- Peer review is very valuable; it's also professional development for the candidate.
- Merit and promotion feedback from Personnel committees is weak, should be expanded.
- Guidelines should exist for appointments, to aid departments with initial appointment level. Again, more feedback from committees at appointment would help made the process better over time.

The Task Force found the comments from campus Deans or other Administrators to be relatively consistent. All valued peer review and supported the current system as valuable to the individual and to the University. The University officials also brought out one additional point that resonated with the Task Force: participation in peer review is professional development; in addition to

the value of the service of peer review, the individual gains valuable insight into the personnel process which becomes personally relevant for future actions. Additionally, the AF member becomes more educated about fellow AF members jobs, duties and performance.

The Task Force found that the Deans and other Administrators often diverted from strictly speaking about merits and promotions to talking about appointments. Clearly, peer review is involved with both processes, but existing AF members mentioned appointments much less often than the administrators. In line with our recommendation #1, it would be beneficial to the University if letters from AF personnel committees regarding proposed appointments were more detailed. Over a relatively short length of time, more detailed information about appointments from personnel committees would feed back to departments and ORUs, leading to more accurate appointment proposals.

A corollary to recommendation #1, related to the transparency of the process is the assertion that guidelines from AF personnel committees could help PIs and departments and schools could more accurately propose rank and step for potential appointees. Beyond most academic appointments requiring a "terminal degree", the APM contains very little guidance in the subject, except to say that individuals with a PhD must be appointed at Associate Specialist rank (UCD APM 330). The Task Force hopes that simple guidelines could be offered by personnel committees to aid the appointment process. For example, an individual proposed for Assistant Professional Researcher, Step 1 would usually be appointed as a Step 2 to be consistent with ladder rank faculty appointments. Similarly, a proposed Assistant Project Scientist appointment could be Step 1 as a new PhD graduate, but with several years of productive experience more appropriately would be a Step 2 or even Step 3. The Task Force understands reluctance by committees to begin issuing guidelines and emphasizes that such guidelines would be just guidelines, and not binding rules. Nevertheless, the Task Force sees a greater benefit to the appointment process and to the AF by having more guidelines than by having fewer guidelines.

## Appendices

Task Force Membership
History of the AF and Peer Review
AF Survey results
Nash-Goldman report

## Special Task Force to Review the Academic Federation Peer Review Process Membership

John Hess, Chair
Professional Researcher
SOM: Cell Biology and Human Anatomy

Emir Hodzic
Project Scientist
VM: Medicine & Epidemiology

Pauline Holmes
Supervisor of Teacher Education
School of Education

Carole Hom
Academic Coordinator
Evolution & Ecology

Patsy Inouye
Librarian
Shields Library

Zeljka Smit-McBride
Project Scientist
SOM: Ophthalmology

Sam Nichols
Lecturer
Music

Jeremy Spencer
Law Librarian
Law Library

Marilyn Townsend
Specialist in Cooperative Extension
Nutrition

Dan Wilson
Academic Administrator
Civil & Environmental Engineering

Staff: Kimberly Pulliam (Senate analyst)

## History of the AF and Peer Review

The Academic Federation is a UC Davis organization composed of academic appointees not represented by the Academic Senate (AS). Within the UC system, it is unique. Former Chancellor James Meyer was responsible for the creation of the Academic Staff Organization (later renamed Academic Federation) in 1969 [http://academicfederation.ucdavis.edu/local_resources/documents/brief_federation_history.pdf]. As envisioned by Chancellor Meyer, the AF served as a third category of university employees, academic faculty [appointees] involved in research and teaching who were not members of the AS.

Unfortunately, intentionally or unintentionally, upon creation of the new ASO/AF organization in 1969, it was immediately relegated to second tier status by virtue of the powers granted to the AS by the standing orders of the Regents. In hindsight, it is unfortunate that the creation of the AF was not accompanied by a system similar to the AS system of peer review. A full 30 years elapsed before a Davis committee assembled to investigate AF personnel reviews issued the "Nash Goldman" report.

The Nash-Goldman report made a total 29 recommendations, focusing on deficiencies of AF Peer Review. As a result of the Nash Goldman report, peer review of AF members was measurably and undeniably improved.

In the years following the publication of the Nash Goldman report, the University has faced decreasing budgets and is under constant pressure to do more with less. A common thread in most discussions is streamlining: making processes easier, removing bottlenecks and ultimately leading to improvements. Peer review remains a time consuming and expensive hallmark of the academic side of the University. This Task Force was charged with examining the campus peer review procedures with the goal of determining the value added at each step.

At the most general level, Peer Review is a process that is relevant and applicable to the incumbent and the institution. Procedurally, in general, the incumbent prepares his/her dossier or merit packet and this is reviewed first by a peer group within the department or ORU, and then is considered by the department or OSU. Following a department vote, review is performed by the Dean of the school.  Depending on the title code, the packet is ultimately reviewed by one of three University level personnel committees (JPC, AFPC, ASPC) (this abbreviated description oversimplifies the process, for example, it ignores AF members who are reviewed by AS committees).  At each level of review, a recommendation is made; thus, the Peer Group, Department vote, School and AF committee all provide a recommendation. The final decision rests

with either the Vice Provost or Dean depending on the type of action and Delegation of Authority.

## Academic Federation Survey: Personnel Process
**The Academic Federation has formed a task force to examine academic personnel processes for its members, with a focus on the principles of peer review, how the peer review process is structured, the value added in each step, and the potential opportunities to optimize the time spent by staff and federation members. Because you hold an appointment in an Academic Federation title, we ask for your input on these questions. The * indicates a required response.**

| 1. *What title(s) do you currently hold? | | |
|---|---|---|

| Multiple Choice | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | Percentage |
| 1. Academic Administrator | 8 | : | 2.266% |
| 2. Academic Coordinator | 35 | = | 9.915% |
| 3. Assistant or Associate Law Librarian | 1 | : | 0.283% |
| 4. Assistant or Associate University Librarian | 2 | : | 0.567% |
| 5. Agronomist | 2 | : | 0.567% |
| 6. Professional Researcher (any level) | 38 | = | 10.765% |
| 7. Project Scientist (any level) | 71 | ══ | 20.113% |
| 8. Specialist (any level) | 26 | = | 7.365% |
| 9. Specialist in Cooperative Extension (any level) | 22 | = | 6.232% |
| 10. Continuing Educator | 8 | : | 2.266% |
| 11. Librarian (any level) | 21 | = | 5.949% |
| 12. Supervisor of Physical Education | 0 | | 0.000% |
| 13. Supervisor of Teacher Education | 7 | : | 1.983% |
| 14. University Extension Teacher | 1 | : | 0.283% |
| 15. Adjunct Professor | 28 | = | 7.932% |
| 16. Lecturer or Senior Lecturer | 59 | ══ | 16.714% |
| 17. Clinical Professor (any level) | 24 | = | 6.799% |
| Total | 353 | | 100% |

| 2. *Have you previously held any other Academic Federation titles at UC Davis? | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Multiple Choice | | | |
| | | Total | Percentage |
| 1. | Yes | 49 | ═ 14.939% |
| 2. | No | 279 | ══════ 85.061% |
| | Total | 328 | 100% |

| 3. What is the current level of your aggregate Academic Federation title appointments? | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Multiple Choice | | | |
| | | Total | Percentage |
| 1. | 100% | 254 | ═════ 77.204% |
| 2. | between 80% and 99% | 19 | ═ 5.775% |
| 3. | between 66% and 79% | 10 | ▪ 3.040% |
| 4. | between 50% and 65% | 22 | ═ 6.687% |
| 5. | less than 50% | 24 | ═ 7.295% |
| | Total | 329 | 100% |

| 4. If your appointments total less than full time, please select the primary reason. | | |
|---|---|---|
| (please skip this question if you hold a full time appointment) | | |
| Multiple Choice | | |
| | Total | Percentage |
| 1. I have another position outside UC Davis. | 5 | ═ 6.494% |
| 2. I have another non-Academic Federation position at UC Davis. | 8 | ═ 10.390% |
| 3. I choose to work less than full time because of personal responsibilities outside the workplace. | 13 | ══ 16.883% |
| 4. Funding availability limited the appointments. | 38 | ═══ 49.351% |
| 5. Other | 13 | ══ 16.883% |
| Total | 77 | 100% |

| 5. How long have you held your current title? |
|---|

| Multiple Choice | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | Percentage | |
| 1. Less than one year. | 57 | | 17.221% |
| 2. More than one year but less than two years. | 35 | | 10.574% |
| 3. More than two years but less than six years. | 92 | | 27.795% |
| 4. More than six years but less than ten years. | 49 | | 14.804% |
| 5. More than ten years. | 98 | | 29.607% |
| Total | 331 | | 100% |

**6. Have you ever deferred a personnel review?**

| Multiple Choice | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | Percentage | |
| 1. No. | 260 | | 79.027% |
| 2. Yes, because my unit didn't act on my request for review. | 1 | | 0.304% |
| 3. Yes, because the grant that funds my position didn't have resources. | 9 | | 2.736% |
| 4. Yes, because I didn't have the time needed to prepare a strong dossier. | 27 | | 8.207% |
| 5. Other | 32 | | 9.726% |
| Total | 329 | | 100% |

**7. When was your more recent personnel review?**

| Multiple Choice | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | Percentage | |
| 1. I haven't had one yet. | 73 | | 22.121% |
| 2. I'm currently being reviewed. | 78 | | 23.636% |
| 3. One year ago. | 103 | | 31.212% |
| 4. Two years ago. | 52 | | 15.758% |
| 5. Three years ago. | 17 | | 5.152% |
| 6. More than three years ago. | 7 | | 2.121% |
| Total | 330 | | 100% |

**8. What was the result of your most recent completed personnel review?**

| Multiple Choice |
|---|

|    |                                                                       | Total | Percentage |          |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------|----------|
| 1. | I haven't had one yet.                                                | 93    |            | 28.354%  |
| 2. | I requested a regular merit, which was approved.                      | 142   |            | 43.293%  |
| 3. | I requested a regular merit, which was declined.                      | 4     |            | 1.220%   |
| 4. | I requested an acceleration, which was approved.                      | 24    |            | 7.317%   |
| 5. | I requested an acceleration, but was approved for only a regular merit. | 6   |            | 1.829%   |
| 6. | I requested a promotion, which was approved.                          | 37    |            | 11.280%  |
| 7. | I requested a promotion, which was declined.                          | 0     |            | 0.000%   |
| 8. | Other                                                                 | 22    |            | 6.707%   |
|    | Total                                                                 | 328   |            | 100%     |

### 9. In general, the personnel process has been helpful to me.

Multiple Choice

|    |                   | Total | Percentage |          |
|----|-------------------|-------|------------|----------|
| 1. | Strongly Agree    | 36    |            | 11.111%  |
| 2. | Agree             | 124   |            | 38.272%  |
| 3. | No Opinion        | 111   |            | 34.259%  |
| 4. | Disagree          | 32    |            | 9.877%   |
| 5. | Strongly Disagree | 21    |            | 6.481%   |
|    | Total             | 324   |            | 100%     |

### 10. Peer and/or voting group comments have been helpful to me.

Multiple Choice

|    |                   | Total | Percentage |          |
|----|-------------------|-------|------------|----------|
| 1. | Strongly Agree    | 26    |            | 8.000%   |
| 2. | Agree             | 100   |            | 30.769%  |
| 3. | No Opinion        | 148   |            | 45.538%  |
| 4. | Disagree          | 39    |            | 12.000%  |
| 5. | Strongly Disagree | 12    |            | 3.692%   |
|    | Total             | 325   |            | 100%     |

### 11. I spend an appropriate amount of time preparing my packet.

Multiple Choice

|    |                   | Total | Percentage |          |
|----|-------------------|-------|------------|----------|
| 1. | Strongly Agree    | 61    |            | 18.712%  |

| 2. | Agree | 121 | | 37.117% |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. | No Opinion | 83 | | 25.460% |
| 4. | Disagree | 44 | | 13.497% |
| 5. | Strongly Disagree | 17 | | 5.215% |
| | Total | 326 | | 100% |

**12. MIV (MyInfoVault) has improved the presentation of my packet.**

Multiple Choice

| | | Total | Percentage | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Strongly Agree | 16 | | 4.938% |
| 2. | Agree | 75 | | 23.148% |
| 3. | No Opinion | 175 | | 54.012% |
| 4. | Disagree | 44 | | 13.580% |
| 5. | Strongly Disagree | 14 | | 4.321% |
| | Total | 324 | | 100% |

**13. Serving on peer groups/voting groups is a valuable use of my time.**

Multiple Choice

| | | Total | Percentage | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Strongly Agree | 40 | | 12.308% |
| 2. | Agree | 129 | | 39.692% |
| 3. | No Opinion | 116 | | 35.692% |
| 4. | Disagree | 27 | | 8.308% |
| 5. | Strongly Disagree | 13 | | 4.000% |
| | Total | 325 | | 100% |

**14. The Academic Federation personnel committees provide useful feedback.**

Multiple Choice

| | | Total | Percentage | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Strongly Agree | 20 | | 6.192% |
| 2. | Agree | 81 | | 25.077% |
| 3. | No Opinion | 169 | | 52.322% |
| 4. | Disagree | 40 | | 12.384% |

| 5. | Strongly Disagree | 13 | = | 4.025% |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| | Total | 323 | | 100% |

**15. I'd rather just have my unit, dean, and Vice Provost review me, without including an Academic Federation personnel committee.**

Multiple Choice

| | | Total | | Percentage |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1. | Strongly Agree | 24 | = | 7.339% |
| 2. | Agree | 61 | = | 18.654% |
| 3. | No Opinion | 120 | = | 36.697% |
| 4. | Disagree | 75 | = | 22.936% |
| 5. | Strongly Disagree | 47 | = | 14.373% |
| | Total | 327 | | 100% |

**16. Have you ever served on a peer group?**

A peer group is a unit-level committee that evaluates a person in an Academic Federation title.

Multiple Choice

| | | Total | | Percentage |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1. | Yes | 173 | = | 52.584% |
| 2. | No | 156 | = | 47.416% |
| | Total | 329 | | 100% |

**17. Have you ever been a member of a voting group?**

A voting group is a committee that receives input from the peer group and votes on a candidate's dossier at the level of a department or unit.

Multiple Choice

| | | Total | | Percentage |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1. | Yes | 159 | = | 48.182% |
| 2. | No | 171 | = | 51.818% |
| | Total | 330 | | 100% |

**18. Have you ever served on an Academic Federation personnel committee?**

The Academic Federation personnel committees review all non-redelegated personnel actions and send advisory recommendations to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

Multiple Choice

| | | Total | Percentage | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | No. | 266 | ▬▬▬ | 81.098% |
| 2. | Yes, the Joint Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC) | 27 | = | 8.232% |
| 3. | Yes, the Administrative Series Personnel Committee (ASPC) | 11 | ≡ | 3.354% |
| 4. | Yes, the Academic Federation Personnel Committee (AFPC) | 24 | = | 7.317% |
| | Total | 328 | | 100% |

**Question 19: Is there anything else you'd like us to know about the personnel process for Academic Federation members?**

No.

Prior to my current appointment, I served for over three years in a parallel position with a nebulous non-AF, non-staff title. I was not reviewed during that period because the PI of the proposal that funded my position never got around to it. The AF personnel process may take time and can be a pain, but it beats the alternative.

I take my responsibilities as an academic appointee very seriously, and I am very happy to work on the sole UC campus with an AF. I know that for librarians in the series, the AF performs a valuable oversight role in the review process.

I like the idea of the peer review process but the implementation makes me suspicious whether Federation members are being fairly (and equally) evaluated by their peers.

It is big time sink for everyone involved, especially the departmental administrative staff that has to do most of the pushing and prodding of Federation members to get their packets together.

There is transparency for me in the sense that I will find out whether my merit/promotion is approved. But I have no idea as to how my peers fare. I feel like the process has this veil of secrecy about it.

In my experience, the peer review process is meaningless. If the peer bodies disagree with the other recommendations, it seems that the peer bodies are usually (always?) overruled.

n/a

No

In UWP, in the past, peers have evaluated and recommended to the voting body. Last year the committee got fed up with this and we voted as a faculty to change the process, but it was stymied by the dean. This year the committee will be very small and I suspect unable to do the kind of thorough review of packets that was done in the past.

Lecturers in HarCS are routinely denied acceleration.

I have had not problems with the current system and all personnel actions have been well supported by my peers. However, the VMDO provides support for packet preparation and sp4ends endless hours entering information into My Info Vault. Much of the information stored would seem of little consequence and certainly it all can't be examined. There should be a way to stream line this process.

Because I hold a joint title; one with teaching and one without, I prepare 2 packets. This seems like unnecessary work. Further, the packets go to two separate committees. The adjunct packet goes to CAP and the Prof Researcher goes to JPC. In my recent promotion both committees agreed. Not clear to me what would happen if they didn't. Also not clear to me why they both need to see it since it doubles the work (or could they see it sequentially)

The review process is a waste of time. We review Senate faculty and our vote does not really count, so why bother? Also all reviews should be at Dean/dept level not waste faculty time on this!!!

I volunteered to serve on the AF personnel committe but was rejected.

It occasionally takes an inordinately long time.

No.

n/a

I believe that AF personnel review committees serve as an important part of the peer review process, especially in cases of contested reviews or faulty administrative decisions. I would resist any attempts to diminish the authority of the AF or the principle of peer review for AF members.

Yes!! I am an Associate Clinical Professor and when I was originally hired, I participated on an AF Review panel for AF members in another department going up for review (which I thought was appropriate). However, when I subsequently went up for review, I was told that they no longer utilized the AF member review groups for merit review. I don't understand how policies can change without members being informed ahead of time. I am repeatedly frustrated by the fact that AF members can not vote on AS members, but AS members vote on AF actions. Also, I am expected to comment on all AS actions in my department or will otherwise be seen as having poor departmental collegiality and attendance/participation; however, I can not vote!

The regular merit system is working okay (though see my answer to #20), but the system for acceleration is hopelessly broken. Our dean categorically rejects all non-teaching award acceleration requests and CAP seems happy to back her up. I my last review portfolio I had two academic books, both used in classrooms and so meeting the criteria of textbooks, I had the backing of my department for a full step acceleration, and still I was denied an acceleration. The dean and CAP have created a kind of moving target for acceleration, one which virtually nothing one does can earn an acceleration. This is happening to every lecturer in my department (UWP). It feels like actionable behavior, and some of us are considering appealing to the union for intervention.

You should really look at what is reviewed and compare that to written job descriptions. My packet gets reviewed like an assistant professor, although my job description does not require grant acquition or first authorship publications. I think some of the definitions of job categories need to be made more clear to reviewers. Please realize this isn't a complaint. The Univerisity just needs to match reviews with job descriptions, that's all.

Academic federation members perform similarly to senate members but more stree

No

It has been my experience that professional researchers and project scientists (those new to UCD and/or those at junior levels) do not know what the expectations are for when they should go for merits and promotions. In the tenure track, *everyone* knows what the timetables are. Because many researchers/scientists don't have a critical mass of people surrounding them talking about their merit and promotion actions, they often do not go up for those actions when they could. AF should do something to communicate this information better.

I believe that Academic Senate members outside the College of Agriculture do not have the appropriate knowledge of the role of Cooperative Extension to properly judge our performance.
I was chair of the Joint Committee for two years and spent most of that time defending federation members from inappropriate criticism.

The amount of time it takes to assemble the packet is too lengthy. The criteria should be very few and should reflect the reality of the position. For instance, in the Research title series that I am in, advising graduate students is not part of the title, but if one is doing research at UC as a PI, then one likely has ( and should have) graduate students. So this part of one's work should not be considered "volunteer", even if one is not specifically paid for it.

No

I am currently under review- I believe for the first time since my appointment was approved. Given that funding from my position comes from a grant, it feels kind of pointless. Spend lots of time on preparing a package for no real gain. If I receive a merit increase, it would come out of the same funding, so I'd end up getting paid for even less of my time than I already do. My PI/Collaborator may try to find money in another fund for me just to make it less pointless. Also, it all seems very political. When I receive a request to review a new appointment that says "The department expects to enthusiastically recommend the appointment of X to the title of Asst. Project Scientist", there's no way I'd feel comfortable writing any contrary opinion when my own evaluations come from a similar process.

In the UWP our personnel committee has been reduced to only 3 members. I don't see how they can evaluate over 45 lecturers with only 3 members. Federation members do not receive extra compensation for serving on work intensive committees like personnel. I would like to see stipends for these kinds of appointments. I would also like to know how academic freedom is defined for federation members.

After 20 years, I just learned about the official criteria for review, as outlined in the APM. I think that these criteria should be made more widely known to everyone. In fact, I believe that every review should include the relevant excerpt on the review criteria from the APM. This is important because *before I knew what the relevant criteria were, I spent too much time on irrelevant activities**!!

I find it very difficult to evaluate many of my peers as our jobs are so different and it is difficult to know if they are going above and beyond and to know what to judge them on. Each position has its own criteria and for some individuals I have reviewed in the past, every time I see their package, their responsibilities have changed so I can't compare what they did before to what they are doing now

continue

Although I have served on many peer groups, in my program (UWP) the program committee is the group that actually counts--we are advisory to that group and that group has often famously ignored our recommendations.

NA

There is low participation among my voting and peer group likely due to the wide range of titles and research programs within the group. I recently reviewed a package for a woman who has been her for something like 13 years and never gone up for a merit. There needs be more mentoring.

Our process is well-intentioned, but incredibly strange--if not destructive. However, I'm not sure who you are or what you're trying to find out, so it's probably best not to elaborate.

The criteria upon which to agree or disagree on a merit review are not clear or not easily accessible. I often feel that I don't know what my vote should be based on.

Everything, since I know almost nothing. It's not part of our venue here.

No one ever explained this to me. Have learned "on the fly" as each merit came up. Distinctions between AF and Senate processes have been difficult to grasp, w/o formal explanation. Because my School has limited AF clinical members, doubt the appropriateness of a peer group review. Certainly that was the case for me when I was asked to serve on the group for a project scientist.

As a librarian I am subject to two peer review groups for any action other than a standard, within, rank merit. This has served me well as for the majority of my service at UCD (25 years) Library Administration has not been interested in good performance. Rather they are interested in loyal, unquestioning, subservience. Anyone who does truly good work for the benefit of the campus and the faculty (both Senate and AF) is seen as a problem. The only reason that I have been successful as a librarian is library peer review backed up by AF peer review.

I can no longer find the recommend guidelines for the merit review of academic federation members. In specific for project scientist in which I previously based my submission of a merit appeal.

It, JPC, is a fair process and it or a similar group provides the honest evaluation needed to check inadequate dept criticism, and to also check inappropriate negative pressure.

This process is very labor intensive for both the candidate and the various levels of review. Other campus review processes accomplish the same objectives without the need to involve additional reviewing body with little, if any, apparent substantive gain. The cost in personnel time is unwarranted especially in our current linited staffing situation.

Regardless of whether Federation Personnel Committee continues to be involved in review, retaining the peer group that includes Federation faculty is an important element of the personnel process.

How do you become part of these groups?

How a senate faculty member in the field of literature can evaluate an excellence in language teaching fairly and professionally?

The peer review worked in our department for several years but with retirements that haven't and are unlikely to be replaced this is becoming less effective. Once 7 strong we had 2 retirements several years ago, 1 scheduled for next year and 1 the year after, 1 person acting as co-chair and unable to also play a roll as peer.   Not much of a peer review any more.

The merit review of Professional Researchers through the JPC screams with injustice. There is a well-established but officially denied JPC culture that rates publications where the associated Senate member is on the author list as signalling lack of independence. HOW CAN WE POSSIBLY PUBLISH WITHOUT THE SENATE MEMBER WHEN WE ARE PUT INTO DIRECT (RESOURCE) DEPENDENCE WITH THEM FROM THE START? Besides: collaboration and team work wins the game; that's how science works. And how about the Professor series: where do the professors have to prove their independence? They don't. If, per APM, the Professional Research Series is equal to that of that of Professor, why not review Professors with this "independence" requirement? I think that would cause quite some commotion. Also: the JPC has no idea how to differentiate different research fields in terms of publication frequency. Scientists with demanding methods (i.e., who are slow to publish) are clearly disadvantaged and reprehended, even if multiple manuscripts are submitted and under review.
All these problems have been laid out before - years ago - by the Goldman report, yet nothing ever happened. If UCD wants to abandon its hypocritical attitude toward the Professional Researchers (who are the carriers of the UC Research Effort), then please: start listening to the committees that look at the inequalities in the Professional Research Series... and take action!

Not really.

I believe that the AF Personnel Commmittes serve a very valuable role in assessing reviews. They often raise important questions that may not be raised at the unit level peer groups.

As a supervisor, the process seems onerous for academic appointees I oversee. For example, publications are a key criteria for their evaluation and most track their publication records with bibliographic software. Yet their does not appear to be a

mechanism to simply upload their pub record into the annual review reports.

What are these peer review processes like for departments outside my own?

I served on JPC for two years and think it is a very good committee to objectively review merit and promotion actions. I found that departmental voting is almost always positive and not very useful. JPC has always been a fair and objective process.

No

It was never explained to me how the process works. I was never sure where to go for information. I'm still getting feedback about changing review period dates. It all feels very haphazard.

The Personnel Committee has shown to be an effective unbiased advocate of an individuals review when in conflict with direct supervisor.

I really have mixed opinion on the peer review process as am I asked to review others in classifications I am not familiar with no guidelines. Candidate Statements are highly varied. I have reviewed personnel whom I am familiar with their work and their statements are inadequate and candidates whom I only know from a staff list so do not know how to judge their work.
Perhaps the peer review process should be optional as requested by the candidate if they feel they may not get adequate support higher up the line.

Voting on promotions or merits of other federation members and being a federation member is a prisoners dilemma were most members (I suspect) cooperate, they both receive the reward for cooperating. That makes the review process weak.
The criteria for merit, promotions and accelerations for academic federation members such as professional researchers and project scientists are weak, and worse, were not clearly outlined or communicated in the past. That is obviously different to senate positions, where lots of material is available and because of the tenure or non-tenure decisions also more interest is shown from both sides (personnel and university)
The real criteria for positive review (promotion, acceleration) of soft money positions depend on the willingness of the PI to a) have the grant money and b) being willing to spent grant money. That can be dangerous, because a highly paid Academic Federation members which itself runs out of grant money (or a PI that runs out of grant money) will not be able support such a group member.

I have never actually seen comments from my department's peer/voting group, or those from the AFPC. Is this because my merit and promotion reviews have all been approved?

n/a

It seems totally arbitrary. Does not seem to be objective or valuse based. I have see poorly qualified individuals who add little to the University get recognized and receive accelerated promotions while individuals who add tremendous value to the institution go unrecognized with routine advancement. Simply put, the current system is broken and does not work.

I think the Personnel Committees are valuable. However, some regular merit actions could be reviewed by the unit/dean/Provost unless there are issues that require review by personnel committees (i.e. in cases where the candidate does not agree with the recommendation/ decision or difficult to evaluate merit packets).

No

I've been here for less than a year and have not had a personnel review yet. Just filling in this questionnaire perked up my curiosity to learn more about the process.

Until recently, in my program the Personnel Committee was composed almost exclusively of Continuing Lecturers. They read through entire files (including all teaching evaluations) and forwarded recommendations to the Program Committee, on which only Senate members were allowed to vote. In recent years, the Personnel Committee's recommendations have often been ignored/overturned by Senate faculty who--by their own admission--do NOT read through entire files. The Program Committee has 8-9 Senate members (three of whom are NOT in the program where those evaluated teach) and two NON-VOTING lecturers, who teach in the program. (I should say that Senate members often apply more lenient standards than did the lecturers' Personnel Committee, though they also look primarily at numerical student evaluations without attending to discursive evaluation comments, they don't look at grading practices, and they pay little attention to teaching materials.)
This year, the Director decided unilaterally to reconstitute the Personnel Committee. There is less lecturer involvement in the process (Last year's committee had 10 Continuing Lecturers and the Director; this year's committee has two lecturers and two Senate members. The workload for the committee is simply too large for a committee that small to complete all of the evaluative work done in the past.)

Ouside letters are no longer a true indicator of an honest and objective review-too much risk in writing a negative review

As a research scientist, the personnel process was unknown to me until promotion time. I belive that a mentoring system is needed to help AF members be more successful in the personnel process.

It would be useful to link to APM documents for each voting action as some series are

less common and have varying requirements to meet series merit/promotion guidelines.

I feel like I am expected to rubber stamp all actions to it's a almost meaningless exercise. but it allows me to see what others in the Federation are doing.

The peer review groups do not matter much in the review process. I feel it is a waste of my time serving on peer review groups.
Moreover, as long as the University does not provide direct salary support for people with Research titles in the Academic Federation, the merit review process is basically dependent on availability of funding and has no meaning. Even staff who qualify for a full merit advancement do not get one and sometimes have to go on less than full time salaries due to lack of funding. The mandatory merit review process forces some investigators to put staff on part-time due to lack of funding and increasing personnel costs.
Staff in the Professional Research titles should be provided some independent funding since they are being reviewed using the same criteria used for a Professor series, yet do not have the independence required of them. Only some kind of financial independence can engender academic independence and a chance for staff to show their own merit.

The standard for reviewing Academic Federation members should not follow the Academic Senate review process. We struggle to pay our salaries based on funded projects that go through rigorous peer reviews. Hence most of our time is allotted for proposal development and submission, research activities, and other priority tasks that provide the funding to sustain our position.

I am an Academic Coordinator II, and I have a Lecturer position (without salary) so that I can fulfill my job duties (which inlcude a lot of teaching). In my most recent review, my peer committee made strong recommendations for me to have a lecturer appointment with salary. However, this is to my disadvantage, and this recommendation has caused me some grief. If this actually happens (my department has taken steps to make this happen), I will need to complete two merit packets (one for each appointment), have to pay union dues (which I don't want to pay), accrue vacation and sick leave at a lower rate, and have my salary increases limited. Thanks, but no thanks!

No.

I have learned more by serving on peer review committees than simply by virtue of going through the process. This is because it exposes me to what others in my title series are doing, and how it is perceived by the committee. The benefits are two-fold: 1. It helps me to see the possibilities for my own work. 2. It is motivating to feel part of an esteemed group doing great work that I wouldn't otherwise hear about.

The system is a waste of time for everyone involved and can be summed up by "you

scratch my back, I'll scratch yours". In theory, it is a good idea, but in execution, it is very dependent on the ability of the candidate to self-promote. I have been disgusted by the inflation of responsibilities that I've seen in some candidate statements. As a reviewer, I often have no way of determining the reliability of the information provided. I think the voting needs to be more anonymous; I regularly abstain from voting for one of my peers for fear of creating tension in the group by voting no on the merit reviews. I have never received any feedback on my merit actions other than a final decision.

The process is completely disconnected from financial situations. It doesn't make sense to be giving raises if the group or program can't afford them.

No

I think the process is extremely valuable to the careers of AF members and strongly advocate for retaining the spirit of robust peer review.

Question 10 does not apply to librarian actions. The only thing librarians up for review see regarding their reviews is: Review Initiator (supervisor) letters, and redacted letters of recommendation, if requested. Our peer group is CAPA (which I have served on) but librarians do not see CAPA letters regarding their packet. We also do not see any feedback from the Academic Federation. Clarification of question 17: the librarian peer review is CAPA. CAPA reaches a consensus and writes a letter (individuals can also disagree and submit a minority opinion), so anyone serving on CAPA "votes" in that way.

The process seems fair, which is an important perception for faculty. It is also clear what are the requirments for success in terms of merits.

No

I strongly object to the number of Academic Senate Personnel on Academic Federation Committees; they often display a lack of understanding of Federation title positions and particularly a disdain for applied research and other than classroom teaching.

I have routinely never been provided more than 10 days notice of a review which often included 2 weekends and once I was out of the country on school business. Very ragged process and inconsiderate of one's time.

No

No.

I have been reviewed once and never received any feedback from the peer/voting

process.

This survey misses the mark, as far as I'm concerned. The issue is not peer review, it is the reversal of decisions made by AF lecturers who dominate in our departmental unit (UWP) by the Dean, as well as "non voting" rights at the AF level. In the UWP 5 Senate faculty vote; the AF Personnel Committee vote "is just a mark of endorsement" which is why having a dept. level review by peers is a waste of time. I'm concerned that your survey doesn't capture the unique problem of the UWP lecturers.

I have been forced to change titles once and subsequently have had a second change in title suggested. This is the result of a lack of a title that adequately describes what I do - run a research facility. I new title such as "Research Facility Administrator" with a new APM should be created.

No comments

I previously worked as an Academic Coordinator in the Humanities and no one in charge of my personnel process understood what a "peer" group was (e.g. my immediate supervisors who are faculty were on in instead of other Academic Coordinators across campus. This was in stark comparison to the personnel process i participated in, in which ALL of us in the group were Academic Coordinators. The comments we gave were thoughtful and informed whereas the ones I received were based on the Lecturer and tenured faculty who made up the majority of the peer group (small wonder the acceleration was denied).   I think it's very important that AF do outreach and mentoring to make sure that peer groups ARE peer groups.   Also, I had to find a mentor outside of my unit to help me put together a packet, I think it would be very helpful if AF helped identify a few mentors who could help folks like me who are new to the system.

Staff titles should not be able to review academic titles. Peer review committees, and the review of academics by academic titles is crucial to the workings of a research university.

We need to be given information about it, the first thing I knew about having to review other folks was when I was sent a packet. I had no idea what I was doing, even that it was required of me once I became a project scientist. The whole process needs to be explained.

Working from a position description, we are able to document our accomplishments much more effectively than members of the Academic Senate. The new Vault system of recording pubs is confusing and fails to recognize the value of all forms of outreach. The peer group in my department is quite small and would benefit from appointments from other departments.

Many candidates in the Project Scientist series are so subordinate to a single Senate PI that broader review for merit and promotion is essentially meaningless. Either the PI approves of their job performance and wants to fund them or they don't. The rest of us are in no position to say anything intelligent to the contrary. In many cases such review feels no different than reviewing someone else's Postdoctoral Fellow / Scholar which would be silly.
Federation review of other Federation packets remains extremely important. There is such a dizzying variety of job requirements in the Federation that it can't be left to Senate Faculty / Chair / Dean to keep them all straight. They rely heavily on the Federation to vet packets and make sure highly specialized but valued experts do not fall through the cracks.

While issues of promotion are complicated by issues of soft money vs. hard money salaries, the review process should really happen automatically. My department never lets me know if I am even eligible for promotion irrespective of whether there is money to pay the increased salary.

Since I have not seen the packet presentation style prior to the implementation of MyInfoVault, I can't comment on how it may have improved the process. My one concern is that it appears to be dependent upon the department the level of access a faculty member has to view and/or edit his or her vault. While we can view the final document and finalize it, it would provide additional peace of mind for individual faculty members to view their own vault and see how each piece of information is added and potentially make changes if needed.

Bylaw 55 creates significantproblems, because of the review by senate members. AF are usually regarded as second class citizens, and since we are primarily engaged in applied work, our efforts are not well appreciated by 'basic research' academics.

When there are only a few members in the voting group - one negative comment can be greatly amplified

no

I think research is over emphasized and extension is under rewarded.

No

I recognize that there is a great deal of information available both on-line and from our staff regarding the personnel process. However, the membership of the Acad. Federation are so disparate and often isolated that clear understanding of the personnel process is often incomplete. Individuals would benefit from peer group meetings early in their appointments to outline expectations. Peer group involvement clearly is helpful to clarify the process and avoid pitfalls. One should not get to the point of filing for

personnel action when they first look at requirements for advancement; unfortunately I believe this happens all too often. Involvement early on with review of others personnel actions would be helpful to any Acad Fed member. I recommend that face-to-face meetings be held, not just email or web-based information distribution. Such meetings need not be one-on-one, but could be based around the peer review group. Strong encouragement to attend would be needed.

Other UC campuses do not have the extra AF layer to factor into what is already a complex, and increasingly so with the new LX MOU, personnel review environment. I philosophically feel that the peer review process for librarians should be consistent across all UC campuses and that the AF should not be part of that process. In addition, I have strong concerns about the individuals, with the best intentions, from other series reviewing librarians who have unique and fast-changing jobs.

As I am so new to the position I have no insights at this time.

I am in the School of Medicine, and believe that only votes from Academic Senate members are counted. Votes from members of the AF are considered advisory. This is not ideal, since AS members do not always understand the AF titles and responsibilities.

personnel committee can serve a useful
purpose or do just the opposite - it depends on the makeup of the committees -
which varies every year and can produce
uneven and sometime unfair results

I am currently serving on a peer/voting committee but have not participated in the process yet.

One of the hallmarks of academic life is peer review. Our transition from the bachelor's level to the Master's and PhD is through the review (at that point called an exam) of our senior peers, our major academic output in the form of papers is peer review, our merit and promotions are peer reviewed. In many ways peer review is a major criterion that delineates the difference between academic and staff positions. I believe that if the peer review process for Academic Federation titles is weakened or eroded this will be a backward step for non-senate academics at UC Davis and is 180 degrees from the longterm effort the Federation has been making to get more Federation Titles recognized with PI status, etc. If the Federation is going to do away with the peer review process I believe that the difference between Federation titles and staff titles becomes thin enough to be found irrelevant. What will define the difference between a non-senate academic position and a staff position?

Obtaining relevant peer and voting groups of AF members who are versed in my area of work continues to be a challenge. As a result, votes on my actions are primarily

composed of votes of AS faculty in my unit with just 1 or 2 AF votes. This does not seem ideal.

ok

No.

We review way too many people, way too often, wasting huge amounts of time. This is especially true for individuals on soft money or otherwise employed at the will of a sponsoring PI. If they are bringing in money and meeting expectations, what is the additional purpose of academic review. We should be trusting department chairs to make routine merit decisions, and saving extended processes for those cases that are truly in question.

unclear what is the peer group those in the Adjunct Professor series are compared to. What is their metric relative to tenure track positions?

NO

I think requiring a full packet, peer review, director's letter of recommendation, federation review, and Dean's approval for a routine (3% step increase) merit is not a good use of everyone's time. That process should be streamlined. I agree that the broad review is appropriate for promotions.

'adjunct' status in SOM is a joke and should be done away with. There is no support to help young adjunct professors progress through the ranks and very little chance of maintaining a career due to difficulty in optaining sufficient funding

No

Many senior level faculty are unfamiliar with what proper rank/ pathway would be recommended for individual faculty. This led directly to me missing a promotion, as the advice I was given was inaccurate. There should be some direct guidance for Faculty to understand the proper pathways and the subsequent economic and academic impact these choices will have. One-on-one counseling every 3-4 years would be helpful. Mass lectures are impossible for Clinical Faculty to attend due to financial pressures. Relying on Chairs and financial officers is not reliable, and has the chance of inappropriate information solely based upon the financial standing of the department.

I am new to the University. I would like to be asked to be on a review commitee so I know how I'm being evaluated.

Nothing.

For the librarians, we do not receive comments from our voting group or from the AF, so these questions don't apply.

None

The way that publications are categorized in the new MIV system is not helpful for Specialists in Cooperative Extension because there is no place for peer reviewed leaflets, bulletins and books, which are an important component of our job.

Cancel it. Most AF members are even worse than ladder rank faculty in evaluating other AF members. Many regular faculty loathe the Professional Researchers titles series (and sometimes also adjunct faculty) and will do anything to get rid of people with that title in their department. Most other AF titles are held by people at the service of ladder rank faculty in their departments. The department faculty and Dean's office should do the personnel reviews.

At least in the Academic Coordinator track the jobs are so varied that it's impossible to understand the spectrum of activity and success that are possible for any given position. It makes evaluating others really difficult. My job has only one or two equivalents systemwide making it somewhat pointless to compare within the campus.

The fact that I have to highlight my contribution in EACH paper it is a tremendous waste of time. I see other colleagues' promotion packet and what they   write about their contributions is something quite far from the truth, nevertheless they are promoted, showing to me that nobody takes seriously the task of reading those packages. It will be more practical to cite the papers that we produce without itemizing our contribution.

I think the process should include a signed statement by each peer group or other group member that they will review the package without bias. They need to agree to do this in writing. It should not be assumed.

I think peer review is an essential component of an academic personnel review. If anything, I think that the views of the AF personnel committees should be given more weight.
When everything goes smoothly, it often appears that Peer reviews are little more than rubber-stamps. But when there is a disagreement between the subject of the review and one or more of the administrative reviewers, the peer committee provides an essential perspective that may counter or reinforce that held by the administrative reviewers. Please do not eliminate this step which is essential to maintain the integrity of the reviews in the name of efficiency.

please make it more transparent, I have no idea how it works, and the website is not very helpful at all.

None

the process would be more helpful if the preaparation process took into better account the variety of work done by members instead of trying to force the categorization into older models of teaching acitiity and scholarship especially

I think the process at UC Davis is a lot more burdensome than at other UC's.

I don't know much about the process or he personnel committee, so it is difficult to address the questions in this survey.

The AF Personnel Committee librarian members should receive the same training as the LAUC-D CAPA members about the review process. When there are changes happening at the last minute or in mid-stream, such as this year's MOU ratification, it would be helpful to have both groups receive the same training on review procedures for this year's reviews.

No

It is unfair that Academic Senate members can vote on my merit or promotion while I cannot vote on there packets as a Academic Federation. Despite my inability to vote, I am expected to comment on these packets.

I don't think the comments from the reviewed are shard with us. We get a letter from the Associate Dean, that's it.
The preparation of the dossier can be very time consuming and we get little feedback on most of our work.

It works quite well in our department because we follow the union contract closely.

I received conflicting information/advice from my immediate supervisor and from the personnell review: the most frustrating part was getting negative feedback from personnell by complying with my supervisor. While I find useful the reflection required of me as part of the process, I wonder whether it's productive to have an annual review every year.

no

No

The voting process should be anonymous.

Academic Personnel MAnual defines Criteria for evaluation of the Project Scientist series. Here is a quote:
"a) Demonstrated significant, original, and creative contributions to a research or creative program or project.
b) Professional competence and activity.
Appointees in this series need not demonstrate the same independence or scholarly breadth as members of the Professor or Professional Research series. University and public service are encouraged but not required."
To this end, I have a major concern regarding the review process
1) In my experience, JCP interpretation of these criteria overemphasizes the number of peer-reviewed journal publications, which are not among the APM criteria for this position title. The required "significant, original, and creative contributions to a research or creative program or project" can be made in many way other ways. Are JPC members instructed to follow the above criteria from the APM?
2) Different projects have different dynamics and technical complexity and it greatly varies across disciplines and projects, even within the same Department. When a Project Scientist is a part of a large team working on the same project, the group produces a large number of shared papers. In other cases, a Project Scientist has a very unique expertise and works independently, which means they have to do pretty much everything on their own: proposal writing, project/expense management, presentations, programming, data analysis, product development, outreach, and, of course journal and conference papers etc. In this case, I believe it is to fare to measure a candidate's contribution by against say, an average number of papers published by a Project Scientist in my Department. What relative weights does the JPC assign to a written proposal and a received $500,000 grant (none of which are among evaluation criteria for this title) versus a published journal paper (which is not a required evaluation criterion, either).
A candidate should have the right to obtain detailed information about the *actual* procedures and criteria used by JCP to evaluate his/her case. For example, in case of a negative merit/promotion decision: what was the basis for the JCP to conclude that the overall contribution [as per a)] and/or competence [as per b)] are insufficient?

due to AF personnel process I got to
Prof VII salary level...a great way to move up without having to move from job to job

The only reason I noted "no opinion" on Question 10 is because I have never seen the peer or voting group comments on my review process (and I've been through 2 review processes now). I imagine that it WOULD indeed be very helpful to see these. I only had brief verbal interaction with my supervisor who shared a few general comments that had been submitted, but I never saw any written comments.
I also feel it is helpful to have at least some members in the peer group who are more personally familiar with the candidate, since many "accomplishments" are difficult to judge otherwise, especially non-publication accomplishments, such as public

presentations, meeting facilitation, etc. for which the quality of the work is as important as the quantity. I was on a peer group for someone with whom I had no familiarity at all, and it was impossible to judge many of his activities, such as trainings he had organized, etc.

The details of the role of academic federation are poorly disseminated and new staff's involvement is undefined.

## Question 20: **Is there anything else you'd like us to know about your review actions?**

No.

I would like to see a clearer understanding on the part of the Academic Affairs Vice-Provost's office regarding the rights of AF members as academic appointees as spelled out in the APM. I would also like the AS to be consulted, as necessary, to ensure that the review process for AF members remains fair.

n/a

No

System-wide Rules and Jurisdiction ruled that lecturers may be voting members of personnel committees (delegated by Academic Senate faculty), but our dean has refused to recognize this and maintains that lecturers' voting on personnel actions is not permitted.

I am actually not sure I got feedback from the AF. I get a letter from the SOM, but I am unclear about the AF review process

It seems that the packet assembly is now dominated by the staff people who interface with MIV and that MIV has resulted in less acknowledgement of items that don't fit neatly into its boxes. In my school all of this is centralized by the Deans office.
This is a real problem for the grants and contracts section. Especially if you are an AF researcher on large grants with multiparts- such as center grants or program projects. Two examples: I have been in the past a leader of a project on a multi project center. Each project is as large or larger than an R01. I wrote the project, it received its own fundable score in grant review. But only the center director is listed as PI because my project is part of a larger center grant. IN the second example, I am a PI on two grants from NIH through the multi-PI mechanism. Yes there are two PIs on these grants BUT We are NOT co-PIs. coPI is a term that is not recognized by NIH. Yet MIV has no way to recognize this sort of mechanism and the staff who go through my packet keep

changing it to coPI when it should be PI.

I have had MIV remove my candidates statement from my packet due to some software glitch after the entire packet was approved by me with the statement in place. The only way I became aware of this was when a colleague asked me why on earth I would send a packet forward without a statement! I can't see what was sent or when to be sure that this doesn't happen again.

Finally, there have been problems/arguments with the personnel who enter the packet information about what is and what is not appropriate to include. This included at the time of my promotion a desire to limit the amount of teaching that was reported as just the last 2 years. While this may be suitable for faculty with heavy teaching loads, it is not sufficient for promotion of AF faculty with lighter loads. Further, there is a very strict adherence to the position description as being all encompassing and limiting as to what can be considered or included in a packet for merit and promotion. This has resulted in items that are not listed as being deemed inappropriate to include. Clarification is needed for staff so that they understand that the basic description is required but that extra items that demonstrate professional competence in the broadest sense, should also be included.

Finally, I have seen erosion of peer review at my dept level. I do not think the dept even knows that there is such as thing as a peer and voting group plan. A new temp secretary assigned the peer review groups and they included fewer individuals than the previous groups. The rationale was that she did not want to go to the extra effort of trying to coordinate with another person from another department. It needs to be made clear to depts that peer and voting groups are decided by the dept, including at least, the chair.

OK yes there is one more issue. There was a peer and voting group that was formed for a full title prof researcher in my dept. This peer group included 2 af members who are housed, and funded by, the member being reviewed. I pointed this out as a possible conflict of interest and the dept staff member told me that there was no policy that prohibited this action from going forward. Again, I think this is a busy staff person who doesn't want to make the effort to go find more people.

---

It is not that clear from the APMs how your merit or promotion is actually approved.

---

No.

---

n/a

---

---

Yes, our review actions are repeatedly scrutinized by AS members who have different performance expectations and job requirements. I find it frustrating and somewhat insulting that we are judged by AS members who may not have any idea of what we do on a daily basis.

Also, I was essentially forced out of a previous position by a colleague who was hired several years after I had been hired. When I asked to be moved to a different area within my unit (which was approved by my supervisor) I was given a letter of expectations with new performance requirements, including time I owed to the hospital. I was also told that I would be required to generate a certain amount of income for the hospital (~$300,000.00/year) for me to keep my position. I have repeatedly tried speaking with my supervisors (hospital director, department chair and even the vice chancellor's office) for clarification on this issue but everyone just tells me not to worry and that I am doing fine. However, this does not generate security in me.

I'm in the UWP and the ratio of senate to federation is untenable in terms of merit reviews. The federation personnel committee is advisory only and so 5 senate faculty are in charge of reviewing 50+ non-senate faculty. Not only does it seem impossible that they could give our files close consideration but the gulf between us and them is widening so much that the idea that this is peer review is outdated.

My experiences in the M&P process will cause me to retire earlier than I normally would have.

The last time I submitted my review package, which failed in the Joint Committee by a 4-2 vote, with two members absent, it cost me 25 percent of my off-scale salary. That is not appropriate for failing to "meet the grade" for advancement. It was unjustly punitive. I will be retiring soon, with a sour taste in my mouth toward this process.

No

I received nothing in the way of instructions on preparing my merit packet. Having reviewed two academic federation appointment reviews, I structured my package like that, then found out that was not at all what was expected. I ended up spending a lot of time crafting it (it ended up being significantly longer than my collaboraitng PI's package as an assistant professor.) Lot's of time on my end- and now it's been more than 2 months and I haven't heard anything about it. I don't even know what the possible outcomes are- will this move me up from Asst. Proj Scientist to another step, or some sub-step? I've jumped through the hoop, so hopefully it will be worth it in some way.

My review actions have been fair so far.

continue

The dean of HARCS does not value lecturers and hence there have been very few accelerations in my unit--and HARCS in general. This is despite the fact that many times the peers groups have given unanimous (or near unanimous) support for these actions.

NA

Now that I have been here several years, it is fairly easy to prepare my package but the first two or three times I prepared a package, especially for my promotion, there was little guidance and a lot of stress.

What review actions?

For the most part the the VP for AA and the Dir AELR have been interested in supporting the administrative structure (Library Administration) and not interested in a clean, efficient and unbiased system. The previous VP for AA was clearly anti-AF and the Dir AELR does not understand the concept of an academic appointment. The Dir AELR served as the council for the person of the VP for AA rather than the office. Her personal loyalty rather than professional service as council hindered her ability to provide good legal service and she ended up spending a good deal of time pursuing actions that were petty and vindictive. The current AV for AA does not seem to share the anti-AF bias of the previous holder of this office.

I have had my merit denied on two occasions (2011 and 2012). After the last denial, I submitted an appeal in which I believe I met 7 of 8 criteria set forth on a now missing web document. I demonstrated this in my appeal with letters of support from my fellow researches. The one criteria in which I fell short was that I only had one publication in which I was not first author. Based on APM311 it seems as though the JPC has a very narrow interpretation of the two criteria set forth for merit review. I feel that JPC needs to more critically review merit documents rather than seemingly rely on publication record alone. An example of this is that they also curiously said there was no clear documentation of a NIH grant I received. I have been told that providing the NIH grant number is sufficient and that secondary documentation is not necessary. The JPC with a little research could have verified the grant from the grant number, if they did not believe my reporting.

Results made known to voters.

This year was the first year I used MyInfoVault. It was an upper level review and 12 years of data needed input. WHAT A WASTE OF TIME and what a horrible unfriendly system that favors senate faculty in the way it is set up. I have a strong package but nearly gave up and deferred the action it was so frustrating. Lack of knowledgable support staff and unjustifiable stubbornness on their behalf also added to the stress level. At some level I spent more than 8 months working on this. For what? My time would have been better spent doing my job. I realize this is not an AF issue but rather a system wide issue. The whole process left a bad taste. Thanks for letting me vent a little.

Read and act on the Goldman report.

| |
|---|
| Not really. |
| no |
| Every year for 6 years we go up for reappointment. If granted, we earn the right to work one more year in our Pre-Six Lecturer position. |
| I have never had any complaints about the review process on my actions. |
| No |
| I have not gone through this process at UC Davis but have gone through it at another campus. At that campus I received much better support from Staff to prepare documents. These were acted upon without the overhead of peer review that is done here and it seem to have gone well. |
| No |
| n/a |
| no. |
| I have recently submitted by second dossier for review, so I have not used MIV enough to have an opinion. I received no feedback on my first review cycle. |
| Requiring arm length letters of recommendations for appointments and promotions - and so many of them- for some of the titles (i.e. research titles: Project Scientist, Specialist) is unreasonable. Requiring 5 or more arm length letters of recommendations for someone who is at the full title and has already proved that he/she has a solid record of productivity and has advanced through the merit process is also ridiculous. If a Professional Researcher has gotten to the full title and has grants as PI or Co-PI, what more prove of national recognition does he/she needs? In my view, it is just a waste of time for everyone (including the administrative personnel in the department) sending out 10 requests for letters of recommendations, reminding people, and waiting for them to come back, etc. |
| No |
| The HARCS Dean has decided that the ONLY grounds for acclerated merit are publications in the field (which she defines quite narrowly) or a teaching award. She has also said that all service is voluntary and therefore cannot be presented as grounds for a merit, no matter how extraordinary the service is and no matter how well-received publications are. (Lecturers who have received national attention for their service |

and/or publications have been denied accelerated merit.)
Lecturers in my program have traditionally one lots of service both on campus and externally, and there has sometimes seemed to be an expectation of service. But with the Dean's proclamation that all service is PURELY voluntary--and with the tacit statements that no lecturer service is truly valued, the long-standing tradition of service is about to die.

More resources needed to use as a model for personal statements

no

Seeing what others do, I feel there is a lack of equity in job duties versus pay in my job class and I will ask to have my appt looked at for equity.

In my most recent review, I requested a regular merit, and was awarded a two-step increase.

No.

The process greatly hinders hiring. We lost a candidate that we wanted to hire waiting for the review process to be completed. It is very awkward to make a job offer to someone without providing a salary offer and a start date because you have to wait for the review process to be completed to find out that information.

Still difficult for AF members to be recognized as independent researchers when they collaborate or are associated with AS members. This makes it more difficult for AF merits and promotion.

No

I would have answered more than one choice in #6. I have deferred a merit action twice - once because of the time committment and a personal leave, and because of a lack of funding.

no

Although the process may be cumbersome, I cannot suggest an alternative. The system at other institutions where the Dept Head makes all merit decisions unilaterally is rather unsettling.

No

Tough cumbersome the process is fair.

| |
|---|
| No |
| No. |
| No comments |
| I really appreciate that every two years I have the chance to demonstrate my work and be compensated for achievements. |
| As the administration attempts to erode the professional standards of the Library, Librarians need the support of the academic federation. |
| Preparing a packet for review is even more time consuming than usual because of the need to enter accomplishments one at a time rather than use more efficient methods, like cut and paste. |
| Many, many people complain that MIV is cumbersome despite the fact that it more or less works and provides a valuable function. The complaining comes from the fact that departments are increasingly offloading the onerous task of entering data into MIV onto faculty and staff. Please solve this problem by investing more school / department level resources into MIV data entry-- e.g., provide some % of an FTE to each department for this purpose. (And, continuing to invest in making MIV faster / easier to use) |
| Lack of university funds for travel and professional development really undermines the university's commitment to AF members as professionals. |
| Just to clarify, I have been retired for nearly 3 years, in part due to funding difficulties, but I am still employed part time so some of my answers reflect my current status, e.g, to my knowledge I am no longer eligible for promotion. |
| Have been a recipient of the usual departmental politics. Seems like high school sometimes, except that high school was more fun. |
| I find MyInfoVault very tailored to senate packages and not well suited to capturing Extension activities and programs |
| no |
| No |
| no. |

n/a

Again, as I am a new member I have so little experience that I have no real opinion yet. I am sure I will develop one in subsequent years.

I don't really understand the process

I have seen both very good and very bad results come out of the peer review process - I am very torn between recommending continuing them or not.
Question 14 = mixed opinion for me, not no opinion.

I believe that peer groups and voting groups would benefit from having an example letter library to make the task of writing review letters a bit easier. One of the reasons that it is often hard to find chairs for peer groups is that it falls to the chair to write the letter. For those of us who have written many of these letters we build our own library or we get examples from more experienced colleagues. Dealing with a blank page is often a time-sink that is a disincentive for newer Federation members. Seeing a couple of examples often suggests how to get the writing rolling and makes the task much less onerous.

ok

Complicated situation - our funding agency (DOE) is averse to funding senior researchers attached to universities, and I am not based on campus so I do not feel the benefits of being part of the university community.

I've gotten regular merits/promotions since I've been here, with no problems. But no matter how much I work or how good I do, it's never enough for personnel committees who always find things to ding you for no matter what. We need a personnel process that actually rewards and appreciates people for their efforts.

My Deferral request was due in large part to my developing a serious life-threatening illness requiring surgery

NO

reviewing status of employees that are year to year (as adjuncts are) is a waste of time. If no funding = no job, so what is the point of going through a review process

I appreciate my colleagues feedback and the opportunity to have some unit control over the merit review process. The issues I have are more on the administrative side. Organization of artifacts, timelines, processing of dossier packet, actual approval process and the appropriate "new placement on the pay scale" have been disorganized

| |
|---|
| leading to confusion and on occasion a delay of raises. |
| No |
| No. |
| Nothing. |
| No |
| Has all gone fairly smoothly. Have not used MIV yet. |
| None |
| There is substantial variation in the way Departments carry out reviews and their standards. I think the Academic Federation Committees do a good job of evening this out. |
| My personal experience taught me the review process can easily be manipulated by department chairs who can populate a peer review committee with a certain outcome in mind. The whole process then becomes a joke. |
| no |
| The candidate should get a check list of all the steps so that they are not blind-sighted by missing steps or incorrect processes that were missed. I have received 8 merit actions (two promotions) and every time a mistake was made. Most of this would have been prevented if there was a check list of each step--beginning with: Is there a current position description on file? Is it signed and dated? (YES!! This was a problem in ALL of my promotions!) |
| None |
| no |
| No |
| The criteria for accelerated merits has never been issued by the administration. Through experience, in Letters and Science, we have learned that these are granted only if a lecturer publishes a textbook in the area of teaching or if a lecturer wins the Federation Excellence in Teaching Award. Over the past ten years or so, however, there have been other reasons that accelerations were granted. At times, it has seemed arbitrary. |

| |
|---|
| Thanks for your work on this. |
| no |
| NO |
| it took 7 months after I submitted my dossier |
| My department (ETOX) and school (AG) are very accommodating to AF personnel |
| For the merit action currently under review, my department proposed that I receive an acceleration. I didn't ask for it, and was surprised to learn about it. I'm curious to see what the Dean's Office will do... |
| The details of the role of academic federation are poorly disseminated and new staff's involvement is undefined. |

**Office of the Vice Provost-Academic Personnel**

---

## NASH-GOLDMAN REPORT

---

### Summary of Recommendations:
### Committee to Evaluate Campus Personnel Reviews of Academic Federation Titles

In the Spring quarter of 1998 Harvey Himelfarb, who was then Vice Provost--Academic Planning and Personnel, appointed a six-member committee charged with evaluating the campus procedures used in personnel reviews of Academic Federation titles and recommending specific changes to relevant policies and procedures.

Overall, the Committee was surprised and disquieted by the extent to which Academic Federation personnel actions (both appointments and merit/promotion actions) were characterized by a lack of knowledge about and/or inadequate and inappropriate position expectations, review criteria, and review procedures. In addition, the Committee was struck by the degree to which peer review, a hallmark of personnel reviews for the Academic Senate, was absent for Academic Federation reviews, particularly in several specific title series. Finally, the Committee noted several important areas in which APM policy and guidelines are absent or contrary to superseding documents. All these situations seem to require actions.

### *I. General Recommendations*

The following recommendation apply to personnel actions in all Academic Federation title series:

*Recommendation 1:* The Office of the Vice Provost should institute a series of annual workshops for key unit personnel (unit heads, MSOs, etc.) at which both permissible and inappropriate appointment practices and criteria for retention and advancement in each of the Federation title series are discussed. These workshops should include guidance for the appointment process when there is not a complete or good fit between the position expectations and the proposed title series.

*Recommendation 2:* Increasing understanding about appropriate appointment and review procedures and review criteria for Federation titles should be addressed at several levels, including the unit level and by the Academic Federation as an organization, which has a responsibility to serve its members. The goal should be to: 1) improve the level of information that each person who is a candidate for appointment and/or review has about the position expectations at the time of appointment/reappointment; and 2) to improve the candidate's understanding about necessary information and evidence he/she should include in his/her submitted review materials.

*Recommendation 3:* Require an annual meeting between each Federation appointee and his/her unit head (or an appropriate responsible officer designated by the unit head) to reconfirm or to modify the appointee's position description and criteria for advancement. A signed copy of each memorandum thus formulated during the period under review should be a prominent feature of every personnel file (e.g. the first page of the dossier) at each stage of the proceedings.

*Recommendation 4:* Require, as the first step in any personnel action, that unit heads familiarize Federation appointees with the detailed review procedures to be followed at the unit level and beyond. At a minimum, candidates should be told of the general characteristics, and where possible the exact composition of the group of individuals who will be voting on the case at the unit level.

*Recommendation 5:* The Academic Federation should continue and expand its practice of offering annual workshops at which both the review process and permissible and inappropriate criteria for retention and advancement in each of the Federation title series are discussed.

*Recommendation 6:* Provide most if not all of the members of the Academic Federation who could logically be termed "career employees" (for example, those who have been a UCDavis employee for 5 years or longer at 50 percent time or more) regular opportunities to review the personnel files of others. Inclusion in this process is an effective way to educate junior Federation employees about the culture and expectations of the review process. This experience would be particularly valuable at a time when the "reviewer" is a year or so away from becoming a "reviewee."

*Recommendation: 7:* Academic Federation title holders (including prospective appointees) should be evaluated at the unit level by peer groups, which (as custom and circumstance might dictate) should involve Federation members in the same title series. In some instances this might require that a unit head recruit reviewers from elsewhere-- presumably on a quid-pro-quo basis, and/or to define the "peer group" more broadly as an affinity group which would include those with similar qualifications and duties to the candidate.

*Recommendation 8:* The data gathered indicated that, in some units, the chair appoints one or more ad-hoc committees to review Federation members and report their findings either to the entire unit or to the chair alone, as unit preferences or MOU's may require/allow. It is recommended that all units adopt this practice unless more widespread consultation is the desired departmental norm.

## II A. Title-Specific Findings and Recommendations:

for the Administrative, Teaching, Clinical, and Experiment Station title series

**Academic Administrator Series:**

*Recommendation 9:* The unit head has the primary responsibility for assessing an Academic Administrator's performance, but the review process should include a mechanism for obtaining the opinions of other members of the unit wherever possible.

*Recommendation 10:* Implement the general recommendations 1-9, and poll unit heads and incumbents regarding the efficacy of the procedures that were followed after one full review cycle.

*Recommendation 11:* The Committee recommends that the UCD APM for this title series include the following statement from Academic Senate regulation 750: "Individuals in this title series who are assigned research or instructional duties will be required to hold a dual title."

**Academic Coordinator Series:**

*Recommendation 12:* The unit head has the primary responsibility for assessing an Academic Coordinator's performance, but the review process should include a mechanism for obtaining the opinions of other members of the unit

*Recommendation 13:* Implement the general guidelines and recommendation of this report, and poll unit heads and incumbents regarding the efficacy of the procedures that were followed, after one full review cycle.

**Agronomist Series:**

*Recommendation 14:* The recommendation to include detailed position descriptions at the beginning of the dossier appears to be especially pertinent for this title. This practice should guide reviewers to an appropriate assessment of each individual's achievements. In addition, it appears to the Committee that it would be prudent to re-visit how well the personnel process is operating for the series after the recent UCD APM revisions have been operative for a year or two.

**Clinical Professor:**

*Recommendation 15:* Building on the current "Guidelines" for this series, the Committee urges the campus to add to the UCD APM, a section for Clinical Professors as soon as possible. Such a document should include a requirement for the Committee on Academic Personnel to participate in, at least, the review of appointments and promotions to the Associate and Full ranks of this series.

**Cooperative Extension Specialist:**

*Recommendation 16:* The Vice Provost, together with appropriate representatives from the Agricultural Experiment Station, should post-audit a reasonable number of Cooperative Extension Specialist personnel actions to determine if their perception of

maltreatment, at both the unit and campuswide levels has validity, and if so, suggest appropriate corrective measures.

**Lecturer:**

*Recommendation 17:* It is strongly recommended that the campus consider reinstating the use of the Senior Lecturer (w/o SOE) title for selected individuals who have provided long (measured in decades) and exemplary service to the campus. If instituted, these advancements should be viewed as academic promotions with the formal involvement of CAP.

*Recommendation 18:* In the general case, teams including departmental peers or members of an appropriate affinity group should evaluate the performance of Lecturers (ideally via direct observation). The cadre of lecturers is so large that there is simply no excuse for not doing so. In addition, everyone who serves on one of these teams should be privy to the contents of the resulting letter of evaluation. (Such is not currently the universal practice.)

*Recommendation 19:* It is recommended that, in consultation with CAP and representative department chairs, the campus develop norms for establishing the initial salaries of individuals in the Lecturer series.

*Recommendation 20:* The campus should require reviews of members of this series at regular intervals.

**Supervisor of Teacher Education**

*Recommendation 21:* It is recommended that this title series be codified in the campus' APM. This would serve to standardize the review process, particularly outside of the academic unit where persons in this series reside.

*II B. Title-Specific Findings and Recommendations:*

for the Research Title Series

**Adjunct Professor Series:**

*Recommendation 22:* It is recommended that units afford their Adjunct faculty franchised participation in the personnel reviews of other Adjuncts and other Federation appointees housed therein to the same degree afforded Academic Senate faculty members at the same rank and step.

*Recommendation 23:* CAP, which oversees promotions in this series, may wish to post-audit some Adjunct-series merit actions to see if this notion has any validity.

**Professional Research:**

*Recommendation 24:* At the time of appointment, offices and review bodies at the college and campus levels should confirm that the Professional Research title is being appropriately used.

*Recommendation 25:* The campus should require regular reviews of members of this series at intervals no greater than five calendar years independently of the scope of the appointment.

**Specialist**

*Recommendation 26:* Position descriptions and reviews of persons in this title series should be reviewed for consistency with APM 330.

*II C. Long-standing Issues of Appropriate Use of Research Titles*

*Recommendation 27:* The Committee recommends that the campus use the Research Professor title for persons to conduct truly independent research and who are funded completely by extramural sources.

*Recommendation 28:* The Committee recommends that the Office of the Vice-Provost convene a taskforce for the purpose of developing a position paper to guide the campus' use of titles in the research series. This position paper should include:

> a. Recommendations for the appropriate use of the Adjunct Professor, Professional Research and Specialist research titles on the UCD campus so that appointments into these titles differentiate between individuals with truly independent research programs that are funded largely by their own efforts and those who are critical components of long term research projects funded and administered primarily by others and research title(s); and

> b. Suggest revisions and additions to the appropriate sections of the campus' APM sections in light of the findings, suggestions, and recommendations presented in this section of the report and by the taskforce.

*III. Policy Recommendation*

*Recommendation 29:* The Committee recommends that the Office of the Vice Provost appoint a joint Academic Federation and Academic Senate Committee to address the issues identified in this Report regarding Point 4 a-f of APM-220A Exhibit D.

---

*Introduction:*

In the Spring quarter of 1998 Harvey Himelfarb, who was then Vice Provost--Academic Planning and Personnel, appointed a six-member committee charged with evaluating the campus procedures used in personnel reviews of Academic Federation titles and recommending specific changes to relevant policies and procedures.

On June 12, 1998, the Committee had an orientation meeting with Himelfarb, his successor, Barry Klein, and Dennis Shimek, Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources. We met another half-dozen times over the summer, with variable attendance as members' schedules permitted, and five more times during the fall and spring quarters. The committee co-chairs also met once with Steve Blank, the Academic Federation Faculty Assistant to the Vice Provost, and most recently with Blank and Vice Provost Klein.

Between meetings, several committee members interviewed individuals from a number of Federation title series and presented their findings to the group. In mid-September the committee devised a questionnaire that was e-mailed to all the Federation members whose addresses were on file in the Academic Senate office. The returns were somewhat disappointing in number but not in content. We attribute the shortfall mainly to the timing of the survey. The interviews were conducted and questionnaires distributed in an attempt to identify personnel issues about which the Committee was unaware or missed in its review of materials. The information gathered was used to extend it knowledge and provide examples of issues described in this report.

In the following sections, the Committee presents its findings, conclusions, and recommendations derived from the questionnaire data and its research, review, and debate about the elements included in its charge. In the first section of this report are general observations, guiding principles, and recommendations that are applicable to virtually all title series in the Academic Federation, followed by ones that are more title-specific.

## Guiding Principles for and General Findings about Academic Federation Personnel Actions

Overall, the Committee was surprised and disquieted by the extent to which Academic Federation personnel actions (both appointments and merit/promotion actions) were characterized by a lack of knowledge about and/or inadequate and inappropriate position expectations, review criteria, and review procedures. In addition, the Committee was struck by the degree to which peer review, a hallmark of personnel reviews for the Academic Senate, was absent for Academic Federation reviews, particularly in several specific title series. Finally, the Committee noted several important areas in which APM policy and guidelines are absent or contrary to superseding documents. All these situations seem to require actions.

*I. General Findings and Recommendations*

*A. Understanding and implementing personnel policies and practices*

The level of understanding of Academic Federation personnel policies and practices--particularly position expectations and appropriate review criteria and procedures--among department chairs/unit heads, MSOs, and incumbents in Academic Federation titles at the unit level is both uneven and inadequate. Through its work, the Committee became aware of enough examples to indicate that the issue is not an isolated one. For example, there were reports of unit heads who sought evidence of teaching from or even assigned teaching duties to individuals in title series for which there is no such expectation mentioned in the APM. For others, position descriptions included the development of an independent program of research and extra mural funding for title series that do not include those activities in the APM and are clearly intended to support the research enterprise rather than develop it.

Finally, the Committee noted with concern the number of questionnaire respondents who indicated little or no knowledge about the criteria or processes used to conduct their own personnel actions. It is inappropriate for any incumbent to be uninformed about his/her position expectations or review procedures. Part of the explanation for failures to convey this information could be ignorance on the part of the department/unit administrator and/or staff.

There are department/unit heads, MSOs and other staff members who are knowledgeable about appropriate appointment procedures and review criteria and procedures for Federation titles and implement appropriate practice at the unit level. However, there are far too many cases for which this is not the case. The following six recommendations are made to correct these inadequacies:

*Recommendation 1-6:*

1. The Office of the Vice Provost should institute a series of annual workshops for key unit personnel (unit heads, MSOs, etc.) at which both permissible and inappropriate appointment practices and criteria for retention and advancement in each of the Federation title series are discussed. These workshops should include guidance for the appointment process when there is not a complete or good fit between the position expectations and the proposed title series.

2. The goal of increased understanding about appropriate appointment and review procedures and review criteria for Federation titles should be addressed at several levels, including the unit level and by the Academic Federation as an organization, which has a responsibility to serve its members. The goal should be to improve: 1) the level of information that each person who is a candidate for appointment and/or review has about the position expectations at the time of appointment/reappointment; and 2) the candidate's understanding about necessary information and evidence he/she should include in his/her submitted review materials.

3. Require an annual meeting between each Federation appointee and his/her unit head (or an appropriate responsible officer designated by the unit head) to reconfirm or to modify the appointee's position description and criteria for advancement. A signed copy of each memorandum thus formulated during the period under review should be a prominent feature of every personnel file (e.g. the first page of the dossier at each stage of the proceedings).

4. Require that as the first step in the personnel review process, unit heads familiarize Federation appointees with the detailed review procedures to be followed at the unit level and beyond. At a minimum, candidates should be told of the general characteristics, and where possible the exact composition of the group of individuals who will be voting on the case at the unit level.

5. The Academic Federation should continue and expand its practice of offering annual workshops at which both the review process and permissible and inappropriate criteria for retention and advancement in each of the Federation title series are discussed.

6. Provide most if not all of the members of the Academic Federation who could logically be termed "career employees" (for example, those who have been a UC Davis employee for 5 years or longer at 50 percent time or more) regular opportunities to review the personnel files of others. Inclusion in this process is an effective way to educate junior Federation employees about the culture and expectations of the review process. This experience would be particularly valuable at a time when the "reviewer" is a year or so away from becoming a "reviewee."

*B. Peer Review*

The Committee believes that peer review is an important component for all personnel actions. The creation of an understanding of responsibilities of a faculty appointment; the context in which the duties are performed; and the standards for meritorious achievement are benefits of peer review that the Academic Senate understands and values in its review process. Both the mission of the campus and the members of the Federation will be well served by building this important component into the review of each Academic Federation member.

The degree to which academic departments/units currently include peers in the personnel reviews of Academic Federation members varies widely depending on the predilections of the unit head, the unit culture, and the title series being reviewed. Most lecturers and Supervisors of Teacher Education are reviewed at the unit level according to one of the methods prescribed by the Memorandum of Understanding between the University and the University Council-American Federation of Teachers.

In some units the inclusion of peers in the review process is a very thoughtful process, codified by written procedures, while in others, the nature of the peer group appears to be an idiosyncratic one determined largely by the unit head. To illustrate, the Committee is aware that in some academic units, appointees holding Academic Federation titles of

Adjunct Professor and Professional Researcher are not included (and have not been for years) in the unit review in the same or related titles. Responses to the Committee's questionnaire and conversation with a range of Academic Federation members indicate that this is not an isolated occurrence.

*Recommendation 7:*

7. Academic Federation title holders (including prospective appointees) should be evaluated at the unit level by peer groups, which (as custom and circumstance might dictate) should involve Federation members in the same title series. In some instances this might require that a unit head recruit reviewers from elsewhere--presumably on a quid-pro-quo basis, and/or to define the "peer group" more broadly as an affinity group-- which would include those with similar qualifications and duties to the candidate.

The data gathered indicated that in some units, the chair appoints one or more ad-hoc committees to review Federation members and report their findings either to the entire unit or to the chair alone, as unit preferences or MOU's may require/allow.

*Recommendation 8:*

8. It is recommended that all units adopt this practice unless more widespread consultation is the desired departmental norm.

There is one invariant in all of this. At at least the unit level, members of the Academic Senate must participate in the teaching evaluation of any Federation members who offer instruction which carries academic degree credit.

## IIA. Title-Specific Findings and Recommendations:

for the Administrative, Teaching, Clinical, and Experiment Station Title Series

**Academic Administrator Series:**

As of 6/24/98 there were 17 individuals appointed in this title series. Three were housed in the Division of Environmental Studies. No other unit had more than one of them. In the fall of 1998 the campus issued a revised version of UCD-340 which in our opinion describes the nature of these appointments quite well. Because there are relatively few Academic Administrators and their assignments are highly mission-specific--- peer review in a literal sense could be quite hard to obtain.

*Recommendation 9:*

9. The unit head has the primary responsibility for assessing an Academic Administrator's performance, but the review process should include a mechanism for obtaining the opinions of other members of the unit wherever possible.

Incumbents who responded to our questionnaire were more or less satisfied with the procedures followed for their reviews in the past, but there was some concern about the criteria being used beyond the unit level to judge people in the same title series who have vastly different duties.

*Recommendation 10:*

10. Implement the general guidelines and recommendations 1 through 9 above, and poll unit heads and incumbents regarding the efficacy of the procedures that were followed after one full review cycle.

The Committee noted that both the systemwide and the local APM sections mention teaching as a permissible activity of appointees in this series. As always, if an individual has "...substantial responsibility for the conduct and content of courses approved by the Academic Senate." then for a suitable fraction of the appointment he/she must hold an appropriate instructional title. ( Academic Senate Regulation 750). The Committee also noted that the systemwide APM 370 has not been revised since 1977 while the equivalent section for Academic Coordinators was revised in 1996. The latter includes the statement: "Individuals in this title series who are assigned research or instructional duties will be required to hold a dual title."

*Recommendation 11:*

11. The Committee recommends that the language quoted immediately above be incorporated into UCD APM 370 and that the campus asks that the systemwide section be similarly amended.

**Academic Coordinator Series:**

There are about twice as many Academic Coordinators as Academic Administrators and several units have two or more of them. In this instance peer review at the unit level could be more easily achieved than for the Academic Administrator. The comments made by questionnaire respondents generally mirror those of the Academic Administrators. Because the UCD APM section dealing with the Academic Coordinators has also been revised heavily in recent months, the Committee only need to echo two recommendations regarding the Academic Administrator series made above, which are:

*Recommendation 12 & 13:*

12. The unit head has the primary responsibility for assessing an Academic Coordinator's performance, but the review process should include a mechanism for obtaining the opinions of other members of the unit

13. Implement the general guidelines and recommendation of this report, and poll unit heads and incumbents regarding the efficacy of the procedures that were followed, after one full review cycle.

**Agronomist Series:**

On 6/24/98 this series had only 5 incumbents and at least one of them was jointly appointed in the Cooperative Extension series. The systemwide policy which applies to this series (APM-320) has not changed since 1985, but the local version, UCD-320, was revised in November, 1998. The latter makes it unambiguously clear that individuals in this series are responsible for mission-oriented research and mission-oriented service conducted under the auspices of the Agricultural Experiment Station. By order of the Regents, this is an equivalent-ranks title series which grants tenure to individuals at and above the rank of Associate Agronomist.

Most, if not all, of the Academic Senate members in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences hold fractional (often greater than 50%) appointments in this series so it would be entirely appropriate for them to participate in some fashion in the personnel reviews of their full-time Agronomist colleagues. Current departmental practices seem to vary in their details quite a bit, but none of the respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the procedure that pertained to them. There was, however, a general perception that too much emphasis was being placed on peer-reviewed journal publications and not enough on their mission-oriented research, outreach and service activities.

*Recommendation 14:*

14. The recommendation to include detailed position descriptions at the beginning of the dossier appears to be especially pertinent for this title. This practice should guide reviewers to an appropriate assessment of each individual's achievements. In addition, it appears to the Committee that it would be prudent to re-visit how well the personnel process is operating for the series after the recent UCD APM revisions have been operative for a year or two.

**Clinical Professor:**

On 6/24/98 this series had 68 incumbents. Only two returned questionnaires and their responses were unremarkable. The systemwide APM is totally silent about this series but there are many numerical title codes for it on the UCOP website. The closest thing to APM language that seems to exist is a set of "Guidelines for Salaried Clinical Faculty in the School of Medicine;" a document of uncertain origin, promulgated in November of 1990 and amended in October of 1991. This document includes nothing at all about procedures for the appointment and review of these individuals. We therefore assume that all of their personnel actions are initiated and processed entirely within the School of Medicine. The number of appointees in the Clinical Professor series has increased considerably in recent years and is likely to continue to do so.

There appears to be a certain symmetry between the use of the Adjunct Professor series to accommodate non-Academic Senate medical researchers (many of whom hold the

Ph.D. degree and are housed in clinical departments) and the Clinical Professor series to accommodate clinicians who are not Academic Senate appointees.

*Recommendation 15:*

15. Building on the current "Guidelines" for this series, the Committee urges the campus to add to the UCD APM, a section for Clinical Professors as soon as possible. Such a document should include a requirement for the Committee on Academic Personnel to participate in, at least, the review of appointments and promotions to the Associate and Full ranks of this series.

**Cooperative Extension Specialist:**

This series had 100 incumbents in June of 1998. As best as can be determined, peer review as we view it, is the norm in virtually every unit. In many if not most instances, the unit head reports the opinions of its Federation and Academic Senate members separately. There were no significant criticisms of the mechanics of the personnel review process.

On the other hand, almost every respondent in one way or another echoed the observation of one of their number that: "Many of the other title series (including academic senate members) don't have a clue what Cooperative Extension is all about and generally pay little or no attention to the CE job description which is supposed to be the yardstick against which Cooperative Extension performance is measured." Many respondents were particularly critical of the Joint Personnel Committee. A perception of second-class citizenship as irritatingly evidenced by a growing salary disparity vs. Senate members was also a recurrent theme. (This of course is an Office of the President issue that has nothing whatsoever to do with the campus's personnel practices).

Committee members were quite surprised by the (evidently widely-held) view of Cooperative Extension Specialists that their roles are so poorly understood by others and that their performance is being judged (at least in part) by inappropriate criteria. It seems to the Committee that following the general guidelines and recommendations in Section I of this report may ameliorate some of the concerns expressed. Specifically, the mandated practice of including a current position description in the review file would necessarily define/limit the expectations of the various reviewers.

In addition, because two members of the Campus-wide Committee which makes personnel recommendations on this title series, are Cooperative Extension Specialists, and one of the three Academic Senate members on this Committee often comes from an A&ES department, the role of these individuals should be better understood and properly evaluated at that level. The Committee did not seek independent evidence to support or discount this view, so for now, its validity remains an opened question.

*Recommendation 16:*

16. The Vice Provost, together with appropriate representatives from the Agricultural Experiment Station, should post-audit a reasonable number of Cooperative Extension Specialist personnel actions to determine if their perception of maltreatment, at both the unit and campuswide levels has validity, and if so, suggest appropriate corrective measures.

**Lecturer:**

There were 334 individuals in this title series at the time of the June census. They are housed in every School, College and Division on campus. Some of them hold the title in conjunction with another one, e.g. Cooperative Extension Specialist, in order to legitimize their assignment to formal teaching duties. Most, however, have this as their only university appointment.

Among other responsibilities, lecturers are very heavily involved in the delivery of lower-division instruction in many departments in the College of Letters and Science and the Division of Biological Sciences, they deliver all of the upper division English Composition courses, and they staff the Campus Writing Center. By systemwide policy, non-SOE appointments in this series are "temporary," although many incumbents have been on campus in excess of 15 years and some for as long as 29 years! Many Lecturers are professionals in the visual or performing arts who are appointed for a small percentage of time in one or two quarters each year to offer instruction in their area of expertise. Many others, however, are the mainstays of their academic programs--e.g. those in the FNP/PA program of the Department of Family and Community Medicine in the School of Medicine, and the instructors in English Composition. It is in the best interest of the campus' teaching mission to recognize that the need for experienced lecturers is unlikely to diminish in the coming decades and their contribution to the campus should be recognized more tangibly.

*Recommendation 17:*

17. It is strongly recommended that the campus consider reinstating the use of the Senior Lecturer (w/o SOE) title for selected individuals who have provided long (measured in decades) and exemplary service to the campus. If instituted, these advancements should be viewed as academic promotions with the formal involvement of CAP.

The personnel appointment/review process for persons in the Lecturer title series varies widely among academic units, and as a consequence is viewed both scornfully and apprehensively by many incumbents. Reappointments are sometimes made at the eleventh hour and/or at reduced percentages, making life planning extremely difficult for the affected individuals.

In some academic units, reviews are conducted entirely by the administrative head. In others, ad hoc committees review the candidate's record and present a recommendation to the entire unit. This variability may be due, at least in part, to the range of options for departmental review listed in the Unit 18 MOU.

While it is clear that the unpredictability of course enrollments requires procedures which afford unit heads a reasonable amount of quick-response flexibility, as a matter of principle the Committee believes that the campus should foster practices which treat the individuals in question as valued academic professionals. It is the Committee's belief that the following recommendations should be the first steps in this direction.

*Recommendation 18:*

18. In the general case, teams including departmental peers or members of an appropriate affinity group should evaluate the performance of Lecturers (ideally via direct observation). The cadre of lecturers is so large that there is simply no excuse for not doing so. In addition, everyone who serves on one of these teams should be privy to the contents of the resulting letter of evaluation. (Such is not currently the universal practice.)

In a codified salary "step" system like ours, initial placements are critically important. Anecdotal evidence suggests that practices in this regard vary widely across the campus, and are viewed by some incumbents as having been determined on grounds only loosely connected with an individual's qualifications.

*Recommendation 19:*

19. It is recommended that, in consultation with CAP and representative department chairs, the campus develop norms for establishing the initial salaries of individuals in the Lecturer series.

The Committee is also concerned about a perceived lack of campuswide uniformity regarding merit increases for Lecturers in their first six years of employment. UCD 287B states that individuals who are not on 3-year appointments are eligible for consideration for a merit increase after two years of service, but that is not the same thing as putting out an eligibility list and requiring that everyone on it be considered. The Lecturer title is not included in the Annual Call for Merits and Promotions, thus leaving the possibility of merit reviews to the discretion of the colleges, and perhaps academic departments.

*Recommendation 20:*

20. The campus should require reviews of members of this series at regular intervals.

**Supervisor of Teacher Education**

Persons holding title Supervisor of Teacher Education serve as the academic mainstays for the campus' professional preparation programs that credential K-12 teachers. The APM is silent about this series, although the campus' Division of Education prepared guidelines for the review of persons in this title series.

*Recommendation 21:*

21. It is recommended that this title series be codified in the campus' APM. This would serve to standardize the review process, particularly outside of the academic unit where persons in this series reside.

**Supervisor of Physical Education and Librarians**

The Committee has no specific recommendation to make regarding these two title series. Personnel matters appear to be implemented relatively well and without unique issues.

*IIB. Title-Specific Findings and Recommendations:*

for the Research Title Series

In this section of the report, the Committee first addresses concerns about the existing situation in three title series: Adjunct Professors, Professional Researchers, and Specialists. The report concludes with recommendations intended to address long-standing issues of appropriate use of these titles.

**Adjunct Professor Series:**

On this campus this title series is used mainly by the health sciences. Out of 59 individuals who were employed in this series as of 6/24/98, 38 were housed in the Medical School and 10 were in the Veterinary School (including 6 at the Primate Center). By academic rank they were distributed 55% Assistant, 27% Associate and 18% Full. Most of the personnel actions in this series are handled at the School level by personnel committees composed entirely of Academic Senate faculty.

The questionnaire responses and interviews revealed a clear perception of second class citizenship by members of this series.

*Recommendation 22:*

22. To address this concern we recommend that units afford their Adjunct faculty franchised participation in the personnel reviews of other Adjuncts and other Federation appointees housed therein to the same degree afforded Academic Senate faculty members at the same rank and step.

Some of the questionnaire respondents noted that in their particular units individuals in this title series are principally answerable to "supervisors", something which greatly rankles folks who generate their own salaries. Comments like this together with the distribution by rank noted above could lead one to conclude that certain appointees in this series may not enjoy--or be required to exhibit--the high degree of scholarly independence which necessarily accompanies a ladder appointment at the same professorial rank.

*Recommendation 23:*

23. CAP, which oversees promotions in this series, may wish to post-audit some Adjunct-series merit actions to see if this notion has any validity.

**Professional Research:**

There were 148 individuals in this title series last June. Forty-eight were housed in departments in A&ES, 34 in the Medical School, 25 in Organized Research Units, 19 in Veterinary Medicine, 12 in Engineering and 10 in L&S. By rank they were distributed Assistant = 108, Associate = 26, Full Rank = 14.

It appears that this series could well be the right one to use for appointments in Organized Research Units such as the Bodega Marine Laboratory. However, the Committee was concerned that even in these cases, and especially with entry-level personnel, external granting agencies might not appreciate the high degree of independence which this series requires; namely, research qualifications equivalent to those of a ladder faculty member with the same academic rank.

According to APM Section 310, the Professional Research title is given: "only to those who engage personally and directly in research, and not to those whose duties are merely to provide technical assistance to a research project..." If this statement is taken literally by review committees, promotions in this series would be very difficult to achieve unless there is convincing evidence (e.g. sole PI status) that the candidate has been the intellectual leader on an appropriate number of projects.

The distribution by rank noted above suggests that many of the appointees in this series could be essentially super-postdocs. As was the case with the Adjunct Professor series, anonymous questionnaire respondents mentioned having to stay on the good side of "supervisors." A MELVYL search of the recent publication records of about a dozen UCDavis appointees in this title series yielded a preponderance of articles published jointly with at least one ladder faculty member. (For example, some of the Professional Researchers in the physics department are members of research teams in high-energy physics which are so large that it takes six or more lines on the screen to list all the authors.)

A major current concern we have about this title series is that there is no requirement for the regular review of incumbents. It would be possible for (perhaps unassertive or uninformed) individuals who are funded mainly by research grants on which they are not the PI to be treated unfairly. (The Committee learned of one example of a 49% Professional Researcher who spent more than ten calendar years at the Assistant rank.)

*Recommendation 24 & 25:*

24. At the time of appointment, offices and review bodies at the college and campus levels should confirm that the Professional Research title is being appropriately used.

25. The campus should require regular reviews of members of this series at intervals no greater than five calendar years independently of the scope of the appointment.

**Specialist**

Currently there are 19 Specialists housed in units across the campus. The APM definition of the Specialist series is that it is used for academic appointees who are engaged in research in specialized areas and who do not have teaching responsibilities. The doctorate is not a condition for employment. Specialists do not serve as PI on research grants, or conduct independent research. The Committee's understanding of this title series is that it is appropriately used in situations where there is a need for specialized, technical research skill.

The Committee observed that, as in the case of other Research titles, the implementation of the Specialist series, in some cases, inappropriately exploits individuals holding this title. In one example, the position description required the development of an independent research program; solicitation of extramural funding; and the publication in peer-reviewed journals. None of these are criteria listed in the APM for appointment or advancement in this series

*Recommendation 26:*

26. Position descriptions and reviews of persons in this title series should be reviewed for consistency with APM 330.

*IIC. Long-standing Issues of Appropriate Use of Research Titles*

As the Committee reviewed the various title series comprising the Federation, it became clear to us that there must be a review of the array of titles with research requirements. Those are the Adjunct Professors, the Professional Researchers and the Specialists.

The recently promulgated campus statement concerning the nature of acceptable teaching assignments in the Adjunct Professor series leads us to conclude that UCD recognizes a sea change in the organizational requirements of competitive research programs in many fields; i.e., professionalized research teams have become increasingly common and important.

We also note earlier in this report that many individuals currently appointed in the Professional Research series are team members for whom documentation of their independent scholarship could be very difficult or impossible to provide. It is suspected that the same could be said of many of the team researchers currently appointed in the Adjunct Professor series.

We believed that what is needed is a clean titular way to differentiate between individuals with truly independent research programs that are funded largely by their own efforts and

those who are critical contributors to long term research projects funded and administered primarily by others.

A viable solution would be to extend the use of the existing (but without a section in the APM), title "Research Professor" to include (only) those truly independent (current and future) scholars who provide the intellectual direction for their research projects and who now populate both the Adjunct Professorial and the Professional Research Series. Individuals in these two series who de facto are not required/expected to show such independence would then be appointed only in the Professional Research series.

Such a practice would permit assigning "real" teaching duties to Adjunct Professorial appointees and compensating them for such services from State rather than grant funding. Further, the Research Professor title would greatly improve the chances of its holders to compete for external funds without suffering either the stigma of the "Adjunct" title or the utter lack of external recognition of the "Professional Research" title.

*Recommendation 27:*

27. The Committee recommends that the campus use the Research Professor title for persons to conduct truly independent research and who are funded completely by extramural sources.

If the above changes are adopted, the campus will need to solve the challenge of having workable titles with competitive salaries to use for persons who are appointed as part of a research team. These persons typically are required to have highly developed research skills and work without supervision but do not provide intellectual leadership to that effort. There are issues with both the Professional Research (requirement for a program of independent research) and the Specialist (salary scale that is not competitive with industry) title series that, in the current form, do not work well for persons appointed to work in a team context .

*Recommendation 28:*

28. The Committee recommends that the Office of the Vice-Provost convene a taskforce for the purpose of developing a position paper to guide the campus' use of titles in the research series. This position paper should include:

> A. Recommendations for the appropriate use of the Adjunct Professor, Professional Research, and Specialist research titles on the UCD campus so that appointments into these titles differentiate between individuals with truly independent research programs that are funded largely by their own efforts and those who are critical components of long term research projects funded and administered primarily by others; and

B. Suggest revisions and additions to the appropriate sections of the campus' APM sections in light of the findings, suggestions, and recommendations presented in Section II of this report and by the taskforce.

### III. Policy Recommendation

As one of the "Specific Charges" given to this Committee, Vice Provost Himelfarb asked us to" "Review any related policy, procedure or document that materially affects the personnel reviews of an Academic Federation title series and identify any conflicts between it and the recommendations made..." in our final report. One such document, Exhibit D of Section 220A of the UCD Academic Personnel Manual, has been the subject of much study and comment for more than a decade because it singularly empowers the tenured Academic Senate faculty of a department to "establish the voting procedures in (certain) personnel actions..." new appointments and advancements in six Academic Federation title series' being among them.

The detailed procedures which departments/units follow in reviewing their Academic Senate faculty members vary considerably across the campus, but always conditioned by the prior approval of the divisional Committee on Academic Personnel (cf. Systemwide Academic Senate Bylaw 55.B.7.). There is currently no equivalent requirement for an external validation of the procedures which a department/unit uses to evaluate its Academic Federation members. As a practical matter, what this means is that unless this Exhibit is either substantially changed or entirely removed from the APM, there will be no way to insure that any recommendation we or others might make for increasing the participation of Academic Federation members in their own personnel actions at the unit level will be considered at all, let alone be implemented, in units where they are currently excluded from the process.

This Exhibit of the UCD APM has other technical/conceptual problems as well. It clearly conflicts with the Memorandum of Understanding between the University and the AFT regarding the departmental review of (Unit 18) Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Supervisors of Teacher Education. The MOU permits the department chair to choose from among three options for evaluating such a faculty member, whereas according to Exhibit D, the unit's tenured Academic Senate faculty "shall determine the voting procedures..." in these cases.

Exhibit D is both incomplete and inconsistent. It applies to Agronomists in the Agricultural Experiment Station---non-faculty "equivalent rank" academic appointees (cf. APM 110) with no teaching obligations whatsoever--but not to Cooperative Extension Specialists, Experiment Station personnel who are required to "conduct educational activities both on and off campus." It is silent regarding Clinical Professors, whose numbers are increasing rapidly.

In 1996, another Committee, jointly created by the then sitting Chairs of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate and the Academic Federation, recommended removing

Exhibit D from the UCD APM because, in brief, they could find: "...no evidence to suggest that the Academic Senate has authority, either derived from the Standing Orders of the Regents or Senate Bylaw 55, to participate in the personnel actions or to establish voting procedures in any personnel actions other than those of Academic Senate members." In a second recommendation they asked the Chancellor to: "...instruct the Federation to propose methods by which its members are evaluated." They noted that in doing so, "the Federation (should) consider methods for including members of the Academic Senate in personnel reviews, as appropriate."

Some faculty think that the recission of Exhibit D would potentially preclude Senate members from significant participation in the personnel actions of non-Senate academic appointees, many of whom fill critically important positions in their units/departments. Others feel that without Exhibit D or some substitute acknowledgment in the APM of the role of the Senate in such matters, performance standards for Federation appointees could be seriously eroded. These concerns are presented more fully in a minority report from this Committee. The majority are confident that if the will to do so is there, the campus can find means to overcome these or similar objections to broadening the franchise in Federation personnel matters.

In addition to the technical/conceptual problems described above with this Exhibit, members of the Academic Federation have fundamental concerns about it. Many have spoken about numerous instances in which UCD-APM 220A Exhibit D is the rationale used (particularly at the unit level) to preclude peer review for Academic Federation members. Others have described the effect of this Exhibit as contributing significantly to the erosion of collegiality between Senate and Federation members. Finally, the Federation Executive Committee, on behalf of its membership, asserts that APM 220A Exhibit D, as a campus addition to the Systemwide Academic Senate's Bylaw 55 regarding departmental voting procedures for Academic Senate personnel actions, inappropriately includes 6 Academic Federation Personnel titles in Point 4 a-f of that Exhibit. For almost 15 years, a number of committees and individuals have recommended action with respect to this section of the APM. It will continue to be an endless issue unless addressed.

Everything we have said in this report to date demonstrates that we unanimously favor peer review in Federation personnel actions to the fullest possible extent. It seems to us that if the Administration accepts the main thrust of our report, it will then be incumbent upon them to effect a transition from the current rather hierarchical structure surrounding many Federation personnel actions to a more inclusive one.

We do not suggest lessening the involvement of Senate faculty in Federation personnel matters, but we clearly believe that at the unit level other voices need/deserve to be heard. The final recommendation is intended to address the issues that have been engendered by and arisen because of the addition of Point 4 a-f of APM-220A Exhibit D.

*Recommendation 29:*

29. The Committee recommends that the Office of the Vice Provost immediately appoint a joint Academic Federation and Academic Senate Committee to address the issues identified in this Report regarding Point 4 a-f of APM-220A Exhibit D

**Concluding Observation**

In the course of its work, some Committee members discussed ways in which some initial Federation appointments are compromised, ultimately affecting the personnel review process. Although issues related to appointments are outside the Committee's charge and hence not included in the body of the report, some of us believe that the practice described below is important to address as part of the Administration's review of campus procedures for Academic Federation titles.

The Committee was struck by the practice at the unit and/or College level, to use Academic Federation title series at the time of appointment that do not match the position description/responsibilities for the particular appointment. These instances seem to occur most often in situations when there is not a complete fit between the position duties and/or hiring period and the title series that are available for use. For example, it was noted that the Professional Research title has been used for appointments that are part of a research team, without the expectation of independent scholarship for the position, and in other instances used as a "catch-all" title to fill out the percentage of an appointment, even though that position had no research responsibility.

Using title series that do not match the expected position expectations/responsibilities, although done with the intent of getting personnel appointed, can and do have repercussions for the holder of these inappropriate appointments during the merit and promotion process. At the unit level, recollections about the reasons for the mismatch fade over time and personnel review may be compromised. At the college and/or campus level(s), personnel review committees judge that the dossier does not contain evidence of the type needed to recommend merit or promotion-- disadvantages of this practice accrue to the title holder. Once the initial appointment goes off track in this way, it is difficult work to correct it.

Therefore, it is recommended that the Office of the Vice Provost work with the campus' personnel committees and key unit and college personnel to determine if any procedural corrections or APM revisions for specific Academic Federation title series should be made in order to: 1) achieve a better fit between position responsibilities and title specifications ; and 2) preclude appointments for which the position responsibilities do not match the review criteria for the title.