

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

2005-2006 ANNUAL AREPORT

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is pleased to report on its activities for the Academic Year 2005-2006.

I. MEMBERSHIP

This year, the membership of CAP included four members from UCM and seven external members. The UCM members were: Raymond Chiao (physics and mathematics), Martha Conklin (engineering), David Ojcius (biology, CAP chair), and Dunya Ramicova (arts). The external members were: Joseph Cerny (chemistry, UCB), Jeannie Darby (engineering, UCD), Roland Davis (biology, UCI), David Goodblatt (humanities/history, UCSD), Chip Martel (computer science, UCD), Thomas Wickens (psychology, UCB), and Donald Wittman (economics, UCSC). Two UCM members left CAP during the Fall semester: Ronald Winston, who became chair of the UCM Division Council; and Arthur Woodward, who assumed administrative duties in the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts. We were fortunate to be assisted by Nancy Clarke, Executive Director of the UCM Academic Senate.

Two members will be leaving CAP during the next academic year, after having served full terms: Martha Conklin (UCM) and Jeannie Darby (UCD). They will be replaced by three new members: James Hunt (civil and environmental engineering, UCB), Anna Maria Busse Berger (music, UCD), and Roger Rangel (mechanical and aerospace engineering, UCI).

II. GENERAL PROCEDURES

CAP is charged with making recommendations on appointments and academic advancements, including merit actions, promotions to tenure (Associate Professor), promotions to Professor, and advancement across the barrier steps Professor V to VI and IX to Above Scale.

CAP deals with about 4-8 cases each week during the peak period of February-May. CAP begins its reviews when files arrive from the Office of Academic Personnel, where they have been analyzed, vetted, and classified to allow efficient processing by CAP. The CAP Chair reads all files. Normally, one reviewer was assigned to read and report on a case. During the 2006-2007 academic year, two reviewers will be assigned to each case, a primary and secondary reader. However, all members are expected to familiarize themselves with cases slated for major actions. Readers' assignments are based on their areas of expertise. In no case do the readers serve as advocates of their areas, but as representatives serving the interests of the general campus. CAP members from UCM who had served on search committees or participated in the School discussion of academic personnel cases recuse themselves automatically from CAP review of the case. At the beginning of the year, CAP determined that a quorum of six members was required for voting on its actions. Seven members will be required for quorum during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Members review files prior to its Thursday meetings and primary readers then present the case to the full Committee. Drafts of CAP reports on the dossiers are prepared by the CAP primary reader or the Executive Director of the UCM Academic Senate for approval by readers and the Chair. The final version is sent as a letter to the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC). If the EVC decides that no further deliberation is needed, then the substance of CAP's reports and other levels of review are summarized by the EVC in a letter transmitted to the Dean of the faculty member's School. For the majority of files, this ends CAP's review. If disagreement prevails at any level of review, the file is returned to the School for reconsideration or a request for further information. This year eight cases fell in that category. CAP later makes a final recommendation to the EVC. The EVC meets with the full CAP to discuss any disagreements with CAP's recommendation on particular cases.

III. SPECIFIC PROCEDURES

Procedures during 2005-2006. For lack of an academic personnel manual at UCM, CAP has been following UC systemwide policies as described in the academic personnel manual (APM): <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/>

Procedures not outlined in the APM but followed at other UC campuses were also, for the most part, followed at UCM. CAP and the EVC disagreed mainly with regards to the need for UCM faculty to be informed of their right to view the case analysis prepared by the School chair, to work with the chair to confirm that the case analysis accurately reflects all faculty views on the case, and as a last resort, to append a minority report to the case analysis.

In eight cases, files were returned to the Schools for further information. Most of the requests were for missing teaching evaluations, missing copies of major publications, or verification that references were not double-counted in files for merit actions. Administrative memos were also appended in ten cases. Most of the memos were meant to advise junior faculty on the need to demonstrate independent scholarship by publishing in peer-reviewed journals or providing other evidence of creative work or performance, request that School chairs contact writers of reference letters who are at a rank commensurate with the level of appointment, or remind Schools that letters of reference and case analyses need to be analytical rather than merely enumerative.

UC Merced Academic Personnel Policies. During the summer of 2006, a UC Merced Academic Personnel Policies (MAPP) was prepared, and will be adopted by CAP during the 2006-2007 academic year. The MAPP includes, among other things: (a) a description of general procedures for faculty recruitment, appointment, merit, promotion and appraisal; (b) a procedural safeguard statement provided to the faculty member considered for advancement; (c) a checklist of materials required for appointment or advancement cases; (d) an annual bio-bibliography form; and (e) a standardized biography form for new appointments. CAP is confident that the MAPP will render more uniform the faculty's understanding of CAP's evaluation process, and improve the efficiency and consistency of CAP's evaluations.

The MAPP is a work in progress. The current version will be made available at the UCM website.

IV. WORK OF CAP, 2005-2006 YEAR

Case load and outcome of personnel actions (Tables 1 - 2). The two tables attached present the cases considered by CAP in different ways. Table 1 gives decisions by the type of action, and Table 2 gives aggregate decisions by academic unit. Overall, CAP agreed with the School recommendation without modification in 79% of all cases (Table 2). For appointments, CAP modified to a higher step 5 out of 43 cases, and modified down 1 case. CAP also disagreed with 1 recommendation for appointment. CAP reviewed 3 recommendations for promotion, and modified to a higher step 2 of the cases. All 14 recommendations for merit increases were accepted by CAP without modification. Finally, 1 recommendation for an endowed chair was approved.

The decisions by CAP are advisory to the Chancellor and EVC, who make the final decisions. They are deeply involved with the process, particularly in matters of promotion and hiring at tenured levels, and take CAP's recommendations seriously. Of the 63 cases considered this year, the EVC has made 2 decisions that counter the recommendation of CAP. The EVC graciously discussed the cases with CAP before making his decision. The level of disagreement between the EVC and CAP (3.2%) appears to be comparable to other UC campuses.

V. MAJOR ISSUES

Off-step Salaries

In order to compete with offers from other universities, a large percentage of new faculty at UCM have been hired with off-step adjustments to meet market prices. The percentage of faculty receiving off-step salaries at UCM is higher than at other UC campuses, which may be necessary given the extra demands placed on faculty at a campus that is still in start-up mode. But the use of off-step salaries has not been equitable across the disciplines at UCM.

CAP has no role in setting salaries except to comment on requests for off-step adjustments, if they are part of regular files. CAP considers academic merit only, and therefore does not respond directly to market pressure. The Chancellor's office is the point at which salary adjustments are made, and indeed, many off-step requests in connection with retention are made directly through the deans to the EVC; consultation with CAP is not required.

However, CAP endorses a policy that would bring salaries, upon a successful merit action, to the trimmed average of the actual salaries at that step across the campus. Over the next three years, this process should narrow the range of salaries at each step and should mitigate, though not eliminate, salary inequities that have accumulated over the recent past.

In conclusion

The MAPP describes the formalities of CAP's membership and responsibilities, and should facilitate preparation of case analyses by the Schools and improve the efficiency of case evaluations by CAP. Many of the problems encountered at CAP in 2005-2006 were due to the absence of well-defined guidelines that could be followed by both the Schools and CAP.

In concluding this report, we take the opportunity to emphasize the satisfaction that members feel in serving on the Committee. This service is not trivial in the time it takes, but except for the regular meetings, the reading of dossiers can be done at the members' convenience. During the past year, discussions have demonstrated the seriousness with which members take their role. In discussing 63 dossiers, members have invariably presented their arguments objectively and articulately, and have respected each others' disagreements.

The Chair wishes to thank all members for the effort, quality and graciousness of their service. The Chair and all CAP members wish especially to thank Nancy Clarke, first, for her good humor and her intelligent recording of our proceedings; second, for her expert, consistent, and timely drafting of letters to the EVC that embody our decisions; and finally, for going beyond the duties of Executive Director of the UCM Academic Senate, in attending most CAP meetings.

Respectfully,

David Ojcius, Chair, Biology (Natural Sciences)

Raymond Chiao, Physics and Mathematics (Natural Sciences & Engineering)

Martha Conklin, Engineering (Engineering)

Dunya Ramicova, Arts (Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts)

Joseph Cerny, Chemistry (UC Berkeley)

Jeannie Darby, Engineering (UC Davis)

Rowland Davis, Biology (UC Irvine)

David Goodblatt, Humanities and History (UC San Diego)

Chip Martel, Computer Science (UC Davis)

Thomas Wickens, Psychology (UC Berkeley)

Donald Wittman, Economics (UC Santa Cruz)

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE
2005 – 2006**

Table 1

	Agree	Disagree	Modify- Up	Modify- Down	TOTAL
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	52	1	7	1	61

Table 1A APPOINTMENTS	Agree	Disagree	Modify- Up	Modify- Down	TOTAL
Assistant Professor (5 Acting)	31	0	5	1	37
Associate Professor	1	0	0	0	1
Professor	3	1	0	0	4
Non-Senate Appointment	1	0	0	0	1
Total	34	1	5	1	43
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					84%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					98%

TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	Agree	Disagree	Modify- Up	Modify- Down	TOTAL
Associate Professor and Advancement to Professor VI	1	0	2	0	3
Total	1	0	2	0	3
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					33%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100%

TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASES	Agree	Disagree	Modify- Up	Modify- Down	TOTAL
Assistant Professor	9	0	0	0	9
Associate Professor	0	0	0	0	0
Professor	5	0	0	0	5
Total	14	0	0	0	14
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					100%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100%

TABLE 1D OTHER ACTIONS	Agree	Disagree	Modify- Up	Modify- Down	TOTAL
Endowed Chair	1	0	0	0	1
Total	1	0	0	0	1

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2005-2006**

Table 2

School	Number Cases Proposed	Agree	Disagree	Modify- Up	Modify- Down	% CAP Agreed w/Dept. or modified up or down	% CAP agreed with School w/o modification
Engineering	7	5	0	1	1	100%	71%
Natural Sciences	30	27	0	3	0	100%	90%
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts	26	20	1	4	0	98%	77%
TOTALS*	63	52	1	7	1	99%	79%

*Totals will differ due to actions involving split appointments across schools.