

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL 2006-2007 ANNUAL REPORT**

### **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 2006-2007.

### **I. MEMBERSHIP**

This year, the membership of CAP included two members from UCM and nine external members. The UCM members were: Raymond Chiao (physics and mathematics) and David Ojcius (biology, CAP chair). The external members were: Anna Maria Busse Berger (music, UCD), Joseph Cerny (chemistry, UCB), Rowland Davis (biology, UCI), David Goodblatt (humanities/history, UCSD), James Hunt (engineering, UCB), Chip Martel (computer science, UCD), Roger Rangel (engineering, UCI), Tom Wickens (psychology, UCB), and Donald Wittman (economics, UCSC). We were fortunate to be assisted by Nancy Clarke, Executive Director of the UCM Academic Senate.

Four members will be leaving CAP during the next academic year: Raymond Chiao (UCM), David Goodblatt (UCSD), James Hunt (UCB), and Chip Martel (UCD). They will be replaced by four new members: Christopher Viney (bioengineering, UCM), Randy Katz (computer science, UCB), Arturo Keller (environmental engineering, UCSB), and Richard Regosin (humanities, UCI). Gregg Camfield (SSHA, UCM) will attend as observer.

### **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 lead reviewer was assigned to read and report on a case. During the 2006-2007 academic year, secondary and tertiary readers were added. 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. Six members will be required for quorum during the 2007-2008 academic year.

Members review files prior to its Thursday meetings and primary readers then present the case to the full Committee. Secondary readers then compare their views with those of the primary reader, followed by the third reader. 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. This year, for appointments at the senior level, a copy of the letter was also sent to the Chancellor, who wished to weigh in on subsequent deliberations.

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. 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 2006-2007.* 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.

*UC Merced Academic Personnel Policies.* During the summer of 2006, the first draft of a UC Merced Academic Personnel Policies (MAPP) was prepared, and is being adopted by CAP. 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.

The MAPP is still a work in progress. The current version is available at the UCM website: <http://academicpersonnel.ucmerced.edu/mapp.asp>

In addition, the School of Engineering and the School of Natural Sciences have School voting procedures. The School of Social Sciences Humanities and Arts has regrouped into three separate Bylaw 55 units, each with its own voting procedures.

*Advice or comments from CAP to the candidate or School.* As CAP reviews merits, it sometimes requests that the Chancellor and/or Provost convey specific comments to the Candidate or School. A sampling of our most frequently offered advice is given in Table 1.

#### **IV. WORK OF CAP, 2006-2007 YEAR**

*Case load and outcome of personnel actions* (Tables 2 - 3). The tables attached present the cases considered by CAP in different ways. Table 2 gives decisions by the type of action, and Table 3 gives aggregate decisions by academic unit. Overall, CAP agreed with the School recommendation without modification in 89% of all cases (Table 3). For appointments, CAP modified to a higher step 3 out of 27 cases, and modified down 1 case. CAP also disagreed with 1 recommendation for appointment. CAP reviewed 2 recommendations for promotion in the Lecturer series, and agreed with both cases. All 21 recommendations for merit increases were accepted by CAP, and modified to a higher step 1 of the cases.

Table 4 summarizes the number of cases reviewed by CAP since 2005. The number of appointments reviewed in 2006-2007 was smaller than in 2005-2006, while the number of merit increases was larger.

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 they take CAP's recommendations seriously. Of the 56 cases considered this year, the EVC has not made any decisions that counter the recommendation of CAP.

#### **V. MAJOR ISSUES**

The MAPP describes the formalities of CAP's 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. The number of problems has decreased significantly in 2006-2007.

There were also no disagreements between CAP and the EVC and Chancellor, unlike previous years.

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 56 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 and Chancellor 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, UCM

Raymond Chiao, Vice-Chair, Physics and Mathematics, UCM

*External members:*

Anna Maria Busse Berger, Music, UCD

Joseph Cerny, Chemistry, UCB

Rowland Davis, Biology, UCI

David Goodblatt, Humanities, UCSD

James Hunt, Engineering, UCB

Chip Martel, Computer Science, UCD

Roger Rangel, Engineering, UCI

Tom Wickens, Psychology, UCB

Donald Wittman, Economics, UCSC

**CAP Table 1**  
**COMMENTS CONVEYED TO THE CANDIDATE OR SCHOOL**  
**2006 – 2007**

**As CAP reviews merits, it sometimes requests that the Chancellor and/or Provost convey specific comments to the Candidate or School. Below is a sampling of our most frequently offered advice:**

**To the Candidate:**

- The Bio-bibliography should include the full citation for all publications.
- Works submitted outside the review period will appropriately be considered in the next review.
- When the time comes for promotion to Associate Professor it will be important to provide demonstrated evidence of research independence from former mentors through publication of independent research papers and, where appropriate, the successful application for extramural research support.
- In a few instances, CAP recommended that the candidate reduce service commitments and devote more professional energies to scholarly work and publication.

**To the School on preparation of files:**

- The candidate's role in collaborative efforts should be clarified.
- It would be helpful to receive information on the publication venues along with an analysis of the publications and their selectivity.
- Unreturned faculty personnel ballots should be explained.
- In several instances an excessive number of outside letters were solicited. Because CAP must read them all it strongly urges a limitation on solicitations such that no more than ten well-chosen, independent opinions are offered.
- The candidate's relationship with the reviewer should be made clear.

**CAP Table 2**  
**FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**  
**2006 – 2007**

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Modify- Up</b>	<b>Modify- Down</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>56</b>

<b>Table 2a APPOINTMENTS</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Modify- Up</b>	<b>Modify- Down</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Assistant Professor (1 Acting)	16		2		<b>18</b>
Associate Professor	2		1	1	<b>4</b>
Professor	8	1			<b>9</b>
Lecturer Series	1				<b>1</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>32</b>
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					<b>84%</b>
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					<b>97%</b>

<b>TABLE 2b PROMOTIONS</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Modify- Up</b>	<b>Modify- Down</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Lecturer Series	2	0	0	0	<b>2</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					<b>100%</b>
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					<b>100%</b>

<b>TABLE 2c MERIT INCREASES</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Modify- Up</b>	<b>Modify- Down</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Assistant Professor	16	0	1	0	<b>17</b>
Associate Professor	2	0	0	0	<b>2</b>
Professor	3	0	0	0	<b>3</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					<b>95%</b>
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					<b>100%</b>

**CAP Table 3  
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS  
2006-2007**

School	Number Proposed	CAP Recommendation				% CAP agreed with recommendation or modified up or down	% CAP agreed with recommendation without modification
		Agree	Disagree	Modify-Up	Modify-Down		
<b>Engineering</b>	19	18	1	0	0	95%	95%
<b>Natural Sciences</b>	20	17	0	2	1	100%	85%
<b>Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts</b>	17	15	0	2	0	100%	88%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>89%</b>

**CAP Table 4  
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2007**

	2005-2006	2006-2007
<b>Total Cases</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Total Appointments</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Total Promotions</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Total Merit Increases</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Total Other</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>