

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL 2010-2011 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 2010-2011.

I. CAP Membership

This year the CAP membership included five members from UCM and seven external members. The UCM members were Raymond Chiao (Engineering and Natural Sciences, Fall 2010 term); Michael Colvin (Natural Sciences, Fall 2010 term); Thomas Harmon, CAP Vice Chair (Engineering); Jian-Qiao Sun (Engineering); and Jan Wallander (Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts). The external members were Joseph Cerny, CAP Chair (UCB, Chemistry); Ruzena Bajcsy (UCB, Computer Science, Fall 2010 term); Robert Deacon (UCSB, Economics, Spring 2011 term); C. Fred Driscoll (UCSD, Physics, Spring 2011 term); Hung Fan (UCI, Molecular Biology and Biochemistry); Richard Regosin (UCI, French and Italian); and Michelle Yeh (UCD, East Asian Languages). Susan Sims (Fall 2010) and Mary Ann Coughlin (Spring 2011) served as the CAP Analysts.

II. CAP Review of Academic Personnel Cases

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

Policies and Procedures

UCM CAP adheres to systemwide policies and procedures as described in the UC Academic Personnel Manual ([APM](#)). Policies and procedures not outlined in the APM, but practiced at other UC campuses, were generally observed at Merced.

The Merced Academic Personnel Policies & Procedures ([MAPP](#)) document is also a useful resource for faculty members, administrators and Academic Personnel Committee (APC) Chairs. As the MAPP is an evolving resource, CAP presents occasional suggestions for revision to the Academic Personnel Office and/or the Divisional Council.

Review Process

CAP's review process begins when the committee receives files from the Academic Personnel Office (APO), where they have been analyzed, vetted, and classified to facilitate further, efficient processing. The cases, as well as reviewer assignments, are distributed to the committee one week prior to CAP's meeting and ensuing discussion of the files. CAP typically reviews three to five files per week. One lead reviewer and one or two secondary reviewers, depending upon the proposed personnel action, are assigned to report on each case; however, all members are expected to read and become familiar with the files. Reviewer assignments are made according to members' areas of expertise. Reviewers serve not as advocates of their areas, but as representatives who act in the best long-term interests of the campus. Committee members who participate in a prior level of review for a file are recused from CAP's respective review of the file.

CAP convenes for two-hour meetings on Friday mornings; non-UCM members participate by teleconference. Reports from the primary and secondary readers on each case are followed by a thorough committee discussion, as well as a vote on the proposed action. CAP's quorum for all personnel actions is half of its membership. Occasionally, a vote on a case is deferred, and the file is returned for further information or clarification. After the meeting the CAP Analyst and the Chair prepare draft reports on the dossiers. These are then distributed to the committee for review, consultation, and approval. Depending upon the level of the proposed personnel action, the final version of the report is sent as a letter to the Chancellor or the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) and Provost. If they determine that no further deliberation is necessary, the substance of CAP's report and those of other levels of review are summarized by Academic Personnel in a letter that is transmitted to the dean of the candidate's School.

For the vast majority of the cases, the above process ends CAP's review of the file. If disagreement prevails at any level of review, the file is returned to the School for reconsideration and/or a request for more information before being resubmitted to CAP. The EVC/Provost communicates with CAP to discuss any disagreements with CAP's recommendation on particular cases.

Throughout the UC system certain categories of academic personnel cases, for example, appointment at tenure or promotion to tenure, require an additional formal review of the dossier and supplemental materials by an *ad hoc* committee of experts. This *ad hoc* committee is appointed by the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designate and its report is included in the materials submitted to CAP; the identity of the committee members is known only to CAP and the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designate. At the older campuses, these *ad hoc* committees generally involve three experts, with an outside Chair and one internal member from the relevant unit. Due to the limited number of tenured faculty at UCM, CAP frequently serves "as its own *ad hoc*"; however, when there is inadequate expertise within CAP to review a particular case, an *ad hoc* committee of expert faculty from other UC campuses is appointed by the EVC/Provost.

Recommendations

Appendix A provides a simple numerical summary and analysis of the CAP caseload for the 2010-2011 academic year. CAP reviewed a total of 96 cases during the year; this represents a 52 percent increase in caseload over the prior year. The committee agreed with the School recommendations without modification on 80 percent of the reviewed cases (see Table 2). Tables 1A – 1D detail caseloads and their respective outcomes according to the proposed personnel actions. Table 2 provides aggregate recommendations by the academic units.

CAP recommendations are transmitted to the Chancellor and the EVC/Provost for a final level of review. Both the Chancellor and the EVC/Provost are deeply involved in the academic personnel process, particularly in matters of appointment and promotion at tenured levels. Their final decisions give significant weight to CAP's recommendations, all of which were accepted this year.

III. Comments Regarding the Submission of Personnel Cases

CAP has general comments regarding the Schools' submission of Personnel cases. These pertain mainly to Mid-Career Appraisals (MCAs) and case materials.

Mid-Career Appraisal

A timely submission of the MCA can be crucial to the career of an Assistant Professor, who should have a punctual evaluation on his/her progress toward tenure. Long delays in receiving this review leave less time for "corrective actions" when they are needed prior to the end of the

tenure clock. The deadline in 2010-2011 for submission of MCA cases to APO was November 12, 2010. CAP had meetings scheduled in late November and December to focus on reviewing these cases; however, only two of the nine (22 percent) MCAs that were submitted for review during the year were submitted by this date.

CAP urges the Schools' Academic Personnel Chairs and the Deans to establish and enforce early deadlines for review materials, particularly for external letters, so that MCA cases for 2011-2012 are submitted in final form to APO by this fall's deadline of November 18, 2011. This is also the deadline for the seventh year final appraisals for some of the assistant Professors.

Case Materials

A well-written and comprehensive case file is critical to maintaining the integrity of the personnel review. Case materials should adequately and appropriately reflect a candidate's research, teaching, and service performance. With regard to research, the case analysis from the Schools should thoroughly evaluate the quality and the significance of candidates' scholarship. Impact factors and related indices cannot substitute for an in-depth evaluation. Below CAP reiterates text from its 2009-2010 annual report:

"Research. A description of a candidate's research should highlight and analyze [and not merely enumerate] the nature, significance, and intellectual impact of the main components of the work. The description need not be long, since CAP reads the same dossier. However, especially in areas unlikely to be understood by outsiders, a brief lay description of the research area is [also] very useful. The report should include summaries, without long or numerous quotations of the opinions of the outside reviewers, since they are best able to judge the impact of the work in the field.

"Publication Venue. One measure of quality (albeit imperfect) is the venue of publication. It would be helpful to give an honest assessment of the publication's recognition in the discipline. Here are some examples: one of the top three general journals in the discipline; the primary journal in the field (where a discipline might be divided into about 6 rather than 30 fields); a well-recognized journal in the subfield; and the major publisher of books on the topic. No adjectives need be applied to journals that do not garner prestige in the discipline."

With regard to teaching, [APM 210-1](#) states, "It is the responsibility of the department chair to submit meaningful statements, accompanied by evidence, of the candidate's teaching effectiveness at lower-division, upper-division, and graduate levels of instruction. More than one kind of evidence shall accompany each review file." The manual follows this with an enumerated listing of acceptable forms of evidence. This does not include faculty members' teaching self-statements, as they do not provide the desired objective evaluations of candidates' teaching efforts.

With regard to service, CAP stresses the importance of properly documenting university, campus, and school committee efforts. As [expected] levels of commitment vary from committee to committee and from member to member, committee workload descriptions and evaluations should be adequately detailed. They should include an appraisal of the quality of the candidate's contributions and of the extent of their efforts in committee assignments.

IV. Counsel to EVC/Provost

CAP reviewed various cases during the year that prompted the committee to make recommendations to the EVC/Provost on academic personnel procedures and policy. CAP transmitted administrative comments to the EVC/Provost regarding the following topics: composition and role of the Schools' Academic Personnel Committees, Adjunct Professor Series, normal time in service at step, delayed reviews of promotion to tenure, and faculty periods of leave. The substance of the administrative comments is detailed in Appendix B.

For the most part, the cases specifically discussed in these administrative comments have returned to CAP with the requested corrections; however, some of the referenced problems have since appeared in new cases. CAP is unable to find clear evidence that new written policy or procedures have resulted from its formal recommendations.

V. Academic Personnel Meetings

Fall Meeting

As is becoming an annual tradition at the UCM campus, the EVC/Provost and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP) requested CAP's presence at a fall academic personnel meeting. The meeting, scheduled on Sept. 9, 2010, was also attended by faculty and administrators. CAP was represented by Chair Joseph Cerny, five internal members, and two external members. The committee led two discussion sessions. The first morning session was held with Assistant Professors and Academic Personnel. This session began with a brief introduction to the academic personnel review process. This was followed by extensive discussion between the Assistant Professors and CAP. A second session, which was held over lunch and continued into the afternoon, was open to all faculty members, School APC Chairs, School personnel staff, the Deans, and Academic Personnel. This session was devoted to questions and answers on various facets of the academic personnel process at UCM. Brief minutes from both sessions are available in the Academic Personnel Office.

Semester Meetings

Academic Personnel, CAP, the Deans, and the School APCs convened once per semester to discuss the academic review process, as well as academic personnel policies and procedures. At the first meeting, held on November 18, 2010, CAP was represented by Chair Joseph Cerny and four internal members. Discussion items focused on the preparation of AP cases and specifically addressed MCA, promotion to tenure, merit increase, and Senate lecturer cases. Formal meeting minutes are available upon request in the Academic Personnel Office.

The second meeting convened on May 20, 2011. CAP was represented by Chair Joseph Cerny, two internal members, and one external member. Attendees discussed MCA; merit review, including the Merit Short Form; delayed tenure review cases; and Bio-Bibliography content. Additional items were discussed in some detail, as was the desire to see more written policy and procedures in the MAPP. While formal minutes are not available in the Academic Personnel Office, the CAP Analyst maintains the informal minutes.

VI. Academic Senate Review Items

The Divisional Council transmitted to CAP various campus and systemwide proposals and documents for review. The Committee returned formal opinions on some of these, including the Proposed Revisions to the MAPP, the School of Engineering's Proposed Changes for

Engineering Academic Personnel Chair Conduct, and various voting unit proposals from the Schools.

VII. Acknowledgments

CAP would like to acknowledge its excellent working relationship with David Ojcius in his role as Vice Provost for Academic Personnel. The Chair and all other CAP members wish to thank Susan Sims and Mary Ann Coughlin for their dedicated support during the academic year.

Finally, CAP would like to gratefully acknowledge the past and present contributions of its outgoing Chair, Joseph Cerny. Professor Cerny has ably served as the UCM CAP Chair for the past three years. Prior to this he served as CAP member for an additional five years. The time and effort that he has sacrificed to help ensure that the University of California standards of scholarship are always upheld at the UCM campus will not be forgotten.

Respectfully,

Joseph Cerny, Chair (UCB)
Tom Harmon, Vice Chair
Raymond Chiao
Michael Colvin
Jian-Qiao Sun
Jan Wallander
Ruzena Bajcsy (UCB)
Robert Deacon (UCSB)
C. Fred Driscoll (UCSD)
Hung Fan (UCI)
Richard Regosin (UCI)
Michelle Yeh (UCD)

Appendix A

**2010-2011 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
TABLES 1A-1D FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	CAP Recommendation				
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	TOTAL
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	75	15	4	2	96

	CAP Recommendation				
TABLE 1A APPOINTMENTS	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	TOTAL
Assistant Professor (4 Acting)	14	4	0	0	18
Associate Professor (1 Acting)	5	2	0	0	7
Professor	3	3	1	0	7
Lecturer Series (1 LPSOE)	1	0	0	0	1
Chairs	1	0	0	0	1
Total	24	9	1	0	34
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					71%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					97%

	CAP Recommendation				
TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	TOTAL
Associate Professor	10	2	0	0	12
Professor	0	0	1	0	1
Professor VI	2	0	0	0	2
Above Scale	1	0	1	0	2
Total	13	2	2	0	17
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					76%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					88%

	CAP Recommendation				
TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASE	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	TOTAL
LPSOE/SOE	3	0	0	0	3
Assistant	16	4	0	0	20
Associate Professor (2 Adjunct)	7	0	0	1	8
Professor	6	0	1	1	8
Total	32	4	1	2	39
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					86%*
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					97%*

*Calculated without pending cases.

TABLE 1D REAPPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant (3 Adjunct)	6	0	0	0	6
Associate	0	0	0	0	0
Professor	0	0	0	0	0
Total	6	0	0	0	6
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					100%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100%

TABLE 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2010-2011

School	Number Proposed	CAP Recommendation				% CAP agreed w/unit without modification	% CAP agreed w/unit or modified up or down
		Agree	Modify-Up	Modify-Down	Disagree		
Engineering	18	13	3	--	2	72%	89%
(MCA)	(2)						
Natural Sciences	39	34	1	3	1	87%	97%
(MCA)	(5)						
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts	39	30	4	4	1	77%	97%
(MCA)	(2)						
TOTALS	96	77*	8	7	4	80%	96%
(MCA)	(9)						

*The two pending merit increases in Table 1C have been counted as agree in this table.

TABLE 3
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2011

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
Total Cases	61	56	82	61
Total Appointments	43	32	45	22
Total Promotions	3	2	2	3
Total Merit Increases	14	22	35	33
Total Other	1	0	0	3

	2009-2010	2010-2011
Total Cases	63	96
Total Appointments	13	34
Total Promotions	10	17
Total Merit Increases	40	39
Total Other		6

Appendix B

School Academic Personnel Committees – Composition and Role (December 3, 2010)

The Committee believes each UC Merced School should have an Academic Personnel Committee, comprised of at least three members, to evaluate each case from a broad intellectual perspective and to provide a case analysis with multiple signatures. Understandably in large units, all Academic Personnel Committee members may not be able to evaluate the research contributions in a given case, but other elements of the case analysis are general enough that all members can provide appropriate input.

Adjunct Professor Series (February 11, 2011)

Adjunct Professor Series appointment and advancement cases must clearly state the assigned duties and responsibilities (as determined at the time of appointment, if possible) for review at all levels of the academic personnel process (see [APM 280](#)-4 and 280-10). The case analysis must address the performance of the candidate with respect to the relevant criteria for the case. The same is expected of a dean's review. At the time of an appointment, an adjunct faculty member must be apprised of the nature of the appointment, relevant duties and responsibilities, and the faculty evaluation process and criteria used for the Adjunct Professor Series and for the candidate's specific appointment.

An appointment in the Adjunct Professor Series must be made at a certain percentage, whether for pay or not. The Case Analysis is expected to analyze the adjunct faculty member's performance relative to both the agreed upon duties and responsibilities and the appointment percentage. When appropriate, a discussion of the candidate's performance at her/his primary institution may also be relevant to demonstrate its value to UC Merced.

Finally, the Case Analysis should be supervised, if not written, by an APC Chair.

Normal Time in Service at Step (March 15, 2011)

In cases where a recommended personnel action falls outside the normal time in service at a particular step (see [APM 220](#)-18), CAP requests that the review agencies preparing the case provide an accompanying explanation in terms of the relevant APM criteria. Clarification and guidance will be particularly valuable in cases involving the overlapping steps in the Assistant and Associate Professor series, where service at those steps count as service toward the next rank.

Delayed Reviews of Promotion to Tenure (April 8, 2011)

CAP believes that a consistent policy is needed with respect to the timeline for review of promotion to tenure. Until the UC Merced Administration and the Senate have the time to discuss and agree upon a permanent policy to be put in MAPP, CAP proposes the following interim policy, taken from the Irvine campus and modified by agreement at the May 20, 2011 meeting:

“In the latter half of an assistant professor's fifth year (under the eight-year rule), the department should determine whether the tenure review should take place, as normal, in the sixth year or whether circumstances exist which justify postponement of the tenure review until the seventh year. Postponement of the tenure review will be justified if the candidate has significant work in progress, the evaluation of which will occur within a year but not in time to be included in a sixth-year review.

To request postponement, the assistant professor should provide tangible evidence to the department that the record will change significantly in the sixth year. The department

should discuss the evidence and vote for or against postponement of the tenure review.

The postponement file must be accompanied by the candidate's full merit or reappointment file, which will normally be required for continuation beyond the sixth year. Form UCI-AP-38 (to be obtained) itemizes the documentation required for the postponement of the tenure review. The postponement file, accompanied by the merit or reappointment file, is forwarded to the appropriate dean's office for recommendation, for further review by the [Committee] on Academic Personnel and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel."

CAP explicitly communicated to the EVC/Provost that this interim policy should become effective July 1, 2011 and continue until a more permanent policy has been agreed upon. CAP also requested that all sixth-year merit review cases in the current pipeline through June 30, 2011, which by default are postponing a tenure review, should be accompanied by a letter from the cognizant dean justifying this postponement.

Faculty Periods of Leave (June 20, 2011)

When candidates for advancement or promotion have been granted a leave of absence by the University for personal or medical reasons, the Academic Personnel Office should properly document the leave on the candidate's appointment history card. Discussions of such leaves of absence should not appear in the case analysis or in other parts of the dossier, except in the context of correctly documenting the review period.