

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT
2012-2013**

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 2012-2013.

I. CAP Membership

This year the CAP membership included three members from UCM and seven external members. The UCM members were Jan Wallander, - Spring 2013 (Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts); David Kelley, CAP Vice Chair (Natural Sciences); and Jian-Qiao Sun, (Engineering). The external members were Ruzena Bajcsy (UCB, Computer Science); Hung Fan (UCI, Molecular Biology and Biochemistry); Raymond Gibbs, CAP Chair (UCSC, Psychology); Gary Jacobson (UCSD, Political Science); Richard Regosin (UCI, French and Italian); and Michelle Yeh (UCD, East Asian Languages).

We had three CAP Analysts assisting the committee this year, in succession, Mary Ann Coughlin, Mayra Chavez and Simrin Takhar.

II. CAP Review of Academic Personnel Cases

CAP is charged with making recommendations on all Senate 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 presented this Spring extensive suggestions for revisions of the document to the Academic Personnel Office (APO) and the Divisional Council (DivCo). These comments were aimed at better aligning the MAPP with the UC APM.

Review Process

CAP's review process begins when the committee receives files from 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 fewer cases in the Fall (two to five) and many more in the Spring (five to eleven). 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 plus one of its membership. On rare occasions, a vote on a case is deferred, and the file is returned for further information or clarification. After the meeting the CAP Chair prepares draft reports on the dossiers. These are then distributed to the committee for review, consultation, and approval. The final version of the report is sent as a letter to the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) and Provost. If the EVC determines 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. In late spring, the EVC, after consultation with the CAP Chair, began forwarding the CAP report as written to the candidate and the responsible Dean.

For the vast majority of the cases, the above process ends CAP's review of the file. 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 2012-2013 academic year. CAP reviewed a total of 99 cases during the year, compared to 90 the year prior. The committee agreed with the School recommendations without modification on 91 (92%) of the reviewed cases (see Table 2). In addition, CAP agreed with the School recommendations but with a modification (e.g., a higher or lower step) for another 2 cases (2%). For 6 other cases (6%), CAP voted against the recommendation for a merit, promotion, or appointment, and for 1 case, an appeal of a recommendation made in 2011-2012, we returned the file to the central administration and asked for its own ruling per APM 220 84b.

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 EVC/Provost for a final level of review. The EVC/Provost is deeply involved in the academic personnel process, particularly in matters of appointment and promotion at tenured levels. This final level of review gives significant weight to CAP's recommendations.

III. General Comments Regarding the Submission of Personnel Cases

CAP offered substantive feedback to improve the academic personnel process via the MAPP document in Spring 2013. The revised MAPP contains most of our recommendations. For now, we highlight two issues that we will be the focus of improvement in the coming year.

First, CAP continues to emphasize the importance of Units/Schools getting their personnel reviews completed in a timely manner. CAP still is receiving files late in the Spring and early Summer that should have been presented to us many months earlier. These delays are all originating at the Unit/School levels.

Second, CAP continues to receive files in which Units/Schools have not properly enumerated the number and types of published materials that were specifically considered for the present review period. In some cases, the number of publications cited as relevant to a case will differ between the faculty member's statement, the Unit/School letter and the Dean's letter.

Finally, and related to the above, there remain cases in which publications are being advanced for a review which have already been evaluated in one form or another in past personnel actions (and this is a particular problem for merit reviews). With the exception of career reviews (i.e., promotions), individual publications can only count once in the review process. It is appropriate to acknowledge when a faculty member has been given additional rewards for a prior publication (e.g., when a previously published article or book has now won an award). But personnel letters should not again count papers from a previous review as part of the present review period just when, for example, an article that was earlier in press has now been published.

Overall, CAP hopes to push Units/School to be more specific and accurate in its count of various publications and other scholarly activities in its letters.

IV. Counsel to EVC/Provost

The CAP Chair briefly discusses each week's cases, after CAP has voted on its recommendation, with the CP/EVC and the VPAA. These discussions mostly focus on individual cases, but there were other general discussions regarding the preparation of academic personnel files, differences between the Academic Divisions in their recommendations, and CAP procedures. The topics of the more general administrative comments included the following: Recommendations for Increases in Off-Scale Salary Components, Bylaw Unit Voting Procedures, Accelerated Promotions, and Case Material Relevant to a Review. The substance of these administrative comments is detailed in Appendix B. Deans and APC are encouraged to review these as well.

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, held on Sept 13, 2012, was also attended by faculty and administrators. CAP was represented by Chair Raymond Gibbs and Vice Chair David Kelly, along with one internal member and two of the six other external members. The committee participated in three 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. A second , lunch, meeting was held involving CAP members and chairs of the Academic Senate Committees at UC Merced. 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 APO.

Spring Meeting

Academic Personnel, CAP, the Deans, and the School APCs convened during the spring semester to discuss the academic review process, as well as academic personnel policies and procedures. This meeting was held on May 20, 2013. CAP was represented by Chair Ray Gibbs and Vice-Chair David Kelley. Discussion items focused on the preparation of the Case Analysis, external evaluation response rates, Bio-Bibliography elements, teaching criteria and relevant streams of evidence, consistency in recommendations for beginning steps, off-scale salary recommendations, the role of diversity in academic reviews, and the Merit Short Form.

VI. Academic Senate Review Items

The Divisional Council transmitted to CAP various campus and systemwide proposals and documents for review. This academic year included a significant amount of such review activity, which was added to the review of cases. The Committee returned formal opinions on some of these, APM 15, 241, 430, 600, 700 as well as Bylaw 55, the Faculty Relocation Policy, the Open Access Policy. We also, as mentioned above, gave extensive feedback on MAPP.

VII. Acknowledgments

CAP would like to acknowledge its excellent working relationship with David Ojcius in his role as Vice Provost for Academic Personnel. The committee would also like to acknowledge APO, the Deans, the APC Chairs, and the AP staff in each school for their dedication to excellence in the personnel review process at UC Merced, and especially the three superb Senate Analysts assigned to CAP this past year.

Respectfully,

Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr., Chair (UCSC)
David F. Kelley, Vice Chair (UCM)
Ruzena Bajcsy (UCB)
Hung Fan (UCI)
Gary Jacobson (UCSD)
Richard Regosin (UCI)
Jian-Qiao Sun (UCM)
Jan Wallander, Spring 2013 (UCM)
Michelle Yeh (UCD)

APPENDIX A

**2012-2013 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
TABLES 1A-1D FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	85	5	8*	0	98

*Includes one split vote and one “no action”

TABLE 1A APPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant Professor (1 Acting)	19	0	0	0	19
Associate Professor	5	0	1	0	6
Professor	2	1	0	0	3
Lecturer Series (LPSOE)	2	0	0	0	2
Chairs	0	0	0	0	0
Total	28	1	1	0	30
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					93
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					97

TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Associate Professor	10	0	2	0	12
Professor	1	0	0	0	1
Professor VI	0	0	0	0	0
Above Scale	0	0	0	0	0
Total	11	0	2	0	13
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					85
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					85

TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASE	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
LPSOE/SOE	1	0	0	0	1
Assistant	20	2	0	0	22
Associate Professor (2 Adjunct)	13	2	1	0	16
Professor	6*	0	2**	0	8
Total	44	0	3	0	47
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					94
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					94

*Includes one 5-year mandatory review (without merit increase)

**Includes one “No Action.”

TABLE 1D REAPPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant	3	0	2	0	5
Associate	1	0	0	0	1
Professor	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	0	2	0	6
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					67
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					67

**TABLE 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2012-2013**

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	Pending		
Engineering (MCA)	24 (3)	20	1	1	2	0	83	92
Natural Sciences (MCA)	40 (2)	35	0	2	3	0	88	93
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts (MCA)	34 (1)	30	0	1	3	2	88	94
TOTALS (MCA)	98 (6)	85	1	4	8	0	87	92

*Includes two split votes.

**Includes one "No Action."

**TABLE 3
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2013**

	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	2011-2012	2012-2013
Total Cases	63	96	90	98
Total Appointments	13	34	33	30
Total Promotions	10	17	18	13
Total Merit Increases	40	39	38	47
Total Other	0	6	1	0