COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT
2013-2014

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 2013-2014.

I. CAP Membership

This year the CAP membership included two members from UCM and six external members. The UCM members were David Kelley, CAP Vice Chair (Natural Sciences) and Theofanis "Fanis" Tsoulouhas (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts). The external members were Raymond Gibbs, CAP Chair (UCSC, Psychology); Gary Jacobson (UCSD, Political Science); John Leslie Redpath (UCI, Biology); Richard Regosin (UCI, French and Italian); Rajiv Singh (UCD, Physics), and Michelle Yeh (UCD, East Asian Languages).

The CAP analyst this year was 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's suggestions for revisions of the document to the Academic Personnel Office (APO) and the Division Council (DivCo).

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 Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC). If the Provost/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.

For the vast majority of the cases, the above process ends CAP's review of the file. The Provost/EVC 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 Provost/EVC.

Recommendations
Appendix A provides a simple numerical summary and analysis of the CAP caseload for the 2013-2014 academic year. CAP reviewed a total of 128 cases (one case was returned for further information and is still pending at the time of this writing) during the year, compared to 98 the year prior. The committee agreed with the School recommendations without modification on 116 (91%) 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 5 cases (4%). For 6 other cases (5%), CAP voted against the recommendation or had a split vote for a merit, promotion, or appointment case. Two of these cases were appeals: one an appeal of non-appointment from AY 2012-2013 and one an appeal of non-reappointment, although CAP was asked to review the file after the faculty member had resigned.

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 Provost/EVC for a final level of review. The Provost/EVC 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
In keeping with tradition, in the spring semester, the Provost/EVC and APO issued revised sections of the MAPP document for campus wide review. Along with the other Senate standing committees, CAP offered substantive feedback to improve the academic personnel process, specifically, recruitment and the process for Career Equity Reviews (CER). CAP suggested that the roles of Deans, AP Chairs, and search committees be made explicit and that the section should require the deans' concurrence with the unit chairs in the postponement, extension or cancellation of a search because of the short list composition. This consultation component will ensure a checks and balances system so that deans are not granted unilateral authority over the composition of the short list. CAP's other significant suggested revision was that CERs and merit increases should proceed separately.

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

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 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. In spring semester, CAP submitted this feedback to APO in response to APO's request for input on Digital Measures, the system used to generate the bio-bibliography.

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 Provost/EVC
The CAP Chair briefly discusses each week's cases, after CAP has voted on its recommendation, with the Provost/EVC and the Vice Provost of Academic Personnel (VPAP). 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. CAP also had several conversations with the

Provost/EVC and the VPAP, along with the Deans, regarding the Deans' role in the faculty appointment process and how best to transmit that information to CAP in specific appointment cases.

V. Academic Personnel Meetings

Fall Meeting
As is becoming an annual tradition at the UCM campus, the Provost/EVC and the VPAP requested CAP's presence at a fall academic personnel meeting. The meeting, held on September 20, 2013, was also attended by faculty and administrators. CAP was represented by Vice Chair David Kelly, along with one other internal member and three 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, Provost/EVC, VPAP, AP Chairs, and UCM faculty. This was followed by an afternoon session and 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. One of the most significant discussion items raised by untenured faculty was the lack of a functional research infrastructure at UCM and the adverse impact their trajectory towards tenure. After the meeting, CAP submitted a memo to the Provost/EVC to express its desire to work with the Provost/EVC to find solutions to these problems.

Spring Meeting
Academic Personnel, CAP, the Deans, and the School AP Chairs 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 9, 2014. CAP was represented by Chair Ray Gibbs, Vice Chair David Kelley, and one other internal member. Discussion items focused on the preparation of the Case Analysis, Bio-Bibliography elements, and the Merit Short Form.

VI. Academic Senate Review Items

The Division Council transmitted to CAP various campus and systemwide proposals and documents for review. The Committee returned formal opinions on some of these, including proposed revisions to APM 35 and 600, as well as Senate Bylaw 55. 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 of 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 the Senate Analyst assigned to CAP this past year. Finally, CAP lost a valuable, longstanding, member of the committee this past Winter with the passing of Professor Richard Regosin from UC Irvine. Richard served on CAP at UCM for the past seven years. He was devoted to maintaining fairness in the academic personnel process,

and took great pleasure in the excellence of faculty appointments and advancement here at UCM. We will miss Richard's insightful observations and his marvelous sense of humor.

Respectfully,

Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr., Chair (UCSC)
David F. Kelley, Vice Chair (UCM)
Theofanis "Fanis" Tsoulouhas (UCM)
Gary Jacobson (UCSD)
John Leslie Redpath (UCI)
Richard Regosin (UCI)
Rajiv Singh (UCD)
Michelle Yeh (UCD)

APPENDIX A

2013-2014 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
TABLES 1A-1D FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE

	CAP Recommendation				
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	TOTAL
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	**116**	**5**	**6***	**1**	**128**

*Includes one split vote

TABLE 1A APPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	TOTAL
Assistant Professor (3 Acting)	34	2	0	0	**36**
Associate Professor	2	0	1*	0	**3**
Professor (1 Adjunct)	5	0	0	1	**6**
Lecturer Series (LPSOE)	2	0	0	0	**2**
Chairs	3	0	0	0	**3**
Total	**46**	**2**	**1**	**1**	**50**
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					**92**
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					**96**

*Includes appeal of non-appointment from AY 2012-13

TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	CAP Recommendation				
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	TOTAL
Associate Professor	9	1	1	0	**11**
Professor	1	0	0	0	**1**
Professor VI	1	0	0	0	**1**
Above Scale	0	0	0	0	**0**
LSOE	3	0	0	0	**3**
Total	**14**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**16**
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					**88**
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					**94**

TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASE	CAP Recommendation				
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	TOTAL
LPSOE/SOE	3	1	0	0	**4**
Assistant	24*	0	0	0	**24**
Associate Professor	18	1	1	0	**20**
Professor	9**	0	2	0	**11**
Total	**54**	**2**	**3**	**0**	**59**
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					**92**
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					**95**

*Includes one MCA only, no merit increase
**Includes one quinquennial mandatory review with merit increase

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

*Includes one split vote

TABLE 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2013-2014

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	**18**	14	2	0	1*	1	82	94
(MCA)	**2**							
Natural Sciences	**41**	38	0	1	2	0	93	95
(MCA)	**1**							
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts	**69**	64	2	0	3	0	93	96
(MCA)	**5**							
TOTALS	**128**	**116**	**4**	**1**	**6**	**1**	**91****	**95****
(MCA)	**8**							

*Includes one split vote.
** Calculated based on 127 recommendations. One case was returned for further information and is pending.

TABLE 3
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2014

	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

	2013-2104
Total Cases	128*
Total Appointments	50
Total Promotions	16
Total Merit Increases	58
Total Other	4 1 MCA only 3 reappointments *1 case pending