

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL  
ANNUAL REPORT  
2015-2016**

**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 2015-2016.

**I. CAP Membership**

This year the CAP membership included two members from UCM and six external members. The UCM members were Theofanis “Fanis” Tsoulouhas, Vice Chair (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts), and Michael Modest (Engineering). The external members were Raymond Gibbs, CAP Chair (UCSC, Psychology); Gary Jacobson (UCSD, Political Science); John Leslie Redpath (UCI, Biology); Rajiv Singh (UCD, Physics), Michelle Yeh (UCD, East Asian Languages), and Mark Wrathall (UCR, Philosophy).

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 (AP) 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, sometimes require an additional formal review of the dossier and supplemental materials by an *ad hoc* committee of experts. In most cases, CAP makes the request for this *ad hoc* review, especially in instances where CAP lacks sufficient expertise in the faculty member's research area or when there are ambiguities in the case file. The *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. These *ad hoc* committees generally involve three experts, with an outside Chair and one internal member from the relevant unit.

### **Recommendations**

Appendix A provides a simple numerical summary and analysis of the CAP caseload for the 2015-2016 academic year. CAP reviewed a total of 148 cases during the year, compared to 92 the year prior. The committee agreed with the School recommendations without modification on 138 (93%) 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 4 cases (3%). For 6 other cases (4%), CAP voted against the recommendation or had a split vote for a merit, promotion, or appointment case. There were 12 cases this year in which a school dean and his/her school/bylaw unit faculty disagreed with each other and therefore presented different recommendations. Of these, CAP agreed with the faculty/bylaw unit 6 times and agreed with the dean 5 times. With regard to the remaining case, CAP agreed with the dean on the mid-career appraisal (MCA) rating and with the faculty/bylaw unit on the advancement recommendation.

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. On rare occasions, the Provost/EVC goes against CAP's recommendation, whereupon, per procedures, he is required to meet with CAP to discuss his decision to overturn. This year, the Provost/EVC disagreed with CAP twice.

### **III. General Comments Regarding the Submission of Personnel Cases**

In keeping with tradition, the Provost/EVC and APO issued revised sections of the MAPP document for campus wide review during the academic year. Along with the other Senate standing committees, CAP offered substantive feedback to improve the academic personnel process. This year's proposed revisions to the MAPP involved the LPSOE/LSOE titles, number of external letters, proposed new ratings for mid-career appraisals, clarification on denial of tenure in assistant professors' seventh year, and various other modifications related to the review process.

CAP discussed at length the present set of adjectives that may be given to faculty for the MCA in regard to their prospects for tenure. We have always had difficulty in deciding whether to recommend "Good" or "Fair" for some cases and have informally heard that some faculty are disturbed when they receive only a "Fair" assessment. CAP's recommendation, therefore, was to change the set of adjectives to include a four-tier system (which is employed at some other UC campuses such as UCSD). They are: (a) Favorable: Promotion is likely, contingent on maintaining the current trajectory of excellence and on appropriate external evaluation; (b) Favorable with reservations: Promotion is likely if the candidate addresses identified weaknesses, deficiencies, or imbalances in the record; (c) Problematic: Promotion is uncertain given significant weaknesses in the record, but possible if these may be adequately addressed, and (d) Unfavorable: Promotion is unlikely given major weaknesses in the record.

Under this system, certain faculty members who have in the past received "Fair" may now be given the more positive "Favorable with reservations," while other cases of "Fair" may now be termed as "Problematic," depending, of course, on the specific challenges each faculty member faces at the time of the MCA. CAP finds the above system to be more comfortable because it may better serve the faculty being given feedback.

CAP also requested clarification regarding denial of tenure and terminal year. The way the MAPP is currently worded implies that if a faculty member makes an unsuccessful bid for tenure at any time (e.g., earlier than at the end of the 6th year), then he/she will receive notification of a terminal year, with no other chances for tenure being possible. CAP suggested that that the statement be modified to state that if a faculty member is again denied in the seventh year, then there are no more opportunities to go up for tenure again, if that is what is intended. As a more general comment regarding the language in MAPP regarding dates, CAP noted that it is unclear as to the exact time frame intended when mentioning "seventh year." This really means, in this case, at the end of the sixth year, but not at the end of the seventh year. CAP therefore suggested that this general concern be addressed by explicitly.

### **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 for the Faculty (VPF). 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. For example, we had several discussions this past year with the Provost/EVC and VPF regarding the MAPP and when best to make change to this document.

## **V. Academic Personnel Meetings**

### **Fall Meeting**

As is becoming an annual tradition at UCM, the Provost/EVC and the VPF requested CAP's presence at a fall academic personnel meeting. The meeting, held on October 12, 2015, was also attended by faculty and administrators. CAP was represented by Chair Raymond Gibbs, Vice Chair Fanis Tsoulouhas, and an additional external member. 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 meeting was held involving CAP members, Provost/EVC, VPF, AP Chairs, and UCM faculty. This was followed by an afternoon session and was open to all faculty members, School AP 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 Senate office. Significant discussion items raised by faculty concerned criteria for promotion, the evaluation of teaching, and extramural funding success.

## **VI. Academic Senate Review Items**

The Division Council transmitted to CAP various campus and systemwide proposals and documents for review. The committee was named as the lead reviewer for proposed revisions to the following APM sections: 278, 210-6, 279, 112, and new section 350 (Clinical series) as well as 360 and 210-4 (Librarian series). We endorsed both sets of revisions. CAP also, as mentioned above, gave feedback on the MAPP.

## **VII. Acknowledgments**

CAP would like to acknowledge its excellent working relationship with Gregg Camfield in his role as VPF. The committee would also like to acknowledge APO, the Deans, the AP 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.

Respectfully,

Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr., Chair (UCSC)  
Theofanis "Fanis" Tsoulouhas (UCM)  
Michael Modest (UCM)  
Gary Jacobson (UCSD)  
John Leslie Redpath (UCI)  
Rajiv Singh (UCD)  
Michelle Yeh (UCD)  
Mark Wrathall (UCR)

**APPENDIX A**

**2015-2016 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL  
TABLES 1A-1D FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
<b>TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6*</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>148</b>

\*Includes 1 split vote and 1 postponed vote

TABLE 1A APPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant Professor (includes Adjuncts & Acting)	30	0	0	0	30
Associate Professor (includes Adjuncts)	2	0	0	0	2
Professor (1 with Endowed Chair)	2	1	0	0	3
Lecturer Series (LPSOE)	2	0	0	0	2
Endowed Chairs	1	0	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>38</b>
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					97
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Associate Professor	7	0	1*	0	8
Professor	10	0	0	0	10
Professor VI	2	0	0	0	2
Above Scale	1	0	0	0	1
LSOE	0	0	1	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					91
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					91

\*Postponed vote

TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASE	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
LPSOE/SOE	6	1	0	0	7
Assistant (1 Adjunct)	45	1	1	0	47
Associate Professor (1 Adjunct)	24	0	3*	0	27
Professor	5	1	0	0	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>87</b>
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					92
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					95

\*Includes 1 split vote

TABLE 1D REAPPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant	1	0	0	0	1
Associate	0	0	0	0	0
Professor	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	0	0	0	0	1
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					100
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

**TABLE 2  
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS  
2015-2016**

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		
<b>Engineering</b>	<b>29</b>	23	1	0	5	0	79	83
<b>(MCA)</b>	<b>3</b>							
<b>Natural Sciences</b>	<b>54</b>	54	0	0	0	0	100	100
<b>(MCA)</b>	<b>6</b>							
<b>Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts</b>	<b>65</b>	61	0	3	1	0	94	98
<b>(MCA)</b>	<b>7</b>							
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>(MCA)</b>	<b>16</b>							

**TABLE 3  
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2016**

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

	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
<b>Total Cases</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Total Appointments</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Total Promotions</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Total Merit Increases</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Total Other</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

	<b>2013-2104</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>
<b>Total Cases</b>	<b>128*</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>148</b>
<b>Total Appointments</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Total Promotions</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Total Merit Increases</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Total Other</b>	4 1 MCA only 3 reappointments *1 case pending	3 reappointments	1 reappointment