

Committee on Academic Personnel 2008-2009 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 2008-2009.

I. Membership

This year the membership of CAP included four members from UCM and six external members. The UCM members were Gregg Camfield (Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts), Tom Harmon (Engineering), Jan Wallander (Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts) and Roland Winston (Engineering/Natural Sciences). The external members were: Joseph Cerny, CAP Chair (UCB: Chemistry), Hung Fan (UCI: Molecular Biology and Biochemistry), Arturo Keller (UCSB: Environmental Science and Management), Roger Rangel (UCI: Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering), Richard Regosin (UCI: French and Italian), and Thomas Wickens (UCB: Psychology). Senate Director Nancy Clarke served as the CAP Analyst.

II. General Procedures

CAP is charged with making recommendations on all faculty 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 Professor IX to Above Scale.

CAP dealt with about 3-5 cases each week during the peak period of February-May; this was a lower number than anticipated due to sharply reduced recruiting due to the severe budget crisis. 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 the files. One lead reviewer and two secondary reviewers are assigned to read and report on each academic personnel case although all members are expected to familiarize themselves with the files. Readers' assignments are based on their areas of expertise. Readers serve not as advocates of their areas but as representatives acting in the best long-term interests of the campus. CAP members from UCM who serve on search committees or participate in School discussion of academic personnel cases recuse themselves automatically from CAP review of the case. A quorum of six members is required for voting on personnel actions.

Members review files prior to CAP's Friday morning meetings; non-UCM members participate by teleconference. Reports of the primary and secondary readers are followed by a thorough discussion of each case and a vote on the proposed action. Occasionally, a vote is deferred on a case and the file is returned for further information or clarification. After the meeting, drafts of the CAP reports on the dossiers are prepared by the CAP Analyst and the CAP Chair and then provided to all members for review and

consultation. Depending on the level of the personnel action, the final version of the report is sent as a letter to the Chancellor or the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC). 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 faculty member's School.

For the vast majority of the cases, the above process ends CAP's review. 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 communicates with CAP to discuss any disagreements with CAP's recommendation on particular cases.

Throughout the UC system, certain academic personnel cases, for example appointment at tenure or promotion to tenure, require an additional formal review of all the case materials by an ad hoc committee of experts from that campus. This ad hoc committee is appointed by the EVC and its report is part of the final materials submitted to CAP; the identity of the committee members is known only to CAP and the EVC. At the older campuses, these ad hoc committees typically involve three experts, with an outside Chair and one internal member. Due to the limited number of tenured faculty at UCM, the 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.

III. Specific Procedures

Procedures during 2008-2009. CAP follows UC systemwide policies as described in the academic personnel manual (APM): <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpeers/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

The Merced Academic Personnel Policies (MAPP) document is a very useful resource for faculty members, administrators and chairs of academic personnel committees. Since MAPP is still a dynamic instrument, CAP presents occasional suggestions for revision to the Academic Personnel Office and/or the Divisional Council. In particular this year, CAP strongly recommended that the current MAPP "coding" for Mid-Career Appraisals be changed from Positive, Positive with Caution and Terminal to Good, Fair and Poor, which appeared to CAP to be clearer and more concise language.

A further issue arose this year in the WASC deliberations with the Academic Senate/Administration on the evaluation of teaching in personnel cases. It was noted that the APM insists that the evaluation of teaching be based on more than one source of information. Beginning with the 2009-2010 academic year, CAP will require that "each

case we receive [must] evaluate teaching quality on the basis of at least two sources of evidence (at least one of which must register student input) and that each case include a robust analysis of the candidate's 'ability and diligence in the teaching role'."

IV. Work of CAP, 2008-2009 Year

CAP reviewed a total of 61 cases during the year (see Table 3, page 7 below). As noted above, this is down from 82 cases in 2007-2008 due to reduced recruiting (compare total appointments between the two years in Table 3). Overall CAP agreed with School recommendations without modification in 87% of all cases (see Table 2). Tables 1A-1C (page 6) detail the caseloads and outcomes of personnel actions by type of action; Table 2 gives aggregate decisions by academic unit.

CAP recommendations are advisory to the Chancellor and the EVC, who make the final decisions. They are deeply involved in the process, particularly in matters of appointment and promotion at tenured levels, and they take CAP's recommendations seriously. In 2008-2009, one CAP recommendation was overturned by either the Chancellor or the EVC.

V. CAP Campus Visits

As is becoming a UCM campus custom around the beginning of the Fall Semester, at the invitation of the EVC and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP), CAP held two meetings on August 21, 2008 with faculty and administrators. CAP was represented by the outgoing 2007-08 Chair and the incoming Chair as well as five other members of the 2007-08 CAP. A morning session was held solely with Assistant Professors and Academic Personnel. This session began with a brief introduction to academic advancement procedures at the University of California and was followed by extensive discussion between the assistant professors and CAP. Then, a second session was held over lunch and continuing into the afternoon which was open to All Faculty Members, Academic Personnel Chairs from the Schools, the Deans, and Academic Personnel. This session was devoted to questions and answers on many different facets of the academic personnel process at UC Merced. Brief minutes from both meetings of the faculty comments/questions and CAP responses are available in the Academic Personnel Office.

Then, as the 2008-2009 academic year progressed, it became clear that the quality of the Mid-Career Appraisals (MCA) coming to CAP was very uneven. Two issues of particular importance to CAP are the timeliness of the MCA case preparation and submission and the unique character of the MCA. As a result, the EVC and the VPAP scheduled a meeting on campus on May 8, 2009 to discuss the MCA process (as well as the revised MCA "coding" and the need for augmented evaluations of teaching – both of these topics are covered earlier in this report). Several external and internal CAP members, together with additional external members by telephone, met with UCM Academic Personnel Chairs from the Schools, Deans, Academic Personnel and interested faculty. A summary of the points that CAP brought up for discussion follows:

With regard to timeliness, it is crucial to the careers of the assistant Professors that the Academic Personnel Committees in the Schools prepare the cases and have them voted on by the faculty for submission by a mid-November deadline. Assistant Professors need the timely feed-back that such a schedule affords so that they can understand their prospects for tenure as early in their (typically) fourth year as possible, and have sufficient time to engage in corrective actions when necessary.

With regard to the MCA itself, in accordance with the Academic Personnel Manual, the purpose of the mid-career appraisal is to inform an assistant professor in a thorough and formal way about her or his prospects for tenure on the basis of the accomplishments so far. It is a crucial document and one of the most effective instruments in the UC personnel system. The MCA thus serves a very different function from the unit letter for a merit increase and should not simply re-state the case made for a merit increase.

Of utmost importance is rigorous evaluation and complete candor. If there are weaknesses in the candidate's career to date, a unit's natural reluctance to cause pain can do much more harm than good to the candidate and the university. CAP very often rejects mid-career appraisals that withhold severe judgment out of a misguided sense of kindness. Fields vary in their expectations for tenure, and mid-career appraisals reflect this. In general, however, positive mid-career accomplishments show evidence of research independent from her or his doctoral and postdoctoral work, of research projects that promise leadership in the field, and peer-reviewed evidence that research will continue once tenure is granted. In the sciences and engineering, the award of grants for research is a prominent piece of evidence that the research program is valid, although grants do not in themselves substitute for lack of published scholarship. It is important to note that, as in any case analysis, research papers or other scholarship of the faculty member must be analyzed and not just enumerated.

Particularly at the time of the MCA, which requires an evaluation of the junior faculty member's entire career at UC Merced, it is crucial that the scholarship of the faculty member be comprehensively analyzed for its impact. In addition, a similar comprehensive analysis of the faculty member's teaching experiences and growth of expertise is essential in the MCA. Specific evaluations of the components of performance should be supplied, with positive notes where appropriate and cautionary ones where necessary. What is not required is a bland summary of information already in the vita (numbers of papers published, lists of courses taught, etc.), except as it bears on the specific evaluation. A discussion of the service record of the faculty member is also appropriate, with a projection of his/her capacity for future service at UCM. Finally, the School tenured faculty's recorded vote, establishing the MAPP MCA coding applicable to the reviewed faculty member's progress, must be included in the forwarded case analysis.

The above issues were discussed in detail at the meeting, which was then followed by additional comments/questions by the faculty about CAP procedures in other types of personnel cases.

In conclusion, 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 CAP members wish to thank Nancy Clarke for her deep knowledge of UC academic personnel procedures, her wise counsel, and her outstanding service in support of CAP's work for the Academic Senate. We also wish her the very best for the future, following her retirement from the University of California on September 1, 2009.

Respectfully,

Joseph Cerny, Chair (UCB)	Roger Rangel (UCI)
Gregg Camfield	Richard Regosin (UCI)
Hung Fan (UCI)	Tom Wickens (UCB)
Tom Harmon	Jan Wallander
Arturo Keller (UCSB)	Roland Winston

**2008-2009 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
TABLES 1A-1C FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Agreed with Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	54	5	2	0	61*

Table 1A APPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Agreed with Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant Professor (1 Acting; 2 Adjunct))	11	2	--	--	13
Associate Professor (1 Adjunct)	2	1	1	--	4
Professor	3	--	--	--	3
Lecturer Series	2	--	--	--	2
Total	18	3	1	--	22
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					82%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					96%

TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Agreed with Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Associate Professor	2	1	--	--	3
Total					
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					3
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100%

TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASE	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Agreed with Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant (14 paired w/MCAs)	23	1	--	--	24
Associate Professor (1 Adjunct)	3	--	--	--	3
Professor (1 Adjunct)	5	--	1	--	6
Total	31	1	1	--	33
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					94%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					97%

*This number includes 1 assistant Professor Reappointment and 2 Endowed Chair Appointments.

**CAP Table 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2008-2009**

School	Number Proposed	CAP Recommendation				% CAP agreed w/unit or modified up or down	% CAP agreed w/unit without modification
		Agree	Modify-Up	Modify-Down	Disagree		
Engineering	15	12	1	--	2	87%	80%
Natural Sciences	29	25	2	2	--	100%	86%
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts	17	16	--	--	1	94%	94%
TOTALS	61	53	3	2	3	95%	87%

**CAP Table 3
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2009**

	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