

**RESERVE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT
2025-2026**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Reserve Committee on Academic Personnel (RCAP) is pleased to report on its activities for the academic year 2025-2026.

I. RCAP Membership

This year's RCAP members were Lin Tian, Chair (School of Natural Sciences), Nathan Monroe (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts), Mark Matsumoto (School of Engineering), Chris Amemiya (School of Natural Sciences), Sarah Kurtz (School of Engineering), and Paul Alemida (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts).

The RCAP analyst was Simrin Takhar.

II. RCAP Review of Academic Personnel Cases

RCAP is charged with reviewing personnel files of current CAP members, or those who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year, and appeals by faculty members.

Policies and Procedures

RCAP 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 department chairs.

Review Process

RCAP'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 RCAP's meeting and ensuing discussion of the files. One lead reviewer and one secondary reviewer are assigned to report on each case; however, all members are expected to read and discuss 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 RCAP's respective review of the file.

If the RCAP lacks sufficient expertise in the faculty member's research area, the bylaws allow for the committee membership to temporarily expand to include external (UC) experts. This occurred in the review of most of the cases in AY 25-26.

Reports from the primary and secondary readers on cases are followed by a thorough committee discussion. All members are asked to give an opinion, as well as a vote on the proposed action. RCAP's quorum for all personnel actions is half plus one of its membership. After the meeting,

the RCAP analyst prepares draft reports on the dossiers. These reports 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/Provost (EVC/Provost), Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP), and APO. After the meeting, the RCAP chair meets with the EVC/Provost and VPAP to discuss the case. Decisions on actions are made by the EVC/Provost or the VPAP; RCAP only makes recommendations. If the EVC/Provost or VPAP determines that no further deliberation is necessary, RCAP's report is transmitted to the candidate's department.

For the vast majority of the cases, the above process ends RCAP's review of the file. The EVC/Provost or VPAP communicates with RCAP to discuss any disagreements with RCAP's recommendation on particular cases. This academic year, the EVC/Provost or VPAP agreed with all of RCAP's recommendations.¹

Recommendations

Appendix A provides a simple numerical summary and analysis of the RCAP caseload for the 2025-2026 academic year. RCAP reviewed four cases this year.

Tables 1A-1B detail 2025-2026 caseload and outcome according to the proposed personnel action. Table 2 provides aggregate recommendation by the schools. Table 3 provides a historical summary of RCAP cases.

Respectfully,

Lin Tian, Chair (SNS)
Nathan Monroe (SSHA)
Mark Matsumoto (SOE)
Chris Amemiya (SNS)
Sarah Kurtz (SOE)
Paul Almeida (SSHA)

¹ CAP did not reach consensus on one of their cases this year and therefore made no recommendation.

APPENDIX A

2025-2026 RESERVE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL TABLES 1-3 FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE

	RCAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	No Recommendation	Disagreed	Pending	
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	2	1	1²	0	4

TABLE 1A ADVANCEMENTS	RCAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Professor	1	0	0	0	1
Professor Step VI	1	0	1 ²	0	2
Total	2	0	1	0	3
% RCAP Agreed with Proposal					67
% RCAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					67

TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	RCAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	No recommendation	Disagreed	Pending	
Associate Professor	0	1	0	0	1
Total	0	1	0	0	1
% RCAP Agreed with Proposal					N/A
% RCAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					N/A

² Disagreed with the dean's recommendation, as the department did not make a recommendation.

TABLE 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2025-2026

School	Number Proposed	RCAP Recommendation					No Recommendation	% RCAP agreed w/dept. or dean without modification	% RCAP agreed w/dept. or dean or modified up or down
		Agree	Modify-Up	Modify-Down	Disagree	Pending			
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A
Natural Sciences	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	50	50
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts	2	1	0	0	1 ²	0	0	50	50
TOTALS	4	2	0	0	1	0	1	50	50

TABLE 3
CASES REVIEWED BY RCAP 2018 - present

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023
Total Cases	1	4	1	13	4
Total Appointments	0	1 (Endowed chair)	0	0	0
Total Promotions	1	0	0	9	0
Total Merit Increases	0	3 (1 Appeal review)	1	4 (including 1 Quinquennial Review)	4

	2023-2024	2024-2025	2025-2026
Total Cases	8	4	4
Total Appointments	0	0	0
Total Promotions	1	2	1
Total Merit Increases	7	2	3