

Committee on Academic Personnel 2007-2008 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 2007-2008.

I. Membership

This year the membership of CAP included two members from UCM and nine external members. The UCM members were Gregg Camfield (Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts) and Roland Winston (Engineering/Natural Sciences). Due to their new academic appointments, CAP members David Ojcius and Christopher Viney resigned from CAP effective January 1, 2008. The external members were: Anna Maria Busse Berger (UCD: Music), Joseph Cerny (UCB: Chemistry), Rowland Davis, CAP Chair (UCI: Biology), Randy Katz (UCB: EECS/Computer Science), Arturo Keller (UCSB: Environmental Science and Management), Roger Rangel (UCI: Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering), Richard Regosin (UCI: French and Italian), Thomas Wickens (UCB: Psychology), and Donald Wittman (UCSC: economics). Five senior members of the UCM faculty served as CAP observers. Senate Director Nancy Clarke served as the CAP Analyst. Due to illness Professor Davis had to resign from CAP in May and Richard Regosin assumed the role of Acting-Chair.

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 IX to Above Scale.

CAP deals with about 4-8 cases each week during the peak period of February-May. 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 files. One lead reviewer and two secondary reviewers are assigned to read and report on each 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 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 meetings. Reports of the primary and secondary readers are followed by thorough discussion of the case. Occasionally a vote is deferred on the recommendation of the unit and files are returned for further information or clarification. After the vote, drafts of CAP reports on the dossiers are prepared by the CAP Analyst and the CAP Chair and provided to all members for review and consultation. Depending on the level of the action, the final version 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 in a letter that is transmitted to the Dean of the faculty member's School.

For the vast majority of files, this ends CAP's review. If disagreement prevails at any level of review, the file is returned to the School for reconsideration before being resubmitted to CAP. The EVC communicates with CAP to discuss any disagreements with CAP's recommendation on particular cases.

III. Specific Procedures

Procedures during 2007-2008. 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

CAP was asked to comment on Academic Personnel's revised Merced Academic Personnel Policies (MAPP). CAP's comments have been forwarded to the Divisional Council where they will be reviewed. Additional comments from the Divisional Council and their likely approval will be forwarded to Provost Alley in the near future. The MAPP will likely become a very useful resource for all faculty members and the heads of academic units.

IV. Work of CAP, 2007-2008 Year

CAP reviewed a total of 82 cases during the year (Table 3). This is up from 56 cases in 2006-2007 (appointments and merit advancements increased, promotions remained the same). Overall CAP agreed with the School recommendations without modification in 89% of all cases (Table 2). Tables 1A-1C detail the case load and outcome of personnel actions by type of action; Table 2 gives aggregate decisions by academic unit.

CAP recommendations are advisory to the EVC and the Chancellor, 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 2007-2008, one CAP decision was overturned by either the Chancellor or EVC.

V. CAP Campus Visit

At the invitation of the EVC, several external members, together with internal members and observers, met with UC Merced faculty and with administrators in February 2008. The visit enhanced CAP's understanding of the campus and the challenges it faces and gave it the opportunity to respond in person to the questions and concerns of faculty and administrators regarding review procedures and the workings of the personnel process. After the visit, the external CAP members shared their experiences with the entire Committee. A formal report was forwarded to the EVC and the Chair of the UC Merced Academic Senate with the strong recommendation that CAP's contents be shared with faculty colleagues at all ranks and with members of the administration. The observations contained in the report were all tied to the members' duties on CAP and were informed by their experience at established UC campuses.

The meeting with campus administration, deans, and AP chairs primarily addressed the preparation of review files including such issues as appointment, advancement, and promotion standards, the composition of the review file, the solicitation and use of outside letters, the need for independent comments at all levels of review, and the importance of providing School context.

The meeting with assistant professors reviewed the process of advancement from appointment to tenure, focused on the respective roles of research, teaching, and service in the tenure decision, and emphasized the need for intellectual independence in research. The place of the self-statement and the purpose of the mid-career appraisal were also discussed. CAP members responded as well to questions of standards for advancement and promotion and to the concerns of assistant professors about their workload at UC Merced as it bears upon readiness for tenure.

The CAP report also contained several important points of concern that bore upon the campus as a whole:

- the need to create a work environment that fosters the careers of assistant professors. This includes addressing the heavy workload borne by junior faculty both in terms of teaching and of service, strengthening the mentoring program, and resolving the problems created by space and facilities shortages.
- the need for all senior faculty to assume a greater share of the workload. The small number of senior professors exacerbates the problem, and many have already responded accordingly, but this is a responsibility that cannot fall on the shoulders of a few and on the junior faculty as a whole.
- the desire for curricular breadth has created a faculty too often divided into small groups or even single persons to construct or teach a major. A lack of intellectual focus in the curriculum may be the result. This also has an impact on workload.
- the problem of achieving balance between the view that one of the campus's major missions is to promote research relevant to the San Joaquin Valley and Sierras and the requirement that such studies produce scholarship relevant to broad, international fields of inquiry. Unless this balance is achieved, stress on local studies becomes directly contrary to the UC mission as CAP members understand it.

In conclusion, CAP would like to acknowledge its excellent working relationship with David Ojcius in his role as Vice Provost for Academic Personnel. The Acting Chair and all CAP members wish to thank Nancy Clarke for her dedicated and committed service. Her consistent support and her wise counsel contribute significantly to the successful workings of the UC Merced CAP and benefit the entire UC Merced academic community.

Respectfully,

Richard Regosin, Acting Chair
Anna-Marie Busse-Berger
Gregg Camfield
Joseph Cerny
Rowland Davis

Randy Katz
Arturo A. Keller
Roger Rangel
Thomas Wickens
Donald Wittman

**2007 – 2008 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
TABLES 1A-1C: FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Agreed with Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	73	5	3	1	82

Table 1A. APPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Agreed with Modification	Disagree	Pending	
Assistant Professor (4 Acting)	22	3	2	0	27
Associate Professor	8	0	0	1	9
Professor	8	0	1	0	9
Lecturer Series	0	0	0	0	0
Total	38	3	3	1	45
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					84%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					91%

TABLE 1B. PROMOTIONS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Agreed with Modification	Disagree	Pending	
Associate Professor	1	1	0	0	2
Professor	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	1	0	0	2
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					50%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100%

TABLE 1C. MERIT INCREASES	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Agreed with Modification	Disagree	Pending	
Assistant (7 paired with MCA's)	29	0	0	0	29
Associate Professor	1	0	0	0	1
Professor	4	1	0	0	5
Total	34	1	0	0	35
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					97%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100%

**CAP Table 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2007-2008**

School	Number Proposed	CAP Recommendation					% CAP agreed w/unit or modified up or down	% CAP agreed w/unit w/o Modification
		Agree	Modify-Up	Modify-Down	Disagree	Pending		
Engineering	19	16	1	0	1	1	89%	84%
Natural Sciences	33	32	0	1	0	0	100%	97%
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts	32	27	1	2	2	0	94%	84%
TOTALS	84*	75	2	3	3	1	95%	89%

*Totals in Table 2 will differ from totals in Tables 1 and 3 due to actions involving split appointments across schools.

**CAP Table 3
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005 - 2008**

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
Total Cases	61	56	82
Total Appointments	43	32	45
Total Promotions	3	2	2
Total Merit Increases	14	22	35