

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT
2011-2012**

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 2011-2012.

I. CAP Membership

This year the CAP membership included three members from UCM and seven external members. The UCM members were Jan Wallander, CAP Chair (Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts); Michael Colvin, CAP Vice Chair – Spring 2012 (Natural Sciences); Jian-Qiao Sun, CAP Vice Chair – Fall 2011 (Engineering). The external members were Ruzena Bajcsy (UCB, Computer Science); C. Fred Driscoll (UCSD, Physics); Hung Fan (UCI, Molecular Biology and Biochemistry); Raymond Gibbs (UCSC, Psychology); Gary Jacobson (UCSD, Political Science, Spring 2012 term); Richard Regosin (UCI, French and Italian); and Michelle Yeh (UCD, East Asian Languages). Mary Ann Coughlin served as the CAP Analyst.

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 presents occasional suggestions for revision to the Academic Personnel Office (APO) and/or the Divisional Council (DivCo). This year the MAPP underwent a substantial rewrite so that it was better aligned with the APM and more accurately reflected academic personnel practices at Merced. CAP, as well as other Senate bodies, reviewed the revision and submitted feedback to the Academic Personnel Office. Progress on the manual is expected to continue during the next academic year.

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 three to five files per week. 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. Occasionally, 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 Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) and Provost. If the 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. In late spring, the EVC, after consultation with the CAP Chair, began forwarding the CAP report as written to the candidate and the responsible Dean.

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

Recommendations

Appendix A provides a simple numerical summary and analysis of the CAP caseload for the 2011-2012 academic year. CAP reviewed a total of 90 cases during the year, compared to 96 the year prior. The committee agreed with the School recommendations without modification on 72 (80%) 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 12 cases (13%). 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 EVC/Provost for a final level of review. The EVC/Provost 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. Comments Regarding the Submission of Personnel Cases

CAP has general comments regarding the Schools' submission of Personnel cases. These pertain mainly to Mid-Career Appraisals (MCAs) and case materials.

Mid-Career Appraisal

A timely submission of the MCA can be crucial to the career of an Assistant Professor, who should have

a punctual evaluation on his/her progress toward tenure. Long delays in receiving this review leave less time for “corrective actions” when they are needed prior to the end of the tenure clock. The deadline in 2011-2012 for submission of MCA cases to APO was November 18, 2011. CAP had meetings scheduled in late November and December to focus on reviewing these cases; however, none of the six MCAs that were submitted for review during the year were submitted by this date. Schools are strongly urged to complete MCA cases earlier in the academic year for the significant benefit of the Assistant Professors.

CAP urges the APC Chairs and the Deans to establish and enforce early deadlines for review materials, particularly for external letters, so that MCA cases for 2012-2013 are submitted in final form to APO by next fall’s deadline. This is also the normal deadline for the seventh-year final appraisals for some of the Assistant Professors. It is noteworthy that some other campuses solicit agreements for external letters prior to the beginning of the academic year during which the review takes place.

Case Materials

A well-written and comprehensive case file is critical to maintaining the integrity of the personnel review. Case materials should adequately and appropriately analyze a candidate’s research, teaching, and service performance. With regard to research, the case analysis from the schools should thoroughly evaluate the quality and the significance of candidates’ scholarship. Impact factors and related indices, while helpful as additional information, cannot substitute for an in-depth evaluation. Below CAP reiterates text from its 2009-2010 annual report:

"Research. A description of a candidate’s research should highlight and analyze [and not merely enumerate] the nature, significance, and intellectual impact of the main components of the work. The description need not be long, since CAP reads the same dossier. However, especially in areas unlikely to be understood by outsiders, a brief lay description of the research area is [also] very useful. The report should include summaries, without long or numerous quotations of the opinions of the outside reviewers, since they are best able to judge the impact of the work in the field.

"Publication Venue. One measure of quality (albeit imperfect) is the venue of publication. It would be helpful to give an honest assessment of the publication’s recognition in the discipline. Here are some examples: one of the top three general journals in the discipline; the primary journal in the field (where a discipline might be divided into about 6 rather than 30 fields); a well-recognized journal in the subfield; and the major publisher of books on the topic. No adjectives need be applied to journals that do not garner prestige in the discipline."

With regard to teaching, [APM 210-1](#) states, “It is the responsibility of the department chair to submit meaningful statements, accompanied by evidence, of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness at lower-division, upper-division, and graduate levels of instruction. *More than one kind of evidence shall accompany each review file* [emphasis added].” The manual follows this with an enumerated listing of acceptable forms of evidence. This does not include faculty members’ teaching self-statements, as they do not provide the desired objective evaluations of candidates’ teaching efforts.

With regard to service, CAP stresses the importance of properly documenting university, campus, and school committee efforts. As [expected] levels of commitment vary from committee to committee and from member to member, committee workload descriptions and evaluations should be adequately detailed. They should include an appraisal of the quality of the candidate’s contributions and of the extent of their efforts in committee assignments.

IV. Counsel to EVC/Provost

CAP reviewed various cases during the year that prompted the committee to make recommendations to

the EVC/Provost on academic personnel procedures and policy. Some of these pertained specifically to one case, while others were more general. The topics of the more general administrative comments included the following: Recommendations for Increases in Off-Scale Salary Components, Bylaw Unit Voting Procedures, Accelerated Promotions, and Case Material Relevant to a Review. The substance of these administrative comments is detailed in Appendix B. Deans and APC are encouraged to review these as well.

V. Academic Personnel Meetings

Fall Meeting

As is becoming an annual tradition at the UCM campus, the EVC/Provost and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP) requested CAP's presence at a fall academic personnel meeting. The meeting, scheduled on Aug. 26, 2011, was also attended by faculty and administrators. CAP was represented by outgoing Chair Joseph Cerny, incoming Chair Jan Wallander, two internal members, and five external members. The committee led two 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. This was followed by extensive discussion between the Assistant Professors and CAP. A second session, which was held over lunch and continued into the afternoon, 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.

Spring Meeting

Academic Personnel, CAP, the Deans, and the School APCs 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 11, 2012. CAP was represented by Chair Jan Wallander, two internal members, and six external members. Discussion items focused on the preparation of the Case Analysis, external evaluation response rates, Bio-Bibliography elements, teaching criteria and relevant streams of evidence, consistency in recommendations for beginning steps, off-scale salary recommendations, AY 2012-13 review schedule, and the Merit Short Form. Informal minutes are maintained in the APO. CAP recommends that the spring meeting be held earlier in the Spring semester to balance better the Fall meeting.

VI. Academic Senate Review Items

The Divisional Council transmitted to CAP various campus and systemwide proposals and documents for review. This academic year included a significant amount of such review activity, which was added to the review of cases. The Committee returned formal opinions on some of these, including the Proposed Changes to APM 010, 015, and 020; the Proposed Changes to APM 200 and 205; the Proposed Changes to APM 668; the Faculty Workload Report; the Report of Salary Task Force; the proposed Career Equity Review Procedures for UCM; the proposed Delegation of Appointment Authority for UCM; the proposed Policy for the Postponement of Tenure Review; and the MAPP Rewrite.

VII. Acknowledgments

CAP would like to acknowledge its excellent working relationship with David Ojcius in his role as Vice Provost for 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 especially Mary Ann Coughlin, the Senate Analyst assigned to CAP.

Respectfully,

Jan Wallander, Chair
Jian-Qiao Sun, Vice Chair, Fall 2011
Michael Colvin, Vice Chair, Spring 2012
Ruzena Bajcsy (UCB)
C. Fred Driscoll (UCSD)
Hung Fan (UCI)
Raymond Gibbs (UCSC)
Gary Jacobson (UCSD)
Richard Regosin (UCI)
Michelle Yeh (UCD)

APPENDIX A

**2011-2012 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
TABLES 1A-1D FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	72*	12	5**	1	90

*Includes two split votes

**Includes one "No Action."

TABLE 1A APPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant Professor (3 Acting)	16	4	0	0	20
Associate Professor (Acting)	1	0	0	0	1
Professor	2	3	0	0	5
Lecturer Series (4 LPSOE)	4	0	0	0	4
Chairs	3	0	0	0	3
Total	26	7	0	0	33
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					79
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Associate Professor	12*	1	2	1	16
Professor	0	0	0	0	0
Professor VI	1	1	0	0	2
Above Scale	0	0	0	0	0
Total	13	2	2	1	18
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					72
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					83

*Includes one split vote.

TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASE	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
LPSOE/SOE	0	0	0	0	0
Assistant	17	3	2**	0	22
Associate Professor (2 Adjunct)	13*	0	0	0	13
Professor	2	0	1	0	3
Total	32	3	3	0	38
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					84
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					92

*Includes one split vote.

**Includes one "No Action."

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
Total	1	0	0	0	1
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					100
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

**TABLE 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2011-2012**

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 (MCA)	17 (1)	12	3	0	2**	0	71	88
Natural Sciences (MCA)	38 (4)	29*	2	3	3	1	76	89
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts (MCA)	35 (1)	31	1	3	0	0	89	100
TOTALS (MCA)	90 (6)	72	6	6	5	1	80	93

*Includes two split votes.

**Includes one "No Action."

**TABLE 3
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2012**

	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
Total Cases	63	96	90
Total Appointments	13	34	33
Total Promotions	10	17	18
Total Merit Increases	40	39	38
Total Other	0	6	1

Appendix B

Recommendations for Increases in Off-Scale Salary Components (January 20, 2012)

Deans sometimes recommend increases in the off-scale salary component at the time a recommendation is made for an advancement. In such cases, CAP would like to see a rationale that is specifically directed to the off-scale increase. CAP holds that it is not sufficient to point to normative salary data. Rather, the case should preferably be based on extraordinary accomplishments of the faculty in the review period. Alternatively, a specific case for an equity adjustment may be made.

Bylaw Unit Voting Procedures (March 1, 2012)

CAP notes that two SNS Bylaw units adhere to unit voting procedures in which all faculty in the unit, without regard for rank, vote on promotion cases. Typically, only faculty in ranks that are higher than that of the candidate being considered for promotion would be able to vote on the file. When such practice is not the standard, CAP believes that conflicts of interest may ensue because a faculty member at the same rank will vote on the promotion of a colleague who later will vote on his/her own promotion. For example, it seems less likely under these conditions that an Assistant Professor will vote against the promotion of a colleague Assistant Professor who will later be in the position to vote on his/her own promotion. More generally this voting procedure may engender implicitly a situation where it is in everyone's best interest to support the promotion of most or all other colleagues. Consequently, the vote transmitted from such a Bylaw unit may be perceived to be less informative when considered at subsequent levels of review. CAP recommends that only faculty in ranks that are higher than that of the candidate being considered for promotion would be able to vote on the file.

Accelerated Promotion (March 15, 2012)

CAP notes deficiencies in the preparation of material for cases where accelerated promotion is being recommended by a previous level of review. An accelerated promotion occurs when the effective date of the recommended promotion is less than six years after the appointment or promotion of an Assistant or Associate professor. It is important that a clear rationale is presented when an accelerated promotion is being recommended. This needs to be addressed explicitly in the Case Analysis prepared by the unit as well as in the Dean's letter, whenever that level of review recommends this action. This also needs to be clearly communicated in the solicitation for external letters so that referees can comment about the appropriateness of this action.

Case Material Relevant to a Review (May 25, 2012)

CAP would like to address the ambiguity that exists in the Schools around materials that are to be considered for review in a given review period, as this lack of clarity has created variances in how Case Files are assembled and thus weakens the broader fairness of the review process. Listed below are guidelines that should be used in the preparation of the Case Analysis, or more generally the Case File, followed by specific examples of recent files that have deviated from these guidelines and that CAP feels should be formally addressed by Academic Personnel.

Actions Requiring a Career Review (e.g., Appointments, Promotions with Tenure)

For actions that require a career review, all scholarly, teaching, and service evidence pertain to the review and should/can be addressed in the Case File. This includes materials prior to an individual's appointment at UC Merced as well as research that has not yet been published.

All Other Actions (e.g., Merit Increases)

For actions that do not require a career review, the general rule is that evidence may only be counted once and only in the review period to which the evidence pertains. In some instances, determining the review period is fairly straightforward, for example, a grant should be included in the review period in which it was awarded. For publications, the relevant review period can be less apparent because a research manuscript can be described in four stages: in preparation, submitted, accepted (or in press), and published (or in print). The Case File should never pay attention to or count manuscripts that are in the "in preparation" or "submitted" status. Both "accepted" and "published" statuses can be relevant to a review period, but any given manuscript can only be referred to or counted in one review period. In other words, if a Case Analysis or other materials in the Case File refers to or counts a manuscript when it is "accepted" in one review cycle, it may not be referred to or counted in the next, even if its status has changed to "published."

In addition, inclusion of book-type products warrants further attention. Typically a book is introduced in the Biobib and Case Analysis when a publisher has agreed to publish the manuscript as a book after vetted and reviewed, signifying it is "in press." It is accepted that the Candidate receive credit in that review period for the achievement of "in press" status and then again when it is published. Occasionally, a book does not get published. It must be noted in the MAPP that it is the responsibility of the faculty unit to review progress on a book in press and address in subsequent Case Analyses, as appropriate, any failure in the book being published.