

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT
2014-2015**

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 2014-2015.

I. CAP Membership

This year the CAP membership included three members from UCM and five external members. The UCM members were David Kelley, CAP Vice Chair (Natural Sciences), Theofanis “Fanis” Tsoulouhas (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), and Michelle Yeh (UCD, East Asian Languages).

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) Committee 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 2014-2015 academic year. CAP reviewed a total of 92 cases during the year, compared to 128 the year prior. The committee agreed with the School recommendations without modification on 83 (90%) 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 (4%). For 5 other cases (5%), CAP voted against the recommendation or had a split vote for a merit, promotion, or appointment case.

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.

III. General Comments Regarding the Submission of Personnel Cases

In keeping with tradition, in the spring semester, the Provost/EVC and APO issued revised sections of the MAPP document for campus wide review. 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. CAP raised an issue concerning the role of peer evaluation of teaching in the academic review process. One section of the proposed revisions referred to peer evaluation as being central to the review process while another section stated that opinions of colleagues "may" be included in the assessment of teaching.

Our question is whether peer evaluation should be included as a *necessary* part of any teaching review. CAP always appreciates multiple sources of evidence in evaluating teaching performance, including peer evaluation, if possible. We note that external reviewers on promotion cases to the rank of LSOE sometimes explicitly inquire about the lack of peer evaluation in the materials they receive.

However, as much as we welcome feedback from peers, especially related to direct observation of classroom instruction, we also acknowledge the difficulties associated with creating a fair, widely agreed upon plan for obtaining peer evaluation of teaching.

For now, CAP simply raised the issue of the slight inconsistency in the MAPP document as to whether peer evaluation is required or not in the assessment of LPSOE and LSOE faculty. But we also urge APO and the Provost/EVC to initiate broader discussions with faculty about how best to fairly, consistently include peer evaluations in these academic personnel reviews.

CAP continues to emphasize the importance of Units/Schools getting their personnel reviews completed in a timely manner. Although there has been significant improvement this past year regarding this problem, CAP still is receiving files in late Spring and early Summer that should have been presented to us many months earlier. These delays are all originating at the Unit/School levels.

CAP continues to receive files in which Units/Schools have not properly enumerated the number and types of published materials that were specifically considered for the present review period. In some cases, the number of publications cited as relevant to a case will differ between the faculty member's statement, the Unit/School letter and the Dean's letter. We urge all when preparing their own contributions to case files to carefully review the number and types of materials and to note when discrepancies are found.

Finally, and related to the above, there remain cases in which publications are being advanced for a review which have already been evaluated in one form or another in past personnel actions (and this is a particular problem for merit reviews). With the exception of career reviews (i.e., promotions), individual publications can only count once in the review process. It is appropriate to acknowledge when a faculty member has been given additional rewards for a prior publication (e.g., when a previously published article or book has now won an award). But personnel letters should not again count papers from a previous review as part of the present review period just when, for example, an article that was earlier in press has now been published. In spring

semester, CAP submitted this feedback to APO in response to APO's request for input on Digital Measures, the system used to generate the bio-bibliography.

Overall, CAP hopes to push Units/School to be more specific and accurate in its count of various publications and other scholarly activities in its letters.

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 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 23, 2014, was also attended by faculty and administrators. CAP was represented by Chair Raymond Gibbs, Vice Chair David Kelly, along with two other internal members, an additional external member, and one external member who joined via teleconference. 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, lunch, 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 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 Senate office. Significant discussion items raised by faculty concerned criteria for promotion to Full Professor, the evaluation of teaching, and extramural funding success.

Spring Meeting

At the discretion of the VPF, there was no spring meeting this academic year. The CAP/Academic Personnel meeting will henceforth be on an annual basis only, in the fall semester.

VI. Academic Senate Review Items

The Division Council transmitted to CAP various campus and systemwide proposals and documents for review. The Committee returned formal opinions on some of these, including proposed revisions to APM 80, 133, 210-D, 220, 330, and 760. CAP also gave feedback on campus items (including APO's draft frequently asked questions document on the academic review process) and systemwide review items (including the remuneration study widely discussed at UCOP this year). We also, as mentioned above, gave feedback on the MAPP. Finally, CAP submitted a memo to the VPF with the suggestion of changing the timeline to

tenure in the MAPP; currently, UCM Assistant Professors are reviewed for tenure at the end of their fifth year but we suggested that reviews occur at the end of the sixth year, as is done on most other UC campuses. CAP has reviewed requests for one-year postponements and has been struck by the amount of labor that faculty candidates, academic units, and deans must put into assembling the materials for these requests. This time and effort may be better used by faculty candidates, especially, engaging in scholarly activities that would concretely increase their chances at successfully obtaining tenure when they come up for review one year later. However, our suggestion that UC Merced revise its policy for tenure reviews to be conducted in the same time period as at other UC campuses does not prevent certain Assistant Professors to request to come up for tenure at an earlier time (e.g., in the sixth-year). These requests should be made only after careful consultation with the academic unit and dean.

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)

David F. Kelley, Vice Chair (UCM)

Theofanis “Fanis” Tsoulouhas (UCM)

Michael Modest (UCM)

Gary Jacobson (UCSD)

John Leslie Redpath (UCI)

Rajiv Singh (UCD)

Michelle Yeh (UCD)

APPENDIX A

**2014-2015 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
TABLES 1A-1D FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	83	4	5	0	92*

*Includes 1 request for postponement of tenure

TABLE 1A APPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant Professor (2 Adjuncts, 1 Acting)	9	0	0	0	9
Associate Professor	3	0	0	0	3
Professor (1 Adjunct)	1	0	1	0	2
Lecturer Series (LPSOE)	2	0	0	0	2
Chairs	0	0	0	0	0
Total	15	0	1	0	16
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					94
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					94

TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Associate Professor	3	1	1	0	5
Professor	6	0	0	0	6
Professor VI	1	0	0	0	1
Above Scale	2	0	0	0	2
LSOE	2	0	0	0	2
Total	14	1	1	0	16
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					88
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					94

TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASE	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
LPSOE/SOE	1	0	0	0	1
Assistant	27	0	1	0	28
Associate Professor (3 Adjuncts)	18	1	1	0	20
Professor	7*	0	1	0	8
Total	53	1	3	0	57
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					93
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					95

*Includes 1 merit review with no advancement

TABLE 1D REAPPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant	3	0	0	0	3
Associate	0	0	0	0	0
Professor	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	0	0	0	3
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					100
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

**TABLE 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2014-2015**

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	21	16	1	1	3	0	76	86
(MCA)	2							
Natural Sciences	31	30	0	0	1	0	97	97
(MCA)	4							
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts	40	37	1	1	1	0	93	98
(MCA)	4							
TOTALS	92	83	2	2	5	0	90	95
(MCA)	10							

**TABLE 3
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2015**

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

	2013-2104	2014-2015
Total Cases	128*	92
Total Appointments	50	16
Total Promotions	16	16
Total Merit Increases	58	57
Total Other	4 1 MCA only 3 reappointments *1 case pending	3 reappointments