

Committee on Academic Personnel 2009-2010 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 2009-2010.

I. Membership

This year the membership of CAP included six members from UCM and four external members. The UCM members were Gregg Camfield (Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts), Tom Harmon (Engineering), Robert Innes (Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts), Jian-Qiao Sun (Engineering), Jan Wallander (Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts) and Roland Winston (Engineering/Natural Sciences). The external members were: Joseph Cerny, CAP Chair (UCB: Chemistry), Ruzena Bajcsy (UCB: Computer Science), Hung Fan (UCI: Molecular Biology and Biochemistry), and Richard Regosin (UCI: French and Italian). Senate Analyst Simrin Takhar 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. 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.

IV. Work of CAP, 2009-2010 Academic Year

CAP reviewed a total of 63 cases during the year (see Table 3, pages 7, 8 below). This is similar to 61 cases in 2008-2009. Overall, CAP agreed with School recommendations without modification in 79% 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 recommendations 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 2009-2010, no final 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 September 10, 2009 with faculty and administrators. CAP was represented by Chair Joseph Cerny, four internal CAP members, and one external member who joined by teleconference. A morning session was held solely with Assistant Professors and Academic Personnel. This session began with a brief introduction to how a case moves through the review process, a statement by the CAP chair about the importance of the APC Chairs to meet the MCA deadlines, 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, School personnel staff, 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.

VI. CAP Comments Regarding the Submission of Personnel Cases for 2010-2011

As CAP noted in last year's report, a timely submission of the Mid-Career Appraisal (MCA) can be crucial to the career of an assistant Professor. The deadline in 2009-2010 for receipt of these MCA plus merit cases in the Academic Personnel Office (APO) was November 13, 2009, and CAP had meetings scheduled in late November and December 2009 to focus on reviewing these cases. Very unfortunately, only a few cases were submitted to APO by this deadline, and, in fact, only eight of the 19 MCA cases that CAP ultimately reviewed in 2009-2010 had been submitted (and had been reviewed) by the end of March 2010. The assistant Professors need a timely response on how their progress toward tenure is being evaluated, and long delays in providing this review leave them with less time for "corrective actions" when they are needed before the tenure clock has run out.

CAP urges the Academic Personnel Chairs in the Schools, and the Deans, to establish and enforce early deadlines for review materials in general -- and particularly for external letters -- so that these MCA and merit cases for 2010-2011 are submitted in final form to APO by this fall's deadline of November 12, 2010. This is also the deadline for the seventh year final appraisals for some of the assistant Professors.

CAP also wishes to comment on the case materials submitted in evaluation of research, teaching and service. Regarding research, in too many instances the case forwarded from the School still does not adequately evaluate the quality and significance of the faculty member's scholarship. In addition, since the personnel cases coming to CAP are increasingly citing impact factors for scholarly journals, an opinion piece from Douglas Arnold, the President of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM) caught our attention. The piece is called "Integrity Under Attack: The State of Scholarly Publishing" and Arnold concludes "that common bibliometrics—such as the impact factor for journals and citation counts for authors—are easily manipulated not only in theory, but also in practice and recommends that their use in ranking and judging be curtailed."

CAP believes that this is a valuable reminder that quoting impact factors and related indices can not be a substitute for quality in-depth review of the publications themselves. Below, we reproduce some earlier comments from CAP about i) the evaluation of research and ii) publication venue in personnel cases.

"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, our annual report of 2008-2009 stated: "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)'..." The great majority of second sources of evidence in the 2009-2010 cases was in fact the faculty member's teaching self-statement. Though these are important documents, they do not provide the desired objective evaluation of the individual's teaching efforts. As one approach, the personnel case could provide i) a report following observation of the faculty member's teaching by his/her colleagues or ii) a written review by a peer of the course's syllabi, lecture notes, exams, quizzes and other assignments. Other possible second sources are detailed in the APM.

With regard to service, most cases document very well the service contributions of assistant Professors, many of which have been truly outstanding as well as critical for the recruitment of excellent UC Merced faculty and/or for the development of courses and curricula. CAP now finds that similar documentation of the service loads for the tenured faculty should be provided to us in their personnel cases, accompanied by an appraisal of the quality of their contributions and the extent of their efforts in these committee assignments.

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 other CAP members wish to thank Simrin Takhar for her outstanding service in support of CAP's work for the Academic Senate.

Respectfully,

Joseph Cerny, Chair (UCB)

Gregg Camfield

Tom Harmon

Robert Innes

Jian-Qiao Sun

Jan Wallander

Roland Winston

Ruzena Bajcsy (UCB)

Hung Fan (UCI)

Richard Regosin (UCI)

**2009-2010 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
TABLES 1A-1C FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	50	13	0	0	63

Table 1A APPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant Professor (3 Acting)	9	1	--	--	10
Associate Professor	--	--	--	--	0
Professor	--	2	--	--	2
Lecturer Series (1 LPSOE)	--	1	--	--	1
Total	9	4	--	--	13
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					69%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100%

TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Associate Professor	4	3	--	--	7
Professor	1	1	--	--	2
Adjunct Faculty	--	1	--	--	1
Total	5	5	--	--	10
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					50%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100%

TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASE	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant (Merit Only)	13	--	--	--	13
Assistant (Also MCA)	16	3	--	--	19
Associate Professor	5	1	--	--	6
Professor	2	--	--	--	2
Total	36	4	--	--	40
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					90%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100%

**CAP Table 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2009-2010**

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		
Engineering	11	10	0	1		91%	100%
(MCA)	2						
Natural Sciences	26	18	5	3		69%	100%
(MCA)	10						
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts	26	22	2	2		85%	100%
(MCA)	7						
TOTALS	63	50	7	6		79%	100%
(MCA)	19						

**CAP Table 3
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2010**

	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

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

	2009-2010
Total Cases	63
Total Appointments	13
Total Promotions	10
Total Merit Increases	40
Total Other	0