

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT
2016-2017**

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 2016-2017.

I. CAP Membership

This year the CAP membership included four members from UCM and five external members. The UCM members were Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts), Michael Modest, Vice Chair (School of Engineering), Heather Bortfeld (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts), and Tom Harmon, who served in spring 2017 (School of Engineering). The external members were Rajiv Singh (UCD, Physics), Mark Wrathall (UCR, Philosophy), J. Lawrence “Larry” Marsh (UCI, Biology), Phil Roeder (UCSD, Political Science), and Joseph Konopelski (UCSC, Chemistry).

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) 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 per meeting) 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 2016-2017 academic year. CAP reviewed a total of 105 cases during the year, compared to 148 the year prior. The committee agreed with the School recommendations without modification on 98 (93%) of the reviewed cases (see Table 2). For 6 other cases (6%), CAP voted against the recommendation or had a split vote for a merit, promotion, or appointment case; for 1 case, CAP voted against the recommendation but with a modification (e.g., a higher or lower step). There were 7 cases this year in which a school dean and his/her school/bylaw unit faculty disagreed with each other and therefore presented different recommendations. Of these, CAP agreed with the faculty/bylaw unit 3 times and agreed with the dean 4 times.

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. On rare occasions, the Provost/EVC goes against CAP's recommendation, whereupon, per procedures, he is required to meet with CAP to discuss his decision to overturn. This year, the Provost/EVC disagreed with CAP three times.

III. General Comments Regarding the Submission of Personnel Cases

In keeping with tradition, the Provost/EVC and APO issued revised sections of the MAPP document for campus wide review during the academic year. 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 a procedure for the appointment and renewal of endowed chairs. CAP agreed with the basic components of the endowed chairs proposal, but encouraged the campus to exercise flexibility in the allocation of such chairships for the purposes of faculty recruitment and retention.

To mitigate concerns over delays in appointments and the workload in the schools surrounding the preparation of short-form advancement (routine merit) case files, CAP issued a memo to the VPF this year, offering to relinquish its review of appointments at Assistant Professor I, II, and III, as well as short-form advancements. The VPF made the new appointments procedure effective in spring semester 2017, while the procedure for short-form advancements will go into effect in the next academic year. These two actions will henceforth be handled at the school/dean level, unless there is a disagreement between the school faculty and the dean - in which case, the file in question will be reviewed by CAP as an independent body.

CAP also reiterated its request to the VPF from the last academic year with regard to units providing a delineation of faculty members' contributions on co-authored publications. A clearer presentation of the evidence of both contributions to the work as well as intellectual leadership would benefit CAP's analysis of the overall research profile. Also, CAP reiterated its previous request to see all grant-seeking activity for faculty on the bio-bibliographies, both successful and unsuccessful. CAP believes this information is needed not only to make final recommendations on individual case files, but also to provide meaningful feedback to faculty on their efforts to obtain funding. Finally, while CAP understands the rationale involved in using short forms for normal merit reviews, the committee suggested to the VPF a modification to the procedures currently outlined in Appendix 2014-C of the MAPP for assistant professors: we recommend that the short form should not be used for subsequent reviews preceding promotion to tenure. CAP believes it is imperative for all levels of review to provide meaningful feedback to assistant professors at these points on their career trajectory.

In conjunction with the VPF, CAP submitted to Division Council a proposal to empanel a standing Reserve CAP (termed "Shadow CAP" in the past) of the Academic Senate to address cases of 1) current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year and 2) appeals by faculty members. Currently, an ad-hoc committee must be established for each of these types of review. This proposal is under review by the Senate and will be addressed in the next academic year.

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 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.

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 November 16, 2016, was also attended by faculty and administrators. CAP was represented by Chair Ignacio López-Calvo, Vice Chair Michael Modest, and an additional external member. 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 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 AP 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. Detailed minutes from both sessions are available in the Senate office. Significant discussion items raised by faculty concerned criteria for promotion, the evaluation of teaching, and extramural funding success.

VI. Academic Senate Review Items

The Division Council transmitted to CAP various campus and systemwide proposals and documents for review. The committee was named as the lead reviewer for proposed revisions to the following APM sections: 285, 210, 133, and 740 pertaining to the re-designation of the L(P)SOE series to "Teaching Professor"; and the Revised Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination and revisions to APM 15." We endorsed both sets of revisions. As mentioned above, CAP also gave feedback on the MAPP.

VII. Acknowledgments

CAP would like to acknowledge its positive working relationship with Gregg Camfield in his role as VPF, as well as Provost/EVC Tom Peterson. 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,

Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair (UCM)
Michael Modest, Vice Chair (UCM)
Heather Bortfeld (UCM)
Tom Harmon (UCM) spring 2017
Rajiv Singh (UCD)
Mark Wrathall (UCR)
J. Lawrence "Larry" Marsh (UCI)
Phil Roeder (UCSD)
Joseph Konopelski (UCSC)

APPENDIX A

**2016-2017 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
TABLES 1A-1D FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	98	1	6*	0	105

*Includes one case in which CAP agreed on MCA, but disagreed on advancement

TABLE 1A APPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant Professor (includes Adjuncts & Acting)	11	0	0	0	11
Associate Professor (includes Adjuncts & Acting)	5	0	0	0	5
Professor	4	0	0	0	4
Lecturer Series (LPSOE/LSOE)	0	0	0	0	0
Endowed Chairs	0	0	0	0	0
Total	20	0	0	0	20
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					100
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Associate Professor	10	0	0	0	10
Professor	6	0	1	0	7
Professor VI	1*	0	1	0	2
Above Scale	1	0	0	0	1
LSOE	0	0	0	0	0
Total	18	0	2	0	20
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					90
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					90

*Includes a Career Equity Review

TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASE	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
LPSOE/SOE	5*	0	0	0	5
Assistant (includes Adjuncts)	26**	1	3	0	30
Associate Professor (includes Adjuncts)	17	0	0	0	17
Professor	10***	0	1	0	11
Total	58	1	4	0	63
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					92
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					94

*Includes 2 with MCAs

**Includes 17 with MCAs

***Includes one merit w/in rank Above Scale

TABLE 1D REAPPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant	0	0	0	0	0
Associate	0	0	0	0	0
Professor	2*	0	0	0	2
Total	2	0	0	0	2
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					100
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

*Both were Endowed Chair reappointments

**TABLE 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2016-2017**

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	23	22	0	0	1	0	96	96
(MCA)	2							
Natural Sciences	33	31	0	0	2	0	94	94
(MCA)	6							
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts	49	45	1	0	3	0	92	94
(MCA)	11							
TOTALS	105	98	1	0	6	0	93	94
(MCA)	19							

**TABLE 3
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2017**

	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	2015-2016
Total Cases	128*	92	148
Total Appointments	50	16	38
Total Promotions	16	16	22
Total Merit Increases	58	57	87
Total Other	4 1 MCA only 3 reappointments *1 case pending	3 reappointments	1 reappointment

	2016-2017
Total Cases	105
Total Appointments	20
Total Promotions	20
Total Merit Increases	59
Total Other	6 4 MCA only 2 Endowed Chair reappointments