

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT
2020-2021**

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 2020-2021.

I. CAP Membership

This year, the CAP membership included seven members from UCM and three external members in the spring and six members from UCM and four external members in the fall. The UCM members were Ashlie Martini, Chair (School of Engineering), Ramesh Balasubramaniam, Vice Chair (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts), Manuel Martín-Rodríguez (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts), Peggy O’Day (School of Natural Sciences), Sayantani Ghosh (School of Natural Sciences), Mukesh Singhal (School of Engineering), and Jan Wallander (spring 2021 only; School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts). The external members were Michael Saler (UCD, History), Reza Abbaschian (UCR, Mechanical Engineering), Georg Striedter (UCI, Molecular Cell Biology), and Mark Appelbaum (fall 2020 only; UCSD, Psychology, dec.).

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. CAP, however, does not review appointment or advancement cases at Assistant Professor III and below, appointment or advancement cases at Assistant Teaching Professor III and below, short-form advancement cases at any rank, or appointment cases for Assistant Adjunct Professors steps I – VI. These actions are handled at the department/dean level unless there is a disagreement between the department faculty and the dean, or if there is a proposed acceleration; in these situations, the file in question is reviewed by CAP as an independent body.

Policies and Procedures

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 observed at Merced.

The Merced Academic Personnel Policies & Procedures ([MAPP](#)) document is also a useful resource for faculty members, administrators and department chairs. The MAPP is an evolving resource. The Academic Personnel Office (APO) issues to the campus any proposed revisions to the MAPP usually on an annual basis. These proposed revisions also undergo Senate review, by all Senate committees, including CAP.

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 and many more in the Spring. One lead reviewer and one secondary reviewer are assigned to report on each case; however, all members are expected to read and discuss 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 members also recused according to reasons listed in the committee's [conflict of interest statement/recusal policy](#) and if they collaborated with the faculty member under review within the past five years.

CAP convened for two-hour teleconference meetings on Friday afternoons. 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 analyst and Chair prepare 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/Provost (EVC/Provost) and to the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP). If the EVC/Provost 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 majority of cases, the above process ends CAP's review of the file. The EVC/Provost and VPAP communicate with CAP to discuss any disagreements with CAP's recommendation on specific cases.

Recommendations

Appendix A provides a simple numerical summary and analysis of the CAP caseload for the 2020-2021 academic year. CAP reviewed a total of 102 cases during the year compared to 77 the year prior. The committee agreed with the School recommendations without modification on 66 (65%) of the reviewed cases (see Table 2). For 10 other cases, CAP voted against the recommendation. For 26 cases, CAP recommended a modification of the proposed action from the department or dean (e.g., a higher or lower step or a higher or lower mid-career appraisal rating).

Tables 1A – 1F 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 and VPAP for a final level of review and approval. If the EVC/Provost or VPAP disagree with CAP's recommendation, he or she meets with CAP to discuss his or her decision to disagree with the committee's recommendation. This year, the EVC/Provost or VPAP disagreed with 5 of CAP's recommendations.¹

III. CAP Communications

In spring 2021, CAP transmitted a memo to Divisional Council about the valuable contributions of external members on CAP. This memo was written in response to the EVC/Provost discussing the renewal of the memorandum of understanding between UC Merced and UCOP for a blanket exception to APM-666-8 to allow UC Merced to compensate UC faculty members from other campuses serving as

¹ The EVC/Provost and VPAP also disagreed with CAP's suggested modifications for 6 cases.

external members of Merced's CAP.

IV. Counsel to EVC/Provost and VPAP

The CAP Chair briefly discusses each week's cases, after CAP has voted on its recommendations, with the EVC/Provost and VPAP. These discussions mostly focus on individual cases.

V. Academic Personnel Meetings

Fall Workshops

After consulting with the CAP chair, the VPAP decided to revise the previous UCM tradition of holding large, all-faculty meetings with CAP to discuss the academic review process in favor of targeted academic personnel workshops. On September 3, the VPAP, CAP chair, and CAP vice chair co-hosted a workshop with department chairs and a workshop with assistant professors on September 10. Both workshops were attended by the CAP analyst, APO staff, and School AP staff. Significant discussion items raised by faculty concerned criteria for advancement and promotion, and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on faculty productivity.

VI. Academic Senate Review Items

The Divisional Council transmitted to CAP various campus and systemwide proposals and documents for review. The EVC/Provost and VPF did not distribute proposed revisions to the MAPP for campus review this year.

VII. Acknowledgments

CAP would like to acknowledge its working relationship with EVC/Provost Gregg Camfield and VPAP Teenie Matlock. The committee would also like to acknowledge APO, the deans, the department chairs, and the AP staff in each school for their dedication to excellence in the personnel review process at UC Merced, as well as the Senate analyst who supports CAP.

Respectfully,

Ashlie Martini, Chair (UCM)
Ramesh Balasubramaniam, Vice Chair (UCM)
Manuel Martín-Rodríguez (UCM)
Peggy O'Day (UCM)
Sayantani Ghosh (UCM)
Mukesh Singhal (UCM)
Jan Wallander, spring 2021 only (UCM)
Michael Saler (UCD)
Reza Abbaschian (UCR)
Georg Striedter (UCI)
Mark Applebaum, fall 2020 only (UCSD, dec.)

APPENDIX A

**2020-2021 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
TABLES 1A-1F FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	66	26	10	0	102

TABLE 1A APPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant Professor (1 Endowed Chair)	2	0	0	0	2
Associate Professor (2 Endowed Chairs)	2	0	0	0	2
Professor (2 Endowed Chairs)	5	0	0	0	5
Teaching Professor	0	1	0	0	1
Total	9	1	0	0	10
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					90
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Associate Professor	15	7	0	0	22
Professor	2	4	3	0	9
Professor VI	1	0	0	0	1
Total	18	11	3	0	32
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					56
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					91

TABLE 1C Advancements/Merits	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant Professor	3	0	0	0	3
Associate Professor	6	5	2	0	13
Associate Teaching Professor	1	1	0	0	2
Associate Adjunct Professor	2	0	0	0	2
Professor (2 Quinquennial Reviews, 1 Merit w/in Rank)	6	4	5	0	15
Total	18	10	7	0	35
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					51
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					80

	CAP Recommendation				
TABLE 1D MID-CAREER APPRAISALS	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	TOTAL
Assistant Professor	17	3	0	0	20
Assistant Teaching Professor	2	0	0	0	2
Total	19	3	0	0	22
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					86
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

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

	CAP Recommendation				
TABLE 1F OTHER	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	TOTAL
Associate Professor (1 Performance Improvement Plan, 1 Career Equity Review)	1	1	0	0	2
Total	1	1	0	0	2
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					50
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

**TABLE 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2020-2021**

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	22	14	3	0	5	0	64	77
(MCA)	8							
Natural Sciences	30	20	1	8	1	0	67	97
(MCA)	7							
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts	50	32	2	12	4	0	64	92
(MCA)	7							
TOTALS	102	66	6	20	10	0	65	91
(MCA)	22							

**TABLE 3
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2021**

	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	2017-2018
Total Cases	105	95
Total Appointments	20	10
Total Promotions	20	26
Total Merit Increases	59	30
Total Other	6 4 MCA only 2 Endowed Chair reappointments	29 26 MCA only 2 reappointments 1 Performance Improvement Plan review

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021
Total Cases	74	77	102
Total Appointments	18	15	10
Total Reappointments	0	2	1
Total Promotions	25	26	32
Total Advancements/Merits	22	21	35
Total Mid-Career Appraisals	8	12	22
Total Other	1 (Career Equity Review)	1 (Career Equity Review)	2 (Performance Improvement Plan, Career Equity Review)