RESERVE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT
2018-2019

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Reserve Committee on Academic Personnel (RCAP) is pleased to report on its activities for its inaugural year 2018-2019.

I. RCAP Membership
Originally empaneled by the Academic Senate in AY 2017-2018, RCAP convened for the first time in AY 2018-2019. The RCAP members were Jan Wallander, Chair (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts), Arnold Kim (School of Natural Sciences), Roland Winston (School of Natural Sciences and School of Engineering), Martha Conklin (School of Engineering), and ShiPu Wang (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts).

The RCAP analyst was Simrin Takhar.

II. RCAP Review of Academic Personnel Cases
RCAP is charged with reviewing personnel files of current CAP members, or those who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year, and appeals by faculty members.

Policies and Procedures
RCAP 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 department chairs.

Review Process
Similar to the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), RCAP'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 RCAP's meeting and ensuing discussion of the files. 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 RCAP's respective review of the file.

If the RCAP lacks sufficient expertise in the faculty member's research area, the committee membership temporarily expands to include external (UC) experts, as occurred in the review of the case in AY 2018-2019.

Reports from the primary and secondary readers on cases are followed by a thorough committee discussion, as well as a vote on the proposed action. RCAP's quorum for all personnel actions is half plus one of its membership. After the meeting, the RCAP 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) and to the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF). After the meeting, the RCAP chair, EVC, and VPF meet to discuss the case. If the EVC determines that no further deliberation is necessary, the substance of RCAP'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 RCAP's review of the file. The EVC communicates with RCAP to discuss any disagreements with RCAP's recommendation on particular cases.

Recommendations
Appendix A provides a simple numerical summary and analysis of the RCAP caseload for the 2018-2019 academic year. RCAP reviewed 1 case in its inaugural year.

Tables 1-3 detail caseload and outcome according to the proposed personnel action. Table 2 provides aggregate recommendation by the academic unit.

RCAP recommendations are transmitted to the EVC for a final level of review and approval. On rare occasions, the EVC goes against RCAP's recommendation, whereupon, he meets with RCAP to discuss his decision to overturn the committee's recommendation. This year, the EVC overturned RCAP's recommendation.

Respectfully,

Jan Wallander, Chair (SSHA)
Arnold Kim (SNS)
Roland Winston (SNS/SOE)
Martha Conklin (SOE)
ShiPu Wang (SSHA)

APPENDIX A

2018-2019 RESERVE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
TABLES 1-3 FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE

	RCAP Recommendation				
	Agreed	**Modification**	**Disagreed**	**Pending**	**TOTAL**
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**

	RCAP Recommendation				
TABLE 1 PROMOTIONS	**Agreed**	**Modification**	**Disagreed**	**Pending**	**TOTAL**
Associate Professor	0	0	1	0	**1**
Professor					
Professor VI					
Above Scale					
LSOE					
Total	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**
% RCAP Agreed with Proposal					**0**
% RCAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					**0**

TABLE 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2018-2019

School	Number Proposed	RCAP Recommendation					% RCAP agreed w/unit without modification	% RCAP agreed w/unit or modified up or down
		Agree	Modify-Up	Modify-Down	Disagree	Pending		
Engineering								
Natural Sciences	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts								
TOTALS	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

TABLE 3
CASES REVIEWED BY RCAP 2019

	2018-2019
Total Cases	1
Total Appointments	0
Total Promotions	1
Total Merit Increases	0