

**RESERVE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL  
ANNUAL REPORT  
2019-2020**

**TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:**

The Reserve Committee on Academic Personnel (RCAP) is pleased to report on its activities for the academic year 2019-2020.

**I. RCAP Membership**

This year's 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), Tanya Golash-Boza (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts), and Michael Dawson (School of Natural Sciences).

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**

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 three of the four cases in AY 2019-2020.

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/Provost) and to the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF). After the meeting, the RCAP chair, EVC/Provost, and VPF meet to discuss the case. If the EVC/Provost 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/Provost 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 2019-2020 academic year. RCAP reviewed four cases this 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/Provost for a final level of review and approval. On rare occasions, the EVC/Provost goes against RCAP's recommendation, whereupon, he meets with RCAP to discuss his decision to overturn the committee's recommendation. This year, the EVC/Provost did not overturn any of RCAP's recommendations.

Respectfully,

Jan Wallander, Chair (SSHA)  
Arnold Kim (SNS)  
Roland Winston (SNS/SOE)  
Martha Conklin (SOE)  
Tanya Golash-Boza (SSHA)  
Michael Dawson (SNS)

**APPENDIX A**

**2019-2020 RESERVE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL  
TABLES 1-3 FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	RCAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
<b>TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>

TABLE 1A APPOINTMENTS	RCAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Associate Professor	0	0	0	0	0
Professor – <b>Endowed Chair</b>	1	0	0	0	1
Professor VI	0	0	0	0	0
Above Scale	0	0	0	0	0
LSOE	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
% RCAP Agreed with Proposal	<b>100</b>				<b>100</b>
% RCAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					<b>0</b>

TABLE 1B ADVANCEMENTS	RCAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Associate Professor	0	0	0	0	0
Professor*	3	0	0	0	3
Professor VI	0	0	0	0	0
Above Scale	0	0	0	0	0
LSOE	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>
% RCAP Agreed with Proposal	<b>100</b>				<b>100</b>
% RCAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					<b>0</b>

**\*One of the advancements included the review of an appeal of a denied advancement.**

**TABLE 2  
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS  
2019-2020**

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	1	1					100	100
Natural Sciences								
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts	3	3					100	100
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

**TABLE 3  
CASES REVIEWED BY RCAP 2019 -**

	2018-2019	2019-2020
<b>Total Cases</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Total Appointments</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1 (Endowed chair)</b>
<b>Total Promotions</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Merit Increases</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3 (1 Appeal review)</b>