

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

**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 2020-2021.

**I. RCAP Membership**

This year's RCAP members were Tanya Golash-Boza, 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 Michael Dawson (School of Natural Sciences). Jan Wallander (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts served as Chair in fall 2020 only).

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 bylaws allow for the committee membership to temporarily expand to include external (UC) experts. This occurred in the review of the one case in AY 2020-2021.

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 prepares draft reports on the dossiers. These reports 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), Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP), and the Academic Personnel Office (APO). The EVC/Provost makes decisions on promotions and he delegated approval authority to the VPAP on advancements and mid-career appraisals. After the meeting, the RCAP chair meets with either the EVC/Provost or VPAP (depending on the type of case) to discuss the case. If the EVC/Provost or VPAP determines that no further deliberation is necessary, the substance of RCAP's report and those of other levels of review are summarized by APO 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 or VPAP communicates with RCAP to discuss any disagreements with RCAP's recommendation on particular cases. The VPAP agreed with RCAP's recommendation this year.

### **Recommendations**

Appendix A provides a simple numerical summary and analysis of the RCAP caseload for the 2020-2021 academic year. RCAP reviewed one case this year.

Table 1 details 2020-2021 caseload and outcome according to the proposed personnel action. Table 2 provides aggregate recommendation by the academic unit. Table 3 provides a historical summary of RCAP cases.

Respectfully,

Tanya Golash-Boza, Chair (SSHA)

Arnold Kim (SNS)

Roland Winston (SNS/SOE)

Martha Conklin (SOE)

Michael Dawson (SNS)

Jan Wallander, SSHA (Member and Chair in Fall 2020 only)

**APPENDIX A**

**2020-2021 RESERVE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL  
TABLES 1-3 FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	<b>RCAP Recommendation</b>				<b>TOTAL</b>
	<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Modification</b>	<b>Disagreed</b>	<b>Pending</b>	
<b>TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

<b>TABLE 1A ADVANCEMENTS</b>	<b>RCAP Recommendation</b>				<b>TOTAL</b>
	<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Modification</b>	<b>Disagreed</b>	<b>Pending</b>	
Associate Professor	0	0	0	0	0
Professor	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 2  
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS  
2020-2021**

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								
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts	1	1					100	100
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>					<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

**TABLE 3  
CASES REVIEWED BY RCAP 2018 - present**

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021
<b>Total Cases</b>	1	4	1
<b>Total Appointments</b>	0	1 (Endowed chair)	0
<b>Total Promotions</b>	1	0	0
<b>Total Merit Increases</b>	0	3 (1 Appeal review)	1