

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT
2017-2018**

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 2017-2018.

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), Nella Van Dyke, Vice Chair (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts), Heather Bortfeld (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts), and Stefano Carpin (School of Engineering). The external members were Philip Roeder (UCSD, Political Science), Joseph Konopelski (UCSC, Chemistry), Charles Glabe (UCI, Biology), Reza Abbaschian (UCR, Materials Science and Engineering), and Parama Roy (UCD, English Literature).

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 cases at Assistant Professor III and below, or short-form advancement cases at any rank. These two actions are handled at the unit/dean level, unless there is a disagreement between the unit faculty and the dean - in which case, the file in question is reviewed by CAP as an independent body.

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. 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 (two to five per meeting) and many more in the Spring (five to ten). 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 convenes for two-hour teleconference meetings on Friday mornings. 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 Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) and to the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF). 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 2017-2018 academic year. CAP reviewed a total of 95 cases during the year, compared to 105 the year prior. The committee agreed with the School recommendations without modification on 81 (85%) of the reviewed cases (see Table 2). For 1 other case, CAP voted against the recommendation. For 13 cases, CAP recommended a modification of the proposed action from the bylaw 55 unit 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 Provost/EVC for a final level of review and approval. On rare occasions, the Provost/EVC goes against CAP's recommendation, whereupon, he meets with CAP to discuss his decision to overturn the committee's recommendation. This

year, the Provost/EVC overturned one CAP recommendation.

III. General Comments Regarding the Submission of Personnel Cases

CAP submitted to the VPF a memo regarding faculty contributions to diversity, as described in APM 210-D. CAP suggested in the memo that if a faculty member under review has made contributions to promote equal opportunity and diversity in a review period, the case analysis should include a section that draws attention to these achievements alongside the sections on research, teaching, and service. However, case documents do not need to include a section on diversity if contributions were not made, since the APM does not require that faculty make them. CAP believed it is imperative that the campus has a uniform interpretation APM 210-D so that faculty reviews are fair, equitable, and consistent in this area. To that end, CAP requested that the VPF revise the MAPP to include a clear articulation, for review committees, of the expectations for contributions to diversity in faculty personnel files.

CAP issued another memo to the VPF with regard to the quality of case analyses of mid-career appraisal cases. The committee asked the VPF to strongly encourage bylaw units/departments to abide by the MAPP and craft thoughtful and careful case analyses in order to provide the necessary guidance for untenured faculty in this critical stage of their careers. Since our untenured colleagues deserve every possible chance of success in crossing the threshold required for tenure, bylaw units/departments should provide thorough feedback in the case files by clearly stating what will be expected by the time of tenure.

In the last academic year, 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. In AY 17-18, Senate committees reviewed this proposal to create a Reserve CAP as a standing committee of the Academic Senate. Division Council endorsed the proposal, and a vote was then issued to Senate faculty to formally approve this revision to the UCM bylaws. The vote passed and a Reserve CAP will be in place 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 October 9, 2017 was also attended by faculty and administrators. CAP was represented by Chair Ignacio López-Calvo, Vice Chair Nella Van Dyke, and member Stefano Carpin. 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 the second round of proposed revisions to APM sections 285, 210, 133, and 740 pertaining to the LPSOE/LSOE series. CAP maintained its original support of the proposed revisions, as they more appropriately recognize the contributions of LPSOE/LSOE faculty to the tripartite UC mission. However, CAP did elect to highlight a few points in regards to the newly-proposed revisions in the committee's memo to Division Council. CAP also reviewed the Provost/EVC's "Value to UCM Assessment" document pertaining to faculty retention. CAP endorsed the idea of instituting such guidelines, but did offer a few suggested revisions.

VII. Acknowledgments

CAP would like to acknowledge its positive working relationship with Gregg Camfield in his role as VPF, as well as with 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)
Nella Van Dyke, Vice Chair (UCM)
Heather Bortfeld (UCM)
Stefano Carpin (UCM)
Philip G. Roeder (UCSD)
Joseph Konopelski (UCSC)
Charles Glabe (UCI)
Reza Abbaschian (UCR)
Parama Roy (UCD)

APPENDIX A

2017-2018 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL TABLES 1A-1F FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE

	CAP Recommendation				
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	TOTAL
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	81	13	1	0	95

	CAP Recommendation				
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	TOTAL
TABLE 1A APPOINTMENTS					
Assistant Professor (includes Adjuncts)	2	0	0	0	2
Associate Professor (includes Adjuncts)	1	0	0	0	1
Professor	4	0	0	0	4
Lecturer Series (LPSOE/LSOE)	2	0	0	0	2
Endowed Chairs	1*	0	0	0	1
Total	10	0	0	0	10
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					100
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

*One endowed chair appointment case was reviewed by a Shadow CAP, and therefore not included in this report.

	CAP Recommendation				
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	TOTAL
TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS					
Associate Professor	10	2	0	0	12
Professor	12	0	0	0	12
Professor VI*	0	0	0	0	0
Above Scale	0	0	0	0	0
LSOE	2	0	0	0	2
Total	24	2	0	0	26
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					92
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

*One advancement to Professor VI case was reviewed by a Shadow CAP and therefore not included in this report.

	CAP Recommendation				
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	TOTAL
TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASE					
LPSOE/LSOE	2	0	0	0	2
Assistant (includes Adjuncts)	4*	0	0	0	4
Associate Professor (includes Adjuncts)	12	0	1	0	13
Professor	10	1	0	0	11
Total	28	1	1	0	30
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					93
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					97

*Includes 2 with Mid-Career Appraisals

CAP Recommendation					
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	TOTAL
TABLE 1D MID-CAREER APPRAISAL ONLY					
LPSOE and Assistant Professor	16	10	0	0	26
Total	16	10	0	0	26
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					62
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

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

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

*Review of Performance Improvement Plan

TABLE 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2017-2018

		CAP Recommendation					% CAP agreed w/unit without modification	% CAP agreed w/unit or modified up or down
School	Number Proposed	Agree	Modify-Up	Modify-Down	Disagree	Pending		
Engineering (MCA)	20	19	0	1	0	0	95	100
	4							
Natural Sciences (MCA)	34	27	1	5	1	0	79	97
	10							
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts (MCA)	41	35	1	5	0	0	85	100
	14							
TOTALS	95	81	2	11	1	0	85	99
	(MCA)							

TABLE 3
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2018

	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

	2013-2014	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	3 reappointments	1 reappointment
	*1 case pending		

	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