

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
December 2, 2014**

To be received and placed on file:

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is an important part of faculty governance and collegial responsibility in the University of California system. As a committee of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate, CAP is appointed by the Senate's Committee on Committees and charged with providing advice to the Chancellor on academic personnel matters and representing the Division in all matters relating to appointments and promotions. CAP consists of ten members, who represent a wide variety of academic disciplines from across campus. All members hold the rank of full professor and serve for offset periods of three years (with annual reappointment) so that there is continuity and memory on the committee. CAP reviews all academic personnel files for merit, appraisal, promotion, and appointment and makes recommendations to the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, and the Chancellor. CAP is also asked to provide feedback and recommendations about a variety of Senate matters and administrative directives.

CAP's goal is to assure that its recommendations are based on rigorous application of the academic personnel procedures in the CALL and the APM, and to assure that decisions are based on a fair and thorough evaluation of evidence in the file.

CAP met on 45 occasions during the 2013-14 academic year. Meetings were approximately 3 hours in length. CAP again is appreciative of the efforts of staff and faculty alike for their efforts in the academic personnel review process.

By the final May submission date in the CALL, there were only 8 outstanding files campuswide. CAP attributes this success to strict adherence to the deadlines set forth in the CALL and to the effort by all involved in the personnel review process.

I. Personnel Actions

a. Summary of Reviews

CAP reviewed 301 personnel actions during 2013-14 and sustained an average turn-around time of 19 days from the time a file is received at CAP from the Academic Personnel Office to the time the CAP recommendation is forwarded to the administration. Committee work during this period includes (a) receipt of the file in the Academic Senate Office by the CAP Analyst, who reviews the file to assure that it is complete for CAP review; (b) assigning of primary and secondary readers to each file by the CAP Chair, who serves as the third reader; (c) announcement to all CAP members that the file is available for their review online; (d) thorough review of the file by the assigned readers in preparation for discussion by the full committee at the next CAP meeting; (e) presentation of the file and discussion/vote by the full committee; (f) preparation of the draft CAP recommendation by the primary and secondary readers; (g) review and signature by the CAP Chair, who forwards the CAP report to the CAP

Analyst to be finalized and forwarded to the Academic Personnel Office.

The Academic Senate office also maintains data reflecting the processing time (including the percentage of files that are forwarded according to due dates in the CALL) by department and school/college, as well as turn-around time for files reviewed by ad hoc committees. These data are available from the Academic Senate Office.

A decision of the Chancellor's office is defined as an over-rule if it is contrary to the majority recommendation from CAP on rank, step, or the awarding of an off-scale.

- Of the 174 merit actions reviewed by CAP, CAP endorsed 153. The final decision of the Chancellor's office over-ruled CAP's recommendation in 7 instances.
- Of the 58 accelerated merits proposed, CAP and the administration disagreed in 5 instances.
- Of the 46 promotions to Associate Professor or Professor, CAP supported 41. The Chancellor's office overruled CAP's recommendation in 2 cases.
- The Chancellor's office and CAP agreed on all 11 cases proposed for advancement to Professor Step VI or to Professor Above-Scale.
- Of the 15 appraisals, the Chancellor's office and CAP disagreed in 3 cases.
- CAP and the administration agreed on supporting 27 of the 29 proposed new appointments. One case will be resubmitted in the 14-15AY and one case is pending a final decision.
- CAP and the administration were in agreement on all reappointments. Five requests were supported and one request resulted in a non-reappointment.
- CAP and the administration agreed on 4 of the 5 career reviews processed. Two cases resulted in a three-step merit increase. One case resulted in a four-step merit increase. One case resulted in a promotion. One case resulted in a promotion plus one-step merit increase.
- Out of the 15 quinquennials reviewed, the Chancellor's Office and CAP disagreed in 2 cases.

A detailed table summary of CAP's personnel reviews merits, promotions, advancements, appraisals, appointments, career reviews, and quinquennial reviews, is appended.

b. Follow up to the cases listed as pending in the 12-13 CAP Report

Of the 16 promotion to Associate Professor reviews, 1 was noted as pending. This case was finalized and the promotion to tenure denied. Of the 145 merit reviews, 1 was noted as pending. This case was finalized and the merit denied. Of the 15 appointment reviews, 1 was noted as pending. This case was finalized and the appointment to Assistant Professor approved.

c. Ad hoc Committees

The Committee on Academic Personnel continued to act as its own ad hoc for all promotion to tenure and Advancement to Above-Scale cases, a process which results in early decisions for the majority of these promotion cases. During the 13-14 review year,

CAP did not utilize an ad hoc committee.

d. Shadow CAP

To avoid conflict of interest, the personnel actions for current CAP members and their spouses/partners are reviewed by Shadow CAP, a 5 or 6-person committee appointed by the Committee on Committees from a pool of former CAP members from the previous five years. During 2013-14, Shadow CAP reviewed 4 cases and one Endowed Chair appointment. The 2013-14 Shadow CAP members were the following:

Chair, Robin DiMatteo
Julia Bailey-Serres
Marek Chrobak
Erika Suderburg
John Trumble
Raymond Williams

e. Assistant Professor Appointments

In January 2008, final decisions for appointments to Assistant Professor Step I-III were delegated to the deans. The 2013-2014 CAP conducted a post-appointment audit of all 11-12 and 12-13 Dean's level hires. CAP continues to support the delegation for appointments to Assistant Professor Step I-III. However, CAP rescinded its waiver of review for all appointments for Acting Assistant Professor, Step III and clarified the expectation is that all reappointments for Assistant Professor Step I-III will continue to be reviewed by CAP.

f. eFile

CAP reviewed 260 of its 301 cases via the eFile system (86%). This compares to the 215 of 252 eFiles reviewed in 2012-13 (85%).

g. Other Personnel Actions (not included in the total number of files reviewed by CAP)

- Dickson Emeritus Professorship: CAP reviewed and endorsed three nominations for the 2013-14 Dickson Emeritus Professorship, sent forward by the Committee on Faculty Welfare.
- Emerita/us titles: CAP reviewed and provided feedback to the administration on the use of Emerita/us titles for three non-Senate faculty.
- Professor of the Graduate Division appointments: CAP reviewed 7 files for appointment as Professor of the Graduate Division. All appointments were approved.

II. CAP Discussions with and Policy Recommendations to the Administration

In addition to regular CAP meetings to review personnel cases, CAP met on occasion with the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost, the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, the College/School and Divisional Deans, and with Departmental Chairs. CAP participation in these joint administrative sessions is especially helpful in

assuring a shared understanding of the review process and guidelines, and of the expectations at every level of review. CAP is grateful for the spirit of cooperation of the campus administrators. CAP provided advice to and initiated or participated in discussions with the administration on the following issues:

a. Revisions to the CALL

CAP reviewed and provided feedback to the VPAP on change requests received by the campus at large and recommended six new revisions to the CALL for the 14-15AY.

b. CAP Review of Proposed Department Chair Appointments

CAP reviewed the list of proposed department chair appointments for the 2013-2014 academic year and expressed no concern about the recommendations submitted.

c. Endowed Chair Appointments

CAP reviewed and provided recommendations on appointments of the Howard H. Hays Chair in University Honors, the Yeager Senior Chair in Bioengineering, the Salma Haider Chair in SOM, and the BCOE Presidential Chair.

d. Administrative Appointments – other Appointment “pre-reads”

As per campus administrative appointment procedures, CAP provided a “pre-read” on the professorial files for the position of Chancellor, the position of Vice Provost of International Affairs, the position of Provost, and the position of Graduate School of Education Dean. CAP completed a preliminary evaluation for two Target of Excellence candidates and a spousal hire. CAP also reviewed and commented on one preemptive retention effort.

III. CAP Advice to the Academic Senate

a. CAP Representation at Systemwide Senate and the Executive Council

CAP continued its active participation on the systemwide University Committee on Academic Personnel. The 2013-14 CAP representative was Jang-Ting Guo. CAP Chair Haggerty represented the committee on the UCR Academic Senate’s Executive Council.

b. CAP Review of Proposed Revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual and other personnel processes

CAP was asked to review and comment on proposed revisions to the following APM sections:

- The Committee discussed the proposed revisions to APM 210-1-d and found the changes help clarify the ambiguity and misperception associated with its original version. However, the committee was concerned with devising our campus' local strategy to implement this new policy (if approved) in a consistent and effective manner. For example, how to adequately assign "equal weight" to a candidate's contributions promoting equal opportunity and diversity as we assign any other contributions in the areas of research,

teaching and service? This will surely become a challenge in future academic personnel reviews.

The Committee considered, but had no comments to offer on the numerous editorial and organizational changes found in the proposed revisions to APM 133-17-g-j; APM 210-1-c; APM 220-18-b; and APM 760-30-a.

- The Committee unanimously approved the proposed changes to the APM 600 series, APM 025, 670, 671 and had no further recommendations.

CAP was asked to review and comment on the following Systemwide reviews:

- The Committee discussed the proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 55 and approved of the changes with the following recommendations:

The language provided in UCSD's proposal states that "voting privileges could be extended only to those Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical Professors who hold an appointment of more than 50% ("career") in the department" whereas the proposed bylaw 55 language change indicates that voting privileges would be extended to all non-Academic Senate Faculty in Health Sciences. UCR has a growing non-senate health science faculty composed of several career paths that are not limited to the Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical Professors series. If it is UCSD's intent to limit senate voting rights to these two career tracks, the proposed bylaw 55 language should reflect what is stated in the proposal.

- The Committee discussed the proposed revised amendment to Senate Bylaw 55 and supported the enactment of version 2.

CAP was asked to review and comment on the following Campus reviews:

- The Committee reviewed and unanimously approved the proposed implementation procedures for the Health Sciences Compensation Plan with no further recommendations.
- The Committee reviewed the proposals for departmental name changes in BCOE and CHASS and expressed the following concerns:

1) Department of Electrical Engineering to the Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering

CAP had various concerns about department overlap and independence of programs that it hopes were dealt with in College Executive Committees. No CAP issues seem specifically at issue here.

2) Department of Theatre to the Department of Theatre, Film and Visual Production

The CHASS Executive Committee consultation with the affected departments seems unbalanced. The proposal includes a written response from the Theatre department, but there is no response from Media and Cultural Studies, Art, nor Creative Writing.

3) Department of Women's Studies to the Department of Gender and Sexualities Studies

CAP approved of the proposed change with no further recommendations.

- Members of CAP considered the proposal to change its by-laws to allow Associate Professors to serve.

The Committee was immediately struck by the importance of the issues raised, but did not feel that there is a quick and easy solution of the kind recommended.

A survey of other UC CAPS revealed that in every case, whatever their stated policy, only Full Professors, and often Professors only above Step VI, serve on CAP. This is for the obvious reason that considerable experience in the personnel process is necessary before serving on CAP. Often CAP members have been department chairs before serving on CAP for this very reason. In any case, most Associate Professors have not had much personnel experience and lack the necessary preparation for the regular workings of CAP.

An even more pressing concern is what we would be asking of Associate Professors, already so overworked in terms of service, if we were to shackle them with the overwhelming burden of CAP service.

Another practical concern emerges if one considers departmental voting practice. According to by-law 55, many departments do not allow Associate Professors to vote on Full Professor files. Whatever one may think of that policy, it does not follow that on a committee like CAP Associate Professors should decide on personnel matters for faculty of the Full Professor ranks.

Several members of CAP feel sympathy with the plea for more diversity. CAP becomes more diverse as members of the faculty are advanced, and we all assume that we can look forward to a continually more diverse CAP.

- The Committee unanimously endorsed the proposed change to the Bylaws of the Riverside Division.
- The Committee reviewed the proposed changes to the Campus Off-Scale Policy and recommended the numerical listing under Unsatisfactory Academic Progress be corrected.

Unsatisfactory Academic Progress: (1) A negative outcome on a reappointment. (2) A negative outcome on an on-time or decelerated merit action. (3) An assessment of negative on an appraisal. (3) An assessment of unsatisfactory on a quinquennial review.

CAP has concerns with this policy and looks forward to discussing the revision to the full Off-Scale Policy at a later time.

- CAP discussed the request for the campus to use the working title of Teaching Professor for those in the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series and found that this title may not be the right title to designate to this group.
- The Committee considered and approved the 12 FTE transfer requests.

c. Bylaw 55 delegations

CAP continues rely on each department to send its Bylaw-55 delegations and departmental voting procedures to the Senate. Departmental Bylaw-55 designations are collected each year through the end of October.

Finally, CAP thanks all who have contributed to the personnel process. The process works as well as it does only because of the hard work and dedication of all involved.

Respectfully submitted,

George Haggerty, Chair
Christine Chiarello
Shou-Wei Ding
Jianying Gan
Ann Goldberg
Jang-Ting Guo
Russell Hille
Ashok Mulchandani
Thomas Patterson
Linda Walling

TABLE I: SUMMARY OF PROMOTIONS AND ADVANCEMENTS

PROMOTIONS TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR:

Total Proposed: 27
 Total Reviewed by CAP: 27
 Total Reviewed by Chancellor: 26 1 file was withdrawn
 Total Approved by Chancellor: 24
 Approval % 92%

Department		Dean			CAP							Chancellor							
Yes	No	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	SPLIT	AHS	AOS	NOS	ALS	LOS	Yes	No	AHS	AOS	NOS	ALS	LOS
25	2	21	3	3	15	4	0	0	2	1	4	1	18	2	0	2	0	3	1

*in one case, a merit was approved in lieu of promotion

PROMOTIONS TO PROFESSOR:

Total Proposed: 19
 Total Reviewed by CAP: 19
 Total Reviewed by Chancellor: 19
 Total Approved by Chancellor: 18
 Approval % 95%

Department		Dean			CAP							Chancellor							
Yes	SPLIT	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	SPLIT	AHS	AOS	NOS	ALS	LOS	Yes	No	AHS	AOS	NOS	ALS	LOS
18	1	15	1	3	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	15	1	0	0	0	3	0

ADVANCEMENTS TO PROFESSOR VI & ABOVE-SCALE:

Total Proposed: 11
 Total Reviewed by CAP: 11
 Total Reviewed by Chancellor: 11
 Total Approved by Chancellor: 11
 Approval % 100%

Department		Dean			CAP							Chancellor							
Yes	No	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	SPLIT	AHS	AOS	NOS	ALS	LOS	Yes	No	AHS	AOS	NOS	ALS	LOS
11	0	9	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: Ad hoc committees used on advancement to AS only, not to step VI.

Table II: SUMMARY OF MERIT ACTIONS*

Total Proposed: 174
 Total Reviewed by CAP: 174
 Total Reviewed by Chancellor: 174
 Total Approved by Chancellor: 151
 Approval % 87%

Rank	# of Files	Department		Dean			CAP						Chancellor								
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	SPLIT	AHS	AOS	NOS	ALS	LOS	Yes	No	AHS	AOS	NOS	ALS	LOS
Assistant Professor	51	47	4	45	6	0	40	4	0	0	3	0	2	2	39	6	0	2	0	1	3
Associate Professor	54	51	3	39	6	9	36	8	0	1	2	3	3	1	34	8	0	3	3	3	3
Professor	63	63	0	44	15	4	46	9	0	0	4	1	2	1	45	9	0	4	2	2	1
within AS	5	5	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
LPSOE/SOE	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Merits	174	167	7	134	27	13	128	21	0	1	9	4	7	4	124	23	0	9	5	6	7

*does not include advancement to VI or advancement to A/S

Key to Abbreviations:

CAP = Committee on Academic Personnel
 CHAN = Chancellor or Executive Vice Chancellor
 SPLIT = Recommendation not clearly positive or negative
 AHS = Recommended/Approved Step Higher than initially recommended by Department
 AOS = Recommended/Approved OS salary in addition to merit advance recommended by Department
 NOS = Recommended/Approved merit advance but not additional OS salary recommended by Department
 ALS = Recommended/Approved Step Lower than initially recommended by Department
 LOS = Recommended/Approved Step Lower than initially recommended by Department and an off-scale

TABLE III: SUMMARY OF APPOINTMENTS

Total Proposed:	29
Total Reviewed by CAP:	28
Total Pending Final Decision:	1
Total Reviewed by Chancellor:	27
Total Approved by Chancellor:	27
Approval %	100%

(Not including appointments delegated to the Dean)

Rank	13-14 Actions
Assistant Professors	9
Associate Professors	6
Professors	14
LPSOE/LSOE/SOE	0
Clinical Professors	0
Professors in Residence	0
TOTAL APPOINTMENT ACTIONS	29

TABLE IV: MISCELLANEOUS ACTIONS

Appraisals:

Total Proposed: 15

	Decision			
	Positive	Qualified Positiv	Negative	Split
CAP	6	6	2	1
EVC/Chancellor	8	5	2	0

Career Reviews:

Total Proposed: 5
 2 Resulted in a merit of 3 steps
 1 Resulted in a merit of 4 steps
 1 Resulted in a promotion
 1 Resulted in a promotion plus a merit of 1 step

Assistant Professor Reappointments:

Total Proposed: 6
 Total Approved: 5

Quinquennial Reviews

Total Proposed: 15

	Decision		
	Satisfactory	Satisfactory w/ Qual	Negative
CAP	11	3	1
EVC/Chancellor	9	5	1

Table V: SUMMARY OF OFF-SCALE SALARIES APPROVED BY CHANCELLOR (OR DESIGNEE)

New off-scale awards were distributed as below for each college or school.

College/School	Merit based recommendation (1/2 step)	Off-scale awarded in lieu of proposed acceleration	*Admin Merit based award	Off-scale awarded at Appointment	A/S Appointment
CHASS	6	4	0	10	1
CNAS	8	2	1	4	0
BCOE	7	2	1	2	0
SoBA	0	0	0	2	0
GSOE	0	0	0	0	1
SoM	0	0	1	1	0
Totals	21	8	3	19	2

Total o/scales awarded = 53