

ANNUAL REPORT
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL - OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
2006-07

The Committee on Academic Personnel – Oversight Committee (CAP) advises the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel on promotions, appointments, terminations, multiyear accelerations within rank that involve skipping a step, high-level merit actions, third-year deferrals, five-year reviews, and appraisals. CAP also recommends membership of ad hoc committees, which are appointed by the Vice Provost. CAP advises both the Academic Senate and the Vice Provost on academic personnel matters as they arise. CAP appoints and directs the Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) that advise the Deans on redelegated personnel actions. See Appendix I for a list of CAP's principal tasks.

Faculty Advancement Criteria

CAP evaluates candidate files according to guidelines established in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM). CAP's mandate is to assure fair and equitable treatment of all faculty while ensuring that high standards of scholarship are maintained across the campus. Its goal is to apply fair, objective, and uniform standards of evaluation across the disciplines, recognizing the variability of measures of accomplishment and success from one discipline to another. Teaching, research or creative activity, service, and professional competence are evaluated.

CAP bases its judgments on documents provided in the formal personnel evaluation process, including documents contained in each candidate's dossier, evaluations by departmental faculty and the chair, commentaries from the dean, and when appropriate, assessments from external evaluators. CAP may also get input from a three-person ad hoc committee appointed by the Vice Provost-Academic Personnel following CAP's recommendations.

The evaluation criteria are set out in the APM (APM-210, <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/sec2-pdf.html>). CAP's judgments are guided by the wording of the APM, according to which the "indispensable qualification" for advancement at all levels is "superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement." CAP typically recommends advancement of a faculty member after the normal period at rank and step on the basis of a record of balanced accomplishment in research and/or creative activity, teaching, and service. Alternatively, CAP might make a favorable recommendation when it judges the performance to be well above expectations in one category although it was below expectations in another, as appropriate to rank and step. Time spent on an activity is not considered to be a substitute for accomplishment. CAP does not use time in service (except for deferrals) or health or personal issues in judging merit advancements.

CAP's evaluation of research reported in peer-reviewed publications (and in other venues) and of creative work presented in many forms and venues is based principally on the originality, creativity, and impact of the work as judged by peers. CAP's primary criteria for the evaluation of teaching are effectiveness and impact, as well as the candidate's command of his or her subject, scholarly growth, and presentation of material in ways that help students to think critically, independently, and creatively. Advising and mentoring activities as well as student evaluations are given substantial weight in judging teaching performance. CAP is also influenced by the amount, variety, and difficulty of teaching. In evaluating service, CAP assesses the effort, impact and outcome.

The files that were forwarded to CAP were mostly well prepared. Evaluations of the impact or quality of service activity were usually absent.

Pace of Activity

During the 2006-07 academic year (September through August), CAP met **38** times and considered **470** personnel actions. CAP also provided advice on numerous other issues related to academic personnel. The normal turnaround time for agenda items was two weeks.

Academic Personnel Actions, 2006-2007

Table 1 provides a summary of CAP's deliberations by category for the past academic year. CAP considered **84**¹ appointments, **103** promotions (including one senior lecturer), **172**² merit actions (including continuing lecturer and retroactive requests), **57** appraisals, and **54** other actions. Nine actions were referred to ad hoc committees (Table 11).

Appointments: CAP fast-tracked **55** new appointments and made recommendations to the Vice Provost. This process helps the campus compete more effectively with comparable institutions in an increasingly competitive environment.

Promotions: For promotions to Associate Professor, CAP recommended promotion in **44** of **52** cases, of which five were one-year accelerations (Table 2). Based on career equity reviews, CAP recommended a further acceleration of the candidate than was requested in three cases, one via a retroactive action and two through acceleration to Associate Professor, Step II instead of Step I (one of which was approved at Associate Professor, Step I by the administration). Of the **8** cases for which CAP did not recommend promotion, it recommended merit advancement to Assistant Professor, Step V in two cases and Assistant Professor, Step VI in one case. In **45** cases the faculty members were

¹ Includes via change in title, department chair, and initial continuing non-Senate faculty appointments.

² Includes retroactive, accelerated continuing lecturer and lecturer merits.

promoted by the administration (one on appeal, with two positive and one negative recommendation pending).

CAP recommended **44** of **50** promotion actions to full Professor, including one to Senior Lecturer, SOE (Table 3). In seven cases the actions recommended by CAP were one-year accelerations, and in three cases 3-year accelerations (skipping a step). Of the six actions not recommended for promotion, CAP recommended merit advancement in five cases. The administration promoted **45** faculty members to full Professor, including in one case a 2-year acceleration not recommended by CAP.

High Level Merit Increases: CAP considered **44** actions for merit increases to Professor, Step VI or above (from Professor V) and supported **36** of these cases for advancement (Table 4). The administration gave a merit increase to Step VI (or above) in **37** of these cases (with one pending), one of which was approved on appeal. Five of the actions recommended by CAP were 1-year accelerations, four were retroactive actions per CAP, one was a 2-year acceleration, and two were recommended for a 1-year acceleration when two years and four years were requested, respectively.

There were a total of **14** requests for merit increases to Professor, Above Scale (Table 5). CAP supported advancement to Above Scale in **10** cases, of which two were 1-year accelerations. Two actions not recommended by CAP were requests for four year accelerations. The administration granted advancement in **12** cases, one of which was a 4-year acceleration.

CAP recommended **11** of **14** proposed merit increases within Professor, Above Scale (Table 6). The administration granted **13** advances. Each of the two additional actions approved by the administration involved a 1-year acceleration.

Other Merit Actions: CAP also considered other merit actions within the Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor ranks.

For the rank of Professor, CAP considered **19** actions below Professor VI and **14** above (not including Above Scale). Of these **33** actions CAP recommended a merit advance in **26** cases (Table 7), including advancement above that requested by the faculty member in **3** cases and one 3-year acceleration. Of the 11 accelerated merit requests in this group, eight were requests for 3-year accelerations and two for 4-year accelerations. In those instances when CAP did not support the multiple-year accelerated action as proposed, either a 1-year retroactive action or a less accelerated action was recommended. The administration approved merit advances for **27** cases, with one pending.

At the Assistant and Associate Professor levels, CAP reviewed a total of **25** proposed merit actions, including one Continuing lecturer (Table 8). CAP recommended a merit advance

in 24 cases, including three 1-year and three 2-year accelerations. In three of the cases for which skipping a step was proposed a normal merit was recommended. The administration concurred with CAP in all cases.

Accelerated Actions: Nearly one-third (78) of the 232 merit or promotion cases reviewed above involved requests for accelerations. Further, although this year requests for multi-year accelerations that did not involve skipping a step went to the FPCs rather than CAP, 48 of these cases, or approximately one-fifth of all the merit and promotion cases reviewed above, were requests for accelerations of two or more years.

Specifically, for merit actions (including Professor Step VI and Above Scale), 9 2-year, 13 3-year and 5 4-year accelerations were requested. Of these actions, five were recommended as requested by CAP and a sixth agreed to by the administration. Two were not recommended or granted, eleven received a normal merit action, and eight received a lesser acceleration (one year retro or accelerated action). For promotions to Associate Professor and Professor, 8 2-year, 11 3-year, 1 4-year and 1 7-year accelerations were requested. Of these actions, three were recommended as requested and a fourth granted by the administration, seven received normal actions and ten received a lesser acceleration.

CAP finds the trend toward requests for multiple-year accelerations somewhat problematic, particularly when discussions with UCAP committee members indicate that such actions are extremely rare on other campuses. CAP also cautions that such requests involve even more detailed scrutiny than in most cases to determine whether such an extraordinary action is justified.

Advancement to Associate Professor, Step IV: Requests for advancement to Associate Professor, Step IV are seen by CAP because for faculty promoted to Associate Professor, Step I, such a merit would typically involve more than six years at rank. However, if promotion is to a higher step this is not the case. In addition, even if a faculty member has spent six years at rank a merit advance rather than promotion may be appropriate if, for example, a submitted book manuscript only requires minor revision before it would be considered “in press.” Nineteen of the merit cases at the Associate rank reviewed above were requests to advance to Associate Professor IV. Three of these requests involved 1-year accelerations, one a 2-year acceleration, and one a 3-year acceleration (for which CAP recommended a normal merit increase).

Retroactive Merit Actions: Retroactive merit actions may be requested by Deans and/or Faculty Personnel Committees. When considering a retroactive action, the review period ends the year before the proposed merit date (e.g., for an action retroactive to July 1, 2006, the creative work/research publications are counted to December 31, 2005, and teaching/service until June 30, 2006). Thus, retroactive recommendations should specifically discuss the record for this review period, and why it supports the acceleration.

In 2006-07, CAP received **30** retroactive merit requests, including **1** at the Assistant Professor level, **3** at the Associate Professor level, **1** at Senior Lecturer SOE level, and **25** at the Professor rank. CAP recommended the requested additional acceleration (retroactive action) be approved in **20** of these cases. The administration approved **12** actions with **15** actions pending.

Career Equity Reviews: To address potential inequities at both the point of hire and/or during a faculty member's advancement, *Career Equity Reviews* are conducted. Career equity reviews consider the entire career record of the individual to determine if current placement on the academic ladder is consistent with faculty at equal and higher rank and step. Requests for career equity review can be initiated by individual faculty members, department chairs, deans, the Vice Provost-Academic Personnel, FPCs or CAP. In 2006-2007 CAP conducted six career equity reviews that were initiated by faculty (Table 9). Of these, CAP recommended an equity adjustment in three cases. In the three cases for which CAP did not recommend an equity adjustment, CAP supported a retroactive merit increase in two cases. CAP also conducts career reviews for every major advancement.

Five-Year Reviews: CAP carried out **12** five-year reviews, recommending "no advancement, performance satisfactory" in **10** cases and recommending "no advancement, performance unsatisfactory" in **2** cases.

Initial Continuing Appointments: CAP reviewed and made recommendations on **16** initial continuing non-Senate appointments in 2006-2007. CAP made favorable recommendations for an initial continuing appointment in **15** of these cases, and the administration approved all **15** of these appointments. Teaching excellence, with a capital "E," is a requirement for a continuing appointment.

Accelerated Merits for Continuing Lecturers: CAP considered **12** cases of accelerated merit advancement for Continuing Lecturers and recommended accelerations in six cases. Teaching excellence, course design and organization of teaching materials, contribution to curriculum and workshop development, student advising and mentoring, instruction-related service to campus and profession are some considerations that CAP looks upon favorably in making positive recommendations in such cases.

Ad Hoc Committees

Review by a campus ad hoc committee may be required in cases of major advancements (promotion to the Associate Professor and full Professor level, and merits to Professor, Step VI, and Above Scale) and for appointments with tenure. A total of **199** cases fell into this category in 2006-07. CAP's membership reflects the variety of disciplines represented on campus and is guided by external reviewers' evaluations, but CAP looks to campus ad

ad hoc committees for highly specialized expertise. CAP proposed ad hoc committees in 9 cases (Table 10), and thanks the faculty members who served on these committees for giving so generously of their time and for the high quality and objectivity of their evaluations and reports. Further, to acquaint new faculty with the personnel process, it has been policy to appoint Assistant Professors (Steps III and IV) as observers to ad hoc committees on promotions to Associate Professor or Professor. During the 2006-07 academic year, 8 assistant professors were appointed by the Vice Provost to serve as non-voting observers on ad hoc committees.

Faculty Personnel Committees

Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) advise the deans on personnel actions redelegated to the deans (except, in most cases, first actions after a promotion or appointment). In 2006-07, these actions included appointment of Assistant Professor, Steps I-III; most normal and accelerated merit actions that do not skip a step (up to and including Professor, Step IX, with the exception of merit increases to Professor, Step VI); most normal merit actions for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment; and Unit 18 actions (including appointments and reappointments of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers without Security of Employment). The FPCs reviewed **338** cases (Table 11). In addition, the Committees conducted **57** appraisals of junior faculty which were then forwarded to CAP for further evaluation. CAP also conducted post-factum audits on the cases dealt with by the FPCs, and found general agreement with the recommendations of the FPCs.

FPCs are appointed by CAP upon the recommendation of the Executive Committees of the colleges, schools, and divisions (Appendix II). CAP appreciates the dedicated efforts and hard work of the members of these Committees.

University Committee On Academic Personnel (UCAP)

Christopher Calvert served as the UC Davis representative to the University Committee on Academic Personnel, which held several meetings throughout the academic year. The Office of the President, UCAP members, or other UC Academic Senate committees and officers bring issues to the attention of UCAP.

A primary function of this systemwide committee is to facilitate the exchange of information among campuses. Accordingly, CAP was regularly informed of UCAP discussions, and through its representative provided input into such discussions when appropriate. In 2006-07 UCAP addressed a broad range of issues, among which were salary scales and off-scale salaries. UCAP made specific recommendations aimed at improving the fairness and transparency of published salary scales and recommended amending the policy language in APM 620 that governs the use of off-scale salaries.

In addition, UCAP reviewed comments from systemwide committees and divisions to UCAP's proposed modifications to APM policy 220-18b (4), articulating the criteria for advancement to Professor, Step VI and Above Scale. The Academic Council recommended endorsing UCAP's proposal with a few minor modifications. UCAP discussed the role of service in merit and promotion criteria, and suggested that the Academic Council consider endorsing the Berkeley Budget Committee's guidelines for evaluation of service in the faculty merit and promotion system. UCAP considered a request from the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) concerning the use of "collegiality" as a factor in promotion and merit decisions, and found that CAPs review all files based on criteria outlined in APM 210 (and did not identify a case where a CAP recommended denial of a merit or promotion based solely on "collegiality"). UCAP also provided the Academic Council with comments on a joint UCEP/CCGA proposal on the role of graduate students in university instruction, a proposed Senate bylaw, a proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 181, and a practice at UC Davis of recharging faculty salaries to extramural grants.

Other Matters

During 2006-2007, CAP made appointments for all Faculty Personnel Committees based upon recommendations from Faculty Executive Committees. CAP also reviewed voting procedures for the following departments: Anesthesiology & Pain Medicine, Dermatology, Emergency Medicine, Entomology, German & Russian, Molecular & Cellular Biology, Native American Studies, Nematology, Neurological Surgery, Obstetrics & Gynecology, Otolaryngology, Plant Pathology, Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences, Radiology, and Viticulture & Enology.

Acknowledgments

CAP would like to express appreciation to the Academic Senate staff, in particular Solomon Bekele for his efficient and professional service and Shelley Lopez-Emerson for her efforts on behalf of ad hoc committees. CAP would also like to express appreciation to the Vice Provost-Academic Personnel, Barbara Horwitz and her staff. As this report shows, our recommendations and the ultimate decision by the administration almost always coincide.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Chris Calvert
Laurel Gershwin
Chip Martel
Christopher Reynolds
Catherine Morrison Paul, Chair

Bill Casey
Ines Hernandez-Avila
Jerry Powell
Steve Tharratt

**Table 1. Personnel Actions Referred to CAP
2006-07**

Appointments	Total	Accelerations	Ad Hoc
Assistant Professor*	16	0	0
Associate Professor*	14	0	0
Professor*	25	0	0
Via Change in Title	11	0	0
Initial Continuing Non-Senate	16	0	0
Dept. Chair (reappointment only)	2	0	0
Total Appointments	84	0	0
Promotions			
Associate Professor*	52	11	6
Professor*	50	23	1
Senior Lecturer, SOE	1		
Total Promotions	103	34	7
Merit Increases⁺			
Assistant Professor*	4	4	0
Associate Professor*	21	6	0
Professor*	105	34	2
Continuing Lecturer	12	12	0
Retroactive	30	30	0
Total Merit Increases	172	86	2
Miscellaneous Actions			
Career Equity Reviews**	6	6	0
Appraisals	57	0	0
Third-Year Deferrals	10	0	0
Five-Year Reviews	12	0	0
TOE Screenings	0	0	0
POP Screenings	7	0	0
Other Actions	19	0	0
Total Miscellaneous Actions	111	6	0
Total Personnel Actions	470	125	9

* Includes Acting, Clinical, In Residence, and Adjunct titles. ** CAP initiates equity reviews for all major advancements. These career equity reviews were initiated by faculty. + Excluding retroactive merits

Table 2. Promotions to Associate Professor, including 11 Proposed Accelerated Actions

Results	Dept.	Dean	Ad Hoc	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	51	42	4	36	36
Yes but less than proposed action	0	2	0	5	5
Yes but more than proposed action	0	1	0	3	2
Divided on proposed action	0	0	0	0	0
No promotion, yet merit increase	0	2	0	3	2
No to proposed action	1	5	2	5	4
Pending	0	0	0	0	3
Total	52	52	6	52	52

Table 3. Promotions to Professor, including 23 Proposed Accelerated Actions

Results	Dept.	Dean	Ad Hoc	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	49	43	1*	33	34
Yes but less than proposed action	1	2	0	10	10
Yes but more than proposed action	0	2	0	1	1
Divided on proposed action	0	0	0	0	0
No promotion, yet merit increase	0	2	0	5	4
No to proposed action	0	1	0	1	1
Total	50	50	1	50	50

* Removal of Acting Title, counted here as promotion.

Table 4. Merit Increase to Professor, Step VI, including 13 Proposed Accelerated Actions

Results	Dept.	Dean	Ad Hoc	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	43	39	0	27	28*
Yes but less than proposed action	0	0	0	5	5
Yes but more than proposed action	0	0	0	4	4
Divided on proposed action	0	0	0	0	0
No to proposed action	1	5	1	8	6
Pending			0	0	1
Total	44	44	1	44	44

* one approved on appeal

Table 5. Merit Increase to Prof., Above Scale, including 4 Accelerated Actions

Results	Dept.	Dean	Ad Hoc	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	14	14	1	10	12
Yes but less than proposed action	0	0	0	2	1
Yes but more than proposed action	0	0	0	0	0
Divided on proposed action	0	0	0	0	0
No to proposed action	0	0	0	2	1
Total	14	14	1	14	14

Table 6. Merit Increases within Professor, Above Scale, including 6 Proposed Accelerated Actions

Results	Dept.	Dean	Ad Hoc	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	14	14	0	11	13
Yes but less than proposed action	0	0	0	0	0
Yes but more than proposed action	0	0	0	0	0
Divided on proposed action	0	0	0	0	0
No to proposed action	0	0	0	3	1
Total	14	14	0	14	14

Table 7. Merit Increases within Professor Rank (excluding Professor, Step VI and Professor, Above Scale)

Results	Dept.	Dean	Ad Hoc	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	30	24	0	16	16
Yes but less than proposed action	0	4	0	7	8
Yes but more than proposed action	3	3	0	3	3
Divided on proposed action	0	0	0	0	0
No to proposed action	0	2	0	7	5
Pending	0	0	0	0	1
Total	33	33	0	33	33

Table 8. Merit Increases Within Assistant and Associate Professor Ranks, including 10 Accelerated Actions

Results	Dept.	Dean	Ad Hoc	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	25	25	0	21	21
Yes but less than proposed action	0	0	0	3	3
Yes but more than proposed action	0	0	0	0	0
Divided on proposed action	0	0	0	0	0
No to proposed action	0	0	0	1	1
Total	25	25	0	25	25

Table 9. Career Equity Reviews

Results	Dept.	Dean	Ad Hoc	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	6	6	0	3	2
Divided on proposed action	0	0	0	0	0
No to proposed action	0	0	0	3	2
Pending	0	0	0	0	2
Total	6	6	0	6	6

Table 10. Actions Sent to Ad Hoc Committees

Actions	Number
Promotion to Associate Professor	6
Promotion to Professor	1
Merit Increase to Professor VI	1
Merit Increase to Above Scale	1
Total	9

Table 11. Redelegated Merit Actions+

	FPC Recommendation			Dean's Decision	
	Yes	No	Split	Yes	No
College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences	46	6	1	49	4
College of Biological Sciences	24	3		25	2
School of Education	2	0		2	0
College of Engineering	43	7		47	3
Graduate School of Management	4	2		5	1
Division of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies	22	2	1	24	1
Division of Mathematical and Physical Sciences	19	0	1	20	0
Division of Social Sciences	54	6	1	55	6
School of Law++					
School of Medicine	34	5		34	5
School of Veterinary Medicine	53	2		55	0
Totals	301	33	4	316	22

(+) The figures do not include “first actions after promotion” in which the Dean makes decisions without FPC input.

(++) The School of Law had five actions in which the FPC did not participate.

APPENDIX I

PRINCIPAL TASKS OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL – OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

1. Nominating faculty to serve on ad hoc committees which make recommendations for promotions, appointments, and upper level merit increases.
2. Reviewing the reports of ad hoc committees and independently evaluating the dossiers of the candidate under consideration.
3. Reviewing proposed accelerated merit increases, terminations, reconsiderations, third-year deferrals, five-year reviews, Chancellor Fellow and Endowed Chair appointments, and reappointments of department chairs.
4. Reviewing merit actions for department chairs, program chairs, associate deans, members of Faculty Personnel Committees (and their near relatives) and other individuals for whom such action has not been redelegated to deans.
5. Appointing faculty to serve on Faculty Personnel Committees.
6. Reviewing policy matters referred by the administration and by the chair or committee of the Academic Senate, as well as initiating new policies and changes in existing policies when appropriate.
7. Conducting an annual post-audit of the recommendations from the Faculty Personnel Committees.
8. Reviewing summaries of confidential files of individual faculty prepared at individual's request by the Vice Provost—Academic Personnel.
9. Approving departmental voting procedures.
10. Reviewing requests for Target of Excellence and Partner Opportunity Program positions.
11. Reviewing cases to ensure equity in the application of criteria for appointments, merits, and promotion actions.
12. Conducting career equity reviews and reviewing continuing appointments for Unit 18 Lecturers.

APPENDIX II

COLLEGE OF AG. & ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Bryan Jenkins (Biological & Ag Engrg) – Chair
Adel Kader (Pomology)
Dina St. Clair (Plant Sciences)
David Reid (Food Science & Technology)
Steve Brush (Human & Community Development)
Kyaw Tha Paw U (LAWR)

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Biswanath Mukherjee (Computer Science) – Chair
Jay Lund (Civil & Environ. Engrg)
Simon Cherry (Biomedical Engineering)
Greg Miller (Applied Science)
Steven Lewis (Electrical & Computer Eng)
Case van Dam (Mechanical & Aero. Eng)

COLLEGE OF LETTERS & SCIENCE

George Roussas (Statistics) – Chair
S. Mani Tripathi (Physics)
M. Cecilia Colombi (Spanish)
Lynette Hunter (Theatre & Dance)
Timothy Cogley (Economics)
Ross Thompson (Psychology)

COLLEGE OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

John Harada (Plant Biology) – Chair
Charles Gasser (MCB)
Charles Langley (Evolution & Ecology)
John Meeks (Microbiology)
Andrew Ishida (NP&B)

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

Anand Swaminathan (GSM) – Chair
Kim Elsbach (GSM)
Klaus Nehring – Economics

SCHOOL OF LAW

Michael Maher - (GSM) – Chair
Clarence Walker (History)
Holly Doremus
Joel Dobris
Alan Brownstein

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Joseph Antognini (Anesthesiology) – Chair
Richard Maddock (Psychology)
Michael Holland (Biological Chemistry)
Jerold Last (Internal Medicine)
Nipavan Chiamvimonvat (Internal Medicine)
Mary O'Hara (Ophthalmology)
Carroll Cross (Internal Medicine)
Robert Berman (Neurological Surgery)
Hung Ho (Surgery)

SCHOOL OF VETERINARY MEDICINE

Peter Ihrke (Medicine & Epidemiology) - Chair
Linda Lowenstine (PMI)
Richard Lecouteur (Surgical & Radiological Sci.)
Alan Conley (PHR)

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Suad Joseph (Anthropology) - Chair
Jon Wagner (Education)
I. Phillip Young (Education)