

ANNUAL REPORT
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL - OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
2003-04

The Committee on Academic Personnel – Oversight Committee, hereafter referred to as 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, appraisals, and off-scale requests beyond two steps for all academic series within the Academic Senate. CAP also recommends membership of ad hoc committees, which are appointed by the Vice Provost. Further, 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.

Criteria for Faculty Advancement

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 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-210-1, <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 makes 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 the 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, mentoring, and student evaluations are given substantial weight in judging teaching performance. In some instances, CAP is influenced by the amount, variety, and difficulty of teaching.

In evaluating service, CAP assesses the impact and outcome of the activities.

Many files that were forwarded to CAP were well prepared, but CAP had to contend with the reality that the information provided was not always the most helpful. Some files provided little balanced analysis or evaluative or critical insight (e.g., failing to state the goals and/or significance of the candidate's activity); sometimes the information was incomplete. Evaluations of the impact of service activity were frequently missing. Descriptions of administrative functions seldom came to CAP with sufficient documentation of effectiveness or impact to be useful. Some reviews were conflicting and required resolution by CAP.

Pace of Activity

During the 2003-04 academic year, CAP met 45 times in the calendar year and considered 558 agenda items. The pace was intense and the number of meetings a record. The normal turnaround time for agenda items remained two weeks.

This year several cases were quite late in coming to CAP, necessitating the formation of ad hoc committees over the summer. There were various reasons for the tardiness of the files, but it is imperative that cases requiring an ad hoc committee be forwarded to CAP in a timely fashion. As in past years, ad hoc committees took anywhere from two weeks to several months to review a file and write their report.

Most supporting files were well prepared by the departments and processed expeditiously once received by CAP. Where the supporting files were inadequately prepared and CAP or the ad hoc committee had to request supplemental information, extended delays sometimes resulted.

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 207 cases fell into this category in 2003-04. Faculty control the process through CAP and the ad hoc committees, and the ad hocs provide CAP essential expert advice. While CAP's membership is reflective of the variety of disciplines represented on campus, it is not feasible for a group of nine people to possess the expertise in all the specialties of the hundreds of faculty members reviewed each year. It is precisely for such extra-departmental and field-specific expertise that CAP looks to campus ad hoc committees. Nevertheless, CAP increasingly "acted as its own ad hoc committee" in cases that seemed clear-cut and for which CAP had sufficient expertise in the candidate's area. CAP continued this practice in 2003-04, with a significant increase in the percentage of cases where it acted as its own ad hoc committee. CAP acted as its own ad hoc committee in 148 cases (71%), and proposed ad hoc committees in 61 cases (29%). Faculty were selected for ad hoc committees on the basis of their judgment and general knowledge of the broad field encompassing the candidate's specialty. CAP thanks the 183 faculty members who served on at least one ad hoc committee for giving so generously of their time and for the high quality and the objectivity of their evaluations and reports.

Observers

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 2003-04 academic year, 62 assistant professors were appointed by the Vice Provost to serve as non-voting members and observers on ad hoc committees.

Academic Personnel Actions, 2003-2004

A summary of CAP's deliberations by category for the past academic year is provided on Table 1. CAP met 45 times and considered 447 personnel actions. CAP considered 111 appointments to various ranks, 103 merit actions and 121 promotions. There were 33 appraisals. There were 61 actions referred to ad hoc committees (Table 2).

Appointments: CAP continued to streamline the personnel process without compromising the tenets of shared governance. Using a fast-track process, CAP reviewed 72 new appointments and made recommendations to the Vice Provost without the need to form ad hoc committees. This expedited process helps the campus compete more effectively with comparable institutions in an increasingly competitive environment. In 9 cases, CAP recommended appointment at a step higher than that originally proposed in order to address any potential equity problems in advance. CAP believes this process is working well.

Promotions: With respect to promotions to Associate Professor, CAP recommended the advancement as requested for 58 of 66 tenure cases (87.9%) (Table 3). In 7 of these cases, CAP recommended a further acceleration of the candidate than was requested. In 4 cases advancement or merit increase was recommended rather than promotion.

CAP supported 48 of 55 promotion actions to Full Professor (Table 4). In 4 of these cases CAP recommended a further acceleration than was requested at earlier levels of review. CAP recommended advancement without promotion or less of an acceleration in 3 cases. In all of these cases, teaching and service were considered commensurate with advancement, with concerns surrounding research impact or creative activity. In all cases there was evidence that work in progress, when brought to fruition, would warrant advancement.

High Level Merit Increases: CAP considered a total of 26 actions for advancement to Professor, Step VI, 5 for Professor, Step VII, 4 for Professor, Step VIII, and 2 for Professor, Step IX. CAP supported 31 (84%) of these actions (Tables 5, 8, 9, 10). CAP supported 20 actions for advancement to Professor, Step VI as proposed, and recommended less of an acceleration in one case. Of the 3 actions to Professor, Step VI, not supported by CAP, all three were not supported at one or more earlier levels of review. In one case, CAP recommended further advancement and was divided in its recommendation for one additional case.

Above Scale Actions: There were a total of 17 Above Scale advancement requests (Tables 6 and 7). CAP supported advancement in 14 cases, and recommended advancement in addition to that requested by the faculty member in one case.

Other Merit Actions: CAP considered accelerated actions within rank at the Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor ranks. At the Assistant level, there were a total of three proposed accelerations, out of which two were approved as requested and a third was approved as a merit

increase (Table 15). There were a total of 20 advancements within the Associate Professor ranks, six of which were proposed two-year accelerated advancements. CAP supported four accelerations as proposed and recommended a one-year accelerated merit increase in one case and a normal merit in another. Out of the remaining fourteen recommendations for normal advancement, CAP supported twelve (Table 16).

For the rank of Professor, CAP considered a total of 24 actions (Tables 11, 12, 13, 14). Sixteen of these actions were normal actions and CAP supported fifteen, including advancement in addition to that requested by the faculty member in two cases. Eight were accelerations. CAP supported all 8 cases.

Advancement to Associate Professor, Step IV: It has been policy that a faculty member who had spent 6 years at the Associate rank would be considered for promotion and would not be eligible for a merit increase to Associate Professor, Step IV except under special circumstances. Effective July 1, 2004, this policy was being revised. Departments may now ask the Vice Provost—Academic Personnel, for permission to submit a merit to Step IV in lieu of a promotion with strong justification. The request must clearly explain why recommending a merit to Step IV is appropriate even though the faculty member has already spent 6 or more years at the Associate rank. One justification for a merit to Step IV is that the faculty member is close to meeting the requirements for promotion – i.e., that submission of a promotion action will occur no later than 3 years hence. An example of when consideration for merit may be appropriate is when a submitted book manuscript only requires minor revision before it would be considered “in press”. Another example is when the Associate Professor has borne/adopted a child while at the Associate rank.

Career Equity Reviews: To address potential inequities at both the point of hire and/or during a faculty member’s advancement, a new program called *Career Equity Review* was initiated and implemented during the 2003-04 academic year. Career equity reviews consider the entire career record of the individual, as well as recent activity, to determine if current placement on the academic ladder is consistent with faculty at equal and higher rank and step. If the candidate’s performance is substantially the same as that of the majority of compared faculty members holding the same rank and step, the review will indicate that the candidate is being treated equitably. If, however, the candidate’s performance is essentially equal or superior to the performance of the majority of compared faculty holding a higher rank or step, a recommendation for an appropriate accelerated advancement or equity adjustment will be made. Requests for career equity review can be initiated by individual faculty members, department chairs, deans, the Vice Provost—Academic Personnel, Faculty Personnel Committees or by CAP.

CAP conducted 15 career equity reviews during 2003-04. Out of these, CAP determined that 4 cases (27%) deserved an equity adjustment and made favorable recommendations supportive of those requests to the Vice Provost. CAP rejected the remaining eleven cases, finding the records presented consistent with Academic Senate faculty at the faculty member's current rank and step, and not warranting any further equity adjustment.

Initial Continuing Appointments: During 2003-04, CAP was requested to advise the Vice Provost on initial continuing appointments for Unit 18 Lecturers. This followed after ratification of a new contract in July 2003, whereby three-year contracts are being replaced by initial continuing appointments for Unit 18 Lecturers. CAP reviewed and made recommendations on 16 such cases in 2003-04. CAP made favorable recommendations for a continuing appointment on 13 of these cases (81%) and recommended against the remaining 3 cases (19%). Teaching excellence is a requirement for a continuing appointment.

Faculty Personnel Committees: Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) advise the deans with personnel actions redelegated to the deans. In 2003-04, these actions included: Appointment of Assistant Professor, Step I, II, and 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 279 cases. In addition, the Committees conducted 33 appraisals of junior faculty which were conveyed directly to CAP for further evaluation.

CAP continues to believe that the interests of both the University and of individual Academic Senate colleagues require that confidentiality govern the personnel process. At the same time, CAP believes that the process itself should be transparent to individual candidates for advancement and promotion. Such transparency is an integral part of peer review and helps ensure that these candidates understand the basis for decisions about their personnel actions. Accordingly, CAP reaffirms the importance of the principle (embodied in current policy) that each candidate for advancement or promotion automatically receive his or her own copy of the comments on his/her personnel action, whatever the outcome of the action. These comments include those made by CAP and the FPCs, along with the comments of Chairs/Directors, Deans, and ad hoc committees.

Members of the Faculty Personnel Committees are nominated 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): Anna Maria Busse Berger served as a member of 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. UCAP addressed a broad range of issues, among which were discussions of the report of the Professorial Step System Task Force (Step VI), discussion of electronic publication and scholarly communication, and amendments to the APM.

Other Policy Matters: During 2003-04 CAP commented on several campus or Universitywide policy matters. These included: 1) draft policy on Endowed Chairs; 2) Reports from the Task Force on Faculty Instructional Activities; 3) reconstitution of the Division of Biological Sciences to the College of Biological Sciences; 4) UCD PPM 210-25 policy, Integrity in Research; 5) APM 260, University Professor; 6) Family Friendly Policy; 7) Proposal to Establish a Doctorate in Educational Leadership; 8) UC Davis Career Equity Process; 9) Proposal to Establish Air Quality Research Center ORU; 10) East Bay Working Professional MBA Program.

Acknowledgments

We thank our staff assistant, Solomon Bekele, for his efficient and professional service, and Don Orescanin for his efforts on behalf of ad hoc committees. We also thank the members of the Faculty Personnel Committees for their hard work, and the faculty who served on ad hoc committees this academic year. Their efforts are vital to the success of the review process.

Respectfully submitted,

Anna Maria Busse Berger
Edward Callahan
C. Chris Calvert
Jeannie Darby
Irwin Liu

Michael Maher
Robert Shumway
Philip Yager
Thomas Morrison, Chair

**Table 1. Personnel Actions Referred to CAP
2003-04**

Appointments	Total	Accelerations	Ad Hoc
Assistant Professor*	16	0	0
Associate Professor*	21	0	0
Professor*	28	0	0
University Professor	1	0	0
Target of Opportunity, Excellence (TOE)	3	0	0
Partner Opportunity (POP)	4	0	0
Via Change in Title	13	0	0
Endowed Chair	5	0	0
Endowed Chair (reappointment)	2	0	0
Initial Continuing Non-Senate	16	0	0
Dept. Chair (reappointment only)	2		
Total Appointments	111	0	0
Promotions			
Associate Professor*	66	17	25
Professor*	55	13	15
Total Promotions	121	30	40
Merit Increases			
Assistant Professor*	3	3	0
Associate Professor*	20	6	0
Professor*	78	29	18
Total Merit Increases	103	39	21
Miscellaneous Actions			
Retroactive Merits	14	14	0
Career Equity Reviews	15	15	0
Appraisals	33	0	0
Removal of Acting Title	3	0	0
Third-Year Deferrals	4	0	0
Five-Year Reviews	17	0	0
TOE Screenings	10	0	0
POP Screenings	11	0	0
Other Actions	5	0	0
Total Miscellaneous Actions	112	25	0
Total Personnel Actions	447	94	61

* Includes Acting, Clinical, In Residence, and Adjunct titles

Table 2. Actions Sent to Ad Hoc Committees

Actions	Number
Appointments	0
Promotion to Associate Professor	25
Promotion to Professor	15
Merit Increase to Professor VI & Above Scale	21
Total	61

Table 3. Promotions to Associate Professor, including 17 Proposed Accelerated Actions

Results	Dept.	Dean	Ad Hoc	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	64	54	18	50	46
Yes but less than proposed action	0	2	2	1	2
Yes but more than proposed action	1	2	0	7	6
Divided on proposed action	0	0	1	1	0
No promotion, yes merit increase	0	3	1	4	7
No to proposed action	1	5	3	3	5
Total	66	66	25	66	66

Table 4. Promotions to Professor, including 13 Proposed Accelerated Actions

Results	Dept.	Dean	Ad Hoc	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	53	49	9	44	44
Yes but less than proposed action	0	0	0	0	0
Yes but more than proposed action	0	2	0	4	4
Divided on proposed action	2	0	0	0	0
No promotion, yes merit increase	0	1	1	3	4
No to proposed action	0	3	5	4	3
Total	55	55	15	55	55

Table 5. Merit Increase to Professor, Step VI, including 8 Proposed Accelerated Actions

Results	Dept.	Dean	Ad Hoc	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	25	22	3	20	21
Yes but less than proposed action	0	0	0	1	1
Yes but more than proposed action	1	1	0	1	1
Divided on proposed action	0	1	2	1	0
No to proposed action	0	2	4	3	3
Total	26	26	9	26	26

Table 6. Merit Increase to Professor, Above Scale, including 7 Proposed Accelerated Actions

Results	Dept.	Dean	Ad Hoc	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	11	11	8	7	8
Yes but less than proposed action	0	0	1	0	0
Yes but more than proposed action	0	0	0	1	0
Divided on proposed action	0	0	1	0	0
No to proposed action	0	0	1	3	2
Total	11	11	11	11	10*

* final decision pending on one action
 In addition, one action is still outstanding with ad hoc committee

Table 7. Merit Increase within Professor, Above Scale, including 2 accelerated actions

Results	Dept.	Dean	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	6	6	6	6
Yes but less than proposed action	0	0	0	0
Yes but more than proposed action	0	0	0	0
Divided on proposed action	0	0	0	0
No to proposed action	0	0	0	0
Total	6	6	6	6

Table 8. Merit Increase to Professor, Step VII, including 1 proposed accelerated action

Results	Dept.	Dean	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	5	4	3	3
Yes but less than proposed action	0	0	0	0
Yes but more than proposed action	0	1	2	2
Divided on proposed action	0	0	0	0
No to proposed action	0	0	0	0
Total	5*	5*	5*	5*

* all faculty in this category were administrators or FPC members

Table 9. Merit Increase to Professor, VIII, including 1 proposed accelerated action

Results	Dept.	Dean	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	3	4	4	4
Yes but less than proposed action	0	0	0	0
Yes but more than proposed action	0	0	0	0
Divided on proposed action	0	0	0	0
No to proposed action	1	0	0	0
Total	4*	4*	4*	4*

* one action in this category involved a 3-year acceleration from Step VI to Step VIII (skipping a step) and the rest were administrators

Table 10. Merit Increase to Professor, Step IX, including 2 proposed accelerated actions

Results	Dept.	Dean	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	2	1	1	1
Yes but less than proposed action	0	1	1	1
Yes but more than proposed action	0	0	0	0
Divided on proposed action	0	0	0	0
No to proposed action	0	0	0	0
Total	2*	2*	2*	2*

* one action in this category involved a 3-year acceleration from Step VII to Step IX (skipping a step) and the other was administrator

Table 11. Merit Increase to Professor, Step II

Results	Dept.	Dean	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	2	2	2	2
Yes but less than proposed action	0	0	0	0
Yes but more than proposed action	0	0	0	0
Divided on proposed action	0	0	0	0
No to proposed action	0	0	0	0
Total	2*	2*	2*	2*

* both actions were regular merit increases for faculty members with administrative responsibilities

Table 12. Merit Increase to Professor, Step III, including 2 proposed accelerated actions

Results	Dept.	Dean	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	8	7	5	6
Yes but less than proposed action	0	0	0	0
Yes but more than proposed action	0	1	2	1
Divided on proposed action	0	0	0	0
No to proposed action	0	0	1	1
Total	8*	8*	8*	8*

* actions involved are merits for FPC members or for faculty with administrative roles. CAP independently recommended accelerations in two cases and the Vice Provost approved one and denied the other

Table 13. Merit Increase to Professor, Step IV, including 6 proposed accelerated actions

Results	Dept.	Dean	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	11	11	11	11
Yes but less than proposed action	0	0	0	0
Yes but more than proposed action	0	0	0	0
Divided on proposed action	0	0	0	0
No to proposed action	0	0	0	0
Total	11	11	11	11

Table 14. Merit Increase to Professor, Step V

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

Table 15. Merit Increase within Assistant Professor, 3 Proposed Accelerated Actions

Results	Dept.	Dean	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	3	3	2	2
Yes but less than proposed action	0	0	1	1
Yes but more than proposed action	0	0	0	0
Divided on proposed action	0	0	0	0
No to proposed action	0	0	0	0
Total	3*	3	3	3

* Department voted for normal merit only.

Table 16. Merit Increase within Associate Professor, including 6 Proposed Accelerated Actions

Results	Dept.	Dean	CAP	Final Decision
Yes to proposed action	19	18	16	16
Yes but less than proposed action	0	1	2	2
Yes but more than proposed action	0	0	0	0
Divided on proposed action	0	0	0	0
No to proposed action	1	1	2	2
Total	20	20	20	20

Redelegated Merit Actions

Table 17. College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences

Rank	FPC Recommendation		Dean's Decision	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Assistant Professor	4	0	4	0
Associate Professor	3	0	3	0
Professor	46	10	48	8
Total	53	10	55	8
Override	2			

Table 18. Division of Biological Sciences

Rank	FPC Recommendation		Dean's Decision	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Associate Professor	3	0	3	0
Professor	11	2	11	2
Total	14	2	14	2
Override	0			

Table 19. School of Education

Rank	FPC Recommendation		Dean's Decision	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Assistant Professor	2	0	2	0
Total	2	0	2	0
Override	0			

Table 20. College of Engineering

Rank	FPC Recommendation		Dean's Decision	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Assistant Professor	9	2	9	2
Associate Professor	7	1	7	1
Professor	17	8	21	4
Total	33	11	37	7
Override	4			

Table 21. Graduate School of Management

Rank	FPC Recommendation		Dean's Decision	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Professor	2	0	2	0
Total	2	0	2	0
Override	0			

Table 22. Division of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies

Rank	FPC Recommendation		Dean's Decision	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Assistant Professor	3	0	3	0
Associate Professor	1	1	1	1
Professor	8	1	9	0
Total	12	2	13	1
Override	1			

Table 23. Division of Mathematical and Physical Sciences

Rank	FPC Recommendation			Dean's Decision	
	Yes	No	Split*	Yes	No
Associate Professor	2	0	0	2	0
Professor	11	2	2	15	0
Total	13	2	2	17	0
Override	2				

Table 24. Division of Social Sciences

Rank	FPC Recommendation			Dean's Decision	
	Yes	No	Split*	Yes	No
Assistant Professor	3	1	1	4	1
Associate Professor	1	0	0	1	0
Professor	17	0	1	18	0
Senior Lecturer	1	0	0	1	0
Total	22	1	2	24	1
Override	0				

* FPC vote was 50-50

Table 25. School of Medicine

Rank	FPC Recommendation		Dean's Decision	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Assistant Professor	16	4	17	3
Associate Professor	13	2	13	2
Professor	26	6	29	3
Total	55	12	59	8
Override	4			

Table 26. School of Veterinary Medicine

Rank	FPC Recommendation			Dean's Decision	
	Yes	No	Split*	Yes	No
Assistant Professor	3	3	1	4	3
Associate Professor	4	0	0	4	0
Professor	15	3	0	16	2
Total	22	6	1	24	5
Override					

*FPC vote was 50-50

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

FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEES 2003 – 2004

COLLEGE OF AG. & ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Catherine Morrison Paul (Ag. & Res Economics) - Chair
Paul Sabatier (Environmental Science & Policy)
Joy Mench (Animal Science)
Michael Barbour (Environmental Horticulture)
Andrew Clifford (Nutrition)
Jan Dvorak (Agronomy & Range Science)

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Patricia Mokhtarian (Civil & Environ. Engrg) - Chair
Charles Martel (Computer Science)
John Miles (Biological & Ag Engrg)
Ahmet Palazoglu (Chemical Engrg & Materials Science)
Bahram Ravani (Mechanical & Aeronautical Engrg)

COLLEGE OF LETTERS & SCIENCE

Abigail Thompson (Mathematics) – Chair
David Nutter (Music)
James Griesemer (Philosophy)
Evan Watkins (English)
Jacquelyn Gervay-Hague (Chemistry)
Keith Widaman (Psychology)

DIVISION OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Roy Doi (Molecular & Cellular Biology) - Chair
Michael Sanderson (Evolution & Ecology)
John Harada (Plant Biology)
Diana Myles (Molecular & Cellular Biology)
Carlito Lebrilla (Chemistry)
***Carl Schmid (Molecuar & Cellular Biology)

*** replacement for Diana Myles - sabbatical leave 2003-04

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

Philip Martin (Ag Resource & Economics) - Chair
Brad Barber (GSM)
Eitan Gerstner (GSM)

SCHOOL OF LAW

Michael Smith (Hum & Comm. Development) - Chair
Edward Imwinkelried (Law School)
Suad Joseph (Anthropology)
Bruce Wolk (Law School)
Evelyn Lewis (Law School)

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Lawrence Laslett (Internal Medicine) - Chair
Joseph Antognini (Anesthesiology)
John McGahan (Radiology)
Michael Syvanen (Microbiology & Immunology)
Ellen Gold (Epidemiology & Prev. Medicine)
Peter Franks (Family & Community Medicine)
Martha O'Donnell (Human Physiology)
Mark Parrish (Pediatrics)
Anthony Stone (Urology)

SCHOOL OF VETERINARY MEDICINE

John Madigan (Medicine & Epidemiology) - Chair
Mary Christopher (Path, Microbiology & Immun.)
Alan Buckpitt (Molecular Biosciences)
Susan Stover (Anatomy, Phys. & Cell Biology)

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Evelyn Silvia (Mathematics) – Chair
Jon Wagner (Education)
Barbara Merino (Education)

