

**NOTICE OF MEETING LOCATION****REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY  
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

To: Representative Assembly Members of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate

From: Davis Division of the Academic Senate Office

Re: Notice of Meeting Location

---

The **February 11, 2020** Representative Assembly meeting will be held in the **International Center, Multi-Purpose Room**. Directions to the building can be found at the following website:

<http://campusmap.ucdavis.edu/?b=259>. The room is located on the first floor of the International Center. The meeting is scheduled to begin at **2:10pm**.

MEETING CALL  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY  
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

**Tuesday, February 11, 2020**

**2:10 – 4:00 p.m.**

**International Center, Multi-purpose Room**

Page No.

1. November 14, 2019 Meeting Summary	3
2. Announcements by the President – None	
3. Announcements by the Vice Presidents – None	
4. Announcements by the Chancellor	
a. State of the Campus Address - Chancellor Gary May	
5. Announcements by the Deans, Directors or other Executive Officers – None	
6. Special Orders	
a. Remarks by Davis Division Chair Kristin Lagattuta	
7. Reports of standing committees	
a. Public Service (To be honored during the Spring quarter)	
i. Confirmation of the 2020 Distinguished Scholarship Public Service Award Recipients	7
b. Distinguished Teaching Award (To be honored during the Spring quarter)	
i. Confirmation of the 2020 Distinguished Teaching Award Recipients	8
c. Faculty Distinguished Research Award (To be honored during the Spring quarter)	
i. Confirmation of the 2020 Faculty Distinguished Research Award Recipient	10
d. Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction	
i. Proposed Revision to Davis Division Bylaw 50: Admissions and Enrollment	11
ii. Proposed Revision to Davis Division Bylaw 83: Library	12
8. Petitions of Students	
9. Unfinished Business	
10. University and Faculty Welfare	
11. New Business	
12. Informational Items	
a. *Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Personnel – Oversight Committee	13
b. Revision of the School of Veterinary Medicine Bylaws and Regulations	26
c. Revision of the General Education Scientific Literacy Interpretation	35

Ahmet Palazoglu, Secretary  
Representative Assembly of the  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

\*Consent Calendar. Items will be removed from the Consent Calendar on the request of any member of the Representative Assembly.

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.

## MEETING SUMMARY

REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY  
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Thursday, November 14, 2019

2:10 – 4:00 p.m.

International Center, Multi-purpose Room

Page No.

1. June 6, 2019 Meeting Summary	4
2. Announcements by the President – None	
3. Announcements by the Vice Presidents – None	
4. Announcements by the Chancellor – None	
5. Announcements by the Deans, Directors or other Executive Officers – None	
6. Special Orders	
a. Remarks by Davis Division Chair Kristin Lagattuta	
• Divisional business for 2019-20 includes: five-year assessment of step plus; continued work on campus operating status issues; recruiting for new provost and for vice chancellor of Student Affairs	
• Systemwide business for 2019-20 includes: presidential recruitment; cohort-based tuition discussions; task force on SAT/ACT use; discussions on faculty diversity; continued discussions on contracts with publishers and open access	
b. Remarks by Academic Federation Chair Zeljka Smit-McBride	
• Focus of 2019-20: celebrate diversity of titles and career choices, craft AF vision statement, and look into professional development opportunities	
c. Remarks by GSA Chair Jonathan Minnick	
• Focus of 2019-20: basic needs assistance, mental health initiatives, graduate student participation in Unitrans, intercampus shuttle advocacy, sustainability activities, social activities	
d. Remarks by ASUCD President Justin Hurst	
• Not present	
<i>Annual Reports on Consent Calendar:</i>	
e. *Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Personnel – Oversight Committee (to be distributed later)	
f. *Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Personnel – Appellate Committee	5
g. *Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility	10
h. *Annual Report of the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment	12
i. *Annual Report of the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity	14
j. *Annual Report of the Committee on Courses of Instruction	15
k. *Annual Report of the Committee on Distinguished Teaching Awards	17
l. *Annual Report of the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction	19
m. *Annual Report of the Emeriti Committee	21

\*Consent Calendar. Items will be removed from the Consent Calendar on the request of any member of the Representative Assembly.

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.

## MEETING SUMMARY

REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY  
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Thursday, November 14, 2019

2:10 – 4:00 p.m.

International Center, Multi-purpose Room

Page No.

n. *Annual Report of the Faculty Distinguished Research Award Committee	22
o. *Annual Report of the Committee on Faculty Welfare	24
p. *Annual Report of the Grade Changes Committee	26
q. *Annual Report of the Graduate Council	28
r. *Annual Report of the Committee on Information Technology	35
s. *Annual Report of the Committee on International Education	37
t. *Annual Report of the Library Committee	39
u. *Annual Report of the Committee on Planning and Budget	41
• *Annual Report of the Subcommittee on Instructional Space	44
v. *Annual Report of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure	46
w. *Annual Report of the Committee on Public Service	48
x. *Annual Report of the Committee on Research	50
y. *Annual Report of the Undergraduate Council	52
• Annual Report of the Subcommittee on General Education	54
• Annual Report of the Subcommittee on Special Academic Programs	56
• Annual Report of the Subcommittee on Preparatory Education	57
• Annual Report of the Subcommittee on Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review	58
z. *Annual Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors, and Prizes	60
7. Reports of standing committees	
8. Petitions of Students	
9. Unfinished Business	
10. University and Faculty Welfare	
11. New Business	
a. Discussion Regarding the Provost Search	
• Isaacson, Miller (search firm) facilitated discussion of qualities desired in the next provost. What should this person accomplish in next five years? What should outcomes and tangible measures of success be? What will attract a great candidate to UC Davis?	
12. Informational Item	
a. Revised College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences Bylaws and Regulations	64

\*Consent Calendar. Items will be removed from the Consent Calendar on the request of any member of the Representative Assembly.

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY  
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

**Thursday, November 14, 2019**

**2:10 – 4:00 p.m.**

**International Center, Multi-purpose Room**

Page No.

Ahmet Palazoglu, Secretary  
Representative Assembly of the  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

\*Consent Calendar. Items will be removed from the Consent Calendar on the request of any member of the Representative Assembly.

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.

## **Recommendations for the 2020 Distinguished Public Service Award**

The University of California has a long tradition of service to the state and the people of California. Faculty members use their expertise in teaching, research, and professional competence to make unpaid contributions to local, statewide, national, or international public arenas. The Academic Senate Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award honors exceptional faculty who continue the tradition and demonstrate the commitment of the UC Davis to public service.

The Public Service Committee recommends three individuals for the 2020 Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award:

### **Dr. Tonya Fancher, Professor of Clinical Internal Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, School of Medicine**

Dr. Tonya Fancher addresses disparities in health care access. She incorporates community engagement and service into training programs that address challenges unique to underserved communities. Moreover, she directly provides healthcare in underserved communities through her work in the Transcultural Wellness Center and by overseeing student-run clinics that provide free medical care to Sacramento's underserved populations. Dr. Fancher also developed innovative programs to improve recruitment and retention of students from underrepresented groups and disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds, including outreach programs in K-12, community college, and post-baccalaureate programs. She also provides regional and state-wide leadership on the California Future Health Workforce Commission.

### **Associate Professor Jonathan London, Department of Human Ecology, College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences**

As director of the Center for Regional Change and co-director of the Community Engagement Core, Associate Professor Jonathan London fosters collaborations between researchers, community groups, and policymakers to address public health, housing, education equity, and environmental justice issues. These efforts develop policies and programs supported by hundreds of millions of state and foundation dollars, effectively addressing issues including equitable drinking water access, identification of locations in greatest need of environmental protection, and climate-smart transportation. Associate Professor London also serves on the state taskforce on nitrates in drinking water and on the advisory board of a California public environmental health program.

### **Associate Professor Kadee Russ, Department of Economics, College of Letters and Science**

Associate Professor Kadee Russ substantially improves public discourse and policy related to international trade. She served in the Obama administration's Council of Economic Advisers as Senior Economist for International Trade and Finance, and she devotes considerable effort to educating the public on the costs of tariffs and policy uncertainty. She has published multiple pieces at the non-partisan EconoFact and interacts extensively with the media, including PBS,

CNBC, BBC, The New York Times, Los Angeles Times, and The Wall Street Journal. In addition, Associate Professor Russ has testified in several California legislative committees to educate legislators on how tariffs and potential trade deals might impact California's economy.

## **Recommendations for the 2020 Distinguished Teaching Awards**

The Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee recommends six individuals for the 2020 Distinguished Teaching Awards in respective categories.

### **Distinguished Teaching Award – Undergraduate Teaching**

#### **Professor Christyann Darwent, Department of Anthropology, College of Letters and Science**

Professor Christyann Darwent is recognized for her outstanding ability to make the subject of archaeology personally meaningful to students. She incorporates popular culture, local events, hands-on material exploration, and personal anecdotes into her lectures. Students also greatly appreciate her enthusiasm and sense of humor. Beyond the classroom, her dedicated mentoring enables students to learn how to curate museum collections or conduct fieldwork under difficult conditions in the Arctic. Under Professor Darwent's mentorship, undergraduates have presented papers about their research at scientific conferences, published papers on their research, and moved on to museum jobs or graduate school.

#### **Distinguished Professor Walter Leal, Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology, College of Biological Sciences**

Distinguished Professor Walter Leal is renowned for both his research in chemical ecology and his highly innovative classes in insect physiology and biochemistry. He has fully embraced the digital revolution in classroom instruction and mentorship through a variety of media, including podcasts, Zoom, Skype, and Camtasia, the latter allowing him to create videos to explain solutions to assigned problems (eSolutions), answer questions from lectures (eClarifications), and address questions before exams (eReviews). Students recognize the time, effort, and attention to detail that Professor Leal puts into his classes, and it inspires them to work just as hard to excel.

#### **Associate Professor Bettina Ng'weno, Department of African American and African Studies, College of Letters and Science**

Associate Professor Bettina Ng'weno has demonstrated a profound commitment to undergraduate teaching and student learning throughout the years. A kind and inquisitive teacher, Associate Professor Ng'weno promotes intellectual curiosity in the classroom that goes beyond the limits of her syllabus. Students praise her for demanding critical thinking, comparative broad perspectives, and introspection about self-perceptions. She excels at explaining and presenting to her students the complex history of the African people and their diaspora around the world. Her approach to teaching is rigorous yet humorous and engaging. Finally, as a mentor, Associate Professor Ng'weno genuinely lives the practices and beliefs she exemplifies when she teaches.



## **Distinguished Teaching Award – Graduate and Professional Teaching**

### **Professor James Adams, Department of Political Science, College of Letters and Science**

Professor James Adams is recognized for his exceptional efforts in the area of graduate teaching and mentorship. He is an extraordinary teacher, and his courses are among the most popular and highly enrolled in the Political Science Ph.D. program. Moreover, he is a dedicated and highly engaged mentor, and graduate students routinely seek his advice. Professor Adams publishes frequently with his students and helps them develop rich and productive research programs. He has an impressive record of placing his Ph.D. students in prestigious positions, and many of his former students comment on how he taps into his enormous network within the larger political science community for the benefit of his students.

### **Professor Pam Houston, Department of English, College of Letters and Science**

Professor Pam Houston has been an inspirational teacher and mentor to generations of graduate students in the Creative Writing Program. Despite the demands of her own writing career—as a prolific author of critically-acclaimed novels, essays, short stories, and autobiographical non-fiction—Professor Houston has served on 103 Master’s committees and been the primary advisor for 59 students. Many of her students have won prestigious awards for fiction and have published collections, novels, and memoirs. One former student says that Professor Houston is “a teacher who truly loves to teach, and who finds joy in helping her students improve their writing and develop as thinking citizens of the world.”

### **Professor Rajiv Singh, Department of Physics, College of Letters and Science**

Professor Rajiv Singh has demonstrated outstanding accomplishments in graduate academic advising and research. He has a notable record of teaching excellence across a wide range of courses, including the introductory sequences for physical science, engineering, and biological science majors as well as over 50 graduate courses in the 30 years he has been teaching. Many students comment on Professor Singh’s extensive knowledge, enthusiasm, teaching clarity, and lecture organization. Even as a Vice-Chair in his department, he chooses to maintain a full teaching load rather than take a teaching release—a clear example of his love for teaching and exemplary service to the Physics Department.

**Faculty Distinguished Research Award Committee Recommendation for Dr.  
Nathan Kuppermann as Recipient of the  
2020 Academic Senate Faculty Distinguished Research Award**

The Faculty Distinguished Research Award Committee unanimously recommends Dr. Nathan Kuppermann in the Department of Emergency Medicine at the School of Medicine as the recipient of the 2020 Faculty Distinguished Research Award.

Dr. Kuppermann has made outstanding contributions to the science of pediatric emergency medicine. His research has improved infant care and helped establish the Pediatric Emergency Research Networks, a multi-site international collaborative research team that conducts rigorous, pioneering investigations into the prevention and management of acute illnesses and injuries in children. His work on traumatic brain injuries, hemorrhagic torso trauma, diabetic ketoacidosis, and life-threatening bacterial infections in febrile infants has established best practices for effectively treating major childhood emergencies.

**PROPOSED REVISION OF DAVIS DIVISION BYLAW 50:  
Admissions and Enrollment**

Submitted and endorsed by the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment.

Endorsed by the Executive Council.

Rationale: The revision to Davis Division Bylaw 50: Admissions and Enrollment, increases committee membership to provide a broader range of consultation with campus academic units.

Proposed Revision: Davis Division Bylaw 50 shall be amended as follows. Deletions are indicated by strikeout; additions are in bold type.

---

50. Admissions and Enrollment (Renum 5/24/2001)

---

- A. This committee shall consist of the Admissions Officer at Davis, ex officio, and ~~five~~ **nine** additional **Academic Senate** members, two undergraduate student representatives, one graduate student representative, and one representative appointed by the Davis Academic Federation. The chair of this committee, or the chair's designate from among the Senate members of the committee, excluding the Admissions Officer, shall be the representative on the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). (Am. 6/9/92; 10/20/97) (Am. 12/15/1967)
- 
- B. The duties of the committee shall be to consider matters involving admission and enrollment at Davis. (En. 1/21/69) (Am. 12/15/1967)

**PROPOSED REVISION OF DAVIS DIVISION BYLAW 83:  
Library**

Submitted and endorsed by the Library Committee.

Endorsed by the Executive Council.

Rationale: The revision to Davis Division Bylaw 83: Library, is to clarify the voting rights of the Librarian ex-officio member.

Proposed Revision: Davis Division Bylaw 83 shall be amended as follows. Deletions are indicated by strikeout; additions are in bold type.

---

83. Library

---

- A. This committee shall consist of ~~fifteen~~ **fourteen** (~~15~~ 14) **appointed** voting members **plus the University Librarian, ex officio, who may also vote unless the University Librarian holds an administrative title per Davis Division Bylaw Part VI Title I.28.C. The fourteen regular voting members shall include two standing members appointed by the Committee on Committees to serve as Chair and Vice Chair. Remaining voting members, appointed by the Faculty Executive Committees, include the following:** one member from the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences; one member from the College of Biological Sciences; one member from the College of Engineering; three members from the College of Letters and Science, with one member from each of the College's three divisions; one member from the Graduate School of Management; one member from the School of Law; one member from the School of Education; one member from the School of Medicine; one member from the School of Nursing; one member from the School of Veterinary Medicine; ~~two standing members appointed by the Committee on Committees, to serve as Chair and Vice Chair; the University Librarian of the Davis campus ex-officio.~~ In addition, this committee shall include **the following** three (3) non-voting representatives: one representative from the Davis Academic Federation; one graduate student representative; and one undergraduate student representative. (Am. 3/16/92; 10/20/97) (Am. 9/1/2017)
- 
- B. The committee shall advise the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee on the administration of the Library and issues related to scholarly communication. The Committee shall also advise the University Librarian on issues pertaining to print, electronic, and other collections, to changing patterns of faculty and student use of the library, to removal and storage of physical library holdings, and to space and other demands. The committee shall report at least once a year to the Representative Assembly. (Am. 6/10/93; effective 1/1/94) (Am. 9/1/2017)

## 2018-2019 ANNUAL REPORT

### Davis Division of the Academic Senate

### Committee on Academic Personnel – Oversight Committee

The Committee on Academic Personnel – Oversight Committee (CAP) advises the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs on matters that affect the personnel process. These include appointments, promotions, merits, high-level merit actions, third-year deferrals, five-year reviews, and appraisals. CAP appoints members of Faculty Personnel Committees and also recommends membership on ad hoc committees when necessary, with the latter appointments made by the Vice Provost. The agenda for CAP actions is determined by a list that prioritizes appointments and tenure cases. Appendix A provides a summary of CAP's deliberations by category for the past committee year.

**Academic Personnel Actions:** During the 2018-19 committee year (9/1/2018-8/31/2018), CAP met 43 times and considered over 520<sup>1</sup> agenda items. The committee provided advice on numerous issues related to academic personnel. These included 12 'Change-of-Title' actions, 24 Endowed Chair actions, 2 Deferrals, 10 Five-Year Reviews, 8 Emeritus Status actions, and 7 appointments or reappointments as Department Chair. CAP also evaluated 22 Initial Continuing Appointments for Lecturers. Of the **545**<sup>2</sup> academic personnel actions, the Vice Provost—Academic Affairs disagreed with CAP's recommendation **47** times (about 9%). In most of these cases, CAP's recommendation included majority and minority votes.

Overall, both CAP and the FPCs made negative recommendations in fewer than **4%** of the cases. This reflects the high quality of research and teaching that is performed by the vast majority of the faculty at UC Davis.

**Step Plus Implementation:** The 2018-19 academic year was the fifth year of Step Plus implementation for all Academic Senate titles and was the second year that accelerations in time for merits were not allowed. The Step Plus system was designed to allow evaluations to be done in a more timely and efficient manner, to reward faculty for outstanding performance in teaching and service in addition to research, and to eliminate the need for faculty to specifically request greater than normal advancement.

*Appendix D* provides a summary of CAP's recommendations on non-redelegated Step Plus promotion cases. CAP reviewed a total of **103** Step Plus promotions during the 2018-19 committee year. CAP agreed with the department recommendations in 63% of cases (n=65). CAP recommended an additional 0.5-step or an additional 1.0-step promotion above and beyond department recommendations in 22% of cases (n=23). CAP recommended 0.5-or 1.0-step below the department recommendation in 9% of cases (n=9). CAP recommended a lateral promotion in 2% of cases (n=2). CAP recommended a merit increase in lieu of a promotion in 3% of cases (n=3). CAP did not recommend promotion in 1% of cases (n=1).

*Appendix E* provides a summary of CAP's recommendations for non-redelegated Step Plus merit cases. CAP reviewed a total of **197** Step Plus merits during the 2018-19 committee year. CAP accepted the department recommendation in 54% of cases (n=107). CAP recommended an additional 0.5-step or an additional 1.0-step merit in 10% of cases (n=19). CAP

<sup>1</sup> During the 2018-19 committee year (9/1/2018-8/31/2018), CAP reviewed several actions that were effective in another year (i.e. 17-18, 18-19, and 19-20). This report analyzes all actions reviewed in 2018-19 including those effective in another year.

<sup>2</sup> Final decision information was not yet available for 4 cases.

recommended 0.5-or 1.0-step below the department recommendation in 31% of cases (n=62). CAP did not recommend merit advancement in 5% of cases (n=9).

**Step 6 Merit Actions:** CAP continues to experience difficulties with some cases for advancement to Professor, Step 6. The requirement for outside letters was discontinued in the 2014-15 academic year. However, Step 6 is still a barrier step and is subject to the criteria set forth in APM 220-18.b.4 and UCD-APM 220.IV.C.4a. In the absence of outside letters, department letters should be very clear in addressing the Step 6 criteria, and should provide the type of information that was previously gathered from outside letters. Department Chairs should reference the standards for research, teaching and service as described in the APM. CAP notes that such information continues to be largely absent from the Department Chair and Deans' letters, suggesting that Step 6 is being regarded as a normal advancement rather than a barrier step. This is further reflected in Department voting patterns and comments, which do not always appear to take the barrier step into account.

If the Department Chair and Dean's letters do not clearly explain how the candidate has met the criteria outlined in the APM for advancing over this barrier step, CAP will send the dossier back and request that extramural letters be submitted with the packet.

***CAP will continue to return dossiers that do not provide sufficient justification for advancement to Professor, Step 6 as specified in the APM.***

**Above Scale Actions:** CAP also continues to experience difficulties with some cases for advancement to Professor, Above Scale. Although this barrier step requires outside letters, the Department and Dean letters and Department voting patterns and comments suggest that Above Scale advancement is sometimes regarded as a normal advancement rather than a barrier step. Department Chairs should reference the standards for research, teaching and service as described in the APM to help ensure understanding of the criteria for advancement to Above Scale.

**Late Appointment Actions:** Over the last several years, CAP has had a problem with late appointment actions. CAP continues to receive appointment actions in late summer/early fall that are effective July 1. This means that CAP is being asked to review an appointment that is retroactive to July 1; in many cases tentative offer letters have already been given to the candidate and in some cases candidates have already moved to Davis and purchased a home. This clearly renders CAP's participation in the appointment process meaningless.

**Dossier Accuracy:** Under Step Plus, more than one-step advancement is being awarded for outstanding teaching and service. Therefore, it is extremely important that dossiers accurately document both the amount and the quality of teaching and service. To prevent the return of dossiers to departments for correction, CAP requests that Departments and Deans' offices clearly document the period of review for service activities, provide sufficient detail about teaching activities, including evaluations and details of graduate student mentoring, provide publications that are readily accessible if not provided in hard copy, and provide verbatim faculty comments in department letters.

***CAP will routinely return improperly prepared dossiers to departments/candidates, which will result in significant delays in processing merit cases and will likely require the department to revote.***

**Discussion Items/Requests for Consultation:** Other items that were discussed this year by CAP included: APM revisions (systemwide and campus), Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policies on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment, Health Science Clinical Professor Peer Review proposal, Proposal to Disestablish the Division of Textiles and Clothing, and systemwide and divisional bylaw revisions.

**Promotions:** For promotions to Associate Professor (n=50) and Professor (n=59), CAP recommended promotion in 108 of 109 cases. CAP recommended the promotion proposed by the department in 69 cases. CAP modified recommendations from the department in 39 cases (i.e., CAP recommended an alternate step for promotion or recommended merit in lieu of promotion). CAP recommended no advancement in 1 case.

**Accelerated Actions in Time:** Appendix B lists the accelerated promotions that came to CAP (as noted, accelerations in time were not an option for normal merit actions in 2018-19). Faculty who received favorable recommendations for a multi-year acceleration generally had received some major recognition nationally or internationally, had superior scholarly achievements, were excellent teachers, and had meritorious service. At the upper levels of the professoriate, the expectation of excellence in all areas increases with each step.

**Career Equity Reviews:** *Career Equity Reviews* occur concurrent with a merit or promotion action for faculty who (1) hold an eligible title, and (2) have not been reviewed by CAP during the previous four academic years. The purpose of career equity reviews is to address potential inequities that may have originated at the point of hire and/or during a faculty member's career. Career equity reviews consider the entire record of the individual to determine whether their current placement on the academic ladder is consistent with that of other faculty at equal or higher rank and step. Career Equity Reviews can also be initiated independent of a merit or promotion action. In 2018-19, CAP conducted 3 career equity reviews that were initiated at a lower level of review with CAP's recommendation being either against the equity adjustment (2) or a modified recommendation (1). As noted above, CAP also examines equity for every case that it reviews and recommends equity adjustments when appropriate.

**Five-Year Reviews:** CAP conducted 10 five-year reviews, recommending "advancement, performance satisfactory" in 0 cases, recommending "no advancement, performance satisfactory" in 9 cases and recommending "no advancement, performance unsatisfactory" in 1 case.

**Initial Continuing Appointments for Lecturers:** CAP reviewed and made recommendations on 22 initial continuing non-Senate appointments in 2018-19. CAP recommended appointment in 19 cases and recommended against appointment in 3 cases. Teaching excellence is the primary requirement for a continuing appointment.

**Accelerated Merits for Continuing Lecturers:** CAP considers accelerated merit requests for Continuing Lecturers, whereas normal merit advancements are redelegated to the Deans. In recommending accelerations (one or two steps beyond the normal two-salary point advancement), CAP looks for evidence of teaching accomplishments that go beyond teaching excellence (the minimum standard for normal advancement). Such evidence may come in the form of prestigious teaching awards or publication of books that have substantial pedagogical impact. In 2018-19, CAP considered 11 such requests and made a positive recommendation in 3 cases.

**University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP):**

Charles Langley served as CAP's representative to the University Committee on Academic Personnel, which held several meetings throughout the committee year. The Office of the President, UCAP members, and other UC Academic Senate committees and officers bring issues to the attention of UCAP. Accordingly, CAP was regularly informed of UCAP discussions and provided input into such discussions, when appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,



Christine Cocanour, Chair

**2018-2019 CAP Membership**

Christine Cocanour, Chair  
 Alexander Soshnikov  
 Charles Langley  
 David Pleasure  
 Gail Goodman  
 Lisa Tell  
 Michelle Yeh  
 Robert Gilbertson  
 Scott Simon  
 Mary Vasquez, Analyst



**APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF CAP ACTIONS**

	<b>Recommended Positive</b>	<b>Modified Actions@</b>	<b>Recommended Negative</b>
<b>Appointments (107)</b>			
Assistant Professor (11)	9	2	0
Associate Professor (13)	12	1	0
Professor (10)	6	4	0
Assistant/Associate/Adjunct Professor (4)	4	0	0
Lecturer SOE (0)	0	0	0
Lecturer PSOE (2)	2	0	0
<sup>3</sup> Via Change in Title (12)	10	2	0
Via Change in Department (2)	2	0	0
Via Change in Title and Department (0)	0	0	0
Initial Continuing Non-Senate (22)	15	4	3
Endowed Chair Appointment/Reappointment (24)	22	1	1
Department Chair Review (7)	5	2	0
<b>Promotions (111)</b>			
Associate Professor (50)	34	15	1
Professor (59)	35	24	0
Lecturer PSOE (2)	1	1	0
<b>Merit Increases (209)</b>			
Assistant Professor (7)	3	4	0
Associate Professor (27)	21	7	1
<sup>4</sup> Merit to or across Professor, Step 6 (55)	34	18	3
<sup>5</sup> Merit to or across Professor, Above Scale (30)	12	18	0
Professor, Above Scale to Further Above Scale (24)	11	11	2
Other Merit Increases (52)	25	24	2
Continuing Lecturer (12)	3	7	1
Lecturer PSOE/SOE (2)	1	2	0
<b>Miscellaneous Actions (102)</b>			
Career Equity Reviews (3)	0	1	2
Emeritus (8)	8	0	0
TOE Screenings (5)	5	0	0
POP Screenings (9)	9	0	0
Appraisals (79)	39	39	1
Five-Year Reviews (10)	9	0	1
Deferrals (2)	2	0	0
Preliminary Assessments (1)	0	0	1
Termination Case (0)	0	0	0
<b>Grand Total = 545</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>19</b>

+positive; ^Guarded; -Negative; @modified actions are those where CAP's recommendation differed from what was initially proposed, e.g., instead of a promotion a merit increase was recommended; or instead of a normal merit or promotion a Step Plus (extra 0.5 or 1.0 step) merit or promotion was recommended

<sup>3</sup> Not accounted for in "Total Appointment" and other "Total" calculations, as these actions were also accounted for under appointments to Associate Professor, Lecturer PSOE, etc.

<sup>4</sup> For example: Professor, Step 4 to 6; Professor, Step 5 to 6; Professor, Step 5 to 7; etc.

<sup>5</sup> For example: Professor, Step 8 to Above Scale; Professor 9 to Above Scale; etc.

**APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF ACCELERATED ACTIONS IN TIME**

Acceleration Proposed	Yes	No	Other
1-yr	14	0	11
2-yr	2	0	3

**APPENDIX C: SUMMARY OF REDELEGATED MERIT ACTIONS (reviewed by FPC)**

College/Division/ School	FPC Recommendation			Dean's Decision on All Actions		Dean's Decision on Actions w/o FPC Review
	Yes	No	Other*	Yes/ Other	No	
CAES	40	2	4	43	2	8
CBS	14	1	3	18	0	1
EDU	3	0	0	3	0	3
ENG	26	1	3	31	0	0
GSM	6	0	0	6	0	2
L&S: HArCS	18	0	7	24	1	34
L&S: MPS	20	2	3	23	2	8
L&S: SS	16	0	3	19	0	40
LAW	6	0	0	6	0	0
SOM	41	5	10	49	6	62
SON	0	0	0	0	0	1
SVM	18	0	8	26	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>160</b>

\* Other indicates modified actions, which are those where the FPC's recommendation differed from what was initially proposed, e.g., instead of a normal merit or promotion a Step Plus (extra 0.5 or 1.0 step) merit or promotion was recommended

## APPENDIX D: SUMMARY OF NON-REDELGATED STEP PLUS ACTIONS (PROMOTIONS)

College/ Division/ School	Proposed Action (1.0 step)	CAP Recommendation	Proposed Action (1.5 step)	CAP Recommendation	Proposed Action (2.0 step)	CAP Recommendation
<b>CAES</b>						
Assistant to Associate	1	• 1 case (agree with proposed)	4	• 3 cases (agree with proposed) • 1 case (recommend 2.0 Step)	1	• 1 case (agree with proposed)
Associate to Full	1	• 1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)	2	• 2 cases (agree with proposed)	2	• 2 cases (agree with proposed)
<b>CBS</b>						
Assistant to Associate	1	• 1 case (agree with proposed)	2	• 1 case (agree with proposed) • 1 case (recommend 2.0 Step)	0	N/A
Associate to Full	1	• 1 case (agree with proposed)	0	N/A	0	N/A
<b>EDU</b>						
Assistant to Associate	0	N/A	1	• 1 case (agree with proposed)	0	N/A
Associate to Full	0	N/A	2	• 1 case (agree with proposed) • 1 case (recommend 2.0 Step)	0	N/A
<b>ENG</b>						
Assistant to Associate	3	• 2 cases (agree with proposed) • 1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)	1	• 1 case (recommend 2.0 Step)	0	N/A
Associate to Full	1	• 1 case (agree with proposed)	1	• 1 case (agree with proposed)	1	• 1 case (agree with proposed)
<b>GSM</b>						
Assistant to Associate	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Associate to Full	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
<b>HArCS</b>						
Assistant to Associate	1	• 1 case (recommend 1.0 Step equity)	1	• 1 case (recommend 2.0 Step)	1	• 1 case (agree with proposed)
Associate to Full	0	N/A	1	• 1 case (recommend 2.0 Step)	2	• 1 case (agree with proposed) • 1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)
<b>MPS</b>						
Assistant to Associate	0	N/A	5	• 4 cases (agree with proposed) • 1 case (recommend 2.0 Step)	1	• 1 case (agree with proposed)

Associate to Full	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 cases (agree with proposed)</li> <li>1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 cases (agree with proposed)</li> </ul>	0	N/A
<b>SS</b>						
Assistant to Associate	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 cases (agree with proposed)</li> <li>1 case (recommend no advancement)</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (agree with proposed)</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 cases (recommend 1.5 Step)</li> </ul>
Associate to Full	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 cases (agree with proposed)</li> <li>1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)</li> <li>1 case (recommend lateral promotion)</li> </ul>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 cases (agree with proposed)</li> <li>1 case (recommend 1.0 Step)</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (agree with proposed)</li> <li>1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)</li> </ul>
<b>LAW</b>						
Assistant to Associate	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Associate to Full	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
<b>SOM</b>						
Assistant to Associate	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 cases (agree with proposed)</li> <li>3 cases (recommend 1.5 Step)</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 cases (agree with proposed)</li> <li>1 case (recommend 2.0 Step)</li> <li>1 case (recommend 1.0 Step)</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (agree with proposed)</li> </ul>
Associate to Full	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9 cases (agree with proposed)</li> <li>1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)</li> </ul>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (recommend 1.0 Step)</li> <li>1 case (recommend 1.5 Step Merit)</li> <li>3 cases (recommend 2.0 Step)</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 cases (recommend 1.5 Step)</li> </ul>
<b>SON</b>						
Assistant to Associate	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Associate to Full	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (recommend 1.0 Step Merit)</li> </ul>	0	N/A	0	N/A
<b>SVM</b>						
Assistant to Associate	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (agree with proposed)</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 cases (agree with proposed)</li> </ul>	0	NA
Associate to Full	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (agree with proposed)</li> <li>1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)</li> <li>1 case (recommend lateral promotion)</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 cases (agree with proposed)</li> <li>2 cases (recommend 2.0 Step)</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 cases (agree with proposed)</li> <li>1 case (recommend 2.5 Step for equity)</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>27 cases: CAP agreed with proposed 1.0 Step Promotion</b> <b>9 cases: CAP recommended 1.5 Step Promotion</b> <b>2 cases: CAP recommended lateral promotion</b> <b>2 cases: CAP recommended 1.0 Step Merit or Equity</b> <b>1 case: CAP recommended No Advancement</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>26 cases: CAP agreed with proposed 1.5 Step Promotion</b> <b>13 cases: CAP recommended 2.0 Step Promotion</b> <b>3 cases: CAP recommended 1.0 Step Promotion</b> <b>1 cases: CAP recommended 1.5 Step Merit</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>12 cases: CAP agreed with proposed 2.0 Step Promotion</b> <b>6 cases: CAP recommended 1.5 Step Promotion</b> <b>1 case: CAP recommended 2.5 Step Promotion for equity</b>

## APPENDIX E: SUMMARY OF NON-REDELEGATED STEP PLUS ACTIONS (MERITS)

College/Division/ School	Proposed Action (1.0 step)	CAP Recommendation	Proposed Action (1.5 step)	CAP Recommendation	Proposed Action (2.0 step)	CAP Recommendation
<b>CAES</b>						
Assistant Professor	0	N/A	0	N/A	2	• 2 cases (recommend 1.5 Step)
Associate Professor	0	N/A	1	• 1 case (recommend 2.0 Step)	3	• 3 cases (agreed with proposed)
Merit to or across Professor, Step 6	2	• 2 cases (recommend 1.5 Step)	0	N/A	5	• 3 cases (agreed with proposed) • 2 cases (recommend 1.5 Step)
Merit to or across Professor, Above Scale	1	• 1 case (agree-d with proposed)	5	• 2 cases (agreed with proposed) • 3 cases (recommend 1.0 Step)	4	• 3 cases (recommend 1.5 Step) • 1 case (recommend 1.0 Step)
Professor, Above Scale to Further Above Scale	0	N/A	2	• 2 cases (recommend 1.0 Step)	2	• 2 cases (recommend 1.0 Step)
Other Merits	1	• 1 case (agreed with proposed)	1	• 1 case (recommend 2.0 Step)	5	• 3 cases (agreed with proposed) • 2 cases (recommend 1.5 Step)
<b>CBS</b>						
Assistant Professor	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Associate Professor	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Merit to or across Professor, Step 6	1	• 1 case (recommend against merit)	1	• 1 case (agreed with proposed)	0	N/A
Merit to or across Professor, Above Scale	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Professor, Above Scale to Further Above Scale	1	• 1 case (agreed with proposed)	1	• 1 case (recommend 1.0 Step)	0	N/A
Other Merits	0	N/A	1	• 1 case (agreed with proposed)	4	• 1 case (agreed with proposed) • 2 cases (recommend 1.5 Step) • 1 case (recommend 1.0 Step)
<b>EDU</b>						
Assistant Professor	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Associate Professor	3	• 3 cases (agree with proposed)	0	N/A	1	• 1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)
Merit to or across Professor, Step 6	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	• 1 case (recommend 1.0 Step)
Merit to or across Professor, Above Scale	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Professor, Above Scale to Further Above Scale	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Other Merits	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	• 1 case (recommend 1.0 Step)

<b>ENG</b>						
Assistant Professor	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	• 1 case (agreed with proposed)
Associate Professor	0	N/A	2	• 1 case (agreed with proposed) • 1 case (recommend 2.0 Step)	2	• 2 cases (agreed with proposed)
Merit to or across Professor, Step 6	4	• 3 cases (agreed with proposed) • 1 case (recommend against merit)	5	• 3 cases (agreed with proposed) • 2 cases (recommend 2.0 Step)	1	• 1 case (agreed with proposed)
Merit to or across Professor, Above Scale	0	N/A	2	• 1 case (agreed with proposed) • 1 case (recommend 1.0 Step)	2	• 1 case (agreed with proposed) • 1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)
Professor, Above Scale to Further Above Scale	1	• 1 case (agreed with proposed)	0	N/A	0	N/A
Other Merits	0	N/A	2	• 1 case (recommend 2.0 Step) • 1 case (recommend 1.0 Step)	1	• 1 case (agreed with proposed)
<b>GSM</b>						
Assistant Professor	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Associate Professor	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Merit to or across Professor, Step 6	0	N/A	1	• 1 case (recommend 1.0 Step)	1	• 1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)
Merit to or across Professor, Above Scale	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Professor, Above Scale to Further Above Scale	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Other Merits	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
<b>HARCS</b>						
Assistant Professor	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	• 1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)
Associate Professor	6	• 1 case (recommend against merit) • 5 cases (agreed with proposed)	0	N/A	0	N/A
Merit to or across Professor, Step 6	2	• 1 case (agreed with proposed) • 1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)	1	• 1 case (agreed with proposed)	4	• 4 cases (agreed with proposed)
Merit to or across Professor, Above Scale	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Professor, Above Scale to Further Above Scale	0	N/A	3	• 1 case (agreed with proposed) • 2 cases (recommend 1.0 Step)	0	N/A
Other Merits	1	• 1 case (agreed with proposed)	1	• 1 case (agreed with proposed)	4	• 2 cases (agreed with proposed) • 2 cases (recommend 1.5 Step)

<b>MPS</b>						
Assistant Professor	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Associate Professor	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Merit to or across Professor, Step 6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 cases (agreed with proposed)</li> </ul>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (agreed with proposed)</li> <li>2 cases (recommend 1.0 Step)</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)</li> </ul>
Merit to or across Professor, Above Scale	0	N/A	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (agreed with proposed)</li> <li>1 case (recommend 1.0 Step)</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (agreed with proposed)</li> </ul>
Professor, Above Scale to Further Above Scale	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (recommend against merit)</li> <li>2 cases (agreed with proposed)</li> <li>1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)</li> </ul>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 cases (agreed with proposed)</li> </ul>	0	N/A
Other Merits	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)</li> </ul>	0	N/A	0	N/A
<b>DSS</b>						
Assistant Professor	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (agreed with proposed)</li> </ul>
Associate Professor	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (agreed with proposed)</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 cases (agreed with proposed)</li> <li>2 cases (recommend 1.0 Step)</li> </ul>	0	N/A
Merit to or across Professor, Step 6	0	N/A	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (agreed with proposed)</li> <li>1 case (recommend 1.0 Step)</li> </ul>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 cases (agreed with proposed)</li> <li>3 cases (recommend 1.5 Step)</li> </ul>
Merit to or across Professor, Above Scale	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (agreed with proposed)</li> </ul>	0	N/A	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 cases (recommend 1.5 Step)</li> </ul>
Professor, Above Scale to Further Above Scale	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (agreed with proposed)</li> <li>1 case (recommend against merit; 1.0 equity)</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 cases (agreed with proposed)</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 cases (recommend 1.5 Step)</li> </ul>
Other Merits	0	N/A	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (agreed with proposed)</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)</li> <li>1 case (recommend 1.0 Step)</li> </ul>
<b>LAW</b>						
Assistant Professor	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Associate Professor	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Merit to or across Professor, Step 6	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (agreed with proposed)</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 cases (agreed with proposed)</li> <li>2 cases (recommend 2.0 Step)</li> </ul>	0	N/A
Merit to or across Professor, Above Scale	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Professor, Above Scale to Further Above Scale	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Other Merits	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (agreed with proposed)</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 case (recommend 2.0 Step)</li> </ul>	0	N/A

<b>SOM</b>						
Assistant Professor	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	• 1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)
Associate Professor	2	• 2 cases (agreed with proposed)	1	• 1 case (agreed with proposed)	1	• 1 case (recommend 1.5 Step)
Merit to or across Professor, Step 6	1	• 1 case (recommend against merit)	5	• 5 cases (agreed with proposed)	1	• 1 case (agreed with proposed)
Merit to or across Professor, Above Scale	1	• 1 case (agreed with proposed)	5	• 3 cases (agreed with proposed) • 2 cases (recommend 1.0 Step)	2	• 2 cases (recommend 1.5 Step)
Professor, Above Scale to Further Above Scale	1	• 1 case (recommend against merit)	0	N/A	0	N/A
Other Merits	5	• 2 cases (agreed with proposed) • 2 cases (recommend against merit) • 1 case (recommend 1.0 Step plus 0.5 equity)	3	• 1 case (agreed with proposed) • 1 case (recommend 2.0 Step) • 1 case (recommend 1.0 Step)	8	• 5 cases (agreed with proposed) • 3 cases (recommend 1.5 Step)
<b>SON</b>						
Assistant Professor	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Associate Professor	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Merit to or across Professor, Step 6	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Merit to or across Professor, Above Scale	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Professor, Above Scale to Further Above Scale	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Other Merits	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
<b>SVM</b>						
Assistant Professor	0	N/A	1	• 1 case (agreed with proposed)	0	N/A
Associate Professor	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	• 1 case (agreed with proposed)
Merit to or across Professor, Step 6	0	N/A	2	• 2 cases (agreed with proposed)	2	• 2 cases (agreed with proposed)
Merit to or across Professor, Above Scale	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Professor, Above Scale to Further Above Scale	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Other Merits	0	N/A	3	• 3 cases (recommend 2.0 Step)	2	• 2 cases (agreed with proposed)



<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>32 cases: CAP agreed with proposed 1.0 Step Merit</b>  <b>6 cases: CAP recommended 1.5 Step Merit</b>  <b>0 cases: CAP recommended 2.0 Step Merit</b>  <b>9 cases: CAP recommended against Merit</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>38 cases: CAP agreed with proposed 1.5 Step Merit</b>  <b>13 cases: CAP recommended 2.0 Step Merit</b>  <b>20 cases: CAP recommended 1.0 Step Merit</b>  <b>0 cases: CAP recommended against Merit</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>37 cases: CAP agreed with proposed 2.0 Step Merit</b>  <b>35 cases: CAP recommended 1.5 Step Merit</b>  <b>7 cases: CAP recommended 1.0 Step Merit</b>  <b>0 case: CAP recommended against Merit</b>
---------------	-----------	---	-----------	---	-----------	---

BYLAWS  
OF THE FACULTY  
OF THE  
SCHOOL OF VETERINARY MEDICINE  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS  
May 29, 2019



## BYLAWS

### PART I. FUNCTIONS

1. The Faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine shall conduct the government of the School of Veterinary Medicine, subject, however, to the rules and coordinating powers of the Graduate Council respecting graduate study and the degree of Doctor of Veterinary Medicine. (Academic Senate Bylaw 30)

### PART II. MEMBERSHIP

2. The Faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine shall consist of:
  - (A) The President of the University;
  - (B) The Chancellor at Davis;
  - (C) The Dean of the School of Veterinary Medicine;
  - (D) All members of the Academic Senate who hold appointments in the School of Veterinary Medicine;
  - (E) As representatives, all salaried members of the School of Veterinary Medicine in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series.

### PART III. OFFICERS

3. **Chairperson.** The Chairperson of the Executive Committee is the Chairperson of the Faculty, and shall be elected by the Faculty at large by mail ballot.
4. **Secretary.** The Secretary of the Faculty shall be appointed annually by the Executive Committee of the School.

### PART IV. MEETINGS

5. Stated meetings of the Faculty shall be held at least twice a year. The Faculty may meet at such other times as it may determine or at the call of the Chairperson or upon written request to the Secretary of eight voting members. In the absence of the Chairperson, the Executive Committee will appoint a member of that committee to preside at Faculty meetings.

### PART V. QUORUM

6. Twenty-five percent of the faculty members shall constitute a quorum for the formal faculty meetings.

### PART VI. COMMITTEES

#### Title 1. Appointment, Tenure and Voting

7.
  - (A) Committees shall be appointed or elected each year, not later than July 1, term of one year from July 1, unless otherwise provided for.
  - (B) Special committees shall exist no longer than five years unless established as standing committees by legislation.

- (C) Committee meetings may be convened and presided over only by the committee chair, a designee of the committee chair, or a designee of the chair of the faculty.
- (D) A quorum for committee meetings shall be fifty percent of the voting members. If the number of members is an odd number, a quorum shall be fifty percent of the voting members rounded up to the next whole number.
- (E) All members of the Standing Committees of the Faculty and Ad hoc Committees appointed by the Executive Committee, unless otherwise indicated in these Bylaws, may vote on questions that will be referred to the Faculty Executive Committee for approval and on questions that will be referred for final Academic Senate action to another Academic Senate agency. Voting rights are extended to Faculty who are non-members of the Academic Senate (salaried Health Sciences Clinical Professor series) to the fullest degree permitted by Legislative Ruling 12.75 of the Academic Senate of the University, which states, "Only members of the Academic Senate may vote in Senate agencies when those agencies are taking final action on any matter for the Academic Senate, or giving advice to University officers or other non-Senate agencies in the name of the Senate. Persons other than Senate members may be given the right to vote on other questions, such as those that involve only recommendations to other Senate agencies, but only by explicit Bylaw provisions."
- (F) Individuals who hold the administrative title of Associate Dean or equivalent, or above, shall serve only as non-voting ex officio members on the Standing Committees of the School.

## Title II. Standing Committees: Their Powers and Duties

8. **Executive.** There shall be an Executive Committee consisting of the Dean of the Veterinary School, a non-voting ex officio member, and six members to be elected by the Faculty for a term of three years. Two members shall be retired each year and two new ones elected. In case of vacancy, a new member shall be appointed by the Executive Committee to serve the remainder of the academic year.

This committee shall consider all matters of general concern to the School and shall bring before the Faculty any recommendations, which the committee may deem advisable.

The committee shall appoint all other standing committees of the Faculty as provided for in these Bylaws and such special committees, as it deems necessary.

The committee shall ensure that the membership as defined in Part II of these Bylaws is determined and counted each year and that the list of that voting membership be generated each year. A quorum as defined under Part V shall also be determined.

This committee shall be responsible for the conduct of elections and voting on all matters submitted to the membership for ballot, including elections, resolutions, and Bylaw revisions. When the Faculty vote on any matter for the Academic Senate or advising in the name of the Academic Senate, votes of Academic Senate and non-Academic Senate members (salaried Health Sciences Clinical Professor series) shall be

recorded separately, with the vote of the non-senate members provided as advisory. The committee annual report shall include a summary report of all balloting or elections so conducted and not previously reported.

- (A) Voting can be performed at a faculty meeting, electronically or by mail. To simplify procedures, electronic voting should be used preferentially unless determined in special situations by the Executive Committee. Throughout these Bylaws the term "ballot" shall indicate either electronic or mail ballot.

When balloting is requested, the balloting shall be conducted by the Chairperson of the Executive Committee. Voting exclusively electronically or by mail will be at the request of the Chairperson of the Executive Committee or by written petition of ten members of the Faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine.

- (1) **Electronic Ballots.** If the voting is performed by electronic methods, each faculty allowed to vote should receive access to a secure, online voting system. The voting procedure should meet the following criteria:
  - (a) The system should verify the identity of all voters and prevent voters from voting more than once
  - (b) It should not be possible to determine how a member has voted.
  - (c) Once a vote has been submitted, nobody should be able to change the vote
  - (d) Nobody should be able to determine the results of the election or the number of votes until after the voting deadline.
- (2) **Ballot by Mail.** If voting is performed by mail ballot each voter receives a plain envelope in which to enclose his or her marked ballot, and an additional envelope addressed to the Chairperson of the Executive Committee to be used for the return of the sealed ballot. On this envelope addressed to the Chairperson is a space for the voter's signature and ballots lacking this validating signature are void. Any voter who spoils a ballot may, by tearing it across once and returning it to the Chairperson, obtain another ballot.

(B) Elections

- (1) **Notice of Elections.** Not less than 30 days prior to any election, the Chairperson shall initiate such election by sending to each member of the Faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine a notice that nominations for the position(s) in question will be received during the next ten days and specifying the date and time after which nominations will no longer be received. These nominations shall be in writing and shall contain a statement that the nominee will accept the nomination. The nominations shall be signed by five members of the Faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine.

(2) Balloting

- (a) Not less than ten days after the time for receiving nominations has expired, the Chairperson shall send to the members of the Faculty a

ballot containing, in alphabetical order, the names of those persons who have been nominated.

- (b) This ballot shall be accompanied by instructions concerning the proper method of returning the ballot and a statement that the ballot is to be returned to the Chairperson within ten days.
- (c) Counting of ballots, unless otherwise specified, shall be conducted as outlined in Bylaw 16 of the Davis Division of Academic Senate.

(C) Matters Other Than Elections

- (1) The Chairperson will notify the members of the nature of the impending mail ballot and the ballot will be prepared. The ballot shall be distributed to the voters not less than 10 days or more than 20 days after the members are notified of the impending ballot, and ballots shall be returned by the members within seven days. Balloting shall be conducted as described under (A) and (B) (2) (b) and (c) of this Bylaw.
- (2) When ballots are distributed to the voters, they shall be accompanied by at least a summary of the arguments pro and con. Arguments for or against the proposal may be submitted by any member or group of members, and, if submitted, shall be distributed with the ballots.

- 9. **Admissions.** This committee shall consist of five senate faculty members and one non-faculty veterinary professional who shall serve as a non-voting member. The Associate Dean of Student Programs and the Director of SVM Admissions shall be non-voting, ex officio members. The non-faculty committee member must be an active member of the profession. Faculty members shall serve a three-year term and the non-faculty member shall serve a one-year term, but be eligible for reappointment for up to three years. In the event that a non-faculty member who meets the criteria cannot be identified in any given year, the committee will proceed without appointing a non-faculty member. It shall be the duty of this committee to examine the credentials of the applicants for admission to the School and to recommend for admission those best qualified.
- 10. **Continuing Education and Extended Learning.** This committee shall consist of four faculty members, including the Director of Veterinary Medical Continuing Education as an ex officio member. It shall be the duty of this committee to consider and make recommendations concerning the participation of the School in continuing education and extended learning. The Committee will be responsible for reviewing the Center for Continuing Professional Education's mission, goals, structure, and policies, and advising the Center on professional continuing education programs for DVM and RVT/Vet Assistant programs.
- 11. **Curriculum.** This committee shall consist of 17 members. Eight senate faculty members will be appointed to serve three-year terms, with at least one member from each department and no greater than two members from any single department. The remainder of the committee will be comprised of the following ex officio members: the Chair of the Clinical Education Committee and the Director of Professional Student Clinical Education (voting, provided the holders of these positions are members of the senate), the Associate Dean for Academic Programs (non-voting), the SVM Education Specialist (non-voting) and a representative from the UCD Library (non-voting). In

addition, the committee will include four veterinary students, one from each class, serving a one-year term, as non-voting members. It shall be the duty of this committee to evaluate and make recommendations concerning pre-veterinary requirements and the professional veterinary curricula. It shall make a continuing evaluation of all educational material offered throughout the 4 years of the DVM curriculum, and recommend new blocks and changes in existing blocks, including their content, scheduling, and leadership. It shall be responsible for oversight of the composition, delivery, assessment, and remediation of the Year-2 practical and didactic comprehensive examinations. It shall be responsible for executing the block leadership recognition process. It shall report to the Executive Committee before reporting to the Faculty.

12. **International Programs.** The International Programs Committee shall consist of thirteen members: five senate faculty members, the Associate Dean and the Director of the Office for Global Programs, both as non-voting ex officio members, the Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education as a non-voting ex officio member, and five students or residents as non-voting members. The students shall consist of three DVM students from the first three classes in the veterinary school, and two graduate students or clinical residents. Faculty members shall serve three-year staggered terms and students shall be appointed annually. The committee shall provide input on all aspects of the School's involvement in international programs and activities.
13. **Research.** This committee shall consist of four faculty members, a non-voting graduate student member, and the Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education and a representative from the UCD Library who will both serve as non-voting ex officio members. Two or three members shall be retired each year and new members appointed, to maintain continuity. It will be the responsibility of this committee to foster faculty research productivity and excellence within the School and to make appropriate recommendations to the faculty and administration on all matters pertaining to research.
14. **Student Affairs.** This committee shall consist of thirteen members, including seven senate faculty members, the Associate Deans for Student Programs and Academic Programs who shall be non-voting ex-officio members, and four veterinary students, one from each class, who shall be non-voting members. It shall be the duty of this committee to consider and make recommendations concerning student-faculty relationships, including study lists and petitions, academic honors, advising, academic promotion of students, student affairs and discipline, and scholarship and loan funds. Faculty members shall be appointed for terms of two years, and student members shall be appointed annually.

## PART VII. ORDER OF BUSINESS

25. (A) The order of business shall be:
  - (1) Minutes
  - (2) Announcements by the President
  - (3) Announcements by the Chairperson
  - (4) Announcements by other executive officers
  - (5) Special orders
  - (6) Reports of special committees
  - (7) Reports of standing committees
  - (8) Petitions of students

- (9) Unfinished business
- (10) New business

- (B) The regular order of business may be suspended at any meeting by a two-thirds vote of the voting members present.

#### PART VIII. RULES OR ORDER

- 26. The rules contained in Robert's Rules of Order shall govern the faculty in all cases in which they are applicable.

#### PART IX. AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS

- 28. The foregoing Bylaws may be added to, amended, or repealed at any regular or special meeting by the two-thirds vote of all the voting members present, provided that written notice of proposed changes shall have been sent to each member of the faculty at least five days previous to the meeting at which the changes are to be moved; but no change in the Bylaws shall be made that is inconsistent with legislation of the Academic Senate.

### REGULATIONS

#### 51. **Admissions**

- (A) Admission to Regular Status

To be admitted to the School of Veterinary Medicine, students must have at least junior standing in one of the colleges of the University of California or an equivalent thereof satisfactory to the faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine, including such special requirements in preparation for courses in the curriculum of the School of Veterinary Medicine as may be prescribed by the faculty of that School. The faculty of the School is authorized to limit the enrollment of students to a number consistent with the facilities available for instruction.

- (B) Admission to Advanced Standing

Applicants for admission to advanced standing may be accepted under the following conditions:

- (1) They must furnish evidence that they are eligible for admission to the Fall Quarter of the School of Veterinary Medicine.
- (2) They must show that they have satisfactorily completed courses equivalent in kind and amount to those given in the School of Veterinary Medicine in the quarters preceding that to which admission is desired.
- (3) At the discretion of the Dean of the School, they may be required to pass examinations in any or all subjects for which they ask credit.



**60. Requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Science.**

- (A) A degree of Bachelor of Science is granted, upon the recommendation of the faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine, to students who do not hold a baccalaureate degree and who have met the following requirements:
- (1) The candidate shall have completed at least 180 units of college work, and shall have satisfied the general University requirements of Paragraphs 630, 634, 636 and 638.
  - (2) The candidate shall have completed, in the School of Veterinary Medicine, all courses prescribed in the first two years of the professional curriculum. Exceptions may be made to students in advanced standing.

**65. Honors.**

The faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine, or a duly authorized committee thereof, shall recommend for Honors or Highest Honors such students as it may judge worthy of that distinction, in accordance with the minimum standards prescribed by the Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors, and Prizes of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate.

**72. Doctor of Veterinary Medicine.**

- (A) The candidate for the degree of Doctor of Veterinary Medicine must have completed the requirements for the Bachelor's degree in one of the colleges or schools of the University of California or at another college or university of approved standing.
- (B) The candidate must give satisfactory evidence of possession of a good moral character.
- (C) The candidate must have studied veterinary medicine for the equivalent of thirteen quarters including four quarters in the senior year. The last two years must have been spent in the University of California, School of Veterinary Medicine. He or she must have completed the required work, have fulfilled satisfactorily all special requirements, and have received throughout the entire veterinary course a satisfactory grade as determined by the faculty of the School.

**80. Student Performance Standards (DVM).**

This regulation is implemented through policies and procedures that will be developed by the Student Affairs Committee and approved by the Executive Committee in accordance with the process described below. These School of Veterinary Medicine policies and procedures address standards, and related procedures, concerning academic and professional deficiencies, academic and social misconduct, professionalism, technical standards, attendance, examinations, and grading (hereafter collectively referred to as "[Student Performance Standards](#)").

The standards and procedures governing Student Performance Standards are detailed in order to provide adequate notice to students of the Faculty's expectations, to adequately address the variety of different circumstances in which these matters arise, and to ensure, where required, adequate due process protections for students. These policies and procedures are subject to regular modifications to respond to evolving legal requirements and to address new needs identified through experiences using these policies and procedures.

New and revised policies and procedures concerning Student Performance Standards shall be developed and adopted as follows:

(A) Development

The Student Affairs Committee shall develop proposed policies and procedures.

(B) Review and Comment

(1) The Student Affairs Committee may, at its discretion, forward new or proposed changes to Student Performance Standards for review and comment to relevant committees and offices, which may include, but is not limited to, the Office for Student Programs, the Office for Academic Programs, the SVM Dean's Council, the SVM Executive Committee, and the Office of the Campus Counsel.

(2) The Student Affairs Committee shall provide written notice to members of the Faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine of any new or proposed changes to Student Performance Standards and provide at least 10 days for review and comment by members of the Faculty.

(C) Approval

The Executive Committee has the authority to approve new or proposed changes to the Student Performance Standards that it receives from the Student Affairs Committee. Upon completion of the review and comment period described above, the Student Affairs Committee may forward proposed new or revised Student Performance Standards, as modified following the review and comment period, to the Executive Committee for approval consideration. Submission of proposed new or revised Student Performance Standards shall include any substantive comments received by the Student Affairs Committee during the review and comment period. New or revised Student Performance Standards approved by the Executive Committee shall be described in an appendix to this Regulation.

## **GE Scientific Literacy**

### **I. Regulations**

Davis Division Regulation 522 sets forth the Baccalaureate Degree Requirement in General Education. Scientific Literacy, a component of Core Literacies (522.C), requires 3 units of coursework (522.C.4).

Regulation 523 sets forth the Criteria for General Education Certification of courses, stating: “A course in Scientific Literacy instructs students in the fundamental ways scientists use experimentation and analysis to approach problems and generate new knowledge, and the ways scientific findings relate to other disciplines and to public policy.” (523.C.8)

### **II. Interpretation**

The objective of Scientific Literacy is to educate students in the use of the scientific method to approach problems, pose questions, gather and analyze data, make conclusions based on data analysis, and then generate new hypotheses for testing.

Courses that meet the scientific literacy must include discussion and analysis of experimental and/or observational approaches to natural and social phenomena, and show students how the results of scientific studies relate to other disciplines and to public policy. These courses need not have a laboratory or field component.

### **Minimum Elements Checklist Courses in**

#### **Scientific Literacy must:**

ME1) Demonstrate that a substantial portion of the course covers scientific methods: posing questions, gathering data, making conclusions and generating new hypothesis when appropriate.

ME2) Demonstrate that the course covers how scientific findings relate to other disciplines and public policy.

ME3) Provide specific demonstration and explanation of the evaluation criteria referring to the scientific literacy.

ME4) Demonstrate the achieving the minimum set of learning objectives of the literacy is an integral part of the class.

### **III. ICMS Submission requirements**

The Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI) evaluates whether the course proposal satisfies the minimum elements checklist above. COCI uses the information provided in the answers to the General Education literacy justification questions and the Expanded Course Description.

Departments requesting that a course be approved for this GE literacy must answer the literacy questions in the Integrated Curriculum Management System (ICMS), as listed below.

For this literacy, COCI evaluates the minimum elements as follows:

- ME1: ICMS literacy question 1 and the Expanded Course Description
  - ME2: ICMS literacy question 2
  - ME3: ICMS literacy question 3
  - ME4: Expanded Course Description
1. How will the course instruct students in the ways natural scientists use experimentation and analysis to approach problems and generate new knowledge?
  2. How will the course instruct students about the ways findings from research in the natural sciences relate to other disciplines and to public policy?
  3. How will the instructors assess student competency in this GE literacy?

Departments may leave the “ICMS Justification” field blank, or use it to provide any additional information about the GE literacy for this course that may be helpful as COCI reviews the request.

**Last revised and approved by Undergraduate Council**

October 25, 2019