To the Irvine Divisional Assembly:

The UC-Irvine Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) is delighted to provide the following summary of its activities for the Academic Year 2005-2006.

I. MEMBERSHIP

The faculty members serving this year on the CAP were, as continuing members, Professors Hung Fan (Biological Sciences), Douglas Goheen (Claire Trevor School of the Arts), Oladele Ogunseitan (Social Ecology), Charles Ribak (Medicine, Basic Sciences), Alladi Venkatesh (Paul Merage School of Business), and S. Eric Wilson (Medicine, Clinical Sciences), who were joined by new members Linda Cohen (Social Sciences), James Earthman (Henry Samueli School of Engineering), Ramesh Jain (Bren School of Information and Computer Sciences), Vicki Ruiz (Humanities), and Susan Trumbore (Physical Sciences). Professor Ogunseitan served as CAP Chair, and Professor Ribak served as Vice-Chair and representative to the University-wide Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). Of the new members, three—Professors Cohen, Ruiz, and Trumbore—were elected for terms beginning September 1, 2005, and two—Professors Earthman and Jain—filled seats vacated by Council members who did not serve their full terms. Nancy Clarke served as the Senate analyst to the Council until January, when she accepted the position of Executive Director of the Merced Division of the Academic Senate. Jill Kato was analyst in the interim and Mia Larson took over responsibilities for staff support of CAP in late March.

II. GENERAL PROCEDURES

CAP’s Responsibility. CAP is responsible for providing a campus-wide perspective on proposals for merits and promotions that originate from academic units. CAP reviews personnel files and makes recommendations to the administration for all Senate faculty series and for some non-Senate faculty series (e.g. Researchers, Lecturers, and Adjunct series). CAP did not review proposals for appointments and advancement in certain series (e.g. Project Scientist) but on occasion, CAP recommends “change in series” to these titles based on CAP’s interpretation of performance evaluation criteria described in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM). CAP procedures, policies, and review criteria are regularly updated and available for consultation through the Frequently Asked Questions document, which is on the Academic Senate web site at www.senate.uci.edu.

CAP plays a crucial role in implementing the shared governance principle adopted by the University of California by reviewing standards of academic excellence and the reward system for faculty performance. CAP makes recommendations as a panel after careful deliberation. All final decisions on personnel actions are made by the Chancellor, or
when delegated, by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (EVCP), by the Vice Provost, or by a Dean (see below).

CAP’s Review Protocol. CAP met 33 times during the academic year with biweekly meetings in the fall quarter and weekly meetings thereafter. CAP established a quorum of 8 members, with each member exercising a vote on cases with full discussion. Abstentions are not allowed, but recusals are permissible where there is evidence or appearance of conflict of interest. During the peak period (February to June) CAP reviews approximately 25 cases per week. Each case is assigned to a subcommittee consisting of the primary, secondary, and tertiary readers, with review by the full panel in session. The CAP Chair reviews and discusses all cases. “Consentable cases” are assigned to a primary and secondary reviewer, and these are typically non-accelerated merit cases that are fully supported by a CAP subcommittee and all prior levels of review. These cases do not require full CAP discussion. If there is dissent in the subcommittee, the case is re-assigned for full panel discussion.

Confidentiality and fairness are central tenets of CAP deliberations, and members uphold these principles. All CAP members read and engage in the full discussion of files presented for major actions, including promotions to Associate and Full Professor, tenured appointments, advancement to Full Professor Step VI and Above Scale. The goal of the panel is to achieve a consensus through exhaustive deliberation. However, in some cases unanimity cannot be achieved. CAP often requests additional information from academic units where questions remain about the record or its evaluation. CAP votes only after each member is satisfied with the completeness of the information upon which the vote is based. The CAP Analyst prepares a draft letter for each case after the meeting, and this draft is reviewed and revised by CAP members. In cases where CAP’s vote is split, both the minority and majority opinions are represented in the letter. The CAP Chair is responsible for the final version of the letter transmitted to the Office of Academic Personnel.

If the Chancellor and/or the EVCP determines that no further discussion is needed, the final decision is transmitted to the academic unit. In cases where CAP’s recommendation differs from the proposal originating from an academic unit, an opportunity is given for the provision of additional information or rebuttal. CAP fully discusses the additional information prior to a second vote. Sometimes, this additional discussion changes the outcome of CAP’s recommendation. The second report is submitted to the Office of Academic Personnel. The EVCP and Vice Provost meet with the full CAP to discuss any disagreements on particular cases.

CAP’s review protocol is continuously streamlined to expedite the review process without compromising its thoroughness and fairness. Still, faculty service on CAP remains a very time-consuming and intensive activity. CAP members spend many hours preparing for meetings, reading files, discussing cases and other administrative proposals, and writing reports. Among all UC campuses, UCI is unique in electing rather than appointing members. UCI CAP members feel honored to be entrusted with this huge
responsibility by their peers. This year’s CAP met this responsibility with utmost care and discretion.

III. CAP’S SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES

Communication with faculty. Early in the year, CAP visited the School of Medicine and the Paul Merage School of Business. All other Schools were invited to request a CAP visit if deemed useful. The visits provided an opportunity for CAP to describe the review process and expectations based on campus-wide standards. CAP emphasized the importance of well-prepared files and documentation (including outside letters, departmental evaluations of creative activity and impact, the roles of teaching and service) and the criteria by which they will be judged. In CAP’s view, the decline in the number of requests for CAP visitation over the years is an indication of successful demystification of CAP procedures and overall satisfaction with the intrinsic fairness of the review process. The visits and web-based FAQ resource have led to a more consistent file format from the different schools.

CAP also participated in informational breakfasts hosted by the Vice Provost to which all School personnel analysts, department chairs, and/or assistant professors were invited. At these meetings, Vice Provost Killackey described the tenure process and associated expectations of CAP. The CAP Chair and several members made important information and perspectives available to assistant professors that represented CAP’s collective insight.

Case load and outcome of personnel actions (Tables 1-3). The three tables attached present the cases considered by CAP in different ways. Table 1 gives decisions by the type of action; Table 2 gives aggregate decisions by academic unit; and Table 3 compares CAP’s decisions this year with those of the past five years.

As noted below, delegation of most “ordinary” merit proposals to the deans relieved CAP of several case categories (single merits to Assistant II and III; single merits to Associate II and III; and single merits to Full Professor II, III, IV, V, VII, VIII, and IX). Dossiers that were considered by CAP were of faculty normally eligible for promotion (from Assistant IV-VI; from Associate IV and V, from Professor V and from Professor IX) or in which serious disagreements arose at a lower level of review. Therefore, delegation has left CAP with a higher percentage of disagreements with the departmental recommendations than in the past, as Tables 1C and 3 reveal. Most delegated cases would have been approved by CAP in previous years. This should be kept in mind as one uses unadorned percentages in discussions of the data.

With the exception of merit actions and certain (few) miscellaneous categories (Table 1D), the overall picture of our actions this year resemble those of the past five years. Table 2 shows our agreement with recommendations by academic unit. A notable feature here is the high percentage of accelerations proposed by a few units, and the correlation of this percentage in some cases with the lower level of agreement by CAP. Table 3
shows the average of agreements of CAP with Departmental recommendations, both without modification of step within rank (top of table) and with modification (bottom of table).

The decisions by CAP are advisory to the Chancellor and EVCP, who make the final decisions. They are deeply involved with the process, particularly in matters of promotion and hiring at tenured levels, and it is CAP's perception that they take our recommendations seriously. Of the 487 cases considered this year, the Chancellor or EVCP made few final decisions that disagreed with CAP's recommendation. In most cases, the disagreement reflected technical issues, tied or close votes of CAP, or UCI's response to market considerations. The EVCP graciously discussed each one with CAP before making his decision. In addition, the EVCP discussed other challenging cases before making a decision concordant with CAP's recommendation.

CAP review of prior Dean's delegated merits. CAP agreed in 2003 to participate in a four-year experiment to conduct a post audit of a previous Dean's delegated merit when a new action warrants review by CAP. Of the 61 prior merits reviewed in this manner in 2005-06, CAP agreed with 56 (92%) of them and disagreed with 5 (8%). Files that can be delegated are Departmental recommendations for normal advancement to Assistant Professor II and III; Associate Professor II and III; Professor II, III, IV, V, VII, VIII, and IX. Actions not to be delegated include accelerations, actions including a Mid-Career Appraisal, and actions immediately following a previous delegated action. The congruence of CAP's assessment with the Dean's on delegated files is being recorded and, at the end of four years, the process as a whole will be evaluated by a joint Senate-Administration body independent of both, not including active CAP members, based on accumulated experience with the process.

New Addendum to Biography Forms for Special Series. CAP transmitted to the Vice Provost suggestions for two new versions of the Addendum to the Biography (Form UCIAP-10) adapted for use in the Researcher and Lecturer series. Among other improvements, using the forms would distinguish new and previously submitted work and enhance CAP's ability to apply uniform evaluation standards.

CAP Vice Chair. The position of CAP Vice-Chair was established in 2003-04. In addition to supporting the Chair in normal CAP activities, the Vice Chair represents the Irvine campus at the system-wide UCAP. Professor Charles Ribak served as CAP Vice Chair in 2005-06. UCAP met four times throughout the 2005-2006 academic year at the Office of the President in Oakland, CA. In addition, UCAP held a teleconference call meeting in June to complete the business of the year. This past year, Anthony Norman from the Riverside campus, was the chair of UCAP.

A major issue discussed by UCAP was the wording for APM 220-18.b (4) about criteria for the barrier steps between Professor Step V and VI and between Professor Step IX and Above Scale. Last year's UCAP provided changes that were subsequently modified by the Academic Council. UCAP disagreed with these modifications and re-wrote these two sections of APM 220-18.b (4) for review by the various campuses. After receiving
feedback, UCAP made the final changes and submitted their new version for review by the Academic Council.

Other issues that were discussed by UCAP during the year included comparison of the implementation of academic personnel policies system-wide by providing information about the composition and workings of each individual campus CAP, discussion of how collaboration in research is evaluated in the personnel process, review of data on academic personnel retention and recruitment, and review of family friendly benefits including on-campus child care facilities. Reports issued by UCAP are available online at http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ucap/reports.html

Other Business. CAP endorsed the proposed revisions of the UC-wide Academic Personnel Manual 700, 710, 711 and addition of 080 that pertain to paid sick leave, reasonable accommodation, medical separation and constructive resignation.

CAP provided recommendations for five-year reviews of one Dean and eight Department Chairs; reviewed proposals for a new school, new departments and programs, and establishment of two new endowed chairs; commented on the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity’s Statement on Diversity (dated June 27, 2005), the Report of the Ad Hoc Summer Session Committee (dated October 2005), and the Graduate Council document entitled “Establishing Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs at UCF” (from November 2005); and submitted nominations for a number of administration and Senate committees. The Chair, as a member of the Senate Cabinet, presents CAP’s responses to other Councils’ and committees’ requests for opinions, and introduces CAP’s own decisions and views on business originating in CAP.

The Irvine Division purchased a computer for the CAP meeting room, after confirming, with the help of Vice Chair Charles Ribak and Executive Director Sue Gumbrecht, that most of the other UC campuses have a computer for CAP use. Beginning in 2006-07, CAP will be able to assess more effectively those faculty dossiers, particularly in the Arts, that in addition to printed media include documentation on CDs, DVDs, and on websites about the candidate’s accomplishments.

IV. MAJOR DISCUSSION ISSUES

Delegation of Faculty Appointments of Assistant Professor Step I - III to the Deans
After consulting historical data and practices at other University of California campuses, and discussing the matter with the EVCP, Vice Provost, and the Academic Senate Cabinet, CAP agreed to delegate to the Deans faculty appointments of Assistant Professor, Steps I – III, for a trial period of three years. During the trial period, the appointment files must be submitted for review and written comment by CAP within one quarter of the appointment start date. This baseline assessment will be helpful for subsequent personnel reviews at all levels and allows CAP to provide helpful administrative comments when appropriate.
In the three years prior to 2005-06, CAP reviewed 180 tenure track appointment cases. Of these, CAP declined to recommend 4 appointments to the EVCP, but nonetheless, all 4 candidates were offered appointments. In addition, CAP recommended entry steps for 30 Assistant Professors that were different from the steps recommended by Deans. Of these, 19 cases were modified up, and 11 cases were modified down. Almost all of CAP's recommendations for step modification were accepted by the Deans and the EVCP. These data suggest that CAP's opinion is more valuable in determining entry step than in identifying candidates who are eligible for tenure track appointments at UCI.

CAP believes this new delegation accommodates the Deans' need for quick response to attract candidates with competing offers without compromising CAP's crucial function of providing guidance on academic personnel placement, specifically equitable standards of meritorious scholarship across disciplines. It also ensures that the process continues to allow CAP to provide valuable feedback to administrators who are charged with providing optimum opportunities for faculty members who must advance to tenure within a restricted time frame.

Proposed Revision to APM 220-18-b (4) Criteria for Advancement to Professor Step VI and Above-Scale
Throughout the year, the Vice Chair kept CAP apprised of the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) discussions on this issue. CAP endorsed the modifications in the draft UCAP memorandum of February 13, 2006. Due to the considerable debate on the campuses, in March 2006, the Academic Council requested that UCAP again review the Council's July 2005 recommendations, as well as all comments submitted by Senate bodies in the course of the year's formal review, and advise Council on the need for any change to clarify current language of the APM 220-18-b (4) regarding criteria for advancement to Professor Step VI and Professor Above-Scale. Further discussion at UCAP, following an extensive survey of CAP practices on all ten UC campuses, resulted in recommendations sent to the Academic Council in June 2006. The matter is currently under review by the Academic Council.

Proposal to Expand Delegation to the Deans of Certain Normal Merits in the Adjunct Professor and Professional Researcher Series
In response to the EVCP's request for comments on a draft proposal to expand delegation to the Deans of certain normal merit increases in the Adjunct Professor and Professional Researcher series, CAP contended that it was in the best interest of the candidate that these steps not be delegated. At the Associate Researcher/Adjunct level, a candidate's file would not be seen by CAP until the time of promotion, which could have a negative impact on certain faculty members who would have benefited from CAP's comments at the overlapping steps. Delegation would also have eliminated the opportunity for CAP to recommend a change-of-series.

Streamlining the AP Process for Dean Delegated Merits
CAP is collecting the responses from Schools and Departments about two streamlining procedures proposed by the Office of Academic Personnel for Dean Delegated Merits:
1. Departments will be mandated to use the Short Form, meaning that the
department evaluation can be no longer than one page.
2. Delegate the authority for the department vote to a duly elected committee or the
chair.

In 2006-07, CAP will review the responses and, as appropriate, make a recommendation
to the Office of Academic Personnel.

Scholarly Communications White Papers and Proposed Policy on Scholarly Work
Copyrights Rights
UCI Librarian Gerald Munoff met with CAP on February 26th, 2006 to discuss the white
papers and proposal prepared by the University-wide Special Committee on Scholarly
Communications. While concerned about the effect that the current crisis in scholarly
communication is having on the ability of faculty in all fields to publish and advance
their careers, CAP as well as UCAP do not support the proposed policy on Scholarly
Work Copyright Rights. In UCAP’s opinion, transmitted to the Academic Council, the
issues are better resolved at the system-wide level rather than at the individual faculty
level.

In a related action, CAP endorsed the proposed change in Senate Bylaw 185 to expand
the responsibilities of the University Committee on Library to include oversight of
faculty scholarly communications, as well as the proposed name change to “University
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication.”

V. CONCLUSION

The Academic Personnel Manual (APM) is a very useful resource for all faculty
members and the heads of academic units. CAP frequently consults the APM to gain
insight into the differences across appointment series and expectations of performance
warranting advancement in each series. CAP urges every faculty member to consult the
APM frequently to become familiar with the guidelines. In addition, the Bylaws of the
Irvine Senate describe the formalities of CAP’s membership and responsibilities. CAP
strives for more transparency in its criteria and procedures, and welcomes feedback from
faculty and staff on the content of the published FAQs and CAP’s responses. Although
the answers published for the FAQs have no formal status, they provide an important
template upon which to frame more specific questions, which should be directed to the
Office of Academic Personnel. (For reasons of confidentiality and fairness, CAP
members should not be approached directly for questions on specific cases.)

In conclusion, it is not unusual to hear current and former members comment that service
on CAP is one of the most engaging and rewarding experiences in academia. The
intense effort is mitigated by teaching relief, a small stipend, and a sense of participating
in one of the most important aspects of shared governance. The Chair thanks all
members for the quality and graciousness of their service. The Chair and all CAP
members wish especially to thank the Senate analysts—Nancy Clarke, Jill Kato, and Mia Larson—for drafting the letters to the Chancellor and EVCP that embody our decisions.

Respectfully submitted,

Oladele Ogunseitan
Chair

Linda Cohen
James Earllman
Hung Fan
Douglas Goheen
Ramesh Jain
Charles Ribak
Vicki Ruiz
Susan Trumbore
Alladi Venkatesh
Eric Wilson
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UCAP Reports:
http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ucap/reports.html
## CAP TABLE 2:
### FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON DEPARTMENTAL PROPOSALS
#### 2005-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number proposed</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Modify-up</th>
<th>Modify-down</th>
<th>Pending</th>
<th>% CAP agreed w/ dept. or modified up or down</th>
<th>% CAP agreed with dept. w/o modification</th>
<th>Accelerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Ecology</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>495</strong></td>
<td><strong>374</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>87%</strong></td>
<td><strong>78%</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Division of Research and Graduate Studies
** Totals in Table 2 will differ from totals in Tables 1 and 3 due to actions involving split appointments across schools.

## TABLE 3:
### CAP'S AGREEMENT WITH DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS 2000-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>374*</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>487**</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointment +/-</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion +/-</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit +/-</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous +/-</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* starting in 2003-04 some merit increase are delegated to the Deans
** starting with 2005-06 CAP reviews prior Dean's Delegated merits
TABLES 1A-1D: FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES</th>
<th>CAP Recommendation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1A. APPOINTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAP Recommendation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% CAP Agreed with Proposal</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1B. PROMOTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAP Recommendation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% CAP Agreed with Proposal</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1C. MERIT INCREASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAP Recommendation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% CAP Agreed with Proposal</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1D. MISCELLANEOUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAP Recommendation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% CAP Agreed with Proposal</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Of the 41 mid-career appraisals (MCA) reviewed, CAP agreed with the departmental recommendation 26 times and disagreed 15 times.