

Council on Academic Personnel
Annual Report
AY 2010-11

To the Irvine Divisional Assembly:

The UC Irvine Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) is pleased to provide the following summary of its activities for academic year 2010-11.

I. Membership

The faculty members serving this year on CAP were, as continuing members, Professors Stephen Bondy (Health Sciences, Basic Sciences), Michelle Garfinkel (Social Sciences), Farghalli A. Mohamed (Engineering), Margot Norris (Humanities), Henry Pontell (Social Ecology) and Steven White (Physical Sciences). New members were Professors Dan Cooper (Health Sciences, Clinical Sciences), Sanjeev Dewan (Business), J. Lawrence Marsh (Biological Sciences), Amelia Regan (Information and Computer Sciences), and Alan Terricciano (Arts). Professor Margaret Murata (Arts) served in Winter, Spring, and Summer 2011 while Professor Terricciano was on sabbatical leave. Professor White served as CAP chair, and Professor Pontell served as CAP Vice Chair and representative to the University-wide Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). Mia Larson was CAP analyst and Rachel Mangold provided additional staff support.

II. General Procedures

CAP's responsibilities. CAP is responsible for providing a campus-wide perspective on proposals for appointments, promotions, and merit increases originating from academic units. CAP reviews the files of academic personnel for all Senate series and for some non-Senate series (e.g., Professional Research series and Continuing Lecturers) and forwards its recommendations to the Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. While CAP does not review proposed actions for all series (e.g., Project Scientists), on occasion it recommends a "change of series" to certain titles based on its interpretation of criteria for these titles in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM). CAP procedures and review criteria are available for consultation through the Frequently Asked Questions document on the Academic Senate website, <http://www.senate.uci.edu/Councils/CAP/CAP%20FAQs-rev%2009.01.09.pdf>.

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. It 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), the Vice Provost, or an academic Dean.

CAP's review protocol. CAP met 35 times during academic year 2010-11 (from September 16, 2010 to July 28, 2011), with biweekly meetings in Fall Quarter and weekly meetings thereafter. Confidentiality, fairness and consistency are central tenets of CAP deliberations, and all members rigorously uphold those principles. CAP established a quorum of 8 members for all

cases. Each member, including the chair, votes on all cases; abstentions are not allowed; recusals are permitted if there is evidence or the appearance of a conflict of interest on a given case. The full council reviews all major actions (non-delegated appointments, promotions to Associate and full Professor, advancement to Professor Step VI and Above Scale) and all Mid-Career Appraisals and accelerations. Primary, secondary and tertiary readers are assigned for in-depth review of each file, but all Council members are expected to read each file. At the meeting, discussion is led by these readers, followed by the chair, who reviews all cases. During open discussion by all council members, the goal is to consider all relevant aspects of the case; discussion continues until all members are satisfied that all relevant aspects have been considered. A vote is then taken on the proposed action, with the majority reported as the decision of the council. Tie votes are recorded as not supporting the proposed action. After the meeting, the CAP analyst prepares a draft letter for each case that is reviewed and revised by the CAP members. The vote is reported in the letter; in cases where the vote is split, both the majority and minority opinions are presented. The CAP chair is responsible for the final version of the letter transmitted to the Office of Academic Personnel.

“Consentable/Subcommittee” cases are read by two members and the chair. Cases eligible for Subcommittee are normal merit increases, first requests for No Actions, and Fifth Year reviews, where all levels of review prior to CAP are in agreement. If the subcommittee agrees with the proposed action, the case is briefly discussed at the CAP meeting and put on the consent agenda for approval. If one or more subcommittee members judge that the case requires more in-depth consideration, the case is reassigned for full council discussion at the next meeting. Post-audits of Dean-delegated appointments at Assistant Professor I – III were also reviewed by Subcommittees after January 1 and put on the consent agenda unless a fuller discussion was needed.

Within a week of the CAP meeting, CAP forwards its recommendation in a report to the Office of Academic Personnel. If CAP’s decision is in agreement with all lower levels of review and the Chancellor and/or EVCP determine that no further discussion is needed, the Office of Academic Personnel transmits the final decision to the academic unit. If any level of review disagreed with the proposed action, an opportunity is provided for additional information or rebuttal. While standard practice at UCI, this is unique in the UC system for cases other than tenure. CAP reviews the additional information received for these cases and when deemed substantively meaningful, a second vote is taken. Sometimes the additional information changes the outcome of CAP’s recommendation.

The APM requires that an *ad hoc* committee review all promotion cases. CAP acts as its own *ad hoc* committee in most cases; however, *ad hoc* committees are convened where at least one level of review recommends denial of tenure or if CAP judges that additional expertise would be important. Reports of outside *ad hoc* committees are considered by CAP before a final vote and recommendation. In 2010-11, four outside *ad hoc* committees were convened, including one that was convened before CAP’s initial review of the file.

CAP’s deliberations result in recommendations to higher levels, which make the final decisions. The EVCP and/or Vice Provost met with CAP prior to the final decision to discuss cases in

which they intended to overrule CAP's recommendation, or where they wished further clarification of CAP's reasoning.

While service on CAP is time-consuming, CAP members felt that it was the most rewarding service in which they have participated. During the busy season of February through July, members typically spent 10-20 hours per week reviewing files, participating in the CAP meetings, and writing reports.

III. CAP's Specific Activities

Communications with the faculty. CAP considers communication with faculty, departments and Deans about the academic review process an important part of its mission. The CAP Chair and the Vice Provost met with department chairs and administrators at the start of the year, and also visited the School of Humanities and the School of Engineering. The CAP Chair also made a presentation at a breakfast meeting for assistant professors and met with equity advisors participating in the UCI ADVANCE program.

Case load and outcome of personnel actions (Tables 1 – 3). Table 1 provides data on 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.

CAP reviewed 473 cases in 2010-11 (see Tables 1 and 3), compared to 393 cases in 2009-10, and 489 in 2008-2009. Part of this increase reflects the lifting of the hiring freeze that was in effect in 2009-10.

As shown in Table 2, the overall rates of agreement between CAP and the original departmental recommendations ranged from 76-94% in 2010-11, compared to 74-100% in 2009-10. When modify-up and modify-down are included, the rates of agreement increase to 86-100%, about the same as in 2009-10. Decisions by CAP are advisory to the Chancellor and EVCP, who make the final decisions. Five of the final decisions (recorded as of August 31, 2011) differed from CAP's recommendations. In all of these cases, the CAP vote was close. In addition, CAP sent comments on five Dean Delegated Appointments. Five files are still under review by the Administration and the additional information requested by CAP for 17 files had not been received by CAP's last meeting in July. The EVCP or the Vice Provost met in person with CAP to discuss cases in which there was disagreement with CAP before making a final decision. This 98.9% concurrence rate between EVCP/VP and CAP in 2010-11 is better than the 97.5 % concurrence rate of 2009-10.

In 2010-11, CAP reviewed and agreed with 2 requests for postponement of the tenure review from the 6th to the 7th year (Table 1D). Other requests were decided by the Vice Provost without advice from CAP. A key criterion for postponement was that an additional year would substantially improve chances for a successful tenure review. The current policy is that Assistant Professors are generally not eligible for postponement if they have had a negative Mid-career review or the last review resulted in No Action.

Mid-career appraisals (MCAs) are key evaluations done by units and CAP of assistant professors during their 4th year. These provide candid guidance and recommendations to the candidate pertaining to future tenure review, identifying tenure prospects as “positive,” “cautionary,” or “negative.” Of the 43 MCAs reviewed by CAP in 2010-11, CAP agreed with the department 28 times and disagreed 15 times (35 percent of the time). CAP disagreed with department MCAs 43 percent of the time in 2009-10 and 50 percent of the time in 2008-09. Frequently, CAP evaluations of candidate tenure prospects are not as glowing as the departments.

Post-audits and streamlining the review process. In 2009-10, in response to suggestions from the campus Task Force on Efficiencies in Academic Personnel Reviews, CAP agreed to waive its authority to review: (1) all actions in the Adjunct Professor series; and (2) normal merits between Professor, Step I and Step III. Throughout 2010-11, CAP conducted post-audits of the major actions in the Adjunct Professor series and prior Dean Delegated Merits of full Professors prior to Step IV. CAP also continued to post-audit Dean Delegated Appointments at the level of Assistant Professor, Steps I – III, which began in AY 2005-06 to streamline the recruitment and appointment process. In conducting post-audits, CAP strives for consistency across schools and provides feedback when CAP disagrees with the appointment level or the action.

Reserve CAP. To avoid potential conflicts of interest, a “Reserve CAP” (formerly “Shadow CAP”) consisting of former CAP members, evaluated dossiers of current and two-years’ past CAP members. The Senate Cabinet, with CAP input, formalized the procedures and appointment process for the RCAP in 2008-09 (<http://www.senate.uci.edu/Councils/CAP/ReserveCAP.asp>). This year, the Reserve CAP reviewed seven new cases and concluded the review of one case carried over from 2009-10.

Diversity in the academic personnel review process. The Addendum to the Biography (AP-10 form) and the Review Profile generated by the MyData database contain sections in which candidates can report their activities in promoting diversity in research, teaching, and/or service. CAP members include this information in their assessment.

Reviews of chairs and deans. CAP provided input to the 5-year review of two department chairs.

Electronic review of files. CAP reviewed three files that were prepared using “AP Review,” the new online system developed by the Office of Academic Personnel and the Office of Information Technology in partnership with UCSD. CAP provided feedback and, overall, had positive reactions to the program. Enhancements are in progress to allow online review of most academic personnel actions within the next 2 – 3 years.

IV. Major Discussion Issues

Procedures in the new UCI School of Law. CAP is considering a request from the Law faculty with regard to Bylaw 55, Departmental Voting Rights. CAP is also working with the Law School administration and faculty on procedures for new appointments.

Salary issues. CAP members discussed and debated during the 2008-2009 year CAP’s appropriate relationship to off-scale faculty salary considerations—both in terms of specific case

review and also whether CAP should engage in larger, systematic analysis of possible salary inequities on campus. In fall 2009, CAP decided to systematically collect data on salary relative to current review period performance. In January, 2010, CAP agreed to comment on any cases in which it was agreed that the candidate's salary appeared to be low relative to performance during the review period. In addition, CAP summarized the data by school and provided it to AP (on an admittedly small sample size). During the 2010-11 year, CAP continued to systematically collect data on salary relative to current review period performance, and to comment on low salaries relative to performance. CAP also summarized the data by school and compared it to the results from the prior year, and agreed to continue monitoring salaries versus performance next year.

Election of CAP members. UCI is the only UC campus for which CAP members are elected. In the 2009-2010 year, CAP was asked by the Senate to consider a request from the Law School to add a member from the Law School, or to suggest a school size when membership should be considered. CAP offered the opinion, based on past precedent, that membership should be considered when schools reach a size of 40 ladder faculty. CAP put forward the recommendation that all ladder-rank faculty should have the opportunity to run for election to CAP and that an additional at-large member should be elected from among the smaller units on campus (currently these would be the School of Law, Department of Education, Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Program in Nursing Sciences, and Program in Public Health). This proposal was endorsed by the Cabinet in the Spring of 2010, and approval was sought from the Divisional Assembly in Fall quarter 2010. However, the proposal proved to be very controversial in the Assembly, where it was not clear that any change to the current policy could be approved. This motion was tabled indefinitely, but expected growth of the smaller units will likely necessitate reconsidering this issue in the future.

Proportion of Faculty in the Clinical X Series. CAP reviewed the fraction of faculty in the Clinical X series in the Clinical Departments in the School of Medicine, and compared this fraction with that at other UCs. The APM requires the Senate to review this fraction if it rises above 1/6. Despite the fraction having risen to 29%, CAP concluded that the series was being used appropriately and that the fraction at UCI was comparable to that at other UC campuses with medical schools.

Response to Senate Requests for Comment. CAP discussed and forwarded comments to the Senate regarding 1) technical changes to the APM, 2) a report on senate membership, and 3) post-employment benefits for faculty.

V. University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP)

In addition to supporting the Chair in normal CAP activities, the Vice Chair represents the Irvine campus at the system-wide University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). Professor Henry Pontell served as CAP Vice Chair in 2010-11. UCAP met four times in-person during academic year 2010-11 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in [Senate Bylaw 135](#). Some of the key issues that UCAP considered this year are:

Proposed Revisions to APM 010 and 015: The University Committee on Academic Freedom proposed the changes (drafted by the Davis division) in response to recent court decisions that have narrowed the scope of academic freedom by threatening the freedom of faculty to express opinions on institutional policy, which could in turn limit the effectiveness of shared governance. UCAP supported these changes.

Post-Employment Benefits (PEB): UCAP discussed two proposed sets of changes in post employment benefits recommended by the President's Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits. UCAP strongly endorsed the UCFW dissenting statement to the President, and agreed that Option C was best.

Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs: UCAP identified several concerns in the proposed policy.

Teaching Faculty: UCAP discussed the question of how teaching faculty can be used differently in the future following a discussion session with Provost Pitts on this and related issues.

Campus Transfers, APM 510: UCAP discussed two proposals submitted by UCFW for modifying APM 510 that concerns inter-campus faculty transfers. The first proposal, aimed at removing the limit on the one-step limit, was unanimously rejected. The second proposal, which is aimed at removing the limit on off-scale salary component, while keeping the limit on the one-step advancement, was reviewed more favorably.

Campus-wide Online Teaching Evaluation System: UCAP discussed developing a set of principles and guidelines that would allow CAPs to be able to evaluate teaching effectiveness more fairly when online systems are used.

Replacing "Above Scale" with "Distinguished Professor": UCAP forwarded a recommendation to formally change "Above Scale" to "Distinguished" for all Academic Senate ladders.

VI. Conclusion

The Academic Personnel Manual (APM) is a foundational resource for all faculty members and the heads of academic units. CAP members frequently consult 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 Division describe the formalities of CAP's membership and responsibilities. CAP strives for transparency in its criteria and procedures, and welcomes feedback from faculty and staff on the content of the published CAP FAQs. Although the answers published for the FAQs have no formal status, they provide important guidance for framing 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.

This year's CAP members once again expressed the view that service on CAP was one of their most rewarding service experiences in academia. Despite the long hours, gravity of the task and hard work, the importance of the mission shaped the membership into a dedicated group during the weekly meetings and the shared late hours in the CAP room. The Chair thanks all of the CAP members for their hard work, support and friendship. The Chair and all CAP members would especially like to thank analyst Mia Larson for skillfully taking notes, drafting the CAP letters, researching Senate issues coming before CAP, and for providing organizational memory for the Council. Rachel Mangold's efforts to organize the agendas and assignments for each meeting are also appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven White, School of Physical Sciences, Chair

Stephen Bondy, School of Medicine-Basic Sciences

Dan Cooper, School of Medicine-Clinical Sciences

Sanjeev Dewan, Paul Merage School of Business

Michelle Garfinkel, School of Social Sciences

J. Lawrence Marsh, School of Biological Sciences

Farghalli A. Mohamed, Henry Samueli School of Engineering

Margot Norris, School of Humanities

Henry Pontell, School of Social Ecology, Vice Chair

Amelia Regan, Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Science

Alan Terricciano and Margaret Murata, Claire Trevor School of the Arts

APPENDICES

Tables IA - ID: Final Recommendations by Action Type

Table II: Final CAP Recommendations on Departmental Proposals

Table III: CAP's Agreement with Departmental Recommendations, 2005-2011

2010-11 CAP ANNUAL REPORT
TABLES 1A-1D: FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE

| TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES | CAP Recommendation | | | | Total | Accelerated |
|-----------------------|--------------------|----------|--------|---------|-------|-------------|
| | Agree | Disagree | Modify | Pending | | |
| | 399 | 36 | 32 | 6 | 473 | 89 |

| TABLE 1A. APPOINTMENTS | CAP Recommendation | | | | Total |
|--|--------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | Agree | Disagree | Modify | Pending | |
| Dean's Delegated Appts. (Asst. Prof. I, II, and III; inc. In Residence and Acting Prof. of Law) Post-Audit | 37 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 44 |
| Assistant Professor (Steps IV, V, VI) | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| Associate Professor, Assoc. Prof. of Clin. X | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 |
| Professor, Prof. of Clin. X, Prof. of Law | 12 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 14 |
| Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer PSOE & SOE | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
| Change of Series (1 paired w/ merit or promotion) | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Non-Senate Appointment | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Non-Senate Change of Series | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 75 | 2 | 12 | 2 | 91 |
| % CAP Agreed with Proposal | | | | | 84% |
| % CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal | | | | | 98% |

| TABLE 1B. PROMOTIONS | Agree | Disagree | Modify | Pending | Total | Accelerated |
|---|---|-----------|-----------|----------|------------|-------------|
| | Associate Professor (includes Clin X & In Res series) | 41 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 50 |
| Professor (includes Clin X & In Res series) | 28 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 39 | 16 |
| Advancement to Professor VI | 15 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 23 | 10 |
| Advancement to Professor Above Scale | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer SOE | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Non-Senate Promotion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Excellence Review w/ Merit Increase | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | n/a |
| Total | 115 | 11 | 14 | 4 | 144 | 41 |
| % CAP Agreed with Proposal | | | | | 82% | |
| % CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal | | | | | 92% | |

| TABLE 1C. MERIT INCREASES* | Agree | Disagree | Modify | Pending | Total | Accelerated |
|---|---|-----------|----------|----------|------------|-------------|
| | Assistant Professor (includes Clin X & In Res series; 38 paired w/ MCA**) | 50 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| Associate Professor (inc. 2 in Clin X or In Res series) | 40 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 47 | 5 |
| Professor (inc. 3 in Clin X or In Res series) | 43 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 53 | 36 |
| Professor Above Scale | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 4 |
| Dean Delegated Merits - Post-Audit* | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | n/a |
| Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer PSOE (3 paired w/ MCA**) | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer SOE | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Non-Senate Merit Increases | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer, Continuing | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | n/a |
| Total | 185 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 208 | 48 |
| % CAP Agreed with Proposal | | | | | 89% | |
| % CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal | | | | | 91% | |

| TABLE 1D. OTHER ACTIONS | Agree | Disagree | Modify | Pending | Total | Accelerated |
|--|-------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| | Non-Reappointment | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Reappointment (1 paired with MCA*) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | n/a |
| No Action (Assoc. Professor & Professor) | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 |
| Fifth-Year Review | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | n/a |
| Career Equity Review | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Postponement of Tenure Review | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | n/a |
| Non-Senate Reappointment | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | n/a |
| Total | 24 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 30 | |
| % CAP Agreed with Proposal | | | | | 80% | |
| % CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal | | | | | 83% | |

*CAP no longer post-audits Dean Delegated Merits, except those in Professor rank prior to Step IV.

**Of the 43 mid-career appraisals (MCA) reviewed, CAP agreed with the departmental recommendation 28 times and disagreed 15 times.

2010-11 CAP ANNUAL REPORT

TABLE 2: FINAL CAP RECOMMENDATIONS ON DEPARTMENTAL PROPOSALS

| School | Number proposed | CAP Recommendation | | | | | % CAP agreed w/ dept. or modified up or down | % CAP agreed with dept. w/o modification | Accelerations | |
|---------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|----------|--|--|---------------|------------|
| | | Agree | Disagree | Modify-up | Modify-down | Pending | | | Number | % propo |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Biological Sciences | 43 | 35 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 93% | 81% | 8 | 19% |
| Business | 14 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 86% | 79% | 2 | 14% |
| Education | 16 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 100% | 94% | 1 | 6% |
| Engineering | 41 | 31 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 90% | 79% | 8 | 20% |
| Health Sciences | 8 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88% | 88% | 2 | 25% |
| Humanities | 72 | 67 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 94% | 93% | 12 | 17% |
| ICS | 28 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 86% | 82% | 9 | 32% |
| Law | 12 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 100% | 92% | 1 | 8% |
| Medicine | 80 | 62 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 88% | 81% | 16 | 20% |
| Physical Sciences | 54 | 48 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 93% | 89% | 15 | 28% |
| Social Ecology | 26 | 21 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 92% | 81% | 9 | 35% |
| Social Sciences | 52 | 48 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 96% | 92% | 8 | 15% |
| Totals* | 480 | 404 | 37 | 13 | 20 | 6 | 92% | 85% | 97 | 20% |

* 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 2004-2010

| | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10* | 2010-11 | 5 yr mean 2005-2010 | Difference 2010-11 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Total cases | 487 | 604 | 645 | 489 | 393 | 473 | 524 | -51 |

| Agree | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Appointments | 72% | 77% | 72% | 75% | 81% | 84% | 75% | 9% |
| Promotions | 66% | 68% | 71% | 72% | 73% | 82% | 70% | 12% |
| Merits | 81% | 88% | 84% | 86% | 87% | 89% | 85% | 4% |
| Other Actions | 81% | 68% | 84% | 89% | 83% | 80% | 81% | -1% |
| Agree or Modification | | | | | | | | |
| Appts. +/- | 89% | 93% | 90% | 97% | 93% | 98% | 92% | 6% |
| Promotions +/- | 83% | 83% | 80% | 91% | 94% | 92% | 86% | 6% |
| Merits +/- | 85% | 92% | 91% | 90% | 94% | 91% | 90% | 1% |
| Other Actions +/- | 83% | 68% | 92% | 94% | 87% | 83% | 85% | -2% |

*Hiring freeze and other budgetary conditions contributed to a decrease in cases in 2009-10.