

**Council on Academic Personnel
Annual Report
2007-2008**

To the Irvine Divisional Assembly:

The UC Irvine Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) is pleased to provide the following summary of its activities for the 2007-08 academic year.

I. Membership

The faculty members serving this year on CAP were, as continuing members, Professors Scott Bollens (Social Ecology), Fadi Kurdahi (Engineering), Frances Journak (Medicine, Basic Sciences), Margot Norris (Humanities) and Kai Wehmeier (Social Sciences). Newly elected members were Professors Nancy Burley (Biological Sciences), Rita Dechter (Information and Computer Sciences), Mary Gilly (Business), and Anthony Kubiak (Arts). In addition, Jonathan Feng (Physical Sciences) and John Longhurst (Medicine, Clinical Sciences) were appointed to complete the terms of elected Council members who did not serve their full terms. Professor Journak served as CAP chair, and Professor Bollens served as CAP Vice Chair and representative to the University-wide Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). Mia Larson served as CAP analyst and Barbara Cartwright provided staff support.

II. General Procedures

CAP's responsibilities. CAP is responsible for providing a campus-wide perspective on proposals for merits and promotions originating from academic units. CAP reviews personnel files and makes recommendations to the Provost and Chancellor for all Senate faculty series and for some non-Senate series (e.g. Researchers, Lecturers and Adjunct Professors). CAP does not review proposed actions for certain series (e.g. Project Scientists) but on occasion it recommends "change in series" to these titles based on its interpretation of criteria for these series 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 website 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. 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, by the Vice Provost, or by a Dean (see below).

CAP's review protocol. CAP met 36 times during the academic year, with biweekly meetings in the fall quarter and weekly meetings thereafter; the final meeting was in the fourth week of July. Confidentiality, fairness and consistency are central tenets of CAP deliberations, and all members rigorously upheld those principles. CAP established a quorum of 8 members; each member (including the chair) voted on all discussed cases; abstentions were not allowed.

However, recusals were permitted if there was evidence or appearance of a conflict of interest on a given case. During the peak period (February through July) CAP reviewed approximately 25 cases per week, with meetings typically lasting 6 hours. Prior to the meeting, each case was assigned for full review by the Council or for sub-committee review (“consentable cases,” see below). Full review was conducted for all major actions, including Mid-Career Assessments, promotions to Associate and Full Professor, all non-delegated appointments, advancement to Professor Step VI and Above Scale, as well as for all accelerations. Prior to the meeting primary, secondary and tertiary readers were assigned for in-depth review of each file, but all Council members were expected to read each file. At the meeting, discussion was led by these reviewers, followed by the chair, who reviewed and discussed all cases. During open discussion by all council members, the goal was to consider all relevant aspects of the case and hopefully reach a consensus. Discussion was continued until all members were satisfied that all relevant aspects had been considered. A vote was then taken on the proposed action, with the majority being reported as the decision of the council. Tie votes were recorded as not supporting the proposed action. After the meeting the CAP analyst prepared a draft letter for each case that was reviewed and revised by the CAP members. In cases where the vote was split, both the majority and minority opinions were represented in the letter. The CAP chair was responsible for the final version of the letter transmitted to the Office of Academic Personnel.

“Consentable cases” were typically normal merit cases or first requests for No Actions, where all levels of review prior to CAP were in agreement. Prior to the CAP meeting they were assigned to a subcommittee consisting of a primary and secondary reader as well as the CAP chair. If all three agreed with the proposed action, the case was briefly discussed at the CAP meeting and approved. If one or more subcommittee members judged that the case required more in-depth consideration, the case was re-assigned for full council discussion at the next meeting. CAP also conducted post-appointment audits of Dean-delegated appointments at Assistant Professor I – III. These audits were conducted as full review cases during the Fall quarter and as “consentable cases” thereafter.

If CAP’s decision on a case was in agreement with all lower levels of review, its recommendation was forwarded to the Chancellor and/or EVCP; if these individuals determined that no further discussion was needed, the final decision was transmitted to the academic unit. If CAP’s judgment differed from lower levels of review, an opportunity was provided for the academic unit to provide additional information or rebuttal. While standard practice at UCI, this is unique in the UC system. CAP fully discussed additional information received for these cases, followed by a second vote. Sometimes the additional discussion changed the outcome of CAP’s recommendation. The second report was submitted to the Office of Academic Personnel.

The APM mandates that all cases for promotion should be considered by an *ad hoc* committee. In most cases, CAP acted as its own *ad hoc* committee in making recommendations. However outside *ad hoc* committees were convened in all cases where denial of tenure was recommended, if CAP judged that additional expertise was important, or at the request of the EVCP. Reports of outside *ad hoc* committees were discussed and considered by CAP before a final vote and recommendation. In 2007-2008, eleven outside *ad hoc* committees were convened, including seven that were convened before CAP’s initial review of the file.

CAP's deliberations result in recommendations to higher levels, who make the final decisions. The EVCP or the Vice Provost met with the full CAP prior to the final decision to discuss any cases in which they intended to disagree with CAP's recommendation, or where they wished further clarification of the reasoning. They also raised concerns of their own on occasion.

CAP members felt that service on the Council was the most rewarding service in which they have participated. Still, service on CAP is time-consuming and intense. During the busy season (February – July), members typically spent 10-15 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 schools about the academic review process an important part of its mission. The CAP chair or vice chair, as well as other CAP members, made presentations, including a list of Do's and Don't's in assembling dossiers, at several forums. These included breakfast meetings hosted by the Vice Provost for department chairs and their administrators, and one for new assistant professors. CAP members and the Vice Provost also met with department chairs of the School of Medicine and the College of Health Science as well as with the faculty of the Paul Merage School of Business; these were the only three school-based meetings requested this year. In the past, other schools have requested meetings with CAP, which may have resulted in better understandings of the academic review process and improved preparation of dossiers.

Although CAP did not gather data on specific incidences, there seemed to be a significant increase in the number of personnel files which necessitated additional information or formal corrections before the review could be completed. A CAP memo, dated February 19, 2008, was distributed by AP to highlight the common types of deficiencies and errors that could result in delays in the review process. CAP did not attempt to identify the reasons for the increasing error rate, but noted that approximately 40% of the faculty members were new to UCI within the last six years and that there had been a high turnover of personnel staff at all levels.

In addition to deficiencies and errors in reporting personnel activities, requests for additional information were also commonly triggered by the lack of analytical, conflict-free letters, both intramural and extramural, to support the requested personnel actions. Because CAP's prior attempts to alert the campus community, in formal meetings or administrative notes, to the growing problem of insufficient numbers of conflict-free letters had not been adequate to correct the problem, CAP formally requested additional information before such files were reviewed. In addition, CAP prepared modifications to the CAP Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), delineating the number and types of letters that are preferred for each type of requested personnel action. CAP also clarified the definition of conflict of interest in those FAQs. Before posting, CAP intended to request feed back from AP as well as the campus via AP, but the response has been delayed. The issue will hopefully be resolved in the upcoming year.

In a large majority of cases, the request for additional information benefited the faculty under review.

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 shown in Tables 1 and 3, CAP reviewed 645 cases in 2007-2008, compared to 604 in 2006-2007. Part of this increase reflected a larger UCI faculty and part was reflective of the post-audits by CAP of prior dean-delegated merits. In 2003-2004, "ordinary" merit proposals (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) were delegated to Deans. Although this led to a decrease in CAP's case load in the 2003-2004 year, reviews (post-audits) of the dean-delegated merit were conducted by CAP at the time of the next action (merit or promotion) and are recorded as separate actions in the table. In 2007-2008, there were 109 reviews of prior dean-delegated merit increases, and CAP agreed with 103 of them. Therefore, the number of new dossiers reviewed this past year was 536, compared to 511 the previous year (plus 93 reviews of prior dean-delegated merits).

As shown in Table 2, the overall rates of agreement between CAP and the original departmental recommendations ranged from 67% - 100% in 2007-2008, compared to 46% - 93% in 2006-2007. When modify-up and modify-down were included, the rates of agreement increased to 83%-100% in 2007-2008, compared to 79% - 100% in 2006-2007. Decisions by CAP are advisory to the Chancellor and EVCP, who make the final decisions. Of the 536 dossiers reviewed by CAP this year, 7 final decisions differed from CAP's recommendations. In all but two cases, these disagreements occurred in cases where there were also close split votes by CAP. The EVCP or the Vice Provost graciously discussed each case where there was disagreement before making a final decision.

The delegation to the Deans of appointments at Assistant Professor I – III began mid-way into the 2005-2006 year, with the major goal of streamlining the recruitment and appointments processes. CAP conducted post-appointment audits of these appointments (54 total, Table 1A), to monitor for consistency across schools, and feedback was provided when CAP disagreed with the appointment level. Of the 6 cases where there was disagreement, CAP judged only one appointment to be unsuitable. Some were judged by CAP to be appointed at too high a step (e.g. acting Assistant Professors at steps higher than I), and some were appointed at too low a step (e.g. Step III vs. Step IV or higher). With regard to the latter cases, there was some concern that these individuals were appointed at Step III for expediency. CAP has recommended to Academic Personnel that for Assistant Professors judged to be appointed at too low a step, a mechanism be established for increasing their step prior to their next merit review, to avoid later career equity issues.

In 2006-2007, the authority to postpone tenure reviews for Assistant Professors from the 6th to the 7th year was taken back from the deans by the EVCP. CAP no longer reviews requests for postponement of the tenure review unless specifically requested by the EVCP. In 2007-2008, CAP reviewed 4 requests for postponements of the tenure review (Table 1D) and recommended in favor of all. A key criterion for postponement was that an additional year would substantially improve chances for a successful tenure review. CAP reminds the departments and faculty that

the current policy is that Assistant Professors are not eligible for postponement if they have had a negative mid-career review or an immediately preceding No Action.

Shadow CAP. To avoid conflicts of interest, dossiers of current and immediate past CAP members were evaluated by a “shadow CAP” consisting of former CAP members. Shadow CAPs were used for 6 cases this year. The Academic Senate was asked to review the UCI procedures for appointing Shadow CAP members and the review is in progress.

Diversity in the academic personnel review process. Based upon discussions in 2006-2007, the AP10 form was modified so that candidates could report their activities in promoting diversity in research, teaching and service. The information was included in the review of each file during 2007-2008 and will continue.

Mary Gilly served as CAP’s representative on the Special Senate Committee on Diversity.

Other Business. CAP provided input to the 5-year review of two Deans and of two department chairs. It endorsed departmentalization for the Department of Population Health and Disease Prevention and the disestablishment of the Department of Community and Environmental Medicine.

In response to a recommendation from other committees, CAP supported the Work-Life statement by the Special Senate Committee on Diversity, the systemwide Senate reviews to amend Senate Bylaw 337, the proposed revisions to Academic Personnel Policies 220-85-b, 335-10-a, 740-11-c, 350, 710, and 711, and the new language for 080 on medical separation. CAP commented on the systemwide Senate review of the New Senior Management Group Policy 505 -Performance management Review Process and the proposed transitional Leave Policy for Senior Management Group.

In response to a request from the Council on Faculty Welfare, CAP provided a summary of the career equity review actions for the recent past.

IV. Major Discussion Issues

Salary issues. CAP supported other Academic Senate committees and councils in requesting the raw data from AP to analyze the faculty salary data. The data are being analyzed by Council on Faculty Welfare. In breaking with the recent past, CAP decided to comment on faculty salaries under two circumstances: (1) when there was a lack of justification for very large salary offset and (2) when a salary appeared to be too low, particularly compared to peers in the same department or research area.

Teaching evaluations. CAP noted several problems related to the teaching data provided to support the evaluation of the teaching component of the file: (1) the student evaluation response rate is declining with the increasing use of on-line evaluations, to the point at which the teaching evaluations become insignificant; (2) several schools do not provide comparative teaching evaluations, as stipulated by APM 210-1 (d) and APP 3-60(4)(b); and (3) most units rely upon student evaluations as the sole method of evidence to support claims of good teaching, whereas

the APM and APP provide examples of other modes of evaluation. CAP has alerted the Academic Senate as well as AP to the problems and will also be raising the issue in 2008-2009 campus meetings. CAP also provided the Council on Student Experience with a list of types of data that can be used to support good teaching.

Evaluation of Deans' delegated actions. Delegation to the Deans of ordinary merits was carried out for a four year trial period and a review by an outside body was mandated. CAP was asked to comment on the final report which evaluated the Dean's delegated reviews for the last four years. CAP supported continuance of the Dean's delegated review process, but requested three modifications to the procedures in a memo dated July 9, 2008. The issues were discussed with the EVCP and final modifications are pending.

Election of CAP members. UCI is the only UC campus for which CAP members are elected. CAP bylaws mandate that two candidates must be nominated from each school with a vacancy. In the past few years, there has been an increasing trend where the Committee on Committees has not been able to identify two faculty members willing to run and consequently only one candidate was nominated from some schools in the 2006-2007 elections. Highlighting the problem in 2006-2007 as well as addressing the issue of consistent compensation for CAP members appeared to eliminate the problem in the 2007-2008 elections. Nevertheless, the Academic Senate remained concerned about the violation of the Senate Bylaws when only one person from a school stood for an election. CAP responded to specific memos by the Committee on Committees as well as was engaged in discussions throughout the year with the Senate Cabinet as to the best way to amend the Senate Bylaws to insure continuity in CAP representation across the schools and to address the specific issue of what should happen when only one person stands for a CAP election for a school. Final proposals were passed at the Senate Cabinet in late July and will be brought to the Assembly for a vote.

Appointments in new schools. With establishment of several new professional schools and programs at UCI (law, nursing science, and public health), faculty recruitment in these disciplines will increase. CAP consulted with academic leaders in Law and Nursing Science to establish the appropriate criteria on which appointments and advancements should be based.

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). Prof. Scott Bollens served as CAP Vice-Chair in 2007-2008. UCAP met four times in Academic Year 2007-2008 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 135. The issues that UCAP considered this year are described briefly as follows:

Implementation of the new faculty salary scales. UCAP received regular updates from UCOP administrators about plans and progress for implementation of the first phase of the four-year systemwide faculty salary scale plan. UCAP members, in turn, reported on campus plans for moving forward and conveyed issues and concerns that arose during implementation.

Report on “non-progressing” and “disengaged” faculty. The Senate chair and vice chair asked UCAP to discuss a concern, expressed by others, that the recent adjustments to the UC salary scales may reward some faculty who are not actively engaged in their research or teaching duties. UCAP was asked to collect and analyze data that would accurately estimate the scale of the concern and to report its findings back to Academic Council. UCAP determined that the number of faculty who the committee would term “disengaged” was 1% or less of faculty systemwide.

Law Faculty salary scales. UCAP discussed the incongruity of the UC law faculty scales in relation to the other professorial scales. In January, the Committee recommended to Academic Council that UC initiate a systemwide review of the law scales in order to align them more closely with other professorial scales, so that law faculty share a similar basis and timeline for academic personnel reviews. On Council’s recommendation, Vice Provost Jewell took steps to form a joint faculty-administration Law Faculty Salary Scales Work Group that will be working in fall 2008.

UCAP’s recommended modifications to APM 220-18b (4). UCAP originally proposed modifications to APM 220-18b (4) in 2005, and worked with Council on revised proposals in 2006 and 2007. The original intent was to clarify the distinction between the criteria for advancement to Professor Step VI and Professor Above Scale, and to align policy with actual practice. Council endorsed a final proposal in March 2007, but administrators later raised their own concerns during an informal review initiated by UCOP.

Cross-Campus comparison of off-scale amounts and advancement rates. There was a request for UCAP to compare campus practices to determine the relative “harshness” or “generousness” of the CAPs. UCAP viewed preliminary data generated by the UCSC representative from systemwide compilations. The rate of progress in rank and step across campuses was similar at all campuses. UCAP in 2008-2009 will revisit these trends in coordination with the Faculty Welfare Committee.

The use of “collegiality” in personnel reviews. At the request of the University Committee on Academic Freedom, Council asked UCAP to consider the use of “collegiality” as a criterion in the faculty merit/promotion review process. UCAP responded that CAPs review all files based on criteria outlined in APM 210, and it could not recall a case where a CAP recommended denial of a merit or a promotion based solely on “collegiality.”

Professor, Step X. UCAP considered a suggestion that the Senate add Step X to the salary scales. After reviewing the history of the step system and discussing the issue with their local committees, the Committee decided not to pursue the issue further.

Investigation of local campus AP procedures. UCAP was asked to investigate campus procedures for writing and implementing local academic personnel policies supplementary to the systemwide APM – commonly known on some campuses as “the Call.” There was concern that these interpretations appear to have the force of policy, but require no review by UCOP, and some could conflict with the APM. UCAP’s annual update of campus practices is a critical means of maintaining consistency in the application of the Academic Personnel Manual.

Campus Reports. UCAP devoted part of each regular meeting to reports about issues facing local committees and comparison of individual campus practices. In these discussions, UCAP members touched briefly on policies and procedures for search waivers; the role of teaching evaluations; strategies for improving efficiencies in the personnel process; credit for electronic-only publications compared to print publications; the role of “service” in merit and promotion criteria and CAP reviews; local implementation of diversity modifications to APM 210; the compensation of CAP members; reporting protocols; problems securing a sufficient number of external letters; cases where there is an appearance of conflict of interest in external and internal letters; recusal policies; special accelerations for retention or other reasons; average case turn-around time; and whether grants can be considered as a criterion in the merit and promotion process.

Survey of CAP Practices. UCAP updated its annual survey of local campus CAP practices and experiences.

VI. Conclusion

The Academic Personnel Manual (APM) is an indispensable 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 Senate 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 FAQs and CAP’s responses. 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.

In conclusion, this year’s CAP members unanimously expressed the feeling 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 and collegial group who enjoyed each others’ company during the weekly meetings and the shared late hours in the CAP room. The chair would like to thank all of the CAP members for their hard work, support and friendship. The Chair and all CAP members would especially like to thank the analyst Mia Larson for taking excellent notes and skillfully drafting the CAP letters, and Barbara Cartwright for organizing and setting the assignments and agendas for each meeting.

2007-08 CAP ANNUAL REPORT
TABLES 1A-1D: FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE

TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES

| CAP Recommendation | | | | Total | Acceleration |
|--------------------|----------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| Agree | Disagree | Modify | Pending | | |
| 512 | 48 | 62 | 23 | 645 | 95 |

TABLE 1A. APPOINTMENTS

| | CAP Recommendation | | | | Total | Acceleration |
|--|--------------------|----------|-----------|----------|------------|--------------|
| | Agree | Disagree | Modify | Pending | | |
| Assistant Professor (Asst. IV, V, VI) | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 8 | n/a |
| Associate Professor | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 9 | n/a |
| Professor | 22 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 34 | n/a |
| Dean's Delegated Appts. (Asst. Prof. I, II, and III) | 48 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 54 | n/a |
| Senior/Lecturer SOE | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | n/a |
| Change of Series w/ Merit/Promotion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | n/a |
| Non-Senate Appointment | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 8 | n/a |
| Non-Senate Change of Series w/Merit/Promotion | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | n/a |
| Total | 94 | 4 | 23 | 9 | 130 | 0 |
| % CAP Agreed with Proposal | | | | | 72% | |
| % CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal | | | | | 90% | |

TABLE 1B. PROMOTIONS

| | Agree | Disagree | Modify | Pending | Total | Acceleration |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|------------|--------------|
| Associate Professor | 32 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 45 | 20 |
| Professor | 21 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 33 | 11 |
| Advancement to Professor VI | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 4 |
| Advancement to Professor Above Scale | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 |
| Sr. Lecturer SOE | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Non-Senate Promotion | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| Excellence Review, Merit Increase | 13 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 16 | n/a |
| Total | 87 | 16 | 11 | 8 | 122 | 37 |
| % CAP Agreed with Proposal | | | | | 71% | |
| % CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal | | | | | 80% | |

TABLE 1C. MERIT INCREASES

| | Agree | Disagree | Modify | Pending | Total | Acceleration |
|---|------------|-----------|-----------|----------|------------|--------------|
| Assistant Professor (29 paired w/ MCA*) | 50 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 53 | 3 |
| Associate Professor | 45 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 59 | 15 |
| Professor | 63 | 11 | 16 | 2 | 92 | 35 |
| Above Scale | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 4 |
| Dean's Delegated Merits (CAP post-audit) | 103 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 109 | n/a |
| Senior/Lecturer SOE (1 paired w/ MCA*) | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Non-Senate Merit Increases (0 paired w/ MCA*) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Lecturer, Continuing | 22 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 25 | n/a |
| Total | 300 | 25 | 25 | 6 | 356 | 57 |
| % CAP Agreed with Proposal | | | | | 84% | |
| % CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal | | | | | 91% | |

TABLE 1D. MISCELLANEOUS

| | Agree | Disagree | Modify | Pending | Total | Acceleration |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| Fifth-Year Review | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | n/a |
| Career Equity Review | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| No Action (Assoc. Professor & Professor) | 11 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 13 | n/a |
| Postponement of Tenure Review | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | n/a |
| Postponement of Promotion Review | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | n/a |
| Reappointment (2 paired with MCA*) | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | n/a |
| Non-Reappointment | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | n/a |
| Non-Senate Reappointment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a |
| Non-Senate Fifth-Year Review | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a |
| Total | 31 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 1 |
| % CAP Agreed with Proposal | | | | | 84% | |
| % CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal | | | | | 92% | |

*Of the 30 mid-career appraisals (MCA) reviewed, CAP agreed with the departmental recommendation 10 times and disagreed 20 times.

2007-08 CAP ANNUAL REPORT
TABLE 2: FINAL CAP RECOMMENDATIONS ON DEPARTMENTAL PROPOSALS

| School | Number proposed | CAP Recommendation | | | | | Pending | % CAP agreed w/ dept. or modified up or down | % CAP agreed with dept. w/o modification | Accelerations | |
|---------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|------------|--|--|---------------|------------|
| | | Agree | Disagree | Modify-up | Modify-down | Modify-up | | | | Number | % proposed |
| Arts | 29 | 24 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 90% | 83% | 3 | 10% | |
| Biological Sciences | 58 | 48 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 93% | 86% | 13 | 22% | |
| Business | 30 | 22 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 83% | 73% | 1 | 3% | |
| Education | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100% | 100% | 0 | 0% | |
| Engineering | 67 | 45 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 85% | 73% | 8 | 12% | |
| Health Sciences | 16 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 93% | 87% | 1 | 6% | |
| Humanities | 96 | 86 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 99% | 91% | 17 | 18% | |
| ICS | 40 | 28 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 92% | 76% | 8 | 20% | |
| Law | 10 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 100% | 67% | 0 | 0% | |
| Medicine | 114 | 83 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 90% | 76% | 14 | 12% | |
| Physical Sciences | 75 | 61 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 92% | 85% | 18 | 24% | |
| Social Ecology | 32 | 28 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 94% | 88% | 3 | 9% | |
| Social Sciences | 78 | 63 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 92% | 83% | 10 | 13% | |
| Misc.* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| Totals** | 661 | 523 | 51 | 28 | 35 | 24 | 92% | 82% | 96 | 15% | |

* Office of Research

** 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 2003-2008

| Action | 2002-03 | 2003-04* | 2004-05* | 2005-06* | 2006-07* | 2007-08* | 5 yr mean | | Difference 2007-08 |
|-------------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|--------------------|
| | | | | | | | 2002-2007 | 2007-08* | |
| Total cases | 554 | 374 | 442 | 487 | 604 | 645 | 492 | 153 | |

| Agree or Modification | 2002-03 | 2003-04* | 2004-05* | 2005-06* | 2006-07* | 2007-08* | 5 yr mean | | Difference 2007-08 |
|------------------------------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|--------------------|
| | | | | | | | 2002-2007 | 2007-08* | |
| Agree | | | | | | | | | |
| Appointment | 70% | 81% | 70% | 72% | 77% | 72% | 74% | -2% | |
| Promotion | 55% | 62% | 53% | 66% | 68% | 71% | 61% | 10% | |
| Merit | 84% | 70% | 80% | 81% | 88% | 84% | 81% | 3% | |
| Miscellaneous | 86% | 77% | 79% | 81% | 68% | 84% | 78% | 6% | |
| Agree or Modification | | | | | | | | | |
| Appoint. +/- | 93% | 93% | 97% | 89% | 93% | 90% | 93% | -3% | |
| Promotion +/- | 88% | 89% | 74% | 83% | 83% | 80% | 83% | -3% | |
| Merit +/- | 87% | 79% | 84% | 85% | 92% | 91% | 85% | 6% | |
| Miscellaneous +/- | 91% | 90% | 89% | 83% | 68% | 92% | 84% | 8% | |

*Beginning in 2003-04, some merit increases were delegated to the Deans; CAP conducted post-audits in 2004-05 - 2007-08