

**Council on Academic Personnel
Annual Report
2006-2007**

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 2006-07 academic year.

I. Membership

The faculty members serving this year on CAP were, as continuing members, Professors Hung Fan (Biological Sciences), Ramesh Jain (Information and Computer Sciences), Susan Trumbore (Physical Sciences), Alladi Venkatesh (Business), and S. Eric Wilson (Medicine, Clinical Sciences). Newly elected members included Scott Bollens (Social Ecology), Frances Jurnak (Medicine, Basic Sciences) and Fadi Kurdahi (Engineering). In addition, Jonathan Feng (Physical Sciences), Catherine Lord (Arts), Margot Norris (Humanities) and Kai Wehmeier (Social Sciences) were appointed to complete the terms of Council members who did not serve their full terms. Professor Fan served as CAP chair, and Professor Venkatesh served as CAP Vice Chair and representative to the University-wide Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). Mia Larson served as CAP analyst and Tracy Calvert 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 34 times during the academic year, with biweekly meetings in the fall quarter and weekly meetings thereafter; the final meeting was in the last week of July. Confidentiality and fairness 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 June) CAP reviewed approximately 25 cases per week, with meetings typically lasting 5-6 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 Full 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. Prior to the 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 2006-2007, three outside *ad hoc* committees were used.

CAP's deliberations result in recommendations to higher levels, who make the final decisions. The EVCP or 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 some of the most rewarding service in which they have participated. Still, service on CAP is very time-consuming and intense. During the busy season (February – July), members typically spent 10-15 hrs 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. In addition, the CAP vice-chair made a presentation at the Department Chairs' retreat. CAP members and the Vice Provost also met with department chairs of the School of Medicine; this was the only school-based meeting requested this year. In the past, other schools have requested meetings with CAP, which resulted in better understandings of the academic review process and improved preparation of dossiers. By and large, this year the files were well-prepared.

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 Table 3, CAP reviewed 604 cases in 2006-2007, compared to 487 in 2005-2006. Part of this increase reflected more dossiers reviewed. In addition, the increase was partly reflective of the delegation to the deans in 2003-2004 of "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). This led to a decrease case load beginning in the 2003-2004 year. After a dean-delegated merit, the next action (merit or promotion) underwent full review by CAP and the EVCP. At that time a review of the prior dean-delegated action was also conducted. Reviews of prior dean-delegated actions were recorded as separate actions in the table. Beginning in 2005-2006, CAP began to review merit or promotions cases where the prior action was dean-delegated,

and this increased during 2006-2007. In 2006-2007, there were 93 reviews of prior dean-delegated actions, and CAP agreed with all but one of them. Therefore, the number of dossiers reviewed this past year was 511, compared to 426 the previous year (61 reviews of prior dean-delegated actions).

As shown in Table 2, the overall rates of agreement between CAP and the original departmental recommendations ranged from 46% - 93%; when modify-up and modify-down were included, the rates of agreement increased to 79% - 100%. Decisions by CAP are advisory to the Chancellor and EVCP, who make the final decisions. Of the 511 dossiers reviewed by CAP this year, 11 final decisions differed from CAP's recommendations. In most cases, these disagreements were in cases where there were also split votes by CAP. The EVCP graciously discussed each case where there was disagreement before making a final decision.

This year, appointments at Assistant Professor I – III were also delegated to the Deans, with the major goal of streamlining the recruitment and appointments processes. CAP conducted post-appointment audits of these appointments (62 total, Table 1A), to monitor for consistency across schools, and feedback was provided when CAP disagreed with the appointment level. Of the 11 cases where there was disagreement, 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.

This year, 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. As a result, CAP reviewed 11 requests for postponements of tenure review (Table 1D); it recommended in favor of 6 postponements and against 5. A key criterion for postponement was that an additional year would substantially improve chances for a successful tenure review. All requests for postponement were reviewed by CAP this year. However, 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. In the future, these cases will not be forwarded to CAP.

Shadow CAP. To avoid conflicts of interest, dossiers of current and immediate past CAP members, and for individual to whom CAP reports, were evaluated by a “shadow CAP” consisting of former CAP members. Shadow CAPs were used for five cases this year.

New Addendum to the Biography Forms for Special Series. New Addendum forms for the Lecturer and for the Researcher series were implemented this year. They eliminated areas not germane to the review for these series, and allowed for CAP to apply uniform evaluation standards for these series.

CAP Vice Chair. The position of the CAP Vice-Chair was established in 2003-2004. In addition to supporting the Chair in normal CAP activities, the Vice Chair represents the Irvine campus at the system-wide UCAP. Professor Alladi Venkatesh served as CAP Vice-Chair in 2006-2007. UCAP met four times throughout 2006-2007 at the Office of the President in Oakland, and by teleconference once. This past year, Mary Croughan, from the UCSF campus was the chair of UCAP.

A major issue discussed by UCAP was the frequent use of off-step salaries. UCAP reviewed feedback received by Council from Senate systemwide committees and divisions to UCAP's report: *Synopsis of the Present Status of the UC Merit and Promotion System and Principles of and Policy Recommendations for UC Faculty Compensation.*

Committees and divisions expressed differing views about the extent to which market forces should determine faculty salaries and how much systemwide salary scale uniformity should be preserved. The proposal to partition the faculty into separate salary scale cohorts by discipline was particularly problematic, although there was more general support for partitioning business and economics.

UCAP members noted that the UC step system has been a great benefit to the success and excellence of the University, but the scales are becoming less competitive. Lagging salaries and the widespread use of off-scales promote inversion and contribute to recruitment, retention and morale problems. In addition, the diversion of unallocated FTEs to fund off scale salaries has a negative impact on the student-to-faculty ratio. These issues are in need of immediate attention.

UCAP members expressed support for:

- Keeping a peer-reviewed scale system that is tied to merit.
- Raising all scales to eliminate the disparities between UC and its Comparison Eight.
- Re-defining "on-scale" to encompass the entire range between steps, recognizing that such a cosmetic fix is only part of the solution.
- Maintaining a single UC salary scale that also respects the autonomy of individual campuses to have continued flexibility to use off-scales for recruitment and retention.
- Modifying the policy language governing off-scales to recognize that off-scale salaries are not temporary exceptions but a legitimate and integral part of normal compensation practices to meet the current competitive environment for recruitment and retention.
- Making upward salary scale adjustment a priority at the assistant, associate, and early full professor levels and instituting a system that fixes and prevents salary inversion between assistant and associate professors.
- Giving faculty on the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, who earn most of their salary from non-19900 funds, increases to retirement and compensation benefits that result from an adjustment to the scales that are equivalent to state-funded faculty.
- Providing parity allotments for productive faculty who have not advanced as quickly or been able to use outside offers as a tool to accelerate their rank and step.

Incorporating Diversity into the Academic Personnel Review Process. CAP met with Professor Douglas Haynes, Director of the UCI ADVANCE Program, to discuss incorporation of diversity into academic review process. This is already mandated in the APM 210, and it was agreed that the AP10 form (Addendum to the Biography) should be modified to encourage candidates to report their activities in promoting diversity in research, teaching and service. Modifications to the AP10 form were implemented, and should be used in the coming year's personnel actions.

CAP Vice-Chair Venkatesh also served as CAP's representative on the Senate Committee on Diversity. With input from this committee, the CAP FAQs now include an entry on incorporating diversity into dossiers.

Other Business. CAP endorsed the final versions of modifications to APM220-18b on evaluation criteria for Professors Step VI and Above Scale, and APM 620 regarding rules and criteria for off-scale salaries. CAP expressed serious concerns about a UCAP proposal to stratify salaries to different disciplines which was among several policy recommendations for UC faculty compensation. The CAP Chair, as a member of the Senate Cabinet, represented CAP's responses to other Council's and committees' requests for opinions, and introduced CAP's own decisions and views on business originating from CAP.

CAP provided input to the 5-year review of one Dean and of 7 department chairs. It endorsed departmentalization for the Department of Women's Studies, and of the departments of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Epidemiology in the Program in Public Health.

In response to a recommendation from the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, CAP modified the criteria for membership in its bylaws to clarify that associate deans or other administrators who are involved in the personnel review process are ineligible to serve on CAP.

IV. Major Discussion Issues

Evaluation of Deans' Delegated Actions. Delegation to the Deans of ordinary merits as described above was carried out for a four year trial period, after which review by an outside body is mandated. The trial period is now completed, and CAP will work with the Office of Academic Personnel to provide information about the delegated reviews. As described above, there has generally been strong agreement between the prior dean-delegated actions in CAP's subsequent reviews. Delegation of these actions has significantly modulated CAP's workload, as evident from Table 3 (years 2002-2003 vs. 2003-2004).

Election of CAP members/compensation and course relief. 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 willing to run. Consequently only one candidate was nominated from some schools in the past election. CAP met with the chair and chair-elect of the Committee on Committees, and the chair and chair-elect of the Senate to discuss this problem. Two issues and solutions were identified. First, it was agreed that COC should put identifying CAP candidates at the top of its agenda, and recruiting (with assistance from CAP members) should begin early during the academic year. Second, a significant barrier to CAP service was identified – the heavy workload. CAP members indicated that they found CAP service very rewarding, but that it was extremely time-consuming and current levels of teaching relief in some cases (one course per year) are not adequate for individuals from schools with heavy teaching loads. CAP is grateful to the chair and chair-elect of the Senate for working together with the EVCP to provide increased course relief for this coming year's and future CAPs.

The difficulty in identifying faculty willing to run for CAP refocused attention on the fact that UCI is the only campus with an elected CAP. Some members felt that it might be easier to recruit strong CAP members if they were appointed. In the future, if COC continues to experience difficulty in fielding slates with two strong candidates from each school, it may be desirable to reconsider appointment of CAP members. As it is, a significant percentage of current CAP members are appointed, filling out terms of elected CAP members who left CAP before their terms ended.

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. The criteria for appointment and advancement in these fields may be distinct, and CAP members discussed methods for educating themselves. For instance, consultation with faculty from sister UC institutions that have those programs would be very helpful. As the workload increases, it may be desirable to add a CAP member(s) from those schools, which would require a change in the CAP bylaws.

Digital storage and access to files. A longterm goal is to have CAP dossiers available for review electronically through secure connections. This would greatly facilitate review of files by CAP members, who must now review all of the files in the CAP office. As a first step towards this, the Office of Academic Personnel is launching a pilot program to store information on faculty (e.g. CVs, publication lists, grant information) in a standardized format. These files could be used to generate various documents or reports (e.g. biosketches for grants) automatically, including biographies and addenda in standard formats. CAP reviewed the proposed fields of data to be captured and provided input as to the information that would be important for personnel reviews.

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 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, 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. All CAP members would like to especially thank the Vice-Chair Alladi Venkatesh for his enduring an unprecedented fourth consecutive year of service and catering the weekly meetings! 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 Tracy Calvert for organizing and setting the assignments and agendas for each meeting.

2006-07 CAP
TABLES 1A-1D: FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE

TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES

CAP Recommendation				Total	Acceleration
Agree	Disagree	Modify	Pending		
485	53	54	12	604	94

TABLE 1A. APPOINTMENTS

	CAP Recommendation				Total	Acceleration
	Agree	Disagree	Modify	Pending		
Assistant Professor	10	0	0	0	10	n/a
Associate Professor	15	0	4	2	21	n/a
Professor	13	0	4	2	19	n/a
Dean's Delegated (Asst. Professors only)	51	0	11	0	62	n/a
Senior/Lecturer SOE	5	0	0	0	5	n/a
Non-Senate Appointment	7	1	3	2	13	n/a
Change of Series/Merit	3	1	0	0	4	n/a
Non-Senate Change of Series/Merit/Promotion	2	1	1	0	4	n/a
Total	106	3	23	6	138	0
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					77%	
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					93%	

TABLE 1B. PROMOTIONS

	Agree	Disagree	Modify	Pending	Total	Acceleration
Associate Professor	35	7	9	1	52	14
Professor	20	4	2	2	28	12
Advancement to Professor VI	12	2	5	1	20	12
Advancement to Above Scale	6	0	0	0	6	1
Sr. Lecturer SOE	2	0	0	0	2	0
Non-Senate Promotion	5	3	1	0	9	2
Total	80	16	17	4	117	41
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					68%	
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					83%	

TABLE 1C. MERIT INCREASES

	Agree	Disagree	Modify	Pending	Total	Acceleration
Assistant Professor (34 paired with MCA*)	41	2	4	0	47	6
Associate Professor	28	2	1	1	32	7
Professor	55	12	8	1	76	35
Above Scale	8	2	0	0	10	3
Dean's Delegated (CAP review of past actions)	92	1	0	0	93	n/a
Lecturer SOE	1	0	0	0	1	0
Non-Senate Merit Increases (2 paired w/MCA*)	11	3	0	0	14	1
Non-Senate Dean's Delegated	1	0	0	0	1	n/a
Excellence Review, Merit Increase	18	0	0	0	18	n/a
Performance Review (Lecturer)	0	0	1	0	1	n/a
Lecturer, Continuing	18	0	0	0	18	n/a
Total	273	22	14	2	311	52
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					88%	
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					92%	

TABLE 1D. MISCELLANEOUS

	Agree	Disagree	Modify	Pending	Total	Acceleration
Fifth-Year Review	2	2	0	0	4	n/a
Non-Senate Fifth-Year Review	1	0	0	0	1	n/a
Career Equity Review	1	1	0	0	2	1
No Action (Assoc. Professor & Professor)	12	2	0	0	14	n/a
Postponement of Tenure Review	6	5	0	0	11	n/a
Reappointment (2 paired with MCA*)	2	0	0	0	2	n/a
Non-Reappointment	1	0	0	0	1	n/a
Non-Senate Reappointment	1	2	0	0	3	n/a
Total	26	12	0	0	38	1
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					68%	
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					68%	

**Of the 38 mid-career appraisals (MCA) reviewed, CAP agreed with the departmental recommendation 21 times and disagreed 17 times.*

**CAP TABLE 2:
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON DEPARTMENTAL PROPOSALS
2006-2007**

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	% proposed
Arts	34	27	3	0	3	1	91%	82%	7	21%
Biological Sciences	62	53	4	4	1	0	94%	85%	9	15%
Business	18	16	2	0	0	0	89%	89%	1	6%
Education	15	6	1	2	4	2	92%	46%	1	7%
Engineering	53	38	11	2	2	0	79%	72%	15	28%
Health Sciences	147	111	18	5	9	4	87%	78%	18	12%
Humanities	96	87	3	3	1	2	97%	93%	6	6%
ICS	32	27	1	1	2	1	97%	87%	5	16%
Physical Sciences	69	61	4	1	2	1	94%	90%	14	20%
Social Ecology	22	17	0	4	1	0	100%	77%	5	23%
Social Sciences	73	57	9	2	4	1	88%	79%	13	18%
Misc.*	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%
Totals**	622	501	56	24	29	12	91%	82%	94	15%

* 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 2001-2007**

Action	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	5 yr mean		Difference
							2001-2006	n/a	
Total cases	564	554	374*	442	487**	604	n/a		n/a

Agree									
Appointment	78%	70%	81%	70%	72%	77%	74%		3%
Promotion	64%	55%	62%	53%	66%	68%	60%		8%
Merit	85%	84%	70%	80%	81%	88%	80%		8%
Miscellaneous	90%	86%	77%	79%	81%	68%	83%		-15%
Agree or Modification									
Appoint. +/-	93%	93%	93%	97%	89%	93%	93%		0%
Promotion +/-	88%	88%	89%	74%	83%	83%	84%		-1%
Merit +/-	88%	87%	79%	84%	85%	92%	85%		7%
Miscellaneous +/-	90%	91%	90%	89%	83%	68%	89%		-21%

*starting in 2003-04 some merit increase were delegated to the Deans

**starting in 2005-06 CAP post-audits prior Dean's Delegated merits