

**Council on Academic Personnel**  
**Annual Report**  
**AY 2011-12**

**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 2011-12.

**I. Membership**

The faculty members serving this year on CAP were, as continuing members, Professors Stephen Bondy (Health Sciences, Basic Sciences), Sanjeev Dewan (Business), J. Lawrence Marsh (Biological Sciences), Farghalli A. Mohamed (Engineering), Henry Pontell (Social Ecology), Amelia Regan (Information and Computer Sciences), and Alan Terricciano (Arts). New members were Professors David Brownstone (Social Sciences), Brook Thomas (Humanities), Frederic Wan (Physical Sciences) and Ping Wang (Health Sciences, Clinical Sciences). Professor Charles Glabe (Biological Sciences) served in Winter, Spring, and Summer 2012 while Professor Marsh was on sabbatical leave. Professor Pontell served as CAP chair, and Professor Terricciano served as 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 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/FAQ.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 2011-12 (from September 22, 2011 to July 26, 2012), 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 present, 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 report 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 report transmitted to the Office of Academic Personnel.

“Consentable/Subcommittee” cases are read by two members and the chair. Eligible cases are normal merit increases, first 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 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, Steps 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 against tenure/promotion 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 2011-12, seven outside *ad hoc* committees were convened, including four that were 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 meet with CAP prior to the final decision to discuss cases in which they intend to overrule CAP’s recommendation, or where they wish 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 Vice Provost and the CAP Chair held a workshop for department chairs and administrators at the start of the year. The CAP Chair also made a presentation at a breakfast meeting for assistant professors in May; at a School Visit with the School of Law Dean, Associate Dean, and selected faculty in October 2011; and also met with the equity advisors, Chairs and Dean in Social Ecology. The CAP Vice Chair attended the UC-wide ADVANCE Roundtable on April 11, 2012, held at UC Berkeley.

*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 483 cases in 2011-12 (see Tables 1 and 3), compared to 473 cases in 2010-11, and 393 cases in 2009-10. 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 82-100% in 2011-12, compared to 76-94% in 2010-11. When modify-up and modify-down are included, the rates of agreement increase to 86-100%, about the same as in 2010-11. Five files are still under review by the Administration and additional information requested by CAP for nine files had not been received by CAP's last meeting in July. Decisions by CAP are advisory to the Chancellor and EVCP, who make the final decisions. Seven of the final decisions (recorded as of August 31, 2012) differed from CAP's recommendations; in almost all of these cases, the CAP vote was close. In addition, CAP sent comments on five Dean Delegated Appointments. Before making a final decision, the EVCP and/or the Vice Provost met in person with CAP to discuss cases in which there was potential disagreement with CAP.

In 2011-12, CAP reviewed and agreed with four requests for postponement of the tenure review from the 6<sup>th</sup> to the 7<sup>th</sup> year (Table 1D). Some 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 by units and CAP of assistant professors during their 4<sup>th</sup> 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 40 MCAs reviewed in 2011-12, CAP agreed with the department 21 times and disagreed 19 times (45.5% of the time). This compares to CAP coming to a different conclusion from a department MCA 35% of the time in 2010-11 and 43% of the time in 2009-10. CAP’s evaluations of a candidate’s tenure prospects are frequently not as glowing as the department’s.

*Electronic routing and review of files.* CAP reviewed five files that were prepared using *AP Review*. Developed by the UCI offices of Academic Personnel and Information Technology in partnership with UCSD, *AP Review* provides online routing and review of personnel files, with systems built in to help ensure compliance with UC personnel policies. Overall, CAP members had positive reactions to the program.

*Post-audits and streamlining the review process.* In AY 2005-06, CAP agreed to Dean Delegated Appointments, thereby waiving its review prior to the appointment of Assistant Professor, Steps I – III. In 2009-10, responding to recommendations from the campus Task Force on Efficiencies in Academic Personnel Reviews, CAP agreed to waive its authority to review: (1) normal merits between Professor, Step I and Step III; and (2) all actions in the Adjunct Professor series. CAP continues to post-audit Dean Delegated Appointments; Dean Delegated Merits of full Professors prior to Step IV; and major actions in the Adjunct Professor series. 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](#)” consisting of former CAP members, evaluates dossiers of current and two-years past CAP members. The RCAP reviewed seven cases this year.

*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 research, teaching, and/or service that promote diversity. This information is reviewed by CAP members in their assessment of the proposed action.

*Reviews of chairs, deans, and proposals for new departments and schools.* CAP provided input to the 5-year reviews of twelve department Chairs and one Dean. CAP also provided comments on the proposal to establish the UC Irvine School of Education.

#### **IV. Major Discussion Issues**

*Procedures in the UCI School of Law.* CAP continued to work with the Law School administration and faculty on voting procedures for new appointments and other personnel actions, consistent with Senate Bylaws, the APM, and UCI Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures.

*Salary issues.* Effective July 1, 2011, the Irvine campus reinstated the UC Irvine Merit Scales to help address the lag between the University-wide faculty salary scales and average salaries of comparison universities. The Irvine scales are calculated from the average salaries of all regular rank faculty at the same rank and step (with outliers excluded), rounded to the nearest \$100, and

then smoothed to provide appropriate increases at each level. Salaries for newly hired faculty are negotiated, but may not fall below the Irvine scales. Ladder rank, academic year faculty who are awarded a promotion or merit increase at the Associate or Full Professor rank are eligible for the Irvine scale if they are currently on-scale or if their off-scale salary is below the Irvine scale. Effective July 1, 2012, for Ladder rank faculty who receive a promotion or merit increase and whose current off-scale salary is above the UC Irvine Merit Scale for his/her new step, the new standard process for calculating off-scale salaries will be 100 percent of the step increment for on-scale salaries, on the UC system-wide scale, for the action in question.

Following the reintroduction of the Irvine scales, which reflect market and range of salaries within schools, CAP voted to discontinue the salary analysis started in February 2010 and annual reporting of “CAP Assessments of File Strength in Relationship to Salary.” CAP continues to comment occasionally on salary requests in the files.

CAP also commented on the following University-wide reports: the Faculty Salaries Task Force Report; the Faculty Diversity Working Group Report; and the Report on Salary Equity.

*Election of CAP members.* Irvine is the only UC campus that elects its CAP members. In 2011-12, working from the principle articulated in 2010 that every tenured ladder rank member of the Senate should be eligible for service on CAP, the Divisional Assembly revised Bylaw 48 to expand CAP membership. One member from the School of Law and an at-large member from the grouping of smaller units will be added.

*Senior/Lecturer P/SOE series.* With several new appointments and increased use of this series across campus, CAP applied the criteria in APM-285 and APM-210: In addition to effective teaching, appointees in this series need to demonstrate some degree of professional recognition and competence. For promotion, the professional activities for a Lecturer SOE are analogous to an associate professor, and for a Senior Lecturer SOE are comparable to a full Professor. The markers of professional recognition are broadly defined and vary by discipline and the candidate. Examples include: member of scholarly committees at the national level; national review boards; publication of teaching materials; scholarly publications and conference presentations; etc. It is incumbent on the department to make the case for how the candidate’s record demonstrates more than excellent teaching (otherwise, the more appropriate series might be a Unit 18 lecturer).

*Response to Senate Requests for Comment.* CAP discussed and returned comments to the Senate regarding: (1) several proposed revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual, including a new APM 668, Negotiated Salary Program; (2) the Salary Equity Report; (3) the Faculty Salaries Task Force Report; and (4) the Faculty Diversity Working Group Report.

## **V. University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP)**

Professor Alan Terricciano served as CAP Vice Chair in 2011-12. The Vice Chair supports the Chair in normal CAP activities and also represents the Irvine campus at the system-wide University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). UCAP had four meetings during AY 2011-2012 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in [Senate Bylaw 135](#). UCAP devoted part of each regular meeting to reports about issues facing local committees and

comparison of individual campus practices. (See [UCAP Annual Report](#) for more information.) Some of the key issues that UCAP considered were:

*Proposed revisions to APM-010, APM-015 and APM-016:* These were reviewed in October 2011 during a Management review and in May 2012 during a complete Systemwide review. The proposed changes respond to an Academic Council request to create an explicit protection for faculty freedom to speak on matters of institutional policy following a ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court that permitted public employers to discipline employees for criticizing agency decisions (Garcetti). The proposed change to APM-016 is proposed by the Administration to add an expectation that faculty will comply with University policies to the existing expectation that faculty will comply with rules and regulations. In its response to Council in June, the committee requested clarification from the Office of General Counsel about why it would like to add the phrase “when acting as a member of the faculty” to the APM and indicated that interpretation of this vague phrase could be problematic.

*Proposed revisions to APM-668, the Negotiated Salary Plan:* UCAP submitted a memo to Council expressing the committee’s concerns in October, and the Academic Assembly voted against APM-668 in January. Administration responses to the vote are still under review.

*UC Salary Equity Report:* This comprehensive report, which was prepared by the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity, provides analysis across 72 different units and shows that UC has not made progress in achieving salary equity for women and underrepresented minorities. UCAP noted that there is no mechanism in the CAP or salary structure to correct the inequity. Another issue is the CAPs at some campuses do not look at salary while others do.

In light of the data available, UCAP concluded that UC should look at distributing available resources to campuses to reduce the inequities. UCAP also suggested that a targeted decoupling increment could be used for this class to adjust salaries or that UCOP could provide the chancellors with funds to use at their discretion for equity adjustment. In May, the committee examined data on faculty salaries prepared by Academic Personnel which prompted further discussion about salary inequities within the UC system. In a June letter to Council, UCAP recommended that each campus determine the full extent of its salary inequity problem and propose strategies to correct the inequities.

*Faculty Diversity:* Although not under formal review, UCAP discussed APM 210 as it pertained to the weighing of diversity in Academic review. The majority opinion was that whether or not APM 210 is ultimately modified, faculty who focus on diversity in their academic field should not receive a bonus simply because of their focus. Members also agreed that CAPs have an understanding of what constitutes good or bad research and that awareness and training, such as through equity advisor programs, would benefit the campuses.

The Faculty Diversity Working Group, one of five working groups established under the President’s Campus Climate Task Force, issued its final report in April. UCAP’s feedback about the report was influenced by the issues the committee has raised regarding APM 210. UCAP is committed to diversity and to preserving equity at all levels. While diversity remains a problem

that should be improved, the committee members did not agree with many of the strategies recommended by the Working Group. In its June response to Council, the committee conveyed its belief that the chancellors, executive vice chancellors and deans are best positioned to make a real difference in improving diversity.

*Faculty Salaries Task Force Report:* The task force, of which Chair Lindenberg was a member, devised a five year plan to improve the faculty salary scales although it is not clear where the funds would come from to implement the plan. Most UCAP members agreed that the strategies in the report are a reasonable start to fixing the scales, and there was support for giving campuses flexibility. It is important to fix the scales, especially intercampus differences, but the committee recognizes that one solution will not fix all of the problems. Although UCAP members felt that the plan is a good first step, the committee was concerned that it will fall short and does not resolve salary differences between faculty at UC and the comparison eight institutions. UCAP conveyed its feedback to Council in a March letter.

*Proposed Open Access Policy for UC:* The University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication asked UCAP for informal feedback of a proposed open access policy, and, more specifically, what effect this policy might have on promotion and tenure. UCAP submitted a letter to Council in July expressing support for the proposed policy.

*Changing Venues:* In April, UCAP submitted a letter to Council suggesting the creation of working groups to look at the issue of changing venues and perhaps generate recommendations to address the changes in the context of the faculty review process. One working group should be comprised of faculty in the humanities, arts and social sciences and the second group comprised of science and engineering faculty. UCAP will continue to discuss this issue during AY 2012-13.

*Other issues:* UCAP submitted formal comments to Academic Council on the following:

- Proposed Revisions to APM-200, General; and APM-205, Recall of Academic Employees
- APM 670, Health Sciences Compensation Plan
- UCSD's Proposed Affiliation Agreement with the California Western School of Law
- Proposed new APM 430, Visiting Scholars
- National Association of Scholars "A Crisis of Competence" Report

*UCAP annual survey of local CAP practices:* UCAP considers the survey to be an important resource that helps the committee identify areas in which campus practices might be brought into closer congruence. This year, members agreed that the survey should be conducted every other year. The survey will next be updated in 2014.

## **VI. Conclusion**

The Bylaws of the Irvine Division describe CAP's membership and responsibilities. The Academic Personnel Manual (APM) is a foundational resource for all faculty members and 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, as well as the

UCI campus Academic Personnel Procedures ([APP](#)), to become familiar with relevant policies and procedures. 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 and gravity of the task, 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 members for their hard work, mutual support and warm collegiality. The Chair and all CAP members would especially like to thank analyst Mia Larson for skillfully taking notes, drafting the CAP letters, researching the issues that come 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,

Henry Pontell, School of Social Ecology, Chair

Stephen Bondy, College of Health Sciences-Basic Sciences

David Brownstone, School of Social Sciences

Sanjeev Dewan, Paul Merage School of Business

J. Lawrence Marsh and Charles Glabe, School of Biological Sciences

Farghalli A. Mohamed, Henry Samueli School of Engineering

Amelia Regan, Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Science

Alan Terricciano, Claire Trevor School of the Arts, Vice Chair

Brook Thomas, School of Humanities

Frederic Wan, School of Physical Sciences

Ping Wang, College of Health Sciences-Clinical Sciences

## **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, 2006-2012

**2011-12 CAP ANNUAL REPORT**  
**TABLES 1A-1D: FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

**TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES**

CAP Recommendation				Total	Accelerated
Agree	Disagree	Modify	Pending		
415	31	26	11	483	66

**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	39	1	3	1	44
Assistant Professor (Steps IV, V, VI)	4	0	1	0	5
Associate Professor (inc. Clin X & In Res series)	4	0	1	0	5
Professor (inc. Prof. of Law, Clin X & In Res series)	12	1	2	0	15
Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer PSOE & SOE	14	0	1	0	15
Change of Series (1 paired w/ merit or promotion)	3	0	0	0	3
Non-Senate Appointment (inc. 7 Dean Deleg Appts)	11	0	0	0	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>98</b>
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					90%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					98%

**TABLE 1B. PROMOTIONS**

	Agree	Disagree	Modify	Pending	Total	Accelerated
Associate Professor (includes Clin X & In Res)	30	2	6	2	40	13
Professor (inc. Prof. of Law, Clin X & In Res)	31	3	5	2	41	10
Advancement to Professor VI	15	2	3	2	22	9
Advancement to Professor Above Scale	8	2	1	0	11	4
Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer SOE	2	0	0	0	2	0
Non-Senate Promotion	3	0	0	0	3	0
Excellence Review w/ Merit Increase	16	0	0	1	17	n/a
<b>Total</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>36</b>
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					81%	
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					93%	

**TABLE 1C. MERIT INCREASES\***

	Agree	Disagree	Modify	Pending	Total	Accelerated
Assistant Professor (39 paired w/ MCA**; includes Clin X & In Res)	48	4	0	0	52	2
Associate Professor (inc. Clin X & In Res)	34	8	1	0	43	6
Professor (inc. Prof. of Law, Clin X & In Res)	46	5	0	1	52	20
Professor Above Scale	19	0	0	0	19	2
Dean Delegated Merits - Post-Audit*	5	0	0	0	5	n/a
Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer SOE	2	0	0	0	2	0
Non-Senate Merit Increases	1	0	0	0	1	0
Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer, Continuing	40	0	0	0	40	n/a
<b>Total</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>30</b>
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					92%	
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					92%	

**TABLE 1D. OTHER ACTIONS**

	Agree	Disagree	Modify	Pending	Total	Accelerated
Non-Reappointment	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
Reappointment (1 w/MCA**; inc. Clin X & In Res)	2	0	0	0	2	n/a
No Action (Assoc. Professor & Professor)	15	1	0	1	17	0
Fifth-Year Review	7	0	0	0	7	n/a
Career Equity Review	0	0	2	0	2	n/a
Postponement of Tenure Review	4	0	0	0	4	n/a
Lecturer-Continuing Reappointment w/o merit	0	2	0	1	3	n/a
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					85%	
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					91%	

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

\*\*In 40 mid-career appraisals (MCA), CAP agreed with the department's MCA 21 times and disagreed 19 times.

2011-12 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	% proposed
Arts	37	35	0	0	2	0	100%	95%	10	27%
Biological Sciences	36	32	0	2	2	0	100%	89%	2	6%
Business	17	15	2	0	0	0	88%	88%	0	0%
Education	17	14	2	1	0	0	88%	82%	0	0%
Engineering	43	36	6	0	1	0	86%	84%	8	19%
Health Sciences	17	14	1	2	0	0	94%	82%	0	0%
Humanities	80	73	3	2	1	0	95%	91%	5	6%
ICS	25	21	3	0	1	0	88%	84%	5	20%
Law	10	8	0	0	0	2	100%	100%	0	0%
Medicine	76	59	8	0	5	4	89%	82%	12	16%
Physical Sciences	43	36	4	0	1	2	90%	88%	10	23%
Social Ecology	21	20	1	0	0	0	95%	95%	1	5%
Social Sciences	72	64	3	0	3	2	96%	91%	13	18%
<b>Totals*</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>427</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>13%</b>

\* 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 2005-2011

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10*	2010-11	2011-12	5 yr mean 2006-2011	Difference 2011-12
<b>Total cases</b>	604	645	489	393	473	483	521	-38

<b>Agree</b>								
Appointments	77%	72%	75%	81%	84%	90%	78%	+12
Promotions	68%	71%	72%	73%	82%	81%	73%	+8
Merits	88%	84%	86%	87%	89%	92%	87%	+5
Other Actions	68%	84%	89%	83%	80%	85%	81%	+4
<b>Agree or Modification</b>								
Appts. +/-	93%	90%	97%	93%	98%	98%	94%	+4
Promotions +/-	83%	80%	91%	94%	92%	93%	88%	+5
Merits +/-	92%	91%	90%	94%	91%	92%	92%	0
Other Actions +/-	68%	92%	94%	87%	83%	91%	85%	+6

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