

Council on Academic Personnel
Annual Report
AY 2015-2016

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 2015-2016.

I. Membership

The continuing faculty members serving this year on CAP were Professors Charles Glabe (Biological Sciences), David Redmiles (Information & Computer Sciences), Miles Coolidge (Art), Bryant Garth (Law), Jone Pearce (Business), Don Forthal (Medicine, Clinical Sciences), Alice Silverberg (Physical Sciences), Rajagopalan Radhakrishnan (Humanities), and Virginia Richards (Social Sciences). New members were Professors Derek Dunn-Rankin (Engineering), Fred Ehlert (Medicine, Basic Sciences), Lisa Grant Ludwig (At Large member, Public Health), and Peter Ditto (Social Ecology). Professor Redmiles served as CAP Chair, and Professor Richards served as Vice Chair and representative to the University-wide Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). Cecilia Gonzalez was CAP analyst until May 2016, Thao Nguyen was the Interim CAP Analyst from June to August 2016, and Office Manager Rachel Mangold provided CAP 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 (updated 2012), <http://senate.uci.edu/committees/councils/council-on-academic-personnel-cap/>.

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 for Academic Personnel, or an academic Dean.

CAP's review protocol. CAP had 35 scheduled meetings in academic year 2015-16 (from September 24, 2015 to July 28, 2016), with bimonthly meetings in Fall Quarter and weekly

meetings thereafter. Confidentiality, fairness and consistency are central tenets of CAP deliberations, and all members rigorously uphold these principles. CAP established a quorum of a minimum of 8 members for all cases. Each member present, including the Chair, votes on all cases; 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, advancements 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, the goal is to consider all relevant aspects of the case and discussion continues until members are satisfied that has happened. 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, and, 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, Fifth Year reviews, and Excellence 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. The subcommittee also reviews Tentative Decisions to review for new or significant information. 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. Honorary Reviews, Post-audits of Dean Delegated appointments at Assistant Professor, Steps I – III, are also reviewed by subcommittee and put on the consent agenda unless a fuller discussion is needed.

CAP forwards its recommendations 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 disagrees 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 when at least one level of review recommends against tenure/promotion or if CAP judges that additional expertise would be necessary for a proper assessment of a file under review. Reports of outside *ad hoc* committees are considered by CAP before a final vote and recommendation. In 2015-16 one outside *ad hoc* committee was convened.

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 for further clarification of CAP's reasoning.

While service on CAP is time-consuming, members feel that it is some of 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

Communication with the faculty. CAP considers communication with faculty, departments and Deans about the academic review process to be an important part of its mission. The Vice Provost and the CAP Chair held a workshop for department chairs and personnel administrators in October and a breakfast meeting for junior faculty in May.

Case load and outcome of personnel actions (Tables 1-3). CAP reviewed 529 cases in 2015-16, compared to 542 in 2014-15, 488 in 2013-14, 461 in 2012-13, 483 in 2011-12 and 473 in 2010-11. Table 1 provides data on decisions by the type of action; Table 2 gives aggregate decisions by schools; Table 3 compares CAP's decisions this year with those of the past five years; and Table 4 gives aggregate decisions by departments.

The overall rates of agreement between CAP and the original departmental recommendations (see Table 2) ranged from 75-100% in 2015-16, compared to 79-100% in 2014-15, 84-100% in 2013-14 and 78-100% in 2012-13. When modify-up and modify-down are included, the rates of agreement increase to 83-100% for 2015-16. 50 files are still under review by the Administration (as of August 30, 2016) and CAP had 15 files on which they met, but had not made a decision on as of July 30, 2016. As stated above, decisions by CAP are advisory to the Chancellor and EVCP, who make the final decisions. 11 of these final decisions differed from CAP's recommendations; the CAP vote was close in all of these cases. 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 2015-16, CAP reviewed and agreed with three requests for postponement of the tenure review from the 6th to the 7th 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 Appraisal or the last review resulted in No Action.

Mid-Career Appraisals (MCAs) of Assistant Professors during their 4th year are key evaluations by units. These appraisals provide candid guidance and recommendations to the candidate pertaining to future tenure review, identifying tenure prospects as "Positive," "Provisional Positive," "Guarded," or "Negative." Of the 28 MCAs reviewed in 2015-16, CAP agreed with the department 23 times and disagreed 5 times (82% agreement). This compares to CAP coming to a different conclusion from a department MCA 44% in 2014-15, 69% in 2013-14, 67% in

2012-13, and 46% in 2011-12. CAP's evaluations of a candidate's tenure prospects tend to be more cautious than the department's, especially as it pertains to work that is yet-to-be created.

Electronic routing and review of files. This year, CAP reviewed 157 files that were prepared using *AP Review*, as compared to 135 files in 2014-15, 103 files in 2013-14, 35 files in 2012-13 and 5 files in 2011-12. 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 built-in systems to help ensure compliance with UC personnel policies.

Post-audits and streamlining the review process. 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 former CAP members who have served during the previous three years. The RCAP reviewed five 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 two Deans and two Department Chairs/Program Directors.

IV. Major Discussion Issues

SENATE REQUESTS FOR COMMENT

CAP discussed and returned comments to the Senate regarding the following:

Systemwide Senate Review-Guiding Principles: Search Waivers for Academic Appointees at the University of California.

Regarding the overall concerns, some committee members commented that this is a significant relaxation of policy with an understanding that the previous policy was not to grant search waivers. CAP's general goal is to maintain quality, equity, and fairness across campus. In general, waivers imply a relaxation of requirements on a search, which potentially can affect quality, equity, and fairness, i.e. in phases before cases reach CAP. CAP recommends that other levels of review consider the above ideals as they continue to refine the guidelines and, with respect to the current form, that UCI adopt a stricter stance (than currently being proposed systemwide).

College Textbooks

CAP found it challenging to address a charge that implied that faculty would not produce textbooks since part of a faculty member's teaching responsibility is to decide and choose materials that from their experience, research, and training are most useful to the students. Others noted that policies existed in certain disciplines, such as mathematics, where a committee decided upon textbooks for a department's courses. Some CAP members had the impression that some professional societies might also have policies. In the end, lacking a specific policy to comment on and believing that faculty in general – not just faculty in the lecturer series – need to develop and use materials for class, CAP had no comment at this time.

Proposal to Advance the Program in Nursing Science to the Sue and Bill Gross School of Nursing

The following issues were discussed as part of CAP's review of the proposal:

1. Members discussed how the school might be represented on CAP: Currently, CAP has an At Large member representing the four programs of Education, Nursing Science, Pharmaceutical Science, and Public Health. This is a wide scope. It might be necessary to have a second At Large member to split the responsibilities. A related issue of scope that CAP discussed is that many schools have grown to have a wide range of diverse disciplines. The idea of multiple CAPs was discussed to deal with the growing workload of reviewing personnel and to adequately represent diversity of disciplines.
2. Members discussed concerns about the proposal's growth plans and whether the current program had an academic profile sufficient to recruit the faculty anticipated in the plan.
3. Members discussed the size of CAP, anticipated campus growth, and the implications for CAP's operations. In relation to this discussion, members discussed how presentations and discussions of cases could be further optimized so that greater numbers of cases could be discussed with the current number of representatives.

Revisions to APM 278 - Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series

CAP found the revised language, designed to strengthen and refine criteria for appointment and advancement depending on the type of academic clinician, to be appropriate.

Department and Chair Letters used in the Personnel Review Process

In response to a request from the Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity and Academic Freedom (CFW), CAP considered the general issue of "Department and Chair Letters Used in the Personnel Review Process." CAP addressed four concerns raised by CFW:

1. CAP agrees that there should not be double representation/voting in the review process: the Chair should limit their participation to one level of review. The Chair can choose to sign for the department or *ad hoc* committee but should be explicit that he/she is transmitting the letter and is not the author of the letter.
2. The Faculty Handbook in Part II.A.7 p. 20 describes the current procedure. It states that when new information is added to a file, the candidate will "be asked to sign a form, the Certification Statement for Additional Information Added to Academic Review, (UCI-AP-50A) to indicate that you [the candidate] have received the information added to your file." CAP will remind AP of this requirement and ask that dossiers be checked for this component. To provide an additional level of review, CAP's members will be reminded

of this requirement and ensure it has been met. CAP will also explore if AP might be able to implement a mechanism to notify candidates directly when additional information is requested for a file.

3. External letter guidelines developed by CAP in consultation with AP and the Vice Provost, are distributed by AP to the schools. These guidelines address the number and kinds of letters required for various appointments, advancements, and promotions. (<http://ap.uci.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/ExternalLetterGuidelines.pdf>.)
4. If a faculty member has concerns about the review process, he or she should consider the options described in the Faculty Handbook. In general, the Faculty Handbook provides information valuable to a candidate undergoing personnel review.

VICE PROVOST OF ACADEMIC PERSONNEL'S REQUESTS FOR COMMENT

CAP discussed/returned comments to the Vice Provost regarding the following:

Above Scale Merits

CAP reviewed the proposed changes to language on UCI APP Above Scale Merits. The issue is that departments do not understand the criteria and do not know how to make a case for Above Scale merits. The APM states that continued good service is not an adequate justification, yet departments often state that continued service or continued performance is their reason for a candidate deserving a merit.

Collaborative Scholarship Evaluation, (Team Science Collaborative Index)

CAP's general suggestion is to use existing elements of personnel cases, such as personal statements, department letters, among others, as vehicles for clarifying an individual's contribution to a team effort. However, some of the ideas in the proposed Index could be formulated into examples or guidelines to support candidates and schools composing better personnel cases, especially when collaboration is the key approach to an individual's research. In general, CAP recognizes that collaborations are an essential and valued approach to research and, for some problems, perhaps the only way.

No Change decisions

CAP made a recommendation to the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel to revise the APP language to consider a performance "satisfactory" when consecutive "no changes," with no advancement in step, does not result in a remediation plan.

Secondary evidence of teaching

Campus procedures now require secondary evidence of teaching excellence.

Labels for Mid-Career Appraisals

In response to the campus's difficulty with use of the label "Cautionary", CAP proposed four labels for mid-career appraisals: Positive – Provisional Positive – Guarded – Negative. Guarded replaces Cautionary and is used when the candidate shows evidence of promise for tenure but there are some areas of the file that could be strengthened.

Distinctions Committee

CAP continues to review honorary actions instead of delegating them to the Distinctions Committee.

Rationale for Requesting 5-7 Analytical/Evaluative Letters

To maintain quality, equity, and fairness across campus CAP, in consultation with AP, sets guidelines for the number and kinds of letters from external referees for different types of actions.

V. University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP)

Vice Chair Virginia M. Richards supported the Chair in normal CAP activities and also represented the Irvine campus at the systemwide University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). UCAP had three meetings during the 2015-16 academic year to conduct business with respect to its duties. As outlined in *Senate Bylaw 135* UCAP considers general policy on academic personnel, including salary scales, appointments and promotions, and all related matters. The issues that UCAP considered this year (see [UCAP Annual Report](#) for more information) are described briefly below:

Faculty Exit Survey

The systemwide Faculty Exit Survey, developed in consultation with UCAP and in partnership with COACHE at Harvard, was piloted at UCLA, UCSD, UCB, UCI, UCR, and UCSB in April 2016. The Survey for the 2014-15 academic year applied to all ladder rank faculty who left UC as well as faculty identified by the campuses as retention cases to serve as a comparison group. The return rate was over 65%. A June 28, 2016 roundtable seminar at UCI discussed the partial results, the general idea of conducting the surveys, and how the results can assist with faculty retention and recruitment. Academic Personnel will join UCAP's Fall 2017 meeting to review results of the Survey.

LSOE Policy Workgroup

LSOE titles (LSOE, Potential, and Senior) were being considered to be renamed Teaching Professors or Professors of Teaching. The proposed title is to provide tenure to good teachers. The LSOE's job is to teach and to research pedagogical and technological issues within teaching. Campuses have very different approaches to the LSOE title. UCLA has fewer than ten and UCI has over a hundred. There was concern that there might be two cultures at UC if the proposal moves forward. Also under consideration were LSOE voting rights and privileges and whether they should be hired directly or appointed from current LSOE who should continue to teach for UC. The policy workgroup is preparing a first draft of APM 285 – LSOE Series and APM 210.3 – Instructions to Review Committees which Advise on Actions Concerning the Lecturer with Security of Employment Series. The formal systemwide review process will begin in the Fall with participation from UCAP.

2015-16 Discretionary Salary Program

The program's discretionary funding were primarily used to address equity issues, although that was not its original purpose. The plan was less robust for Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP) faculty because it did not fit well for how salary and reviews occur for these personnel. The 2016-17 Salary Program will have two key parts: an adjustment to the scales and a discretionary program. Campuses are in active discussion of future implementation.

Other Issues and Additional Business. I

In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, UCAP submitted views on the following:

- Proposed Revisions to APM 360 – Librarian Series
- Proposed Revisions to APM 278 – Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series

Less formally, UCAP considered/discussed various items, including

- Efforts to streamline the transfer of units for students transferring from community colleges (transfer pathway)
- Potential credit for on-line courses and life experiences
- Potential changes in the governance of UC Medical Centers
- The history of Step VI as a barrier step
- Potential changes regarding disciplinary processes associated with harassment
- Change in the wording of the APM language for Health Science Clinical Professors
- Concerns with errors faculty are making in terms of service, invited talks, etc. UCAP will develop additional language for to clarify various categories.
- Concerns regarding the UC Audit released in 2016
- Updates on cyber security

Campus Reports. UCAP devoted part of each regular meeting to discussion of issues facing local committees and comparison of individual campus practices.

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 Frequently Asked Questions (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.

Respectfully submitted,

David Redmiles, Donald Bren School of Information & Computer Sciences, Chair

Virginia Richards, School of Social Sciences, Vice Chair

Derek Dunn-Rankin, Henry Samueli School of Engineering

Lisa Grant Ludwig, member at large, Public Health

Peter Ditto, School of Social Ecology

Fred Ehler, School of Medicine– Basic Sciences

Miles Coolidge, Claire Trevor School of the Arts

Charles Glabe, Francisco Ayala School of Biological Sciences

Bryant Garth, School of Law

Jone Pearce, Paul Merage School of Business

Donald Forthal, School of Medicine – Clinical Sciences

Alice Silverberg, School of Physical Sciences

Rajagopalan Radhakrishnan, School of Humanities

APPENDICES

Tables 1A - 1D: Final Recommendations by Action Type

Table 2: Final CAP Recommendations on Departmental Proposals and agreement level
by School

Table 3: CAP's Agreement with Departmental Recommendations, 2010-2015

2015-16 CAP ANNUAL REPORT

TABLES 1A-1D: FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE

TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	CAP Recommendation				Total	Accelerated
	Agree	Disagree	Modify	Pending		
	431	32	51	15		

TABLE 1A. APPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				Total	Accelerated
	Agree	Disagree	Modify	Pending		
Dean Delegated Appts. (Asst. Prof. I, II, and III; inc. In Residence and Acting Prof. of Law) Post-Audit	51	0	0	0	51	0
Assistant Professor (Steps IV, V, VI) incl 1 Asst Res and 2 asst prof in Res	11	0	1	0	12	0
Associate Professor (inc. Clin X & In Res series)	16	0	1	1	18	0
Professor (inc. Prof. of Law, Clin X & 1 In Res series)	21	1	6	1	29	0
Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer PSOE & SOE	8	0	0	0	8	0
Change of Series (1 paired w/ appt honorary title)	7	1	0	0	8	0
Non-Senate Appointment	4	0	0	0	4	0
Appontment of Honorary Title	21	2	0	0	23	0
Total	139	4	8	2	153	0
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					91%	
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					96%	

TABLE 1B. PROMOTIONS	Agree	Disagree	Modify	Pending	Total	Accelerated
Associate Professor (Promo to Tenure)	25	1	7	0	33	20
Professor (inc. 2 Prof Clin X & 2 In Res)	22	5	6	8	41	17
Advancement to Professor VI	12	2	0	2	16	6
Advancement to Professor Above Scale	4	0	1	0	5	2
Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer SOE	6	1	0	0	7	0
Non-Senate Promotion	1	0	0	0	1	0
Excellence Review w/ Merit Increase	11	0	0	0	11	0
Total	81	9	14	10	114	45
% CAP Agreed with Proposal	71%					
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal	83%					

2015-16 CAP ANNUAL REPORT
TABLES 1A-1D: FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE

TABLE 1C. MERIT INCREASES*

	Agree	Disagree	Modify	Pending	Total	Accelerated
Assistant Professor (includes Merits with MCA, Clin X & In Res) (18 MCA= Agree 0 MCA=Disagree)	29	0	3	0	32	8
Associate Professor (inc. Clin X & In Res)	44	4	7	0	55	10
Professor (inc. Prof. of Law, 3 Clin X & 2 In Res)	51	7	14	1	73	41
Professor Above Scale	15	5	0	0	20	5
Dean Delegated Merits - Post-Audit*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer PSOE & SOE	3	0	0	0	3	0
Non-Senate Merit Increases	1	0	0	0	1	0
Lecturer, Continuing	34	1	0	0	35	0
Total	177	17	24	1	219	64
% CAP Agreed with Proposal	81%					
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal	92%					

TABLE 1D. OTHER ACTIONS

	Agree	Disagree	Modify	Pending	Total	Accelerated
Review for Honorary Titles	1	0	0	0	1	0
Non-Reappointment	3	0	0	0	3	0
Reappointment (inc. Clin X & In Res)	3	0	0	0	3	0
Reappointment, MCA	1	0	1	0	2	0
MCA	1	0	0	0	1	0
No Action (No Change) (Assoc. Professor & Professor)	8	1	1	1	11	0
Fifth Year Review	13	1	1	0	15	0
Career Equity Review	1	0	2	1	4	0
Postponement of Tenure Review	3	0	0	0	3	0
Change of Series (incl. non senate)	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	34	2	5	2	43	1
% CAP Agreed with Proposal	79%					
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal	91%					

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

** 6 split appts in same dept and action

2015-16 CAP ANNUAL REPORT

TABLE 2: 2015-16 Annual Report By Schools

TABLE 2 AND TABLE 3

School	Number prop.	CAP Agree	CAP Disagree	CAP Mod up/Down	CAP Pending	% CAP agreed w/ dept. or mod up or down	% CAP agreed with dept. w/o mod	Final Agree	Final Disagree	Final Mod Up/Down	Final Pending	Accelerated	% Final decision w/mod	% Final decision w/o mod
BREN SCHOOL OF ICS	27	21	3	3	0	89%	78%	21	2	2	2	11	85%	78%
CLAIRE TREVOR SCHOOL OF THE ARTS	37	28	2	5	2	89%	76%	29	1	3	4	11	86%	78%
COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES	13	12	0	1	0	100%	92%	12	0	1	0	3	100%	92%
FRANCISCO J. AYALA SCHOOL OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	28	25	0	3	0	100%	89%	25	0	3	0	5	100%	89%
OFFICE OF RESEARCH	2	2	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	1	0	50%	50%
PAUL MERAGE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS	25	25	0	0	0	100%	100%	24	0	0	1	0	96%	96%
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION	19	15	0	4	0	100%	79%	14	0	2	3	4	84%	74%
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES	72	58	8	2	4	83%	81%	56	3	0	13	10	78%	78%
SCHOOL OF LAW	17	15	0	2	0	100%	88%	15	0	2	0	0	100%	88%
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE (BASIC SCIENCE)	21	18	1	2	0	95%	86%	18	1	1	1	3	90%	86%
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE (CLINICAL SCIENCE)	63	49	8	4	2	84%	78%	49	3	1	10	9	79%	78%
SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL SCIENCES	64	51	1	8	4	92%	80%	50	1	3	10	22	83%	78%
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL ECOLOGY	36	29	1	6	0	97%	81%	29	0	6	1	12	97%	81%
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES	65	53	4	5	3	89%	82%	54	3	5	3	14	91%	83%
THE HENRY SAMUELI SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING	40	30	5	5	0	88%	75%	32	3	4	1	6	90%	80%
Totals	529	431	33	50	15	91%	81%	429	17	33	50	110	87%	81%

**2015-16 CAP ANNUAL REPORT
TABLE 2 AND TABLE 3**

TABLE 3: CAP'S AGREEMENT WITH DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS 2011-2016

5 yr
mean

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16		
Total cases	483	461	488	542	529		501
Agree							
Appointments	90%	80%	80%	88%	91%		85.5%
Promotions	81%	83%	72%	82%	71%		77.8%
Merits	92%	92%	84%	90%	81%		87.8%
Other Actions	85%	74%	84%	92%	79%		82.8%
Agree or Modification							
Appts. +/-	98%	96%	90%	92%	96%		94.4%
Promotions +/-	93%	92%	88%	89%	83%		89.0%
Merits +/-	92%	94%	89%	93%	92%		92.0%
Other Actions +/-	91%	81%	94%	92%	91%		89.8%