

**Council on Academic Personnel**  
**Annual Report**  
**AY 2018-2019**

**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 2018-2019.

**I. Membership**

The continuing faculty members serving this year on CAP were Professors Bogi Andersen (Medicine, Clinical), Sharon Block (Humanities), Magda El Zarki (Information & Computer Sciences), Robin Keller (Business), Antoinette LaFarge (Arts), and Georg Striedter (Biological Sciences). New members were Professors Alan Barbour (Medicine, Basic Sciences), Joseph DiMento (Law), Valerie Jenness (Social Ecology), Young Kwon (At-Large member, Pharmaceutical Sciences), Michael Lee (Social Sciences), Gudrun Magnúsdóttir (Physical Sciences), Lee Swindlehurst (Engineering). Professor Striedter served as CAP Chair and Professor Block served as Vice Chair and representative to the University-wide Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). Lynn Harris was CAP analyst, and Office Manager Rachel Mangold and Analyst Christine Aguilar 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 most Senate series titles and forwards its recommendations to the Chancellor and Provost. CAP procedures and review criteria are typically communicated through information sessions held in conjunction with the Office of Academic Personnel, and available for consultation through the Frequently Asked Questions document on the Academic Senate website (updated 2017), <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 Provost, the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, or an academic Dean.

*CAP's review protocol.* CAP had 34 scheduled meetings in academic year 2018-19 (from September 20, 2018 to July 25, 2019), with meetings every other week in fall quarter and weekly meetings thereafter. Confidentiality, fairness, and consistency are central tenets of CAP deliberations, and all members rigorously uphold these principles. At its initial meeting in the fall, CAP established a quorum of a minimum of eight members for all cases. Each member

present, including the Chair, votes on all cases; recusals are requested 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 of more than two years and more than one step. Primary, secondary and tertiary readers are assigned in-depth review of each file, and all Council members acquaint themselves with every case up for review. 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. 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 was reviewed, which is then revised by the CAP members. In the report, the vote is conveyed, and in some instances 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, accelerations within the same rank and within one step, first No Change, Fifth Year reviews, Appointments of LPSOE or SLPSOE, and Reappointment without Merit 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 evaluate the presence of new or significant information for all but tenure cases. If one or more subcommittee members judge that a case requires more in-depth consideration, the case is reassigned for full Council discussion at the next meeting. Titles of Distinction are also reviewed by subcommittee and put on the consent agenda unless a fuller discussion is needed.

CAP forwards its recommendations in its 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 Provost 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 unusual 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. Although infrequent, the additional information may change CAP’s recommendation.

Additionally, *ad hoc* committees are convened when at least one level of review recommends against tenure or if CAP judges that additional expertise would be necessary for a thorough assessment of a file under review. Reports of outside *ad hoc* committees are considered by CAP before a final vote and recommendation. In 2018-19, seven outside *ad hoc* committees were convened.

CAP’s deliberations result in recommendations to higher levels of authority, who make the final decisions. The Provost and/or Vice Provost for Academic Personnel generally meet with

CAP prior to the final decision to discuss cases on which they are considering overruling CAP's recommendation, or where they want further clarification of CAP's reasoning.

While service on CAP is time-consuming, and sometimes stressful, members feel that it is some of the most significant and rewarding campus service in which they have participated. During the busy season of January through July, members typically spend about a dozen hours each week reviewing files, participating in the CAP meetings, and writing reports. With the exception of some books or creative production materials, all files and their review content are distributed online, so that CAP members no longer need to visit the physical CAP room to review files.

### **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 deans, department chairs and personnel administrators in September, and a workshop for junior faculty and those in the Lecturer / Potential Security of Employment series in May. In the fall, CAP invited new campus deans individually to discuss the review process for their schools. In total, CAP met with five new deans.

*Case load and outcome of personnel actions* (Tables 1-4). CAP reviewed 380 cases in 2018-19, compared to 443 cases in 2017-18, 486 cases in 2016-17, 529 in 2015-16, and 542 in 2014-15. Because the campus is growing, the reduction in case load is largely due to redelegations of file types back to deans or to other levels of review. 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.

Across schools, the overall rates of agreement between CAP and the original departmental recommendations (see Table 2) ranged from 50-92% in 2018-19, compared to 71-100% in 2017-18, 65-100% in 2016-17, 75-100% in 2015-16, and 79-100% in 2014-15. When modifications to acceleration files, such as recommendations to modify up or down are included in the "agree" category, the rates of agreement increase to 75-100% for 2018-19. As of August 14, 2019, CAP had 5 pending files and 62 files are still under review by the Administration. As stated above, decisions by CAP are advisory to the Chancellor and Provost, who make the final decisions. In total, only about 5% of these final decisions differed from CAP's recommendations. In those cases, the Provost and/or Vice Provost for Academic Personnel generally consulted with CAP prior to making the final decision. In cases where CAP's vote was tied or nearly tied, the Provost and/or Vice Provost for Academic Personnel sometimes consulted only with the CAP Chair, rather than the entire committee.

Mid-Career Appraisals (MCAs) of Assistant Professors, usually during their 4<sup>th</sup> 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,” “Provisionally Positive,” “Guarded,” or “Negative.” Of the 36 MCAs reviewed in 2018-19, the department’s recommendations were frequently positive or provisionally positive, whereas CAP’s recommendations were more equally distributed across Positive, Provisionally Positive and Guarded. Neither the departments nor CAP judged any MCA to be negative.

*Electronic routing and review of files.* This year, CAP reviewed 262 files that were prepared using *AP Review*, as compared to 265 in 2017-18, 247 in 2016-17, 157 files in 2015-16, and 135 files in 2014-15. 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.

*Reserve CAP.* To avoid potential conflicts of interest, a “Reserve CAP,” consisting largely of former CAP members, evaluates dossiers of current and former CAP members who have served during the previous three years. The RCAP reviewed eight cases this year.

*Diversity in the academic personnel review process.* CAP continues to consider how to best promote diversity and inclusive excellence in research, teaching, and/or service, as well as ways to report related activities on the Addendum to the Biography (AP-10 form). This information is reviewed by CAP members and can significantly influence assessments of proposed actions.

*Reviews of Chairs, Deans, and proposals for new Departments and Schools.* CAP provided input to the 5-year reviews of one dean and two department chairs.

*Frequently Asked Questions.* CAP offers a Frequently Asked Questions document that answers common questions about CAP and reflects changes to Academic Personnel policy and CAP procedures. CAP strives for transparency in its criteria and procedures, and it welcomes feedback from faculty and staff on the content. 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. These FAQs have most recently been updated in September 2017, and will be further updated in the next CAP term. <https://senate.uci.edu/files/2014/02/FAQ-updated-September-2017.pdf>

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

##### *SENATE REQUESTS FOR COMMENT*

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

*Recommendations for the Use of Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Statements for Academic Positions at the University of California (Systemwide)* CAP supports the UC’s efforts to further diversify the professoriate and to improve DEI contributions across campus. CAP offered its comments for suggested implementation for use in the review process.

After review and discussion, CAP did not provide significant changes or opinions on the following Senate review items, judging them appropriate as written.

- *Systemwide Review of Proposed Reviews to Delegation of Authority to Solicit and Accept Gifts*
- *Proposal to Create a School of Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences*
- *Proposal for a New Department of Clinical Pharmacy Practice (UCI)*
- *Proposed Absorption of the Department of Pharmacology into the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Disestablishment of the Department of Pharmacology*
- *Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual Section 230 (APM-230), Visiting Appointments*

#### *VICE PROVOST - ACADEMIC PERSONNEL'S REQUEST FOR COMMENT*

CAP continues to value the opportunity to work closely with the Provost and Vice Provost for Academic Personnel on topics relevant to the academic personnel process. This year CAP considered the following items:

*Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment series to Professor of Teaching series mapping.* With CAP input and feedback, AP developed a mapping protocol for schools to use to place their LPSOE faculty into the Professor of Teaching series. The new Professor of Teaching series now includes ranks and steps in alignment with ladder rank faculty. The School of Biological Sciences was used as the pilot school and subsequent proposals were reviewed by CAP. CAP either accepted the school's mapping or provided feedback and sent back proposals for revision and CAP's re-review.

#### *Conflicts of Interest – Engineering pilot*

With CAP feedback, AP piloted a Conflict of Interest protocol with the School of Engineering, which allows for potential conflicts of interest to be divulged so that they can be potentially managed. CAP helped develop a form which the schools can submit to AP for CAP review.

#### *Landing Pages feedback*

CAP offered feedback and comments on draft "Landing Pages" hosted by AP for use by faculty seeking guidance on how the campus evaluates research, teaching, service, inclusive excellence, community engaged research, and team science.

#### *AP-10*

CAP continued to review and comment on proposed updates to the AP-10 (Addendum) as it transitions to a new format.

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

Vice Chair Sharon Block supported the Chair in normal CAP activities and also represented the Irvine campus at the Systemwide University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). UCAP had four meetings during the 2018-19 academic year, one at UCOP and three by videoconference, 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 principal issues that UCAP considered this year are described briefly below:

### *Student Evaluations.*

UCAP discussed how best to evaluate student evaluations of teaching and directly contributed to a Teaching Evaluation Task Force charge.

### *Evaluations of LSOE Series guidelines:*

UCAP shared best practices for LSOE evaluation in the personnel process.

### *Contributions to Diversity Statements:*

UCAP offered extensive feedback to UC Academic Council regarding mandated statements as opposed to other forms of entry for diversity and inclusive excellence (DIE) work and sought to emphasize that work beyond normal duties should be given extra weight in the review process. UCAP contributed to a rewriting of Point #6 in the UC Use of DEI Statements document to clarify that DEI is not an additional category of review and should be considered as part of research, teaching, and service.

### *CAPs and Title IX:*

UCAP discussed how to be consistent in handling information about Title IX or other disciplinary findings in the review process.

### *Evaluation of Teaching by Faculty in SSGDPs:*

UCAP collected information and discussed how different campuses view and evaluate teaching in self-supporting graduate professional degree programs. There was no overall consensus on how campuses treat this teaching.

### *APM Revisions:*

UCAP offered feedback on: definitions of mentoring as part of revisions to APM-210; and new recommendations on documenting diversity in the review process.

### *Triennial CAP Practices Survey:*

Most campuses filled out the CAP practices survey. Lynn Harris and Sharon Block jointly provided Irvine's information.

*CAP Review process software:*

UCAP discussed various software systems used in the review process, including homegrown systems and Interfolio, and raised concerns over reported problems with systems, and who might own the entered data in various commercial systems.

*Campus Reports*

UCAP devoted part of each regular meeting to a discussion of issues facing local councils and the exchange of information about 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. 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 shared mission shaped the membership into a dedicated, tight-knit group. The Chair thanks all of the members for their hard work, mutual support, and warm collegiality.

Respectfully submitted,

Georg Striedter, School of Biological Sciences, Chair  
Sharon Block, School of Humanities, Vice Chair  
Bogi Andersen, School of Medicine – Clinical  
Alan Barbour, School of Medicine - Basic  
Joseph DiMento, School of Law  
Magda El Zarki, School of Information & Computer Sciences  
Valerie Jenness, School of Social Ecology  
Robin Keller, School of Business  
Young Jik Kwon, College of Health Sciences, At-Large  
Antoinette LaFarge, School of the Arts  
Michael Lee, School of Social Sciences  
Gudrun Magnusdottir, School of Physical Sciences  
Lee Swindlehurst, School of Engineering

**APPENDICES**

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

Table 2: CAP Recommendations by School

Table 3: CAP Agreement with Departmental Recommendations, 2014-2019

Table 4: CAP Recommendations by Department



**2018-19 CAP ANNUAL REPORT**  
**TABLES 1A-1D: CAP RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

<b>TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES</b>	<b>CAP Recommendation</b>				<b>Total</b>	<b>Accelerated</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Modify</b>	<b>Pending</b>		
	294	32	49	5		

<b>TABLE 1A. APPOINTMENTS</b>	<b>CAP Recommendation</b>				<b>Total</b>	<b>Accelerated</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Modify</b>	<b>Pending</b>		
Assistant Professor (Steps IV, V, VI)	3	0	1	0	4	0
Associate Professor (inc. Clin X & In Res series)	12	2	1	0	15	0
Professor (inc. Prof. of Law, Clin X & In Res series)	20	1	4	1	26	0
Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer PSOE & SOE	0	0	1	0	1	0
Change of Series	0	0	0	0	0	0
Appontment of Honorary Title	15	0	0	0	15	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>% CAP Agreed with Proposal</b>					<b>82%</b>	
<b>% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal</b>					<b>93%</b>	

<b>TABLE 1B. PROMOTIONS</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Modify</b>	<b>Pending</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Accelerated</b>
Associate Professor (Promotion to Tenure) (Includes 2 Assoc. in Res, 2 Assoc. Clin X)	24	0	3	0	27	14
Professor (inc. Prof Clin X & In Res)	24	0	10	1	35	5
Advancement to Professor VI	15	4	6	2	27	10
Advancement to Professor Above Scale	10	4	0	0	14	3
Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer SOE	3	2	0	0	5	1
Excellence Review w/ Merit Increase					0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>% CAP Agreed with Proposal</b>					<b>70%</b>	
<b>% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal</b>					<b>88%</b>	

**2018-19 CAP ANNUAL REPORT**  
**TABLES 1A-1D: CAP RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

<b>TABLE 1C. MERIT INCREASES</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Modify</b>	<b>Pending</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Accelerated</b>
Assistant Professor (includes Merits with MCA, Clin X & In Res) (Includes 1 Acting Professor-Law School) (28 MCA= Agree)	31	1	6	0	38	7
Associate Professor (inc. Clin X & In Res)	39	0	4	0	43	6
Professor (inc. Prof. of Law, Clin X & In Res)	46	6	10	0	62	36
Professor Above Scale	17	9	0	0	26	1
Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer PSOE & SOE (3 MCA=Agree)	5	0	1	0	6	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>% CAP Agreed with Proposal</b>					<b>79%</b>	
<b>% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal</b>					<b>91%</b>	

<b>TABLE 1D. OTHER ACTIONS</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Modify</b>	<b>Pending</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Accelerated</b>
Review for Honorary Titles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Reappointment	0	1	0	0	1	0
Reappointment (inc. Clin X & In Res) (2 MCA=Agree)	3	0	0	0	3	0
MCA	1	0	0	0	1	0
No Action (No Change) (Assoc. Professor & Professor)	18	0	0	1	19	0
Fifth Year Review	8	2	0	0	10	0
Career Equity Review	0	0	2	0	2	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>% CAP Agreed with Proposal</b>					<b>83%</b>	
<b>% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal</b>					<b>89%</b>	

**2018-19 CAP ANNUAL REPORT  
TABLE 2: RECOMMENDATIONS BY SCHOOL**

School	Number Proposed Actions	CAP Agree	CAP Disagree	CAP Mod-Up/Mod-Down	CAP Pending	% CAP Agreed, Mod-Up, or Mod-Down w/ School	% CAP Agreed with School	Final Decision Agree	Final Decision Disagree	Final Decision Mod-Up/Mod-Down	Final Decision Pending	% Final Decision Agreed, Mod-Up, or Mod-Down w/ School	% Final Decision Agreed with School	Accelerated
CLAIRE TREVOR SCHOOL OF THE ARTS	17	14	0	2	1	94%	82%	12	0	0	5	71%	71%	7
SCHOOL OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	35	29	3	3	0	91%	83%	26	1	3	5	83%	74%	7
PAUL MERAGE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS	13	12	0	1	0	100%	92%	11	0	1	1	92%	85%	2
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION	9	7	0	2	0	100%	78%	6	0	0	3	67%	67%	3
THE HENRY SAMUELI SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING	41	33	4	4	0	90%	80%	33	0	1	7	83%	80%	6
COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES	12	9	0	3	0	100%	75%	9	0	3	0	100%	75%	2
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES	32	24	2	5	1	91%	75%	23	1	3	5	81%	72%	4
DONALD BREN SCHOOL OF ICS	23	21	0	2	0	100%	91%	19	0	1	3	87%	83%	4
SCHOOL OF LAW	7	6	0	1	0	100%	86%	4	0	1	2	71%	57%	0
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE (BASIC SCIENCE)	17	13	3	1	0	82%	76%	12	1	1	3	76%	71%	2
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE (CLINICAL SCIENCE)	52	38	5	7	2	87%	73%	35	2	4	11	75%	67%	6
SUE & BILL GROSS SCHOOL OF NURSING	4	2	1	1	0	75%	50%	2	1	1	0	75%	50%	1
SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL SCIENCES	43	32	7	4	0	84%	74%	32	3	0	8	74%	74%	20
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL ECOLOGY	21	15	1	5	0	95%	71%	17	0	3	1	95%	81%	7
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES	53	39	6	8	0	89%	74%	37	3	6	7	81%	70%	12
OFFICE OF RESEARCH	1	0	0	0	1	0%	0%	0	0	0	1	0%	0%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>83</b>

**2018-19 CAP ANNUAL REPORT**

**TABLE 3: CAP AGREEMENT WITH DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS 2014-2019**

	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2019-19</b>		<b>5-yr mean</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Total cases	542	529	486	443	380		476	-96
<b>CAP Agree</b>								
Appointments	88%	91%	94%	87%	82%		88%	-6%
Promotions	82%	71%	74%	72%	70%		74%	-4%
Merits	90%	81%	81%	85%	79%		83%	-4%
Other Actions	92%	79%	87%	87%	83%		86%	-3%
<b>CAP Agree or Modify</b>								
Appointments +/-	92%	96%	99%	95%	93%		95%	-2%
Promotions +/-	89%	83%	92%	83%	88%		87%	1%
Merits +/-	93%	92%	93%	93%	91%		92%	-1%
Other Actions +/-	92%	91%	94%	87%	89%		91%	-2%

2018-19 CAP ANNUAL REPORT

TABLE 4: RECOMMENDATIONS BY DEPARTMENT

Departments	Number proposed	CAP Agree	CAP Disagree	CAP Modify	Pending CAP	% CAP Agreed, Mod-Up, or Mod-Down w/ Dept.	% CAP Agreed w/ Dept.	Final Agree	Final Disagree	Final Modify	Final Pending	% Final Decision Agreed, Mod-Up, or Mod-Down w/ Dept.	% Final Decision Agreed w/ Dept.	Accelerations
ACADEMIC ENGLISH/ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE	1	1	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	100%	100%	0
ANATOMY AND NEUROBIOLOGY	2	1	0	1	0	100%	50%	1	0	1	0	100%	50%	0
ANESTHESIOLOGY AND PERIOPERATIVE CARE	2	1	0	0	1	50%	50%	1	0	0	1	50%	50%	0
ANTHROPOLOGY	9	7	0	2	0	100%	78%	6	0	1	2	100%	78%	1
ART	4	3	0	1	0	100%	75%	2	0	0	2	100%	75%	2
ART HISTORY	2	2	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	0	0	0	100%	100%	0
ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES	2	2	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	0	0	0	100%	100%	0
BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY	3	3	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	0	100%	100%	0
BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING	10	9	0	1	0	100%	90%	8	0	0	2	100%	90%	0
CHEMICAL ENGINEERING AND MATERIALS SCIENCE	6	5	0	1	0	100%	83%	5	0	0	1	100%	83%	0
CHEMISTRY	16	15	1	0	0	94%	94%	14	0	0	2	94%	94%	7
CHICANO/LATINO STUDIES	2	1	0	1	0	100%	50%	1	0	1	0	100%	50%	1
CIVIL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING	8	7	1	0	0	88%	88%	7	0	0	1	88%	88%	3
CLASSICS	1	0	0	0	1	0%	0%	0	0	0	1	0%	0%	0
COGNITIVE SCIENCES	8	6	0	2	0	100%	75%	7	0	1	0	100%	75%	2
COMMUNITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL MEDICINE	1	0	1	0	0	0%	0%	0	1	0	0	0%	0%	0
COMPARATIVE LITERATURE	2	2	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	1	100%	100%	0
COMPUTER SCIENCE	11	9	0	2	0	100%	82%	8	0	1	2	100%	82%	3
CRIMINOLOGY, LAW AND SOCIETY	5	5	0	0	0	100%	100%	5	0	0	0	100%	100%	2
DANCE	3	2	0	0	1	67%	67%	2	0	0	1	67%	67%	0
DERMATOLOGY	1	1	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	100%	100%	1
DEVELOPMENTAL AND CELL BIOLOGY	10	8	1	1	0	90%	80%	9	0	1	0	90%	80%	2
DRAMA	4	3	0	1	0	100%	75%	2	0	0	2	100%	75%	3
EARTH SYSTEM SCIENCE	7	7	0	0	0	100%	100%	7	0	0	0	100%	100%	2
ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY	6	4	1	1	0	83%	67%	3	1	1	1	83%	67%	0
ECONOMICS	7	6	0	1	0	100%	86%	5	0	1	1	100%	86%	1
EDUCATION	9	7	0	2	0	100%	78%	6	0	0	3	100%	78%	3
ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING AND COMPUTER SCIENCE	7	6	0	1	0	100%	86%	7	0	0	0	100%	86%	2
EMERGENCY MEDICINE	6	4	0	2	0	100%	67%	4	0	1	1	100%	67%	3
ENGLISH	6	4	1	1	0	83%	67%	5	1	0	0	83%	67%	1
EPIDEMIOLOGY	3	3	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	0	100%	100%	0
EUROPEAN LANGUAGES AND STUDIES	1	1	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	100%	100%	0
FILM AND MEDIA STUDIES	6	5	0	1	0	100%	83%	4	0	1	1	100%	83%	0
HISTORY	5	3	0	2	0	100%	60%	3	0	1	1	100%	60%	0
INFORMATICS	8	8	0	0	0	100%	100%	8	0	0	0	100%	100%	1
LANGUAGE SCIENCE	2	2	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	0	0	0	100%	100%	0
LOGIC AND PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE	5	3	2	0	0	60%	60%	2	3	0	0	60%	60%	2
MATERIAL SCIENCE & ENGINEERING	2	1	1	0	0	50%	50%	1	0	0	1	50%	50%	0
MATHEMATICS	12	5	4	3	0	67%	42%	6	1	0	5	67%	42%	6
MECHANICAL AND AEROSPACE ENGINEERING	8	5	2	1	0	75%	63%	5	0	1	2	75%	63%	1
MEDICINE	13	12	0	1	0	100%	92%	12	0	1	0	100%	92%	0
MICROBIOLOGY AND MOLECULAR GENETICS	1	0	1	0	0	0%	0%	0	0	0	1	0%	0%	0
MOLECULAR BIOLOGY AND BIOCHEMISTRY	11	9	1	1	0	91%	82%	7	0	1	3	91%	82%	3

2018-19 CAP ANNUAL REPORT

TABLE 4: RECOMMENDATIONS BY DEPARTMENT

Departments	Number proposed	CAP Agree	CAP Disagree	CAP Modify	Pending CAP	% CAP Agreed, Mod-Up, or Mod-Down w/ Dept.	% CAP Agreed w/ Dept.	Final Agree	Final Disagree	Final Modify	Final Pending	% Final Decision Agreed, Mod-Up, or Mod-Down w/ Dept.	% Final Decision Agreed w/ Dept.	Accelerations
MUSIC	6	6	0	0	0	100%	100%	6	0	0	0	100%	100%	2
NEUROBIOLOGY AND BEHAVIOR	8	8	0	0	0	100%	100%	7	0	0	1	100%	100%	2
NEUROLOGICAL SURGERY	2	1	0	1	0	100%	50%	0	0	0	2	100%	50%	0
NEUROLOGY	4	3	0	1	0	100%	75%	3	0	0	1	100%	75%	2
OPHTHALMOLOGY	1	1	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	100%	100%	0
OTOLARYNGOLOGY	1	1	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	100%	100%	0
PATHOLOGY AND LABORATORY MEDICINE	3	1	1	1	0	67%	33%	1	1	1	0	67%	33%	0
PAUL MERAGE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS	13	12	0	1	0	100%	92%	11	0	1	1	100%	92%	2
PEDIATRICS	1	1	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	100%	100%	0
PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES	3	3	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	0	100%	100%	0
PHARMACOLOGY	2	1	1	0	0	50%	50%	1	0	0	1	50%	50%	0
PHILOSOPHY	4	2	1	1	0	75%	50%	2	0	1	1	75%	50%	3
PHYSICAL MEDICINE AND REHABILITATION	1	1	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	100%	100%	0
PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY	8	5	2	1	0	75%	63%	5	2	0	1	75%	63%	5
PHYSIOLOGY AND BIOPHYSICS	5	5	0	0	0	100%	100%	4	0	0	1	100%	100%	2
POLITICAL SCIENCE	8	5	2	1	0	75%	63%	5	0	1	2	75%	63%	2
PROGRAM IN PUBLIC HEALTH	9	6	0	3	0	100%	67%	6	0	3	0	100%	67%	2
PSYCHIATRY AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR	2	2	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	1	100%	100%	0
PSYCHOLOGICAL SCIENCE	11	7	0	4	0	100%	64%	9	0	2	0	100%	64%	3
RADIATION ONCOLOGY	2	2	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	0	0	0	100%	100%	0
RADIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	4		2	1	1	25%	0%	0	0	1	3	25%	0%	0
SCHOOL OF LAW	7	6	0	1	0	100%	86%	4	0	1	2	100%	86%	0
SOCIAL SCIENCES	2	1	1	0	0	50%	50%	1	0	0	1	50%	50%	0
SOCIOLOGY	10	8	1	1	0	90%	80%	8	0	1	1	90%	80%	3
SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE	2	2	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	0	0	0	100%	100%	0
STATISTICS	4	4	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	1	100%	100%	0
SUE & BILL GROSS SCHOOL OF NURSING	4	2	1	1	0	75%	50%	2	1	1	0	75%	50%	1
SURGERY	3	1	2	0	0	33%	33%	1	1	0	1	33%	33%	0
THESAURUS LINGUAE GRACAE PROJECT	1	0	0	0	1	0%	0%	0	0	0	1	0%	0%	0
URBAN PLANNING AND PUBLIC POLICY	5	3	1	1	0	80%	60%	3	0	1	1	80%	60%	2
UROLOGY	6	6	0	0	0	100%	100%	5	0	0	1	100%	100%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>83</b>