

**Council on Academic Personnel
Annual Report
AY 2021-2022**

To the Irvine Divisional Assembly:

The UC Irvine Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) is pleased to provide the following summary of its activities for 2021-2022. CAP's service year extends from September 1, 2021 through August 31, 2022.

I. Membership

The continuing faculty members serving this year on CAP were Professors Victor Fleischer (Law), Michelle Garfinkel (Social Sciences), Alexander Ihler (Information & Computer Sciences), Victoria Johnson (Humanities), Catherine Loudon (Biological Sciences), Lisa Naugle (Arts), and Connie Pechmann (Business). New members were Professors Alan Goldin (Medicine, Basic), Sheldon Greenfield (Medicine, Clinical Science), Susanne Jaeggi (At-large, Education), Jung-Ah Lee (At-large, Nursing), Jodi Quas (Social Ecology), Timothy Rupert (Engineering), and Scott Rychnovsky (Physical Sciences). Professor Naugle served as CAP Chair and Professor Garfinkel served as Vice Chair and representative to the University-wide Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). Casey Lough was the CAP analyst and Operations Manager Rachel Mangold provided CAP staff support.

II. General Procedures

CAP's responsibilities. 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, as well as the UCI campus Academic Personnel Procedures (APP) to review expectations for each series.

CAP is responsible for providing a campus-wide perspective on proposals for appointments, promotions, merit, and above-scale increases originating from academic units. CAP reviews the academic personnel files for Senate series including, but not limited to, Professors of Teaching titles and forwards its recommendations to the Chancellor and Provost. CAP procedures and review criteria are typically communicated through campus-wide and school information sessions held in conjunction with the Office of Academic Personnel (AP). CAP also provides input and feedback on AP Procedures and Faculty Guidance pages (<https://ap.uci.edu/policies-procedures/app/>; <https://ap.uci.edu/faculty/guidance>) and provides annual updates to its own Frequently Asked Questions document: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1XCZNTNDiyZF3KNamkxKQkqeSP1hUU6gdX2WkehK3Dr4/edit?usp=sharing>.

CAP plays a crucial role in implementing the University of California's shared governance principle. It both evaluates and applies standards of academic excellence to faculty

performance. CAP makes recommendations as a council after careful discussion and deliberation. All final decisions on personnel actions are made by the Chancellor or, when delegated, by the Provost, the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP), or an academic Dean.

CAP's review protocol. CAP had 34 scheduled meetings in 2021-2022 (from September 23, 2021 to July 21, 2022), with meetings every other week in fall quarter and weekly meetings thereafter. Confidentiality, equity, and consistency are central tenets of CAP deliberations, and all members aim to rigorously uphold these principles. As CAP's membership increased to 14 members due to the addition of two new members, CAP, at its initial meeting in the fall, established a new quorum of a minimum of nine members present 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 according to CAP's standards for recusal: <https://sites.uci.edu/academicsenate/files/2022/08/CAP-Recusal-Policy-2021-22-Fillable.pdf>.

The full Council reviews all major actions (non-delegated appointments, promotions to Associate and Full Professor, advancements to Professor Step 6 and Above Scale) and all Mid-Career Appraisals and Accelerations. Primary and secondary readers are assigned to these "all read" files as in-depth reviewers of each file, and all Council members are expected to read every case for a full Council discussion and vote. At the meeting, discussion is led by primary and secondary readers, followed by the Chair, who is a reader on all cases. Open discussion continues until members are satisfied that all relevant aspects of a case have been analyzed and all perspectives are heard. 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, a draft report for each reviewed case is prepared, which is revised by the Chair and then by CAP members. In the report, the vote is conveyed, and when relevant, both the majority and minority opinions are presented. The CAP Chair is responsible for the final version of the report, which is transmitted to the Office of Academic Personnel.

In promotion and advancement cases for which a negative decision is recommended, CAP and VPAP allow the department to submit additional information that may have been left off the AP-10 or was pending. These "Tentative Decision" cases are reviewed by a CAP subcommittee, consisting of two members and the Chair. The subcommittee evaluates the presence of new or significant information, and 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. The Council reviews the additional information received, and if the new information is deemed substantively meaningful, a second vote is taken. Historically, additional information rarely results in changes to CAP's recommendation. For the other types of "all read" cases with which CAP disagrees with the proposed action, a tentative decision is not automatic. However, CAP often requests additional information if it judges the file incomplete or sees a need for clarification before voting on a case.

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 more thorough assessment of a file under review. CAP considers the report from an outside *ad hoc* committee before its final vote and recommendation. In 2021-2022, three outside *ad hoc* committees were convened.

In addition to “all read” files, all normal merit increases, first No Change, Fifth Year review, and Appointment cases that have obtained agreement at each level of review prior to CAP, as well as Titles of Distinction cases, are considered “Consentable/Subcommittee” cases. Cases in this category are read by a subcommittee consisting of two members and the Chair. If the subcommittee agrees with the proposed action, the case is put on the consent agenda for full council approval.

CAP forwards the recommendations in its report to AP. If CAP’s recommendations are 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. The Provost and/or VPAP generally meet with CAP prior to the final decision if they are considering overruling CAP’s recommendation, or if they want further clarification of CAP’s reasoning.

While service on CAP is time-consuming and sometimes stressful, members consistently find it to be 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 multiple days each week reviewing files, participating in CAP meetings, and writing reports. CAP utilized the remote modality for meetings to promote efficiency. Since all files and their review content are now distributed online, CAP members are no longer limited by having to review some files exclusively in the CAP conference room. In addition, the CAP Chair attends Academic Senate meetings, participates in the review of new policies and procedures, and co-leads school-wide workshops with Academic Personnel.

III. CAP’s Specific Activities

Communication with the faculty. Communication with faculty, academic units and Deans about the academic review process is an important part of CAP’s responsibilities. VPAP and the CAP Chair held two workshops to advise the campus on new personnel policies for deans, department chairs, and personnel administrators. These included the annual “Fall Kick-Off” in September and, in response to campus requests to receive information earlier, a “Summer Updates” session in July. VPAP and CAP Chair also held workshops in May on AP practices and procedures for untenured faculty. In addition, they initiated a new workshop for Associate Professors, which was well attended. Given its success, this workshop will be offered regularly in the future. VPAP and CAP Chair also visited four schools by request.

Caseload and outcome of personnel actions (Tables 1-4). CAP reviewed 388 cases in 2021-22, compared to 380 in 2020-21, 436 in 2019-20, 380 in 2018-19, and 443 in 2017-18. Table 1 provides data on decisions by the type of action; Table 2A 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 rate of exact agreement between CAP and the original academic unit recommendations was 77% for all cases that came to CAP in 2021-22. This includes 13 cases left over from 2020-2021. When modifications to files, such as recommendations to modify up or modify down are included in the "agree" category, the rate of agreement is 89% for all cases reviewed in 2021-22. Most of CAP's differing recommendations involved accelerations or step placement rather than disagreements with the entire action. CAP fully disagreed only with 11% of proposals (Table 2A), most of which involved promotions or merit increases.

As of August 10, 2022, CAP had four cases pending additional information and 42 files still under review by the Administration. In total, 4% of the Chancellor's or Provost's final decisions differed from CAP's recommendations. In those cases, the Provost and/or VPAP consulted with CAP prior to making a final decision.

Mid-Career Appraisals (MCAs) of Assistant Professors, usually undertaken in their 4th year, provide candid guidance to the candidate by identifying tenure progress to date as "Positive," "Provisionally Positive," "Guarded," or "Negative." Of the MCAs reviewed in 2021-22, the academic unit's recommendations were frequently positive, whereas CAP's recommendations were more frequently provisionally positive. Neither the departments nor CAP judged any MCA to be negative.

Acceleration proposal rates varied widely across schools, with a high of 59% of files proposed as accelerations (School of Social Ecology) and a low of 0% (Sue & Bill Gross School of Nursing). Approximately 30% of faculty personnel reviews involved acceleration requests, which represents a sizable increase from 17% in 2017-18. CAP fully agreed with 77 cases involving a proposed acceleration, 65% of all acceleration cases (77 out of 118) or 20% of all cases for which it completed its review (77 out of 338). See Table 2B for details.

Reserve CAP. To avoid potential conflicts of interest, a "Reserve CAP," consisting largely of former CAP members, evaluates dossiers of current and recent CAP members. The Senate also requested that academic personnel cases of the current Senate Chair and Chair-Elect be seen by Reserve CAP as well. CAP agreed that this was an appropriate request. The RCAP reviewed three cases this year.

Guiding Principles and Best Practices. CAP spent time in multiple fall and winter meetings discussing university-wide standards, as well as general guiding principles for review and evaluation as a way to promote consistency among members and across years.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI). DEI accomplishments are regularly considered in the review process and can positively influence CAP's assessments of proposed actions. CAP discussed with VPAP interest in an interactive, case-based training session on implicit bias. VPAP agreed to work with the Office of Inclusive Excellence to identify resources.

Reviews of Chairs and Deans. CAP provided input to the five-year reviews of five department chairs. CAP also discussed the practical value of these reviews and sees value in providing such review feedback.

IV. Academic Senate Major Discussion Items

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

Revised Pre-Proposal to Establish a School of Population and Public Health

CAP reviewed the revised pre-proposal, which addressed the concerns previously raised in CAP's memo last spring. Members addressed the strengths of the revised pre-proposal, as well as some lingering weaknesses over the course of multiple meetings, and the final version was submitted to the Academic Senate Cabinet.

UC Working Group on Mitigating COVID-19 Impacts on Faculty

Upon UC Provost Brown providing the final report from the systemwide working group, CAP members acknowledged that they were already applying "Achievement Relative to Opportunities (ARO)" principles through a holistic review. A recommendation in the report to develop a pre-pandemic standard was deemed not useful and may be wasted effort, while developing shared departmental expectations and context around COVID-19 limitations would be more useful as this is the more challenging discussion area for CAP. Lastly, members underscored that developing rigid criteria for reviewing cases is counter-productive as faculty continue to demonstrate excellence and impact in a variety of ways. CAP's holistic review allows these multidimensional cases to be weighed and appreciated appropriately.

The CAP Chair provided input to the Academic Senate Cabinet that faculty at all levels, regardless of rank, may be impacted by COVID-19 and recommended that going forward, opportunities to apply for and participate in the COVID Research Recovery Program should be based on need and extended from assistant professors to faculty at all levels, thus making it a more equitable program. The CAP Chair also strongly recommended that CAP be listed as one of the key stakeholders of the campus implementation plan as CAP has been implementing ARO principles and participating in updates related to COVID-19.

CAP expressed concern that the language "Encourage file submission for all faculty no matter how significantly impacted by COVID-19 with a commitment to incorporating Achievement Relative to Opportunities (ARO) principles..." might send a mixed message and discourage faculty from using campus resources such as COVID Stop the Clocks or other options when they really need them.

Achievement Relative to Opportunities

CAP applied ARO principles in the 2021-2022 academic personnel review cycle. From the very beginning of this cycle, it was apparent to CAP members that COVID-19 was already having an impact on research, teaching and/or service; therefore, without hesitation, CAP brought the ARO principles into its discussions of merits and promotions.

The application of ARO principles was empowered by the information provided by the candidates, departments, chairs and deans. When candidates conveyed their efforts and challenges, including supporting materials, and other levels of review provided additional information, CAP was able to better understand the context for the candidates' activities and outcomes. Throughout the year, CAP reviewed personnel files that presented evidence of a variety of impediments to research—e.g., limited or no access to research labs, libraries, performance spaces and other venues; a marked slowdown in the refereeing process; canceled conferences; and limited opportunities for collaboration with researchers outside of UCI, to name a few. Additional efforts required in teaching and mentoring affected both teaching and research as UCI switched back and forth between modes of instruction. Taking into account the candidate's current and pre-COVID-19 activities in the context of such evidence, CAP members were able to assess the impact of COVID-19 on the candidates' output (both quantity and quality) and take an even more holistic view in assessing files. Accelerated merits, promotions, and advancements were also impacted by COVID-19 and required similar activity.

While many files presented evidence of negative COVID-19 impacts, CAP also saw the ways in which many faculty took action to move their work forward in relation to their experience and perception of opportunity. CAP members were especially impressed by how some faculty were able to pivot to and develop new areas of research, teaching, and/or service. CAP members were also impressed by the efforts some faculty made to help their colleagues shift between different modes of instruction and mentoring (e.g., participation in special school task forces).

ARO principles provided a perspective through which CAP reviewed files, especially those files where faculty and/or other levels of review provided information on how an individual, group or field was disproportionately impacted by the pandemic. CAP's efforts in this regard fit comfortably within its efforts to understand the candidates' performance subject to the new constraints that COVID-19 presented.

External Letters from a Common Department

CAP discussed files that had multiple external letters from the same department or campus and whether or not further guidance should be given to departments. Letters from various institutions helped to clarify national or international reputation, but the quality of the letters remained the most helpful aspect regardless of a common department.

Chair Outreach to New Deans

The CAP Chair reached out to six deans who began their terms this year for a brief meet-and-greet. It is a common practice for CAP Chairs to initiate these meetings to put a collegial face forward for the council and underscore CAP's positive intention and effort during the review process. Members representing the schools were invited to join; however, since the meetings were brief and did not touch on any substantive topics, members felt it best for the CAP Chair and the CAP Analyst to meet the new deans.

Academic Council Statement on Critical Race Theory and Academic Freedom

CAP reviewed the Academic Council's statement and was very supportive of the position.

Report of the Negotiated Salary Trial Program Phase 2 Taskforce

CAP reviewed the materials and opined that the trial program requires three months in summer salary, thereby precluding the participation of some faculty who may need to pursue industry-training opportunities for a month in the summer.

Use of Distinguished Professor Title for Non-Senate Faculty in HS Clinical Series

Academic Senate Chair Ho asked CAP about the potential use of the Distinguished Professor title for non-senate faculty in the HS Clinical series. Given the rigorous review and stringent expectations for awarding the Distinguished Professor title, CAP unanimously opposed extending use of the title to non-senate faculty. Most other UC schools do not extend these titles. The use of a distinguished professor title is exceptional and must have a compelling reason. Senate Chair Ho supported CAP's considered comments.

UC Academic Council Update to "The Use of Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Statements for Academic Positions at the University of California"

CAP reviewed the materials and noted that it closely follows current practices on campus.

Changes to Bylaw 48 on CAP Membership

CAP unanimously recommended a change to Bylaw 48 in an effort to codify current accepted practices that do not allow CAP members to serve as Equity Advisors. CAP has clear guidelines on conflicts of interest to maintain the integrity of the council and more generally the academic review process. Equity Advisors provide guidance to faculty on their personnel files and inform faculty members and departments within their schools about this process. CAP members have the responsibility of reviewing and making recommendations to the Chancellor and the Provost on faculty personnel files. A member of CAP concurrently serving as a school's Equity Advisor would give rise to a conflict of interest and the appearance thereof. The proposed modification to Bylaw 48 codifies current accepted practices that do not allow CAP members to serve as Equity Advisors. Putting forth this clear communication is vital to current practices and campus stakeholders, allows future members to plan for a smooth transition of roles, and maintains the integrity of the council and the academic review process.

Office of Academic Personnel Major Discussion Items

CAP continued to value the opportunity to work closely with the Provost and VPAP on topics relevant to the academic personnel process. CAP and AP developed and implemented new policies and procedures to promote equity in the file review process.

Guidance for reporting disclosures for publications

As AP asked for guidance, the CAP Chair brought forward a question:

For cases in which a journal's policy is to not report disclosures even when sent to them, should a candidate state any disclosures somewhere else in the file? Or would this then cause a mismatch if a reviewer checked the publication and found none reported in the publication?

After some discussion, CAP found it unnecessary for a candidate to list the disclosure somewhere else in their case file. CAP appreciates the efforts by candidates to follow a journal's disclosure protocols and CAP reviewers would not be concerned about a mismatch in a case file. This guidance was passed along to AP.

Proposed Departmental Terminology and Sample Voting Grid

CAP became aware that a few schools were concerned that the APP 1-14 form was unclear when defining the abstain category in department votes. Some departments counted faculty who did not respond to a voting ballot along with those who abstained, while other departments counted only faculty who actively indicated their wish to abstain. CAP unanimously agreed that "abstain" is an active choice by faculty who are indicating their intention not to vote for or against a proposed action. If faculty members are on leave or otherwise unavailable, this should be indicated in a department letter voting grid under "did not vote." CAP also suggested that under the terminology section those members "excluded from voting" should be clarified further. [APP 1-14 E](#) now reflects the agreement between CAP and VPAP.

Soft Requests for External Reviewers

Variation in external reviewer requests had come to VPAP's attention and CAP was asked for input. Some departments have sent "soft requests" to potential external reviewers regarding their availability to review a file. If they said "yes," then the department sent that person an official request with attendant information and that person was listed on the AP-11. If a person said "no" to the initial request, then (some) departments did not list that person (soft request) on the AP-11.

CAP agreed that all external reviewer requests (including "soft requests", i.e., phone calls, emails, or conversations) should be listed on the AP-11. If the individual declines, their name must also be listed on the AP-11. This provides a clearer understanding of the file and ensures consistent practices among all departments. Additionally, like hard requests, CAP suggested copies of soft external requests be included in case files. Some CAP members requested that the AP-11 form be updated to indicate, by a checkbox, whether the request to an external reviewer was hard or soft.

Pilot Faculty Reflection on Student Course Feedback Form

CAP reviewed a draft Pilot Faculty Reflection on Student Course Feedback Form created by the Office of the Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning and shared with CAP via VPAP. CAP members also reviewed the feedback CAP had provided last year to an earlier draft version and members were concerned that many of last year's comments had not been addressed. While requesting other Senate councils to review the document, CAP provided a wide variety of its own comments, reflecting the members' perspective and underscoring their skepticism that the form would provide rich enough information to be useful in a candidate's file. CAP's response memo was sent to VPAP. Although there was agreement that the document should not be included in the candidate files, members imagined that faculty could use it to remind them of their own thoughts when drafting their Reflective Teaching Statement. Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning Michael Dennin thanked CAP for the helpful feedback and committed to ensuring that the rollout of the optional form would emphasize that the form is not intended to be included in AP files.

Fall 2021 and Winter 2022 Student Course Feedback Form Watermark

Student course feedback forms from Fall 2021 and Winter 2022 were watermarked due to COVID-19, similar to other quarters during the pandemic. This decision was made after discussions among the Academic Senate Chair, VPAP, and the CAP Chair.

APP 1-12 Updates

CAP unanimously supported revisions provided by VPAP to the APP 1-12 form and the AP FAQ section on childbearing. The revisions clarified how to count periods of parental leave and active service-modified duties (ASMD) for merits and promotions.

Clarifying Approaches to Law School Tenure Cases with AP and School

CAP sought clarification from AP on the Law School tenure process and steps through historical case research and dialogue. AP carried out its own research to better understand what has occurred in the past few years with Law School tenure cases. VPAP, CAP and the Law School engaged in a dialogue to develop a clearer shared understanding of practices and norms. The AP Office, working in coordination with the Law School, will draft four sample tenure case timelines to illuminate the Law School process and considerations. Five and six year sample timelines for faculty with fewer than three years of teaching, as well as five and six year sample timelines for faculty with more than three years of teaching.

Update to Transmission of CAP Administrative Comments and Candidate Comments on Files

CAP Administrative Comments and Candidate Comments regarding file preparation will be transmitted as written beginning 2022-2023, instead of being transmitted under VPAP's letterhead. CAP and VPAP agreed that converting a CAP memo into a VPAP memo was cumbersome and did not add value to the process.

Maximum Length of Self-Statements

CAP and VPAP agreed that concise, specific self-statements were most helpful for reviews, and CAP unanimously supported a three-page maximum length for candidate self-statements.

Review Campus Call for Nominations to Fill Two Endowed Chairs

CAP reviewed and supported the call for nominations.

Professors of Teaching School Guidelines Review

VPAP requested that CAP review the Professor of Teaching Guidelines submitted by each school. Members discussed the strengths and weaknesses of each school's guidelines, took a formal vote, and conveyed recommendations to VPAP. VPAP confirmed that departments would not vote on the recommendations approved by the Provost, just as they would not vote on the APP criteria used to assess faculty merits or promotions. VPAP will work with each school to facilitate the revision process. Members will review those guidelines that did not receive the support of CAP again once revisions are made.

Professor of Teaching Sample Appointment and Promotion/Advancement Solicitation Letters

CAP noticed that there was currently only one Professor of Teaching Sample Promotion Solicitation letter example and no Professor of Teaching Sample Appointment Solicitation letter example. Therefore, the CAP drafted additional sample letters for each level of promotion and

appointment, which were provided to VPAP. VPAP appreciated CAP's diligent work and would use the drafts to build out all the sample letters and inform the campus of their availability.

Department Letters

CAP and VPAP agreed that unsigned department letters do not allow for transparency in case of a potential conflict of interest and/or may give a department chair undue influence. All department letters must include a clear signature from a faculty member. Chairs are given the opportunity to write their own, additional letter and CAP typically finds it helpful when chair's provide their perspective. The topic was discussed in the Summer Updates to the campus highlighting that CAP requires all department letters to be signed by a non-conflicted committee chair. The department letter should not be signed by the department chair and anonymous/unsigned letters will not be accepted.

CAP Memo to Deans Providing Overview of Administrative Comments

In an effort to improve file preparation and review efficiency, CAP prepared a summary of Administrative Comments for each school. VPAP appreciated CAP's effort to improve the Academic Personnel process and supported the distribution of those summaries to the appropriate stakeholders.

Location of the DTEI and Professional Development Activities in the AP-10

CAP and AP recognize professional development activities and agreed that adding such activities in a newly created Professional Development category in each section on the AP-10 would be useful. Some examples of what might be included under the Professional Development category in the Teaching section are participation in DTEI workshops, grant training, and leadership workshops or certificates. Included in the Service category might be participation in leadership training programs, and in the Research category candidates might include participation in a grant writing and other workshops where the candidate is mentored or provided guidance by other professionals in the field.

V. University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP)

Vice Chair Michelle Garfinkel supported the Chair in normal CAP activities and represented the Irvine campus at the Systemwide University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). UCAP held five meetings during the 2021-22 academic year by videoconference. 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 included the following and were brought to the divisional CAP as informational items:

The Regents' Report on Innovation and Entrepreneurship

UCAP discussed Recommendation 8 of the Regents' Report on Innovation and Entrepreneurship. Premised on the notion that innovation at UC might be held back by not giving adequate credit for innovation and entrepreneurship, the recommendation was to modify promotion and tenure guidelines to include explicit consideration of these activities. UCAP members, as a whole, concluded that the current APM language is sufficiently flexible to allow a broadening of the UC mission to include innovation and entrepreneurial activity. While UCAP

agreed with one of the main points of the Regents' Report that the culture of assessment should change to better support rather than hinder work that would appear to deviate from the norm, members felt that adjustments should be made at the department level with encouragement by the Office of the President to campus leadership.

UCAP also discussed Recommendation 9 of the Regents' Report to modify the leave of absence policy to allow for innovation and entrepreneurial activities. UCAP members agreed that it would be desirable for UC to proceed with this change; however, such changes should be considered carefully to minimize possible disruptions to the UC's teaching mission.

Professors of Teaching Service on Divisional CAPs

UCAP discussed a possible inconsistency of service by Professors of Teaching on divisional CAPs with Systemwide Bylaw 55 (on voting rights in departments). In particular, Bylaw 55 limits the voting rights of those in the Professor of Teaching series within a department to personnel actions concerning their own series and only for actions at their own rank or below, unless the department votes, by a 2/3 majority, to extend those rights. Members of UCAP agreed that eligibility of membership on CAP (determined by Bylaw 35 as being an Academic Senate member with tenure) is not in conflict with Bylaw 55 and is, in fact, a different matter. Each Divisional Senate has the authority to select members of the Academic Senate, and UCAP believes that the selection process across campuses ensures those ultimately chosen to serve on the divisional CAPs are capable to do so.

Mitigating the Impact of COVID-19 on Faculty

UCAP discussed the preliminary report from the Workgroup on Mitigating the Impact of COVID-19 on Faculty, which had been disseminated by UC Provost Brown in October, focusing primarily on ARO principles. ARO principles and how they should be applied across campuses will be further explored by UCAP in the next year.

FAQs on Open Access Publications

UCAP provided feedback on a set of FAQs, drafted by the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication, for divisional CAPs on how to evaluate open access publications.

Systemwide Review Items

UCAP discussed and provided feedback on proposed revisions to APM 759 (Leaves of Absence/Other Leaves without Pay) and APM 025 and APM 671 (Conflicts of Commitment of Outside Activities of Faculty Members). UCAP also reviewed and discussed the Report of the Negotiated Salary Trial Program Phase 2 Taskforce, the proposed 1.5% equity/market adjustment to salaries for 2022-23, and the Revised Recommendations for the Use of DEI Statements for Academic Positions at UC.

VI. Conclusion

This year's CAP members once again expressed 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 working very collaboratively and efficiently in a remote environment on Zoom, for their consistent engagement in thoughtful dialogue, their ability to disagree without being disagreeable, and for making the entire process a very rewarding opportunity to make a contribution to the UCI campus.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Naugle, School of the Arts, Chair

Michelle Garfinkel, School of Social Sciences, Vice Chair

Victor Fleischer, School of Law

Alan Goldin, School of Medicine (Basic Science)

Sheldon Greenfield, School of Medicine (Clinical Science)

Alexander Ihler, School of Information & Computer Sciences

Susanne Jaeggi, School of Education

Victoria Johnson, School of Humanities

Jung-Ah Lee, School of Nursing

Catherine Loudon, School of Biological Sciences

Connie Pechmann, School of Business

Jodi Quas, School of Social Ecology

Timothy Rupert, School of Engineering

Scott Rychnovsky, School of Physical Sciences

APPENDICES

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

Table 2A: CAP Recommendations by School

Table 2B: Proposed Accelerations by Schools, CAP Recommendations and Final Decisions 2021-22

Table 3: CAP Agreement with Departmental Recommendations, 2017-2022

Table 4: CAP Recommendations by Department

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

	CAP Recommendation					Total
	Agree	Disagree	Modify - Up	Modify - Down	Pending	
Total Personnel Cases	294	41	4	45	4	388

Table 1A. Appointments	CAP Recommendation					Total
	Agree	Disagree	Modify - Up	Modify - Down	Pending	
Assistant Professor	2	0	0	0	0	2
Associate Professor (incl. PoT, Clin X, In Res.)	10	0	0	0	0	10
Professor (incl. Clin X, In Res., of Law)	16	0	1	0	0	17
Appointment of Honorary Title	7	0	0	0	0	7
Total	35	0	1	0	0	36
% CAP Agreed with Proposal*						97%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Up Proposal*						100%

*Denominator does not include Pending cases

Table 1B. Promotions and Advancements	Agree	Disagree	Modify - Up	Modify - Down	Pending	Total	Cases with Proposed Accelerations	% Cases with Proposed Accelerations
Associate Professor (incl. PoT, Clin X, In Res, of Law)	33	0	1	6	1	41	18	44%
Professor (incl. PoT, Clin X)	38	3	2	9	0	52	26	50%
Advancement to Professor, Step 6 (incl. PoT, Clin X)	29	8	0	4	1	42	13	31%
Advancement to Above Scale (incl. Clin X)	13	5	0	3	0	21	4	19%
Total	113	16	3	22	2	156	61	39%
% CAP Agreed with Proposal*							73%	
% CAP Agreed or Modified Up Proposal*							75%	

*Denominator does not include Pending cases

Table 1C. Merit Increases	Agree	Disagree	Modify - Up	Modify - Down	Pending	Total	Cases with Proposed Accelerations	% Cases with Proposed Accelerations
Assistant Professor (incl. Merits with MCA, PoT, Clin X, In Res) (39 of MCA=Agree)	40	2	0	1	0	43	7	16%
Associate Professor (incl. PoT)	30	2	0	6	0	38	10	26%
Professor (incl. PoT, Clin X, In Res)	46	10	0	10	0	66	37	56%
Professor Above Scale Merit	3	4	0	0	2	9	0	0%
Professor Above Scale Plus (incl. Prof. of Law)	7	2	0	5	0	14	2	14%
Total	126	20	0	22	2	170	56	33%
% CAP Agreed with Proposal*							75%	
% CAP Agreed or Modified Up Proposal*							75%	

*Denominator does not include Pending cases

Table 1D. Other Actions	Agree	Disagree	Modify - Up	Modify - Down	Pending	Total
5th Yr Review	4	0	0	0	0	4
5th Yr Review - Satisfactory	0	2	0	0	0	2
5th Yr Review - Unsatisfactory	2	0	0	0	0	2
Career Equity Review	0	1	0	1	0	2
Change of Series, Promotion	1	0	0	0	0	1
Dean's Delegated Merit	0	1	0	0	0	1
MCA	6	0	0	0	0	6
No Change	5	0	0	0	0	5
Non-Reappointment	0	1	0	0	0	1
Reappointment	2	0	0	0	0	2
Total	20	5	0	1	0	26
% CAP Agreed with Proposal*						77%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Up Proposal*						77%

*Denominator does not include Pending cases

Table 2A: CAP Recommendations by School

School	Proposed Cases	CAP Agree	CAP Disagree	CAP Modify-Up	CAP Modify-Down	CAP Pending	% CAP Agreed, Mod-Up, or Mod-Down with Dept.*	% CAP Agreed with Dept.*	Final Decision Agree	Final Decision Disagree	Final Decision Modify-Up	Final Decision Modify-Down	Final Decision Pending	% Final Decision Agreed, Mod-Up, or Mod-Down with Dept.*	% Final Decision Agreed with Dept.*
Claire Trevor School of the Arts	21	14	3	0	4	0	86%	67%	6	1	0	1	13	88%	75%
Normal proposal	17	12	3	0	2	0	82%	71%	5	1	0	1	10	86%	71%
Accelerated proposal	4	2	0	0	2	0	100%	50%	1	0	0	0	3	100%	100%
Donald Bren School of ICS	27	21	2	0	3	1	92%	81%	21	2	0	3	1	92%	81%
Normal proposal	19	16	2	0	0	1	89%	89%	16	2	0	0	1	89%	89%
Accelerated proposal	8	5	0	0	3	0	100%	63%	5	0	0	3	0	100%	63%
Henry Samueli School of Engineering	37	24	11	0	2	0	70%	65%	24	8	0	1	4	76%	73%
Normal proposal	27	17	8	0	2	0	70%	63%	17	5	0	1	4	78%	74%
Accelerated proposal	10	7	3	0	0	0	70%	70%	7	3	0	0	0	70%	70%
Paul Merage School of Business	11	10	1	0	0	0	91%	91%	10	0	0	0	1	100%	100%
Normal proposal	9	8	1	0	0	0	89%	89%	8	0	0	0	1	100%	100%
Accelerated proposal	2	2	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	0	0	0	0	100%	100%
Program in Public Health	13	11	1	1	0	0	92%	85%	9	2	1	0	1	83%	75%
Normal proposal	11	10	0	1	0	0	100%	91%	8	1	1	0	1	90%	80%
Accelerated proposal	2	1	1	0	0	0	50%	50%	1	1	0	0	0	50%	50%
School of Biological Sciences	32	23	3	0	5	1	90%	74%	23	4	0	4	1	87%	74%
Normal proposal	25	18	3	0	3	1	88%	75%	18	3	0	3	1	88%	75%
Accelerated proposal	7	5	0	0	2	0	100%	71%	5	1	0	1	0	86%	71%
School of Education	13	9	1	0	3	0	92%	69%	6	0	0	2	5	100%	75%
Normal proposal	8	5	1	0	2	0	88%	63%	4	0	0	2	2	100%	67%
Accelerated proposal	5	4	0	0	1	0	100%	80%	2	0	0	0	3	100%	100%
School of Humanities	42	34	3	2	3	0	93%	81%	35	2	2	3	0	95%	83%
Normal proposal	27	23	2	2	0	0	93%	85%	24	1	2	0	0	96%	89%
Accelerated proposal	15	11	1	0	3	0	93%	73%	11	1	0	3	0	93%	73%
School of Law	15	9	4	1	1	0	73%	60%	12	1	1	1	0	93%	80%
Normal proposal	12	9	3	0	0	0	75%	75%	11	1	0	0	0	92%	92%
Accelerated proposal	3	0	1	1	1	0	67%	0%	1	0	1	1	0	100%	33%
School of Medicine	74	60	5	0	7	2	93%	83%	56	5	0	5	8	92%	85%
Normal proposal	58	50	3	0	3	2	95%	89%	46	4	0	2	6	92%	88%
Accelerated proposal	16	10	2	0	4	0	88%	63%	10	1	0	3	2	93%	71%
School of Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences	6	5	0	0	1	0	100%	83%	4	0	0	1	1	100%	80%
Normal proposal	4	3	0	0	1	0	100%	75%	2	0	0	1	1	100%	67%
Accelerated proposal	2	2	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	0	0	0	0	100%	100%
School of Physical Sciences	33	25	4	0	4	0	88%	76%	25	4	0	4	0	88%	76%
Normal proposal	18	15	3	0	0	0	83%	83%	15	3	0	0	0	83%	83%
Accelerated proposal	15	10	1	0	4	0	93%	67%	10	1	0	4	0	93%	67%
School of Social Ecology	22	16	1	0	5	0	95%	73%	15	0	0	4	3	100%	79%
Normal proposal	9	8	1	0	0	0	89%	89%	7	0	0	0	2	100%	100%
Accelerated proposal	13	8	0	0	5	0	100%	62%	8	0	0	4	1	100%	67%
School of Social Sciences	39	31	1	0	7	0	97%	79%	30	0	0	2	7	100%	94%
Normal proposal	23	21	1	0	1	0	96%	91%	20	0	0	0	3	100%	100%
Accelerated proposal	16	10	0	0	6	0	100%	63%	10	0	0	2	4	100%	83%
Sue & Bill Gross School of Nursing	3	2	1	0	0	0	67%	67%	2	0	0	0	1	100%	100%
Normal proposal	3	2	1	0	0	0	67%	67%	2	0	0	0	1	100%	100%
Total Proposals	388	294	41	4	45	4	89%	77%	278	29	4	31	46	92%	81%
Total Normal Proposals	270	217	32	3	14	4	88%	82%	203	21	3	10	33	91%	86%
Total Accelerated Proposals	118	77	9	1	31	0	92%	65%	75	8	1	21	13	92%	71%

*Denominator does not include Pending cases

Table 2B: Proposed Accelerations by Schools, CAP Recommendations, and Final Decisions 2021-22

School	Total Cases	Number of Proposed Acceleration	CAP Agree with Proposed Accelerations†	CAP Disagree with Proposed Accelerations	CAP Modify Up and Modify Down with Proposed Accelerations	CAP Pending with Proposed Accelerations	% CAP Agreed with Proposed Accelerations out of Total Cases*	Final Decision Agree with Proposed Accelerations†	Final Decision Disagree with Proposed Accelerations	Final Decision Modify Up and Modify Down with Proposed Accelerations	Final Decision Pending with Proposed Accelerations	% Final Decision Agreed with Proposed Accelerations out of Total Cases**
Claire Trevor School of the Arts	21	4	2	0	2	0	10%	1	0	0	3	6%
Donald Bren School of ICS	27	8	5	0	3	0	19%	5	0	3	0	19%
Henry Samueli School of Engineering	37	10	7	3	0	0	19%	7	3	0	0	19%
Paul Merage School of Business	11	2	2	0	0	0	18%	2	0	0	0	18%
Program in Public Health	13	2	1	1	0	0	8%	1	1	0	0	8%
School of Biological Sciences	32	7	5	0	2	0	16%	5	1	1	0	16%
School of Education	13	5	4	0	1	0	31%	2	0	0	3	20%
School of Humanities	42	15	11	1	3	0	26%	11	1	3	0	26%
School of Law	15	3	0	1	2	0	0%	1	0	2	0	7%
School of Medicine	74	16	10	2	4	0	14%	10	1	3	2	14%
School of Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences	6	2	2	0	0	0	33%	2	0	0	0	33%
School of Physical Sciences	33	15	10	1	4	0	30%	10	1	4	0	30%
School of Social Ecology	22	13	8	0	5	0	36%	8	0	4	1	38%
School of Social Sciences	39	16	10	0	6	0	26%	10	0	2	4	29%
Sue & Bill Gross School of Nursing	3	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	N/A
Totals	388	118	77	9	32	0	20%	75	8	22	13	20%

*Denominator does not include CAP Pending cases

**Denominator does not include Final Decision Pending cases

†Does not include Modify-Up and Modify-Down

Table 3: CAP Cases and Agreement with Departmental Recommendations, 2017-2022

CAP	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	5-yr Mean	Difference
Total cases	443	380	436	380	388	405	-17

CAP Agree	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	5-yr Mean	Difference
Appointments	87%	82%	71%	88%	97%	85%	12%
Promotions and Advancements	72%	70%	55%	72%	72%	68%	4%
Merits	85%	79%	69%	80%	75%	78%	-3%
Other Actions	87%	83%	70%	81%	77%	80%	-3%

CAP Agree or Modify-Up/Down	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	5-yr Mean	Difference
Appointments +/-	95%	93%	86%	100%	100%	95%	5%
Promotions and Advancements +/-	83%	88%	79%	86%	90%	85%	5%
Merits +/-	93%	91%	82%	95%	88%	90%	-2%
Other Actions +/-	87%	89%	76%	89%	81%	84%	-3%

Table 4: Recommendations by Department

Department	Proposed Cases	CAP Agree	CAP Disagree	CAP Modify-Up	CAP Modify-Down	CAP Pending	% CAP Agreed, Mod-Up, or Mod-Down with Dept.*	% CAP Agreed with Dept.*	Final Decision Agree	Final Decision Disagree	Final Decision Modify-Up	Final Decision Modify-Down	Final Decision Pending	% Final Decision Agreed, Mod-Up, or Mod-Down with Dept.*	% Final Decision Agreed with Dept.*	Accelerated	% Accelerated	% Accelerated CAP Agreed with Dept.	% Accelerated Final Decision Agreed with Dept.
African American Studies	2	0	0	1	1	0	100%	0%	0	0	1	1	0	100%	0%	1	50%	0%	0%
Anatomy & Neurobiology	4	2	1	0	1	0	75%	50%	2	1	0	1	0	75%	50%	1	25%	0%	0%
Anesthesiology	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Anthropology	3	0	0	0	3	0	100%	0%	1	0	0	0	2	100%	100%	2	67%	0%	0%
Art	9	5	1	0	3	0	89%	56%	2	0	0	0	7	100%	100%	3	33%	33%	33%
Art History	1	0	0	1	0	0	100%	0%	0	0	1	0	0	100%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Asian American Studies	3	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	67%	100%	100%
Biological Chemistry	7	5	0	0	2	0	100%	71%	4	0	0	0	3	100%	100%	1	14%	0%	0%
Biomedical Engineering	5	5	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	4	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	2	40%	100%	100%
Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering	5	3	1	0	1	0	80%	60%	4	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	1	20%	100%	100%
Chemistry	8	8	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	8	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	4	50%	100%	100%
Chicano Latino Studies	3	2	0	0	1	0	100%	67%	2	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	3	100%	67%	67%
Civil and Environmental Engineering	9	8	1	0	0	0	89%	89%	8	1	0	0	0	89%	89%	2	22%	100%	100%
Classics	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Cognitive Sciences	6	6	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	5	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	1	17%	100%	100%
Comparative Literature	2	2	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Computer Science	14	12	2	0	0	0	86%	86%	12	2	0	0	0	86%	86%	4	29%	100%	100%
Criminology Law & Society	9	5	0	0	4	0	100%	56%	5	0	0	3	1	100%	63%	4	44%	0%	0%
Dance	3	2	0	0	1	0	100%	67%	2	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Dermatology	2	2	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	50%	100%	100%
Developmental & Cell Biology	7	3	1	0	3	0	86%	43%	3	2	0	2	0	71%	43%	3	43%	67%	67%
Drama	6	4	2	0	0	0	67%	67%	0	1	0	1	4	50%	0%	1	17%	100%	0%
Earth System Science	5	4	0	0	1	0	100%	80%	4	0	0	1	0	100%	80%	2	40%	50%	50%
East Asian Studies	3	2	1	0	0	0	67%	67%	2	1	0	0	0	67%	67%	1	33%	0%	0%
Ecology & Evolutionary Biology	9	8	0	0	1	0	100%	89%	8	0	0	1	0	100%	89%	1	11%	0%	0%
Economics	8	8	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	8	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Education	13	9	1	0	3	0	92%	69%	6	0	0	2	5	100%	75%	5	38%	80%	40%
Electrical Engineering and Computer Science	12	5	7	0	0	0	42%	42%	5	6	0	0	1	45%	45%	4	33%	25%	25%
Emergency Medicine	5	4	0	0	1	0	100%	80%	3	0	0	1	1	100%	75%	1	20%	0%	0%
English	9	8	1	0	0	0	89%	89%	8	1	0	0	0	89%	89%	2	22%	100%	100%
Environmental & Occupational Health	3	2	0	1	0	0	100%	67%	2	0	1	0	0	100%	67%	1	33%	100%	100%
Epidemiology	3	2	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	1	1	0	0	1	50%	50%	0	0%	0%	0%
European Languages & Studies	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Family Medicine	3	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Film & Media Studies	4	4	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	4	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	50%	100%	100%
Gender & Sexuality Studies	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Global & International Studies	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Health, Society & Behavior	2	2	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
History	8	6	0	0	2	0	100%	75%	6	0	0	2	0	100%	75%	3	38%	33%	33%
Humanities	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Humanities Core	1	0	1	0	0	0	0%	0%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Informatics	10	7	0	0	3	0	100%	70%	7	0	0	3	0	100%	70%	4	40%	25%	25%
Language Science	3	2	0	0	1	0	100%	67%	1	0	0	1	1	100%	50%	2	67%	50%	50%
Logic & Philosophy of Science	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	100%	100%	100%
Materials Science and Engineer	2	1	0	0	1	0	100%	50%	1	0	0	1	0	100%	50%	1	50%	100%	100%
Mathematics	11	7	3	0	1	0	73%	64%	7	3	0	1	0	73%	64%	4	36%	50%	50%
Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering	4	2	2	0	0	0	50%	50%	2	1	0	0	1	67%	67%	0	0%	0%	0%
Medicine	8	8	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	7	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	2	25%	100%	50%
Microbio & Molecular Genetics	2	1	0	0	1	0	100%	50%	1	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Molecular Biology & Biochemistry	9	7	1	0	1	0	89%	78%	7	1	0	1	0	89%	78%	2	22%	100%	100%

Table 4: Recommendations by Department

Department	Proposed Cases	CAP Agree	CAP Disagree	CAP Modify-Up	CAP Modify-Down	CAP Pending	% CAP Agreed, Mod-Up, or Mod-Down with Dept.*	% CAP Agreed with Dept.*	Final Decision Agree	Final Decision Disagree	Final Decision Modify-Up	Final Decision Modify-Down	Final Decision Pending	% Final Decision Agreed, Mod-Up, or Mod-Down with Dept.*	% Final Decision Agreed with Dept.*	Accelerated	% Accelerated	% Accelerated CAP Agreed with Dept.	% Accelerated Final Decision Agreed with Dept.
Music	3	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Neurobiology & Behavior	7	5	1	0	0	1	83%	83%	5	1	0	0	1	83%	83%	1	14%	100%	100%
Neurology	5	4	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	4	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	2	40%	100%	100%
Neurosurgery	1	0	1	0	0	0	0%	0%	0	1	0	0	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Nursing	3	2	1	0	0	0	67%	67%	2	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Obstetrics & Gynecology	3	2	0	0	1	0	100%	67%	2	0	0	1	0	100%	67%	1	33%	0%	0%
Ophthalmology	3	2	1	0	0	0	67%	67%	2	0	0	1	0	100%	67%	0	0%	0%	0%
Orthopedic Surgery	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	100%	100%	100%
Otolaryngology	2	1	0	0	1	0	100%	50%	1	0	0	1	0	100%	50%	2	100%	50%	50%
Pathology	3	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	33%	100%	100%
Paul Merage School of Business	11	10	1	0	0	0	91%	91%	10	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	2	18%	100%	100%
Pediatrics	6	5	1	0	0	0	83%	83%	4	2	0	0	0	67%	67%	0	0%	0%	0%
Pharmaceutical Science	6	5	0	0	1	0	100%	83%	4	0	0	1	1	100%	80%	2	33%	100%	100%
Philosophy	2	2	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	50%	100%	100%
Physics & Astronomy	9	6	1	0	2	0	89%	67%	6	1	0	2	0	89%	67%	5	56%	60%	60%
Physiology & Biophysics	6	6	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	6	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	17%	100%	100%
Plastic Surgery	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Political Science	7	6	1	0	0	0	86%	86%	6	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	2	29%	100%	100%
Population Health & Disease Prevention	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Program in Global Languages & Communication	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	100%	100%	100%
Program in Public Health	5	4	1	0	0	0	80%	80%	4	1	0	0	0	80%	80%	1	20%	0%	0%
Psychiatry & Human Behavior	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Psychological Science	9	9	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	8	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	7	78%	100%	100%
Radiation Oncology	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	100%	100%	100%
Radiological Sciences	5	5	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	5	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Religious Studies	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	100%	100%	100%
School of Law	15	9	4	1	1	0	73%	60%	12	1	1	1	0	93%	80%	3	20%	0%	33%
Sociology	7	5	0	0	2	0	100%	71%	5	0	0	1	1	100%	83%	5	71%	60%	60%
Spanish & Portuguese	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	100%	100%	100%
Statistics	3	2	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	2	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Surgery	3	2	1	0	0	0	67%	67%	2	1	0	0	0	67%	67%	1	33%	0%	100%
Urban Planning & Public Policy	4	2	1	0	1	0	75%	50%	2	0	0	1	1	100%	67%	2	50%	50%	50%
Total	388	294	41	4	45	4	89%	77%	278	29	4	31	46	92%	81%	118	30%	65%	64%

*Denominator does not include Pending cases