

**Council on Academic Personnel  
Annual Report  
AY 2022-2023**

**To the Irvine Divisional Assembly:**

The UC Irvine Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) is pleased to provide the following summary of its activities for 2022-2023. CAP's service year extends from September 1, 2022 through August 31, 2023.

**I. Membership**

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

**II. General Procedures**

**Responsibilities.** The Bylaws of the Irvine Division describe CAP 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 campuswide perspective on proposals for appointments, promotions, merit, and above-scale increases originating from academic units. CAP reviews the academic personnel files for [Senate series titles](#) and forwards its recommendations to the Chancellor and Provost. CAP procedures and review criteria are typically communicated through campuswide 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 both evaluates and applies standards of academic excellence to faculty performance. In doing so, CAP plays a crucial role in implementing the University of California's shared governance principle. Through its careful, deliberative process, CAP makes recommendations

for the administration's consideration in making final decisions. All final decisions on personnel actions are made by the Chancellor, the Provost or an academic Dean (the Vice Dean of Academic Affairs in the case of the School of Medicine) in accordance with Irvine Delegations of Authority.

**Review protocol.** CAP had 34 scheduled meetings in 2022-2023 (from September 2022 to July 2023), 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. At its initial meeting in the fall, CAP established a 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/academicssenate/files/2023/02/CAP-Recusal-Policy-2022-2023-2.13.23.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 (MCAs) and accelerations. Primary and secondary readers are assigned to these "all read" files as in-depth reviewers of each file, and all 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 have been heard. A vote is then taken on the proposed action, with the majority reported as the recommendation 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 AP.

In normal promotion cases where there is disagreement between a department, chair, dean, or CAP recommendations, the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP) allows 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. The other types of "all read" cases for which CAP disagrees with the proposed action are not automatically considered tentative decisions. However, CAP may request additional information if it judges the file to be incomplete or needs clarification before voting on a case.

*Ad hoc* committees are convened when at least one level of review recommends against promotion to tenure or security of employment, recommends termination at any rank, or if CAP judges that additional expertise is necessary for a thorough assessment of a file under review. CAP considers the report from an *ad hoc* committee before its final vote and recommendation. In 2022-2023, four *ad hoc* committees were convened.

All normal merit increases, first “no change,” fifth-year review, and appointment cases for which there was 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 recommendation is in agreement with all lower levels of review, and the Chancellor and/or the Provost determine that no further discussion is needed, AP transmits the final decision to the academic unit. The Provost and/or the 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 used a mix of in-person and remote modalities for meetings to promote community while maintaining efficiency. In addition, the CAP Chair attends various UCI Academic Senate meetings, participates in the review of new policies and procedures, and co-leads workshops with the VPAP.

### **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. The 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 the “Summer Updates” session in June. In addition, the VPAP and the CAP Chair held two workshops in May on AP practices and procedures for assistant professor rank Senate faculty and associate professor rank Senate faculty. The VPAP and CAP also visited two schools by request.

***Caseload and outcome of personnel actions (Appendix Tables 1-5).*** CAP reviewed 425 cases in 2022-23, compared with 388 cases in 2021-22, 380 in 2020-21, 436 in 2019-20, and 380 in 2018-19. Table 1 provides data on decisions by the type of action; Table 2 gives aggregate CAP’s recommendations and the administration’s final decisions by schools; Table 3 provides data on CAP’s recommendations for one-year and one-step accelerations; Table 4

compares CAP's recommendations this year with those of the past five years; and Table 5 gives aggregate CAP's recommendations and the administration's final decisions by departments.

Across schools, the overall rate of full agreement between CAP and the original academic unit recommendation was 69% for all cases that came to CAP in 2022-23; this includes 13 cases left over from 2021-2022. When modifications to proposed actions, such as recommendations to modify up or modify down are included in the "agree" category, the rate of agreement is 88% for all cases reviewed in 2022-23. Most of CAP's differing recommendations involved accelerations or step placement rather than disagreements with the entire action. CAP fully disagreed with only 12% of all proposals (Table 1), most of which involved promotions or merit increases.

As of August 14, 2023, CAP had two cases pending additional information and 25 files still under review by the Administration.

In total, 4% of the Chancellor's or the Provost's final decisions differed from CAP's recommendations. The Provost and/or VPAP consulted with CAP prior to making those differing decisions.

Mid-Career Appraisals (MCAs) of assistant rank Senate faculty, usually undertaken in their 4<sup>th</sup> year, provide candid guidance by identifying progress to tenure or security of employment to date as "Positive," "Provisionally Positive," "Guarded," or "Negative." "Positive" is rare and means no areas for improvement were identified by CAP. "Provisional Positive" is most common and means CAP identified some areas for improvement. "Guarded" means CAP viewed significant improvements would be needed. "Negative" means CAP had more significant concerns in multiple areas of review. Of the 46 MCAs reviewed in 2022-23, the academic units recommended Positive in 31 cases (67%), Provisionally Positive in 14 cases (30%), and Guarded in 1 case (2%), whereas CAP recommended Positive in 4 cases (9%), Provisionally Positive in 27 cases (59%), Guarded in 14 cases (30%), and Negative in 1 case (2%). (These data do not appear in the tables.)

This year 131 faculty personnel cases involved acceleration requests, compared with 118 cases in 2021-22, 101 in 2020-21, 111 in 2019-20, and 83 in 2018-19. Acceleration proposal rates varied widely across schools, ranging from a high of 57% of files proposed as accelerations (Sue & Bill Gross School of Nursing) to a low of 0% (The Paul Merage School of Business and School of Law). CAP fully agreed with 67 cases involving a proposed acceleration, 52% of all acceleration cases (67 out of 130 case recommendations) or 16% of all cases for which it completed its review (67 out of 423 case recommendations). See Table 2 for details. CAP fully agreed with 77% of the one-year accelerations proposed (23 out of 30 cases) and 49% of the one-step accelerations proposed (42 out of 85 cases). See Table 3 for details.

**Reserve CAP.** To avoid potential conflicts of interest, a "Reserve CAP (RCAP)," consisting largely of former CAP members, evaluates dossiers of current CAP members, their significant others if they are Senate faculty, the current Senate Chair, and the Chair Elect. RCAP reviewed five cases this year.

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

**Inclusive Excellence.** Inclusive excellence accomplishments are regularly considered in the review process and can positively influence CAP's assessments of proposed actions. Furthermore, committed to addressing unconscious or implicit bias in their review of files, CAP members participated in an unconscious bias workshop discussion with Sharon Block, Associate Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion.

**Reviews of Chairs and Deans.** CAP provided input into the five-year reviews of four department chairs and four deans. CAP appreciated the opportunity to contribute to these reviews.

#### **IV. Academic Senate Major Discussion Items**

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

##### ***Proposed Revisions to APM-210***

CAP reviewed revisions to APM-210 that aimed to expand activities under the teaching umbrella to explicitly include mentorship. Members noted that they have been valuing mentoring already and expressed hope this expansion would prompt departments to further clarify their expectations. Some members saw this expansion as solving issues where there are limited teaching opportunities in some series, while other members expressed concern that their school has limited opportunities for mentoring and the departments would not be prepared to properly evaluate this activity. Members asked that letters from former students and mentees be discouraged as they tend to be cherry-picked, may place mentees in awkward positions with requests, and such material is rarely helpful.

##### ***Proposal to Establish a School of Population and Public Health***

CAP reviewed the full proposal to establish a School of Population and Public Health and was pleased to see that it addressed a major concern previously highlighted by CAP. Specifically, there is now a detailed explanation of how the teaching load will be reduced to two courses per faculty member. CAP requested further clarification regarding the types of faculty listed in the chart that explains the differences in a "responsibilities-row" for professors, professors of teaching (PoT), in-residence professors and adjunct professors.

##### ***Vice Provost Haynes' Request for Information on How Innovation and Transfer & Entrepreneurship are Recognized***

CAP reviewed the request by Vice Provost Haynes, and the CAP Chair shared member comments with Senate Chair Georg Striedter. The Senate Chair supported increased communication about Innovation and Entrepreneurship (I&E) by CAP and AP, with the understanding that I&E occurs in different forms across all schools and fields. CAP will respond to UCAP if and when a formal request is sent.

## **Office of Academic Personnel Major Discussion Items**

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

### ***UAW Strike Watermark on Fall 2022 Student Course Feedback Form***

Student course feedback forms from Fall 2022 were watermarked due to the UAW strike, in acknowledgment of challenges that may have occurred in classes and for historical context, similar to other quarters during the pandemic. This decision was made after discussions among the Senate Chair, the VPAP, and the CAP Chair.

### ***VPAP/CAP Communication on UAW Strike Considerations***

CAP and the VPAP distributed a joint communication to Senate faculty and AP administrators. The brief message encouraged individual faculty to share their challenges in self-statements, other levels of review to weigh-in appropriately, and reminded everyone that a watermark was already added to the fall student evaluations.

### ***Professors of Teaching School Guidelines***

CAP reviewed six school professor of teaching (PoT) guidelines that were resubmitted following “revise and resubmit” recommendations and one new school guideline submission. CAP also followed up with five other schools to ensure their guidelines framed professional presentations in either research and creative activity sections in a way that is consistent with the campus-wide expectations for all PoTs across campus. CAP provided recommendations to the VPAP, and all the PoT guidelines were approved by the Provost and have been published on the AP website at <https://ap.uci.edu/faculty/potreviewguidelines/>.

### ***Guidance on Documenting Informal Mentoring***

CAP and the VPAP worked with the Council on Equity and Inclusion and the 2022-23 Inclusive Excellence Professors to provide guidance for all Senate faculty in documenting their informal mentoring activities that support undergraduate and graduate students, as well as early-career and other faculty, who may be experiencing academic, career, or personal challenges and seek out additional support and guidance. Such informal mentoring often goes beyond what is normally expected of formal mentors or advisors or in developing collegial relationships. To ensure that faculty members are recognized in the review process for their efforts, they are encouraged to describe in their review files their activities, time commitment, and contributions, along with their impact and outcomes, when possible, while maintaining the confidentiality of mentees. CAP and the VPAP encourage chairs, deans, and other faculty members who wish to recognize colleagues for excellent mentoring, including those who take on a disproportionate share of invisible or informal mentoring activities, to comment in their respective letters on the impact of these activities and help to contextualize them. See Guidance on Documenting Informal Mentoring at <https://ap.uci.edu/2023/08/03/docinformalmentoring/>.

### ***Documenting COVID-19 Impact in Merit and Promotion Files***

With UCAP's encouragement to reaffirm campus approaches, a joint CAP-VPAP memo was distributed to all Senate faculty in the fall to provide them with timely guidance and additional examples of how to document COVID-19 impact in merit and promotion files. Of particular note, faculty are encouraged to entitle the relevant sections in their self-statements as "COVID-19 Opportunities and Challenges" (to be consistent with systemwide guidance). See Documenting COVID-19 Impact in Merit and Promotion Files at <https://ap.uci.edu/documentingcovid19-2/>.

### ***New and Revised Professor of Teaching Sample External Letters for Promotions***

The VPAP incorporated much of CAP's feedback and formatted the letters so that language from the PoT school guidelines are integrated into the letters.

### ***Revisions to the Inter- and Intra-School FTE Transfer Procedure***

Upon request from Senate Chair Striedter, CAP reviewed the VPAP's proposal to remove APP 3-10 D 2.2.3. CAP agreed that the department losing the faculty member should not have veto power in intra-school transfers of FTE faculty. CAP underscored the importance of making sure that deans work diligently to communicate with the relevant chairs to address any challenges and come to some agreement regarding the details of the transfer of the faculty member, as required in APP 3-10 D 2.3.3. CAP also emphasized the importance of making sure that the dean (or future dean) is held responsible for carrying through on the agreement.

### ***Guidance for Professorial Review of Full-Time Faculty Administrators with Underlying Professorial Appointments***

CAP and the VPAP developed clarifying guidance for the academic performance review of Full-Time Faculty Administrators with Underlying Professorial Appointments. This guidance has been integrated into the APP to assist such faculty in the preparation of their files and to assist others in reviewing them. See APP-3-60-J at <https://ap.uci.edu/policies-procedures/app/3-60/>.

### ***AP-11 Form Update***

CAP provided feedback to the VPAP to update the form to more clearly distinguish those external letter writers who responded from those who did not respond.

### ***Updates to Above Scale Proposed Actions***

CAP worked with the VPAP and Senate leadership to revise and provide consistency and clarity to the expectations for all above scale actions.

### ***Updated Guidance for Department Review and Voting Procedures***

In an effort to lessen the burden for departments in the review of files, CAP and the VPAP relaxed the requirement for full department discussion of normal merit files. A subcommittee may be appointed to review the dossier and write a draft letter that is then made available, with the dossier, to all voting members for comment. All of this can be done electronically, and the final letter that incorporates comments must be distributed to all voting members before an official vote is taken. All promotion, advancement, above-scale merit, and merit cases with MCAs should continue to be discussed fully by faculty. See APP 1-12-D-3 at <https://ap.uci.edu/policies-procedures/app/1-12/>.

### ***Request to ARAC and CXAC to Clarify Participation of their Members in Reviews of Academic Personnel in the School of Medicine***

Having observed increased incidences of conflicts of interest in case files across campus, CAP requested, through the VPAP, that each letter from the School of Medicine's Academic Resources Advisory Committee (ARAC) and Clinical X Committee (CXAC) list the committee's membership and any recusals or alternatively list those present. Such information will enable better management of conflicts of interest and help to preserve the value of the recommendations from those advisory councils.

### ***CAP Memo to Deans Providing Overview of Administrative Comments***

In an effort to improve file preparation and review efficiency, CAP prepared a summary of its administrative comments for each school. The VPAP appreciated CAP's effort to improve the academic personnel process and supported the distribution of those summaries to the appropriate stakeholders. Although the project was planned to be implemented last year, other initiatives took priority. This year will be the first that CAP's summary will be distributed through the VPAP.

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

Vice Chair Jaeggi supported the Chair in normal CAP activities and represented the Irvine campus at UCAP. UCAP held four meetings during the 2022-23 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:

### ***Draft Revisions to APM-025 and APM-671***

UCAP discussed draft revisions to APM-025 and APM-671.

### ***Report on the State of Shared Governance at the UC***

UCAP reviewed the report and how it expressed some concerns around a breakdown of communications between the UC administration and the Senate.

### ***Mitigating COVID-19 Impacts on Faculty Working Group (MCIF-WG) Report***

UCAP reviewed the report and UCI's UCAP representative highlighted the recommendations for CAP on page 76. UC President Drake responded to and accepted five of the recommendations.

### ***Response letter from Immediate Past Chair Horwitz regarding sabbatical credits***

UCAP shared the response letter and highlighted that a sabbatical credit return program was rejected at the system level, although UCI's program was highlighted as a positive example.

### ***Academic Council: Guidance for Review of Academic Personnel Affected by the Pandemic***

UCAP shared guidance and materials from the Academic Council highlighting issues campuses should consider during file review to recognize the impacts of the pandemic on faculty members'



scholarly activity, productivity, and opportunities. The VPAP brought UC Davis's COVID Impact Statement Guidance to CAP's attention for consideration.

***Achieving the Academic Mission: Academic Senate Survey of UC Faculty and Instructors and the Continuing Impact of the Pandemic in the 2021–22 Academic Year***

UCAP discussed and shared the results of an informative Senate faculty survey that showed research and teaching continued despite challenges from the COVID-19 pandemic, but significant stress was added to faculty. This is the third such survey and continues to show that faculty are stressed, especially those who are early career, women, and underrepresented minorities.

***Statements Describing Faculty Contributions to Inclusive Excellence***

UCAP shared an informational document that provides history and implementation background through the process of hiring, merits, and promotions. Legal guidance is also provided on the alignment with the California state constitution. CAP members appreciated the information and encouraged one another to continue to consistently acknowledge faculty contributions to inclusive excellence.

***Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity***

UCAP shared the sub-report and noted that UCI was highlighted as a successful model to attract exceptional faculty and build upon inclusive excellence. UCI has established robust funding for FTE support which several schools have successfully utilized. CAP members noted that challenges remained with graduate student diversity and supporting the success of early career faculty.

***Vice Provost Haynes Request for Information on How Innovation Transfer & Entrepreneurship is Recognized***

UCAP shared a potential upcoming request from Vice Provost Haynes about how Innovation Transfer & Entrepreneurship (I&E) is recognized on campus. CAP members agreed that while such activities, like patents, originate from research activities that enough labor is necessary to achieve such I&E they should be credited by CAP and other levels of review. Members believed such crediting does occur already, but that the emphasis on demonstrating the impact of I&E activities could be improved. Candidates should be encouraged, along with other levels of review, to speak to the impact of the candidates' I&E activities. Members suggested this should be a future talking point at AP/CAP workshops, and CAP should make an update to its CAP FAQ.

***UC-wide CAP Practices Survey***

UCAP shared a UC-wide CAP practices survey spreadsheet that highlighted CAP practices across all 10 campuses. The survey is conducted every three years. UCAP members discussed the differences in total caseloads, how often CAPs met together, how some CAPs did not receive teaching releases or funding, gender composition of membership, as well as the differing rates of agreement between CAPs and their Provosts at a subset of campuses. The CAP Vice Chair noted that the survey may provide a few procedural considerations on how to more efficiently review an increasing annual caseload. Members very much appreciated the teaching release offered at UCI, discussed additional reasons other campuses may have differing rates of agreement, and compared the number of Senate faculty at various campuses.

***Resource for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Scholarly Communication***

UCAP shared materials from the Academic Council that highlight how inequities can arise. Vice Chair Jaeggi encouraged members to share the materials with their peers and mentees.

## **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 members for working collaboratively and efficiently, for their consistent engagement in thoughtful dialogue, their ability to disagree without being disagreeable, and for making the entire process a highly rewarding opportunity to make a contribution to the UCI campus.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Garfinkel, School of Social Sciences, Chair  
Susanne Jaeggi, School of Education, Vice Chair  
Ed Coulson, School of Business  
Victor Fleischer, School of Law  
Alan Goldin, School of Medicine (Basic Science)  
Sheldon Greenfield, School of Medicine (Clinical Science)  
Steven Gross, School of Biological Sciences  
Victoria Johnson, School of Humanities  
Jung-Ah Lee, School of Nursing  
Annie Qu, School of Information & Computer Sciences  
Jodi Quas, School of Social Ecology  
Timothy Rupert, School of Engineering  
Scott Rychnovsky, School of Physical Sciences  
Darryl Taylor, School of the Arts

## **APPENDIX**

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

Table 2: CAP Recommendations by School

Table 3: CAP Recommendations for One-year and One-step Accelerations

Table 4: CAP Agreement with Departmental Recommendations, 2018-2023

Table 5: CAP Recommendations by Department

Glossary of CAP Recommendations

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

	CAP Recommendations					Total
	Full Agreement - as proposed	Partial Agreement - modified up	Partial Agreement - modified down	Disagreement	In Process	
<b>Total Personnel Cases</b>	291	13	69	50	2	425
<b>% CAP Recommendations*</b>	69%	3%	16%	12%		

\*Denominator does not include Pending cases

Table 1A. Appointments	CAP Recommendations					Total
	Full Agreement - as proposed	Partial Agreement - modified up	Partial Agreement - modified down	Disagreement	In Process	
Assistant Professor (incl. PoT, Clin X)	6	0	0	0	0	6
Associate Professor (incl. PoT, Clin X, In Res, of Law)	14	0	0	1	0	15
Professor (incl. PoT, Clin X)	20	3	0	0	1	24
Appointment of Honorary Title	11	0	0	0	0	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>% CAP Agreed with Proposal*</b>						<b>93%</b>
<b>% CAP Agreed or Modified Up Proposal*</b>						<b>98%</b>

\*Denominator does not include Pending cases

Table 1B. Promotions and Advancements	CAP Recommendations					Total	Cases with Proposed Accelerations	% Cases with Proposed Accelerations
	Full Agreement - as proposed	Partial Agreement - modified up	Partial Agreement - modified down	Disagreement	In Process			
Associate Professor (incl. PoT, Clin X, In Res)	29	4	14	5	1	53	24	45%
Professor (incl. PoT, Clin X, In Res)	18	5	11	1	0	35	17	49%
Advancement to Professor 6	23	0	8	5	0	36	13	36%
Advancement to Above Scale	10	0	2	9	0	21	5	24%
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>41%</b>
<b>% CAP Agreed with Proposal*</b>						<b>56%</b>		
<b>% CAP Agreed or Modified Up Proposal*</b>						<b>62%</b>		

\*Denominator does not include Pending cases

Table 1C. Merit Increases	CAP Recommendations					Total	Cases with Proposed Accelerations	% Cases with Proposed Accelerations
	Full Agreement - as proposed	Partial Agreement - modified up	Partial Agreement - modified down	Disagreement	In Process			
Assistant Professor (incl. Merits with MCA, PoT, Clin X)	31	0	7	1	0	39	8	21%
Associate Professor (incl. Clin X, In Res)	31	0	5	3	0	39	13	33%
Professor (incl. PoT, Clin X, of Law)	59	1	13	6	0	79	51	65%
Professor Above Scale Merit (incl. of Law)	7	0	6	5	0	18	0	0%
Professor Above Scale Merit Plus	3	0	3	3	0	9	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>% CAP Agreed with Proposal*</b>						<b>71%</b>		
<b>% CAP Agreed or Modified Up Proposal*</b>						<b>72%</b>		

\*Denominator does not include Pending cases

Table 1D. Other Actions	CAP Recommendations					Total
	Full Agreement - as proposed	Partial Agreement - modified up	Partial Agreement - modified down	Disagreement	In Process	
5th Yr Reviews	10	0	0	0	0	10
Career Equity Review	1	0	0	4	0	5
Change of Series, Promotion	1	0	0	0	0	1
Dean's Delegated Merit	0	0	0	2	0	2
MCA	4	0	0	4	0	8
No Change	8	0	0	0	0	8
Non-Reappointment	0	0	0	1	0	1
Reappointment (incl. MCA)	5	0	0	0	0	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>% CAP Agreed with Proposal*</b>						<b>73%</b>
<b>% CAP Agreed or Modified Up Proposal*</b>						<b>73%</b>

\*Denominator does not include Pending cases

**Table 2: CAP Recommendations by School**

School	Proposed Cases	CAP Full Agreement	CAP Partial Agreement-modified up	CAP Partial Agreement-modified down	CAP Disagreement	CAP In Process	% CAP Agreed or Partial Agreement-Mod-Up or Mod-Down*	% CAP Full Agreement*	Final Decision Full Agreement	Final Decision Partial Agreement-modified up	Final Decision Partial Agreement-modified down	Final Decision Disagreement	Final Decision Pending	% Final Decision Agreement or Partial Agreement-Mod-Up or Mod-Down*	% Final Decision Full Agreement*
<b>Claire Trevor School of the Arts</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>73%</b>
Normal proposal	11	9	0	1	1	0	91%	82%	9	0	1	0	1	100%	90%
Accelerated proposal	5	2	1	2	0	0	100%	40%	2	1	2	0	0	100%	40%
<b>Donald Bren School of ICS</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>74%</b>
Normal proposal	15	12	1	0	2	0	87%	80%	12	1	0	2	0	87%	80%
Accelerated proposal	4	2	1	1	0	0	100%	50%	2	1	1	0	0	100%	50%
<b>Henry Samueli School of Engineering</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>71%</b>
Normal proposal	24	18	1	1	4	0	83%	75%	16	1	0	3	4	85%	80%
Accelerated proposal	13	5	0	5	2	1	83%	42%	6	0	4	1	2	91%	55%
<b>Paul Merage School of Business</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>85%</b>
Normal proposal	20	17	0	0	3	0	85%	85%	17	0	0	3	0	0	85%
Accelerated proposal	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A
<b>Program in Public Health</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>83%</b>
Normal proposal	15	13	1	0	1	0	93%	87%	14	1	0	0	0	100%	93%
Accelerated proposal	9	6	0	3	0	0	100%	67%	5	0	3	0	1	100%	63%
<b>School of Biological Sciences</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>67%</b>
Normal proposal	25	18	0	5	2	0	92%	72%	16	0	2	6	1	75%	67%
Accelerated proposal	18	12	0	6	0	0	100%	67%	12	0	6	0	0	100%	67%
<b>School of Education</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>62%</b>
Normal proposal	7	4	0	1	2	0	71%	57%	3	0	1	2	1	67%	50%
Accelerated proposal	7	4	0	3	0	0	100%	57%	5	0	2	0	0	100%	71%
<b>School of Humanities</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>65%</b>
Normal proposal	30	19	2	2	7	0	77%	63%	16	2	1	7	4	73%	62%
Accelerated proposal	8	6	0	2	0	0	100%	75%	6	0	2	0	0	100%	75%
<b>School of Law</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>89%</b>
Normal proposal	9	8	0	1	0	0	100%	89%	8	0	1	0	0	100%	89%
Accelerated proposal	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A
<b>School of Medicine</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>70%</b>
Normal proposal	70	52	1	6	10	1	86%	75%	52	1	4	10	3	85%	78%
Accelerated proposal	21	7	2	8	4	0	81%	33%	8	0	7	4	2	79%	42%
<b>School of Pharmacy &amp; Pharmaceutical Sciences</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
Normal proposal	3	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%
Accelerated proposal	3	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	0	0	0	100%
<b>School of Physical Sciences</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>65%</b>
Normal proposal	25	19	0	2	4	0	84%	76%	18	0	2	4	1	83%	75%
Accelerated proposal	21	10	0	7	4	0	81%	48%	10	0	7	2	2	89%	53%
<b>School of Social Ecology</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>71%</b>
Normal proposal	11	9	2	0	0	0	100%	82%	9	2	0	0	0	100%	82%
Accelerated proposal	10	5	0	5	0	0	100%	50%	6	0	4	0	0	100%	60%
<b>School of Social Sciences</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>75%</b>
Normal proposal	26	20	1	1	4	0	85%	77%	20	1	1	3	1	88%	80%
Accelerated proposal	8	4	0	4	0	0	100%	50%	4	0	3	0	1	100%	57%
<b>Sue &amp; Bill Gross School of Nursing</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>67%</b>
Normal proposal	3	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	0	0	0	100%
Accelerated proposal	4	1	0	3	0	0	100%	25%	1	0	2	0	1	100%	33%
<b>Total Proposals</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>72%</b>
<b>Total Normal Proposals</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>78%</b>
<b>Total Accelerated Proposals</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>57%</b>

\*Denominator does not include Pending cases

**Table 3: CAP Recommendations for One-year and One-step Accelerations**

One-year Accelerations	CAP Recommendations				Total	% CAP Agreement	% CAP Agreed or Partial Agreement-Mod-Up or Mod-Down
	Full Agreement-as proposed	Partial Agreement-modified up	Partial Agreement-modified down	Disagreement			
Advancement to Above Scale	0	0	0	1	1	0%	0%
Advancement to Professor 6	2	0	0	1	3	67%	67%
Merit	15	1	0	2	18	83%	89%
Promotion to Professor	3	0	0	0	3	100%	100%
Promotion to Associate Professor	3	1	0	1	5	60%	80%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>83%</b>

One-step Accelerations	CAP Recommendations				Total	% CAP Agreement	% CAP Agreed or Partial Agreement-Mod-Up or Mod-Down
	Full Agreement-as proposed	Partial Agreement-modified up	Partial Agreement-modified down	Disagreement			
Advancement to Professor 6	2	0	7	0	9	22%	100%
3-year	2	0	7	0	9	22%	100%
Merit	27	0	17	0	44	61%	100%
2-year	4	0	4	0	8	50%	100%
3-year	23	0	13	0	36	64%	100%
Merit, MCA	1	0	6	0	7	14%	100%
2-year	1	0	6	0	7	14%	100%
Promotion to Professor	3	0	5	0	8	38%	100%
3-year	3	0	5	0	8	38%	100%
Promotion to Associate Professor	9	0	7	1	17	53%	94%
2-year	9	0	7	1	17	53%	94%
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>96%</b>

**Table 4: CAP Agreement with Departmental Recommendations, 2018-2023**

<b>CAP</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>5-yr Mean</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Total cases	380	436	380	388	425	402	23

<b>CAP Full Agreement</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>5-yr Mean</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Appointments	82%	71%	88%	97%	93%	86%	7%
Promotions and Advancements	70%	55%	72%	72%	56%	65%	-9%
Merits	79%	69%	80%	75%	71%	75%	-4%
Other Actions	83%	70%	81%	77%	73%	77%	-4%

<b>CAP Full Agreement or Modify-Up/Down</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>5-yr Mean</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Appointments +/-	93%	86%	100%	100%	98%	95%	3%
Promotions and Advancements +/-	88%	79%	86%	90%	86%	86%	0%
Merits +/-	91%	82%	95%	88%	90%	89%	1%
Other Actions +/-	89%	76%	89%	81%	73%	82%	-9%

**Table 5: CAP Recommendations by Department**

Department	Proposed Cases	CAP Full Agreement	CAP Partial Agreement- modified up	CAP Partial Agreement- modified down	CAP Disagreement	CAP In Process	% CAP Agreed or Partial Agreement- Mod-Up or Mod-Down*	% CAP Full Agreement*	Final Decision Full Agreement	Final Decision Partial Agreement- modified up	Final Decision Partial Agreement- modified down	Final Decision Disagreement	Final Decision Pending	% Final Decision Agreement or Partial Agreement- Mod-Up or Mod-Down*	% Final Decision Full Agreement*	Accelerated	% Accelerated	% Accelerated CAP Full Agreement	% Accelerated Final Decision Full Agreement*
African American Studies	2	1	0	0	1	0	50%	50%	1	0	0	1	0	50%	50%	0	0%	0%	0%
Anatomy & Neurobiology	3	1	0	1	1	0	67%	33%	1	0	1	1	0	67%	33%	2	67%	0%	0%
Anesthesiology	3	2	0	0	1	0	67%	67%	2	0	0	1	0	67%	67%	0	0%	0%	0%
Anthropology	6	3	0	2	1	0	83%	50%	3	0	1	1	1	80%	60%	1	17%	0%	0%
Art	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	100%	100%	100%
Art History	2	1	0	1	0	0	100%	50%	1	0	1	0	0	100%	50%	1	50%	0%	0%
Asian American Studies	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	0%	0	0	0	1	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Biological Chemistry	8	2	0	3	3	0	63%	25%	3	0	1	4	0	50%	38%	3	38%	33%	67%
Biomedical Engineering	6	4	1	0	1	0	83%	67%	4	1	0	1	0	83%	67%	0	0%	0%	0%
Chemical & Biomolecular Engr	2	1	0	1	0	0	100%	50%	1	0	1	0	0	100%	50%	1	50%	0%	0%
Chemistry	15	13	0	0	2	0	87%	87%	13	0	0	2	0	87%	87%	5	33%	100%	100%
Chicano Latino Studies	4	4	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	1	0	75%	75%	1	25%	100%	100%
Civil & Environmental Engr	5	4	0	0	1	0	80%	80%	3	0	0	1	1	75%	75%	2	40%	100%	100%
Classics	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Clinical Pharmacy Practice	3	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	67%	100%	100%
Cognitive Sciences	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	100%	100%	100%
Comparative Literature	3	1	0	2	0	0	100%	33%	1	0	2	0	0	100%	33%	1	33%	0%	0%
Computer Science	12	9	0	1	2	0	83%	75%	9	0	1	2	0	83%	75%	2	17%	50%	50%
Criminology Law & Society	8	5	2	1	0	0	100%	63%	5	2	1	0	0	100%	63%	3	38%	67%	67%
Dance	4	3	1	0	0	0	100%	75%	3	1	0	0	0	100%	75%	1	25%	0%	0%
Developmental & Cell Biology	12	9	0	1	2	0	83%	75%	8	0	1	2	1	82%	73%	3	25%	67%	67%
Drama	8	5	0	3	0	0	100%	63%	5	0	3	0	0	100%	63%	2	25%	0%	0%
Earth System Science	7	5	0	2	0	0	100%	71%	4	0	2	1	0	86%	57%	4	57%	50%	50%
East Asian Studies	3	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	1	33%	100%	100%
Ecology & Evolutionary Biology	10	6	0	4	0	0	100%	60%	6	0	3	1	0	90%	60%	5	50%	40%	40%
Economics	3	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Electrical Engr & Computer Sci	10	4	0	3	2	1	78%	44%	4	0	1	1	4	83%	67%	3	30%	0%	33%
Emergency Medicine	4	4	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	4	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	25%	100%	100%
English	11	9	0	0	2	0	82%	82%	8	0	0	2	1	80%	80%	1	9%	100%	100%
Environ & Occupational Health	5	4	1	0	0	0	100%	80%	4	1	0	0	0	100%	80%	2	40%	100%	100%
Epidemiology	1	0	0	1	0	0	100%	0%	0	0	1	0	0	100%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Epidemiology & Biostats	3	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
European Languages & Studies	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	0%	0	0	0	1	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Family Medicine	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Film & Media Studies	5	1	1	1	2	0	60%	20%	1	1	0	2	1	50%	25%	0	0%	0%	0%
Global & International Studies	3	2	1	0	0	0	100%	67%	2	1	0	0	0	100%	67%	0	0%	0%	0%
Health, Society & Behavior	10	10	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	10	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	20%	100%	100%
History	5	4	1	0	0	0	100%	80%	4	1	0	0	0	100%	80%	2	40%	100%	100%
Informatics	4	2	2	0	0	0	100%	50%	2	2	0	0	0	100%	50%	2	50%	50%	50%
Logic & Philosophy of Science	4	3	0	0	1	0	75%	75%	3	0	0	1	0	75%	75%	2	50%	100%	100%
Materials Science and Engineer	8	6	0	1	1	0	88%	75%	6	0	1	0	1	100%	86%	3	38%	33%	33%
Mathematics	5	3	0	2	0	0	100%	60%	3	0	2	0	0	100%	60%	3	60%	33%	33%
Mechanical & Aerospace Engr	6	4	0	1	1	0	83%	67%	4	1	0	1	0	83%	67%	4	67%	50%	50%
Medicine	16	10	2	1	2	1	87%	67%	10	0	1	2	3	85%	77%	5	31%	60%	60%
Microbio & Molecular Genetics	5	4	0	1	0	0	100%	80%	4	0	1	0	0	100%	80%	1	20%	0%	0%
Molecular Bio & Biochemistry	6	4	0	2	0	0	100%	67%	4	0	2	0	0	100%	67%	2	33%	50%	50%
Music	3	2	0	0	1	0	67%	67%	2	0	0	0	1	100%	100%	1	33%	100%	100%
Neurobiology & Behavior	15	11	0	4	0	0	100%	73%	10	0	2	3	0	80%	67%	8	53%	88%	88%
Neurology	6	4	0	1	1	0	83%	67%	4	0	0	2	0	67%	67%	1	17%	0%	0%
Nursing/ Administration	7	4	0	3	0	0	100%	57%	4	0	2	0	1	100%	67%	4	57%	25%	25%
Ophthalmology	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Otolaryngology	2	1	0	0	1	0	50%	50%	1	0	0	1	0	50%	50%	2	100%	50%	50%
Pathology	10	8	0	1	1	0	90%	80%	8	0	1	1	0	90%	80%	2	20%	50%	50%
Paul Merage School of Business	20	17	0	0	3	0	85%	85%	17	0	0	3	0	85%	85%	0	0%	0%	0%
Pediatrics	6	3	1	1	1	0	83%	50%	3	1	1	0	1	100%	60%	0	0%	0%	0%
Pharmaceutical Science	3	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	33%	100%	100%
Philosophy	3	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	67%	100%	100%
Physical Med & Rehabilitation	2	2	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	2	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Physics & Astronomy	19	8	0	5	6	0	68%	42%	8	0	5	3	3	81%	50%	9	47%	22%	22%
Physiology & Biophysics	6	4	0	1	1	0	83%	67%	4	0	1	0	1	100%	80%	1	17%	0%	0%
Political Science	5	4	0	1	0	0	100%	80%	4	0	1	0	0	100%	80%	1	20%	0%	0%
Pop Hlth & Disease Prevention	5	1	0	3	1	0	80%	20%	2	0	3	0	0	100%	40%	4	80%	25%	25%
Psychiatry & Human Behavior	6	4	0	1	1	0	83%	67%	4	0	1	1	0	83%	67%	0	0%	0%	0%
Psychological Science	8	7	0	1	0	0	100%	88%	7	0	1	0	0	100%	88%	4	50%	75%	75%
Public Health Deans Office	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0%	0%	1	100%	100%	0%
Radiation Oncology	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Radiological Sciences	3	2	0	1	0	0	100%	67%	2	1	0	0	0	100%	67%	1	33%	0%	0%
School of Education	14	8	0	4	2	0	86%	57%	8	0	3	2	1	85%	62%	7	50%	57%	71%
School of Law	9	8	0	1	0	0	100%	89%	8	0	1	0	0	100%	89%	0	0%	0%	0%

Department	Proposed Cases	CAP Full Agreement	CAP Partial Agreement-modified up	CAP Partial Agreement-modified down	CAP Disagreement	CAP In Process	% CAP Agreed or Partial Agreement-Mod-Up or Mod-Down*	% CAP Full Agreement*	Final Decision Full Agreement	Final Decision Partial Agreement-modified up	Final Decision Partial Agreement-modified down	Final Decision Disagreement	Final Decision Pending	% Final Decision or Partial Agreement-Mod-Up or Mod-Down*	% Final Decision Full Agreement*	Accelerated	% Accelerated	% Accelerated CAP Full Agreement	% Accelerated Final Decision Full Agreement*
Sociology	8	4	0	2	2	0	75%	50%	5	0	2	0	1	100%	71%	2	25%	0%	0%
Spanish & Portuguese	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Statistics	3	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Surgery	3	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	3	0	0	0	0	100%	100%	0	0%	0%	0%
Urban Planning & Public Policy	5	2	0	3	0	0	100%	40%	3	0	2	0	0	100%	60%	3	60%	0%	33%
Urology	4	2	0	1	1	0	75%	50%	2	0	1	1	0	75%	50%	2	50%	0%	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>53%</b>



## **Glossary of CAP Recommendations**

- **Full Agreement - as proposed** – CAP recommendations in agreement with the proposed action and step.
- **Partial Agreement - modified up** – CAP recommendations in agreement with the proposed action, such as a merit, promotion, or advancement, but to a higher step than proposed.
- **Partial Agreement - modified down** – CAP recommendations in agreement with the proposed action, such as an accelerated merit, promotion, or advancement, but to a lower step than proposed.
- **Disagreement** – CAP recommendations that are fully against the proposed action; this category also includes CAP recommendations for a merit instead of the proposed promotion.
- **CAP in Process** – CAP has not provided a recommendation, as an Ad Hoc or Additional Information was requested.
- **Final Pending** – A final decision has not been made by the Chancellor or Provost at the time the data were aggregated.