To the Irvine Divisional Assembly:

The UC Irvine Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) is pleased to provide the following summary of its activities for academic year 2017-2018.

I. Membership

The continuing faculty members serving this year on CAP were Professors Peter Ditto (Social Ecology), Fred Ehlert (Medicine, Basic Sciences), Magda El Zarki (Information & Computer Sciences), Lisa Grant Ludwig (At Large member, Public Health), Robin Keller (Business), Antoinette LaFarge (Arts), and Georg Striedter (Biological Sciences). New members were Professors Bogi Andersen (Medicine, Clinical), Frank Bean (Social Sciences), Sharon Block (Humanities), and Roger Rangel (Engineering). Professors Joe DiMento (Law) and Abel Klein (Physical Sciences) served during the fall quarter and Olufunmilayo Arewa (Law) and Timothy Tait (Physical Sciences) served during winter and spring quarters. Two members, from Law and Social Sciences, resigned in April and were not replaced. Professor Ditto served as CAP Chair, and Professor Striedter served as Vice Chair and representative to the University-wide Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). Lynn Harris was CAP analyst and Office Manager Rachel Mangold and Specialist Christine Aguilar provided CAP staff support.

II. General Procedures

CAP’s responsibilities. CAP is responsible for providing a campus-wide perspective on proposals for appointments, promotions, and merit increases originating from academic units. CAP reviews the files of academic personnel for most Senate series titles and forwards its recommendations to the Chancellor and Provost. CAP procedures and review criteria are available for consultation through the Frequently Asked Questions document on the Academic Senate website (updated 2017), http://senate.uci.edu/committees/councils/council-on-academic-personnel-cap/, and communicated through public information sessions held in conjunction with the Office of Academic Personnel.

CAP plays a crucial role in implementing the shared governance principle adopted by the University of California by reviewing standards of academic excellence and the reward system for faculty performance. It makes recommendations as a panel after careful deliberation. All final decisions on personnel actions are made by the Chancellor or, when delegated, by the Provost, the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, or an academic Dean.
CAP’s review protocol. CAP had 37 scheduled meetings (only 35 of which were held) in academic year 2017-18 (from September 21, 2017 to July 26, 2018), with meetings every other week in fall quarter and weekly meetings thereafter. Confidentiality, fairness and consistency are central tenets of CAP deliberations, and all members rigorously uphold these principles. At its initial meeting in the fall, CAP established a quorum of a minimum of eight members for all cases. This quorum was adjusted to seven members beginning in May after two members resigned in April. Each member present, including the Chair, votes on all cases; recusals are permitted if there is evidence or the appearance of a conflict of interest on a given case. The full Council reviews all major actions (non-delegated appointments, promotions to Associate and Full Professor, advancements to Professor Step VI and Above Scale) and all Mid-Career Appraisals and Accelerations of more than two years outside of rank and more than one step. Primary, secondary and tertiary readers are assigned in-depth review of each file, but all Council members acquaint themselves with every case up for review. At the meeting, discussion is led by these readers, followed by the Chair, who reviews all cases. During open discussion, the goal is to consider all relevant aspects of the case, and discussion continues until members are satisfied. A vote is then taken on the proposed action, with the majority reported as the decision of the Council. Tie votes are recorded as not supporting the proposed action. After the meeting, the CAP analyst prepares a draft report for each case that was reviewed, which is then revised by the CAP members. In the report, the vote is conveyed, and in some instances both the majority and minority opinions are presented. The CAP Chair is responsible for the final version of the report transmitted to the Office of Academic Personnel.

“Consentable/Subcommittee” cases are read by two members and the Chair. Eligible cases are normal merit increases, accelerations within the same rank and within one step, first No Change, Fifth Year reviews, Appointments of Assistant and Associate Researchers, LPSOE or SLPSOE, and Reappointment without Merit where all levels of review prior to CAP are in agreement. If the subcommittee agrees with the proposed action, the case is put on the consent agenda for approval. The subcommittee also reviews Tentative Decisions to evaluate the presence of new or significant information for all but tenure cases. If one or more subcommittee members judge that a case requires more in-depth consideration, the case is reassigned for full Council discussion at the next meeting. Titles of Distinction as well as Post-audits of Dean Delegated appointments at Assistant Professor when there is disagreement at any level of review, are also reviewed by subcommittee and put on the consent agenda unless a fuller discussion is needed.

CAP forwards its recommendations in its report to the Office of Academic Personnel. If CAP’s decision is in agreement with all lower levels of review and the Chancellor and/or Provost determine that no further discussion is needed, the Office of Academic Personnel transmits the final decision to the academic unit. If any level of review disagrees with the proposed action, an opportunity is provided for additional information or rebuttal. While standard practice at UCI, this is unique in the UC system for cases other than tenure. CAP reviews the additional information received for these cases and, when deemed substantively meaningful, a second vote is taken. Sometimes the additional information changes CAP’s recommendation.
Additionally, ad hoc committees are convened when at least one level of review recommends against tenure or if CAP judges that additional expertise would be necessary for a thorough assessment of a file under review. Reports of outside ad hoc committees are considered by CAP before a final vote and recommendation. In 2017-18, four outside ad hoc committees were convened.

CAP’s deliberations result in recommendations to higher levels of authority, who make the final decisions. The Provost and/or Vice Provost for Academic Personnel meet with CAP prior to the final decision to discuss cases in which they are considering overruling CAP’s recommendation, or where they want further clarification of CAP’s reasoning.

While service on CAP is time-consuming, members feel that it is some of the most rewarding service in which they have participated. During the busy season of January through July, members typically spend well over 10 hours each week reviewing files, participating in the CAP meetings, and writing reports.

III. CAP’s Specific Activities

Communication with the faculty. CAP considers communication with faculty, departments and Deans about the academic review process to be an important part of its mission. The Vice Provost and the CAP Chair held a workshop for department chairs and personnel administrators in September, and a workshop for junior faculty and those in the Lecturer/Potential Security of Employment series in May. CAP also welcomes the opportunity to meet with individual schools to discuss the process, but had no such meetings in 2017-18.

Case load and outcome of personnel actions (Tables 1-4). CAP reviewed 443 cases in 2017-18, compared to 486 cases in 2016-17, 529 in 2015-16, 542 in 2014-15, and 488 in 2013-14. Table 1 provides data on decisions by the type of action; Table 2 gives aggregate decisions by schools; Table 3 compares CAP’s decisions this year with those of the past five years; and Table 4 gives aggregate decisions by departments.

Across schools, the overall rates of agreement between CAP and the original departmental recommendations (see Table 2) ranged from 71-100% in 2017-18, compared to 65-100% in 2016-17, 75-100% in 2015-16, 79-100% in 2014-15 and 84-100% in 2013-14. When modifications to acceleration files are included in the "agree" category, the rates of agreement increase to 79-100% for 2017-18. As of August 8, 2018, CAP had no pending files and 47 files are still under review by the Administration. As stated above, decisions by CAP are advisory to the Chancellor and Provost, who make the final decisions. In total, only about 5% of these final decisions differed from CAP’s recommendations. Before making a final decision, the Provost and/or the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel met in person with CAP to discuss cases in which there was potential disagreement on the final recommendation. In some few cases if CAP’s vote was tied or nearly tied, the Provost and/or Vice Provost for Academic Personnel would consult with the CAP Chair rather than the entire committee.
In 2017-18, CAP reviewed and agreed with two requests for postponement of tenure review. A key criterion for postponement was that an additional year would substantially improve chances for a successful tenure review. The current policy is that Assistant Professors are generally not eligible for postponement if they have had a negative Mid-Career Appraisal or the last review resulted in No Change.

Mid-Career Appraisals (MCAs) of Assistant Professors during their 4th year are key evaluations by units. These appraisals provide candid guidance and recommendations to the candidate pertaining to future tenure review, identifying tenure prospects as “Positive,” “Provisionally Positive,” “Guarded,” or “Negative.” Of the 43 MCAs reviewed in 2017-18, the department’s recommendations were frequently positive or provisionally positive, whereas CAP’s recommendations were more equally distributed across Positive, Provisionally Positive and Guarded. Neither the departments nor CAP judged any MCA to be negative.

Electronic routing and review of files. This year, CAP reviewed 265 files that were prepared using AP Review, as compared to 247 in 2016-17, 157 files in 2015-16, 135 files in 2014-15, and 103 files in 2013-14. Developed by the UCI Offices of Academic Personnel and Information Technology in partnership with UCSD, AP Review provides online routing and review of personnel files, with built-in systems to help ensure compliance with UC personnel policies.

Post-audits and streamlining the review process. At the beginning of the year, CAP voted to review accelerations of less than full step and within rank on the consent agenda. Toward the end of the year CAP voted to no longer post-audit Dean Delegated Appointments in the Assistant Professor and Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment Series Steps I through III. However, it continues to post-audit Dean Delegated Merits of Full Professors prior to Step IV, as well as major actions in the Adjunct Professor series. In conducting post-audits, CAP strives for consistency across schools and provides feedback when CAP disagrees with the appointment level or the action.

Lecturer-Continuing and Excellence Review. To further streamline the review process, Unit 18 (Lecturer) Excellence Reviews and Continuing merits effective after 7/1/17 were reviewed by a newly formed committee in the Office of Academic Personnel, based on a recommendation from an ad hoc committee convened during 2016-17 to identify efficiencies. During 2017-18, 49 cases were reviewed by this committee. For consistency, CAP continues to review cases prior to 7/1/17.

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

Diversity in the academic personnel review process. CAP continues to consider how to best identify and promote diversity in research, teaching, and/or service, as well as ways to report
diversity-related activities on the Addendum to the Biography (AP-10 form). This information is reviewed by CAP members and can lead to a better assessment of the proposed action.

Reviews of Chairs, Deans, and proposals for new Departments and Schools. CAP provided input to the 5-year reviews of two Deans and six Department Chairs.


IV. Major Discussion Issues

SENATE REQUESTS FOR COMMENT
CAP discussed and returned comments to the Senate regarding the following:

Second Systemwide Review APM 285-210-3-133-740-135-235. In general, CAP supports the UC’s efforts to improve the Lecturer/Potential Security of Employment/Teaching Professor series, but it also outlined potential logistical challenges that should be addressed before full implementation.

Systemwide Review of APM 675 - Veterinary Medicine Salary Administration. CAP does not typically opine on matters of salary, but commented on the larger issue of the unnecessary proliferation of discipline-specific APM policies, especially when other potential solutions are available, as in this case.

Implementation for CTLSE Recommendations to Redesign Teaching Evaluations. In general, CAP supports the proposal to redesign the evaluation/feedback process as one measure to assess teaching effectiveness. CAP also noted its concern regarding ongoing issues such as bias, creating one standardized form that is meaningful across disciplines, and continued low student response rates.

Proposal to Establish the Department of Global and International Studies in the School of Social Sciences. In general, CAP supports the proposal but notes potential challenges relevant to the academic personnel process that 1) standards for merits and promotion in multi-disciplinary programs be made clear and 2) that small departments have a large enough faculty to adequately review and present faculty files.

Proposal to Establish the Jerry D. Choate Endowed Chair in Urologic Oncology. CAP supports the proposal in general, but noted some potential concerns related to the academic personnel process and the criteria by which chair holders will be selected.

After review and discussion, CAP did not provide significant changes or opinions on the following Senate review items judging them appropriate as written.
• Systemwide Review of the Task Force Report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program
• Proposal to Reconstitute the Department of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science (ChEMS) Into Separate Departments
• Senate Review SB-128
• Chair – Dhan Kaur Sahota Presidential Chair in Sikh Studies, School of Social Sciences

VICE PROVOST - ACADEMIC PERSONNEL ’S REQUEST FOR COMMENT

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

Redelegation Proposals
CAP reviewed, commented on, and agreed to a proposal for redelegations of authority in the Reappointment of Senior/Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment During Second Year of Appointment in the School of Law to the Dean.

Transfer of In-Residence Professor Series
CAP agreed to waive its review for transfer of this series to the Professor series.

AP-10
CAP reviewed and commented on proposed updates to the AP-10 (Addendum) as it transitions to a new format. CAP made recommendations to clarify the categories.

Use of Titles of Distinction at UCI
CAP reviewed, discussed and support the recommendations of an ad hoc committee charged to evaluate the use of titles of distinction on the UCI campus.

Dean’s Delegated Merits
CAP proposed that Dean Delegated Merit cases on which there is disagreement at any lower level continue to be reviewed at CAP.

Team Science
CAP opined on a proposed index to help faculty assess the ways in which they have contributed to the teams with whom they conduct academic research.

In addition to the items listed above, CAP continues to provide input and feedback on faculty resources for teaching effectiveness and diversity and inclusion in the academic personnel review process.
V. University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP)

Vice Chair Georg Striedter supported the Chair in normal CAP activities and also represented the Irvine campus at the Systemwide University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). UCAP had three meetings during the 2017-18 academic year, one at UCOP and two by videoconference, to conduct business with respect to its duties. As outlined in Senate Bylaw 135, UCAP considers general policy on academic personnel, including salary scales, appointments and promotions, and all related matters. The principal issues that UCAP considered this year are described briefly below:

Revisions to APMs 285, 210-3, 133 and 740
Continuing discussions from the prior year, UCAP members considered proposed policy changes to the Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOE) series. They approved of the plan to make use of the title “Teaching Professor” optional, allowing individual campuses to use the title as they consider appropriate. UCAP members also approved of the idea that LSOEs be given the opportunity for sabbaticals and to transfer them to a scale with discrete steps, the same as for the traditional ladder-rank faculty. UCAP did, however, raise some concerns about the details of how LSOEs would be evaluated, especially at higher levels (e.g. step VI and AS), about the process of transferring them to the new series, and about the larger financial implications of making their salary scale "the same" as that of current ladder-rank faculty.

Negotiated Salary Trial Program
At the beginning of the academic year, UCAP reviewed data on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP), a five year pilot at three UC campuses intended to aid recruitment and retention by allowing faculty to supplement their salary with external, non-UC funds in certain circumstances and under the supervision of faculty groups at the campus. UCAP supported the proposed extension of this trial program, but did raise some concerns about the quality of the available data and the feasibility of discontinuing the program at the end of an extended trial period, when many faculty and units have grown accustomed to the use of this program.

Academic Analytics
Toward the end of the academic year, UCAP members became aware that data from Academic Analytics, a company that provides institutional subscribers with measures of faculty performance, were being used at several UC campuses. The UCAP chair asked members to gather information about whether their campus subscribes to AA and how the data were being used. After some discussion, UCAP decided to alert the Academic Council of this issue and reported that it "vigorously discourages" the use of this service in any personnel assessments and decisions.

Campus Reports
UCAP devoted part of each regular meeting to a discussion of issues facing local committees and the exchange of information about individual campus practices.
VI. Conclusion

The Bylaws of the Irvine Division describe CAP’s membership and responsibilities. The Academic Personnel Manual (APM) is a foundational resource for all faculty members and heads of academic units. CAP members frequently consult the APM to gain insight into the differences across appointment series and expectations of performance warranting advancement in each series. CAP urges every faculty member to consult the APM frequently, as well as the UCI campus Academic Personnel Procedures (APP), to become familiar with relevant policies and procedures. CAP strives for transparency in its criteria and procedures, and it welcomes feedback from faculty and staff on the content of the published Frequently Asked Questions. Although the answers published for the FAQs have no formal status, they provide important guidance for framing more specific questions, which should be directed to the Office of Academic Personnel. For reasons of confidentiality and fairness, CAP members should not be approached directly for questions on specific cases.

This year’s CAP members once again expressed the view that service on CAP was one of their most rewarding service experiences in academia. Despite the long hours and gravity of the task, the importance of the mission shaped the membership into a dedicated group during the weekly meetings and the shared hours in the CAP room. The Chair thanks all of the members for their hard work, mutual support and warm collegiality.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Ditto, School of Social Ecology, Chair
Georg Striedter, School of Biological Sciences, Vice Chair
Bogi Andersen, School of Medicine - Clinical
Sharon Block, School of Humanities
Fred Ehlert, School of Medicine – Basic Sciences
Magda El Zarki, School of Information & Computer Sciences
Lisa Grant Ludwig, member at large, Program in Public Health
Robin Keller, School of Business
Antoinette LaFarge, School of the Arts
Roger Rangel, School of Engineering
Timothy Tait, School of Physical Sciences
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