The Committee of Academic Personnel – Oversight Committee (CAP) advises the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs on matters concerning academic personnel advancement. These include promotions, appointments, terminations, multiyear accelerations within rank that involve skipping a step, high-level merit actions, third-year deferrals, five-year reviews, and appraisals of assistant professors. The committee appoints and directs the Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) that advise Deans on personnel actions redelegated by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs to academic units (Appendix D). A list of CAP’s principal tasks is included in Appendix E.

**Faculty Advancement Criteria:** CAP evaluates the files of candidates according to guidelines established in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM-210). CAP’s mandate is to make recommendations based on fair and equitable treatment of all faculty while ensuring that high standards of academic endeavor are maintained across the campus. Its goal is to apply objective and uniform criteria of evaluation across disciplines and interdisciplinary initiatives, recognizing the variability of measures of accomplishment and success from one discipline or interdisciplinary initiative to another.

In its review of academic personnel, CAP bases a recommendation on materials provided in the formal personnel evaluation process, including documents contained in the candidate’s dossier, evaluations by departmental faculty and the chair, commentaries from the dean, and when appropriate, assessments from external evaluators. CAP also may appoint an *ad hoc* committee of three faculty members if it determines such a committee to be necessary for the appropriate review of a personnel action; the office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs then handles the appointment process for such committees and organizes their meetings.
CAP’s evaluation is guided by the APM statement that the “indispensable qualification” for advancement at all levels is “superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement.” CAP typically recommends advancement of a faculty member at the end of the normal period at rank and step on the basis of a record of balanced accomplishment in research and/or creative activity, teaching, and service. Alternatively, CAP may recommend advancement when it finds that a faculty member’s performance is well above expectations in one category even though the record is below expectations in another category. Time spent on an activity is not considered to be a substitute for accomplishment. Except for deferrals, CAP does not use time in service or health or personal issues in assessing the grounds for merit advancements.

CAP evaluates research reported in peer-reviewed publications and other venues and creative work presented in a variety of forms and venues principally on the basis of the originality and creativity of the work as judged by peers. The primary criteria for the evaluation of teaching are effectiveness and impact, as well as the candidate’s command of his or her subject, scholarly growth, and presentation of material in ways that help students to think critically, independently, and creatively. Advising and mentoring activities as well as student evaluations are given substantial weight in assessing teaching performance. CAP also considers the amount, variety, and challenges of teaching endeavors. In evaluating service, CAP assesses the effort, impact, and outcome. In general, there is an expectation that service will increase in amount and leadership as faculty members advance in rank.

**Academic Personnel and Other Actions**
During the 2012-2013 academic year (September through August), CAP met 43 times out of 52 weeks and considered 484 agenda items, of which 449 were academic personnel actions. The committee provided advice on numerous issues related to academic personnel. These include:

- 3 TOE requests for search waivers,
- 48 appraisals,
- 12 Change-of-Title actions (1 of them with a merit increase),
- 11 Initial Continuing Appointments for Lecturers
- 7 merit actions for Continuing Lecturers and Senior Lecturers
- 11 Endowed Chair actions,
- 10 Third-Year Deferrals,
- 16 Five-Year Reviews,
• 10 Emeritus Status actions.

CAP also reviewed 1 file for a reappointment of a Department Chair and made recommendations concerning Chancellor's Fellows.

In addition to recommendations listed above, CAP made recommendations concerning 310 actions that involved appointment, promotion, or merit advancement for Academic Senate faculty. In relation to these actions, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, the Provost, or the Chancellor made decisions in disagreement with CAP 28 times (in about 9% of cases considered).

For 2 cases on which CAP voted positively, the Vice Provost’s decisions were different from the proposed actions; in one of these cases, the Vice Provost denied a promotion recommended by CAP and decided instead in favor of merit advancement; in the other case, the Vice Provost approved a further acceleration beyond what CAP had recommended.

In 3 cases, CAP had a split vote; in 2 of these cases, the Vice Provost (1) or the Provost (1) affirmed the recommendation of CAP members who voted positively; in the other case, the Vice Provost made a decision for a lesser advancement than the split CAP vote but greater advancement than a CAP vote on an alternative advancement.

For 23 cases, the Vice Provost (16), the Committee on Academic Personnel-Appeals Committee (1), the Provost (2), or the Chancellor (2) approved cases on which CAP voted negatively, or the Vice Provost made a modified decision (2). Thirteen of these cases involved proposed accelerations.

Overall, CAP and FPCs that considered redelegated actions made negative recommendations on appointment, merit, and promotion actions in less than 6.7% of the cases. This low percentage of negative recommendations reflects the high-quality research and teaching done by the vast majority of the faculty at UC Davis.

CAP’s weekly agenda for consideration of proposed academic personnel advancements is determined by a rank ordering that gives highest priority to appointments, tenure cases, and appraisals; other proposed advancements are considered in clusters of similar actions (e.g., promotion to Professor, Step VI) as time permits. Once an item is placed on a weekly CAP agenda, unless CAP nominates an ad hoc committee to provide a recommendation, the normal completion time is two weeks.
Appendix A provides a summary of CAP’s deliberations by category for the past academic year.

**Appointments**
CAP made recommendations concerning 36 appointments and 6 POP appointment screening requests. It recommended appointment in all of the POP cases and 33 of the regular cases; in 6 of these latter cases, it recommended appointment at a different step than that proposed by the academic unit. In no case did the Vice Provost not approve appointment of a candidate recommended by CAP. In 3 cases, CAP did not recommend appointment; for 1 of these cases, the Vice Provost approved the appointment; another was approved as an acting position.

**Promotions**
CAP considered 118 promotion actions, 67 of them for promotions to Associate Professor, and 51 for promotions to Professor. CAP recommended promotion in 100 of 118 cases. CAP did not recommend advancement in rank in only 10 cases concerning promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor (for one of these cases, CAP recommended advancement to an overlapping step at the lower rank), and 8 cases concerning promotion from Associate Professor to Professor (for one of these cases, CAP recommended advancement to an overlapping step at the lower rank). In one case, the CAP vote was evenly split. Overall, in 21 cases, CAP made recommendations that differed from those proposed at other levels of review, including merits to an overlapping step at the lower rank, lateral promotions, normal promotions instead of accelerated ones, accelerated promotions, and retroactive promotions. One promotion case remains pending.

**Merit Advancements, Professor, Step VI, Step IX, and Above Scale**
Overall, CAP made recommendations concerning 160 merit cases, including 4 for Continuing Lecturers. For ladder academic senate faculty, 77 actions were for “barrier steps,” i.e., Professor, Step VI, and Professor, Above Scale. For the 53 Professor, Step VI, cases, CAP made positive recommendations in 33 cases, modified recommendations in 5 cases, and negative recommendations in 15 cases. For the 24 Professor, Above Scale, cases, CAP made positive recommendations in 15 cases, a modified recommendation in 1 case, and negative recommendations in 8 cases.
Accelerated Actions
Appendix B lists the cases for accelerations that came to CAP (accelerations involving a promotion, a merit increase to Professor, Step VI, and to Above Scale or within Above Scale, a merit increase for an FPC member, department chair or administrator, as well as all accelerations that entailed skipping a step at any level).

Faculty for whom CAP made favorable recommendations for a multi-year acceleration generally had received some major recognition nationally or internationally, established a record of unequivocally superior scholarly achievements, and maintained excellent records of teaching and service. At the upper levels of the professoriate, the expectation of excellence in all areas grows with each step. In a number of cases for which CAP did not recommend a proposed acceleration, CAP instead recommended an alternative acceleration (e.g., a one-year retroactive advancement to the next merit step instead of an acceleration skipping a merit step, i.e., from Professor II to Professor IV). Salary and retention are beyond the charge of CAP, which is expected to make recommendations solely on the basis of APM standards, as discussed above.

Advancement to Associate Professor, Step IV or V
As a collaboration, in 2012-2013 Academic Affairs and CAP initiated the first year of a two-year pilot program in which “regular” merits to Associate Professor, Step IV and V were redelegated, and therefore considered by the FPCs and not CAP. To be redelegated as a “regular” merit under this pilot program, a proposed action had to meet the following criteria: (1) the faculty member had been at rank for 4 years or less, (2) the faculty member moved into rank at Associate Professor, Step II or above, and (3) the faculty member had not had any deferrals in the Associate rank. In response to questions about several cases, the Vice Provost for Academic affairs has simplified the criteria for redelegation for 2013-2014 as follows: faculty appointed or promoted to the Associate Professor rank for 6 years or less will have their merits reviewed as a redelegated action, whereas, faculty who have been at the Associate rank for more than 6 years will have their merit actions reviewed as non-redelegated.

During 2012-2013, CAP reviewed requests for advancement to Associate Professor, Steps IV and V, under the guidelines described above, i.e., for faculty for whom advancement to either of these steps would result in a non-normative period of time as an associate professor. As the APM indicates, the normal action for such faculty involves promotion to full
Professor. For such faculty, CAP typically recommends advancement to an overlapping merit step at the Associate Professor rank (Associate Professor, Step IV – overlapping with Professor, Step I, or Associate Professor, Step V – overlapping with Professor, Step II) only when a faculty member has an overall record of substantial scholarly accomplishments – potentially including demonstrated progress on uncompleted projects – that does not warrant promotion, yet demonstrates promise that such promotion will occur in the near future. Such a merit advancement, rather than promotion, may be appropriate if, for example, a submitted book manuscript only requires minor revision before it will be considered “in press.” Non-normative advancements to an overlapping step are unusual in the Associate ranks.

**Retroactive Merit Actions**

Retroactive merit actions may be requested by Deans or FPCs. When a retroactive action is considered, the review period ends the year before the proposed merit date (e.g., for an action retroactive to July 1, 2012, the creative work/research publications are counted to December 31, 2011, and teaching/service until June 30, 2011). Thus, retroactive recommendations should specifically discuss the record for this review period and explain in detail why that record supports the retroactive merit. In 2012-2013, CAP reviewed 1 retroactive request initiated at other levels of review; it did not recommend retroactive advancement; the Vice Provost approved a merit acceleration.

**Career Equity Reviews**

A formal Career Equity Review (CER) considers the entire career record of the individual to determine if the current placement in rank and step is consistent with faculty at equal and higher rank and step. The purpose of a CER is to address potential inequities that are products of rank and step at the point of hire and/or during a faculty member’s advancement. CERs occur coincident with a merit or promotion action and only a faculty member who (1) has held an eligible title, and (2) has not been reviewed by CAP during the previous four academic years, can be considered for a CER. In 2012-2013, CAP conducted 1 CER that was initiated at a lower level of review; this review resulted in an adjustment of rank and step. Even in the absence of a formal Career Equity Review request, CAP considers a candidate’s career pattern of advancement and the overall appropriateness of rank and step whenever it reviews a file, i.e., for every major advancement.
Five-Year Reviews
Of the 16 five-year reviews that CAP conducted, it recommended merit advancement in 1 case, “no advancement, performance satisfactory” in 10 cases and recommending “no advancement, performance unsatisfactory” in 5 cases. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs agreed with the merit advancement recommendation and the recommendations of “no advancement, performance unsatisfactory” in 3 cases; as of this writing, decisions are still pending on all other five-year review cases.

TOE Screenings
CAP considered 3 requests for search waivers for Target of Excellence recruitment proposals and approved all 3 of them.

Initial Continuing Appointments for Lecturers
Teaching excellence is the overriding requirement for a non-Senate continuing appointment. Of the 11 initial continuing appointments in 2012-2013 that CAP reviewed, it recommended continuing appointments in 10 cases and recommended against a continuing appointment in 1 case. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs made decisions in all 11 cases that concurred with CAP’s recommendations.

Accelerated Merits for Continuing Lecturers
For Continuing Lecturers, normal merit advancements are redelegated to the deans, and CAP considers requests for accelerations. To recommend accelerations (one or two steps beyond the normal two-step advancement), CAP looks for evidence of teaching accomplishments that go beyond teaching excellence, which is the minimum standard for normal advancement. Such evidence may come in the form of prestigious teaching awards or publication of books (and other creative works) that have substantial pedagogical impact. In 2012-2013, CAP considered 5 requests for accelerations. It recommended normal merits in 4 cases; one case was remanded to an FPC; the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs concurred with all these recommendations. One other case – a Lecturer, SOE, was remanded to an FPC. In addition, CAP recommended one merit advancement for a Senior Lecturer, and the Vice Provost followed that recommendation.

Faculty Personnel Committee Actions
Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) of the colleges and schools advise deans on personnel actions redelegated to them (they do not, in most cases, make recommendations on first actions after a promotion or appointment). In 2012-2013, the actions reviewed by FPCs included:
appointments at the rank of Assistant Professor, Steps I to III; most normal and accelerated merit actions that do not skip a step up to and including Professor, Step IX (with the exception of merit increases to Professor, Step VI); most normal merit actions for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment; and Unit 18 actions (including appointments and reappointments of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers without Security of Employment). Information on FPC actions is reported in Appendix C.

Ad Hoc Committees
Review by an ad hoc committee may be required in cases of major advancements (promotions to the Associate Professor and full Professor rank, and merit advancements to Professor, Step VI and Above Scale) and for appointments with tenure. CAP's membership reflects the variety of disciplines represented on campus and is guided by external reviewers’ evaluations, but on occasion the committee looks to campus ad hoc committees for highly specialized expertise. In 2012-2013, CAP proposed ad hoc committees in six cases; thanks are due to the faculty members who served on these committees for giving so generously of their time and for the high quality and objectivity of their evaluations and reports.

CAP appoints the nine Faculty Personnel Committees of the Colleges and Schools based upon recommendations from Faculty Executive Committees. At the end of the academic year, CAP also performs post-factum audits of FPC actions and writes memos to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs summarizing those actions. CAP appreciates the dedicated effort and hard work of all FPC members.

Other CAP Agenda Items
CAP also gave opinions on 15 Requests for Consultation from the Academic Senate and reviewed 11 sets of voting procedures from departments or programs for their conformity to Academic Senate bylaw 55.

Clarification of Appeals versus Reconsiderations
CAP decisions are subject to either reconsideration or appeal. The distinction is clarified in a flow chart, available at: http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/documents/Senate-Chair-letter-and-flowchart-RE-CERJ-Advice-Merit-Appeal.pdf. As described there, a candidate for advancement who wishes to appeal is expected to provide evidence of a personnel committee’s failure to apply established
standards of merit or failure to follow established procedure. When there is no issue concerning whether a personnel committee applied established standards of merit or procedure appropriately, a reconsideration can be initiated on the basis of new information concerning the candidate’s record that has not previously been provided to a committee. Such information is expected to concern the candidate’s record during the period under review: e.g., publications or other creative works, awards, teaching evaluations, new grants, or original requested extramural letters that arrived late.

In 2012-2013, CAP received 7 requests for reconsideration based on new information; in 3 of these cases, CAP’s reconsideration resulted in a change of its original recommendation.

**Criteria of Scholarship**

In 2002, CAP solicited criteria of scholarship documents from campus departments. The intent was that these documents could provide disciplinary context that CAP could utilize during review of cases from departments. CAP received documents from some but not all departments.

CAP does not approve such documents, the contents of which do not fall within its jurisdiction. They are treated as departmental policy statements that do not preempt the peer review process, but which provide CAP with context for faculty records and discussions in departmental letters. CAP evaluates cases on the basis of standards set forth in the APM. Departments are welcome to provide new or revised criteria-of-scholarship documents as they deem appropriate.

To ensure that criteria of scholarship are considered at all levels during review, CAP suggests that the Criteria be attached to the dossier, or at least referred to in the Department Chair letter. Doing so will call attention to their appropriate use during review by the Faculty Personnel Committee, Dean’s Office, and/or CAP.

**University Committee On Academic Personnel (UCAP)**

Martin Usrey served as CAP’s representative to the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP), which held several meetings during the academic year. The Office of the President, UCAP members, or other UC Academic Senate committees and officers bring issues to the attention of UCAP. A primary function of this systemwide committee is to facilitate the exchange of information among campuses. Accordingly, CAP was
Particular items that were discussed this year by UCAP include the following:

**Proposed Revisions to APM 210**
The existing wording of APM 210.1-d can be read to say that those whose academic endeavors involve diversity and equity should be given some sort of “extra credit” in the review process because the University has taken a position that involvement of the faculty in diversity and equity issues is to be encouraged. APM 210 was revised in 2004-2005 because faculty with diversity and equity aspects to their work had complained that these aspects were not taken seriously; they inferred that at least some campus CAPs considered such endeavors as inferior, thus making them the objects of discrimination. The language in APM 210.1-d was supposed to eliminate any basis for discrimination. However, its wording suggested to some that the University took the opposite position – that such endeavors should be favored during merit review. In the wording for this paragraph, there is a tension between making clear that research into issues of diversity and equity is to be treated equally to other academic disciplines (not favored or disfavored) and at the same time stating that the University is in favor of all faculty members actively advancing diversity and equity. This issue remains unresolved.

**Proposed Open Access Policy**
In its letter to Council, UCAP outlined a variety of concerns about the open-access publication policy, including that the policy is going to have a differential impact/burden on faculty from different disciplines. UCAP recommended that compliance with the policy should not be a criterion for personnel reviews/evaluations and that a funding mechanism should be available to faculty who incur added costs of publication by agreeing to open access.

**Negotiated Salary Plan (Proposed APM 668)**
In fall 2012, UCAP participated in a systemwide review of the proposed Negotiated Salary Plan Trial Program to be offered to eligible faculty on the general campuses. The committee commented on the original proposal in October 2011. This year, in a November 2012 memo to Council, UCAP raised multiple objections and noted that the trial of the plan, as described, failed to address the problems with the proposal delineated in UCAP’s October 2011 comments. UCAP expressed concern
about UCOP’s failure to collect data to determine if there is a pressing recruitment and retention issue, instead of relying on anecdotal information. Connected to this is the report’s lack of clarity regarding how the success or failure of this program will be judged. The committee continued to have concerns about the impact the negotiated salary plan would likely have on the CAPs’ workloads. UCAP recommended that the trial address all the objections that UCAP has raised or it should not be implemented. UCAP will monitor the results of the trial program.

**Salary Equity Surveys**
UCAP reviewed the campus salary equity survey plans during the March and May 2013 meetings. Committee members agreed that, while many of the CAPs do not look at salaries, all CAPs should be concerned about merit equity. UCAP members also agreed that even if CAPs do not look at salaries, the impact of merit step advances should be taken into consideration, and CAPs should know about any systematic biases. UCAP was critical of those campuses that did not provide comprehensive plans and suggested that the campuses that have developed metrics and conducted some analyses could provide consultation. UCAP asked that the campuses share any issues related to equity that they uncover as well as how they might respond if they do find a lack of equity. The committee also suggested that the campuses should be asked to look at both the rate at which faculty members progress through merit steps as well as how well they are paid as they advance. UCAP also requested that the campuses provide firm dates and deadlines for when salary equity analyses will be completed.

**APM 075**
The proposed revision of APM 700 resulted in UCAP’s review of APM 75, the policy regarding termination for incompetent performance. APM 75 refers to making a determination that a faculty member has been incompetent for several years. UCAP suggests that the phrase “several years” should be defined. Currently, there is no policy that indicates when a CAP can notify a faculty member that a serious lack of performance in teaching or research needs to be addressed. UCAP members noted that there may be differences at the campuses that require flexibility, such that “several years” might best be defined in each campus’s yearly published academic review procedures. The committee also agreed that from a legal perspective concerning due process, it might be helpful for campuses to be able to point to guidelines and a clear timetable.
Academic Personnel Dossier Logistics
Because a considerable portion academic personnel action materials have migrated from physical to electronic files, CAP is increasingly dependent on ready access to materials via computers and tablets via the internet. The transition has been less than seamless. This year, CAP undertook a number of discussions concerning relevant issues, and engaged in further discussions with Academic Senate staff and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA) and her office staff. A variety of minor improvements were suggested for MyInfoVault, and CAP hopes that the VPAA’s office will implement these suggestions as time and resources permit. The more formidable problem concerns access to academic personnel files, which are now almost completely archived in the campus’s Electronic Database Management System (EDMS). This system was originally designed for mainframe and associated terminal use. The EDMS software is old-fashioned, and because it is not designed as an internet platform, it is not easily adopted to the proliferation of alternative computers and tablets. Substantial efforts undertaken this year improved EDMS access for members of CAP. The antiquated character of the EDMS, however, is not likely to see near-term improvement, and its present version undermines the effective use of CAP members’ time reviewing cases.
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## APPENDIX A: CAP ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Recommended Positive</th>
<th>Modified Actions @</th>
<th>Recommended Negative</th>
<th>Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointments (68)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor (10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (12)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor (14)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Change in Title (10)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Continuing Non-Senate (11)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Chair</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotions (118)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (67)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor (51)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merit Increases (160)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Lecturer (4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (21)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Step V to VI (53)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Step IX to Above Scale (24)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Above Scale (19)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Merits (37)</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Actions (103)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsiderations (7)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer, SOE (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer, SOE (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Equity Reviews (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus (10)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOE Screenings (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP Screenings (6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisals*** (48)</td>
<td>16+</td>
<td>29^</td>
<td>1-</td>
<td>2~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Reviews (16)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1++</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-Year Deferrals (10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total = 449</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Split (4:4, w/one absent).
** Merit increase for FPC members, Deans, Assoc. Deans, and Dept. Chairs.
*** + = positive; ^ = Mixed; - = Negative; ~ = Guarded.
@ Modified actions are those CAP recommendations that differed from what was proposed, i.e., instead of a promotion a merit increase was recommended.
++ Advancement recommended.
APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF ACCELERATED ACTIONS (not including retroactive merits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceleration Proposed</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Split</th>
<th>Pending</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-yr</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-yr</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-yr</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-yr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-yr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C: REDELEGATED MERIT ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/Div/ School [total]</th>
<th>FPC</th>
<th>Dean’s Decision</th>
<th>Actions w/o FPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Split</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAES [54]</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS [21]*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU [8]*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG [48]*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSM [13]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HArCS [38]</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS [45]^</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS [44]</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW [6]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM [118]&amp;</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM [41]*</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total [429]</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One action was reviewed by CAP as candidate was an FPC member.
^ Data on FPC vote unavailable for 25 cases.
& Three cases are pending.
APPENDIX D:
FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEES 2012-2013

COLLEGE OF AG. & ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
Rachael Goodhue (A&RE)- Chair
Patricia Oteiza (Nutrition)
Thomas Adams (Animal Science)
John Largier (Env. Science & Policy)
Wendy Silk (LAWR)
Emilio Laca (Plant Sciences)

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
Zhaojun Bai (Computer Sci) - Chair
Ken Giles (Biol. & Ag Eng)
Pieter Stroeve (Chem Eng & Materials Sci)
Laura Marcu (Biomedical Eng)
Timothy Ginn (Civil & Environ Eng)
Rida Farouki (Mechanical & Aerospace Eng)
Chen-Nee Chuah (Electrical & Computer Eng)

COLLEGE OF LETTERS & SCIENCE

*Humanities, Arts & Cultural Studies - HArCS*
Scott Shershow (English) - Chair
Yvette Flores (Chicana/o Studies)
Peter Lichtenfels (Theatre & Dance)
Alexander Soshnikov (Math)
Mike Saler (History)

*Social Sciences - SS*
Lynne Isbell (Anthropology) - Chair
Gregory Clark (Economics)
Mike Saler (History)
Peter Lichtenfels (Theatre & Dance)
Dean Tantillo (Chemistry)

*Mathematical & Physical Sciences - MPS*
Motohico Mulase (Mathematics) - Chair
Alexander Soshnikov (Math)
Dean Tantillo (Chemistry)
Yvette Flores (Chicana/o Studies)
Gregory Clark (Economics)
COLLEGE OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
Richard Grosberg (Evol & Ecol) - Chair
Raymond Rodriguez (Cell & Molecular Biol.)
Stacey Harmer (Plant Biology)
Mitchell Singer (Microbiology)
Gregg Reconzone (NPB)

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT
Vicki Smith - Sociology - Chair
Chih-Ling Tsai (GSM)
David Woodruff (GSM)

SCHOOL OF LAW
Gail Goodman (Psychology) - Chair
Lisa Pruitt
Miguel Mendez
Tom Joo
Andres Resendez (History)

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
Deborah Diercks (Emergency Medicine) - Chair
David Rocke (Public Health Sciences)
Kermit Carraway (Biochemistry & Molecular Medicine)
Stuart Cohen (Internal Medicine)
Shirley Luckhart (Microbiology & Immunology)
Neal Fleming (Anesthesiology & Pain Medicine)
Edward Pugh (Cell Biology & Human Anatomy)
Susanna Park (Ophthalmology)
Philip Wolinsky (Orthopedic Surgery)

SCHOOL OF VETERINARY MEDICINE
Birgit Puschner - Molecular Biosciences - Chair
Mark Anderson - CAHFS/PMI
Larry Cowgill (Medicine & Epidemiology)
Peter Pascoe (Surg. & Radiological Sci.)
Clare Yellowley-Genetos (Anatomy, Phys. Cell Biol)

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Keith Widaman (Psychology) - Chair
Cristina Gonzalez (Education)
Peter Mundy (Education)
APPENDIX E:

PRINCIPAL TASKS OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL – OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

1. Reviewing cases to ensure equity in the application of criteria for appointments, merits, and promotion actions.

2. Nominating faculty to serve on ad hoc committees which make recommendations for promotions, appointments, and upper level merit increases.

3. Reviewing the reports of ad hoc committees and independently evaluating the dossiers of the candidate under consideration.

4. Reviewing proposed skip-step accelerated merit increases, terminations, reconsiderations, third-year deferrals, five-year reviews, Chancellor Fellow and Endowed Chair appointments, and reappointments of department chairs.

5. Reviewing appraisals for mid-career assistant professors.

6. Reviewing merit actions for department chairs, program chairs, associate deans, members of Faculty Personnel Committees (and their near relatives) and other individuals for whom such action has not been redelegated to deans.

7. Appointing faculty to serve on Faculty Personnel Committees.

8. Reviewing policy matters referred by the administration and by the chair or committee of the Academic Senate, as well as initiating new policies and changes in existing policies when appropriate.

9. Conducting annual post-factum audits of the recommendations from the Faculty Personnel Committees.

10. Approving departmental voting procedures.

11. Reviewing requests for Target of Excellence and Partner Opportunity Program positions.

12. Conducting career equity reviews when requested by faculty or Deans.

13. Reviewing first continuing appointments for Unit 18 Lecturers and accelerated merits for continuing lecturers.