

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
December 6, 2016**

To be received and placed on file:

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is an important part of faculty governance and collegial responsibility in the University of California system. As a committee of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate, CAP is appointed by the Senate's Committee on Committees and charged with providing advice to the Chancellor on academic personnel matters and representing the Division in all matters relating to appointments and promotions. CAP consists of ten members, who represent a wide variety of academic disciplines from across campus. All members hold the rank of full professor and serve for offset periods of three years (with annual reappointment) so that there is continuity and memory on the committee. CAP reviews all academic personnel files for merit, appraisal, promotion, and appointment and makes recommendations to the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, and the Chancellor. CAP is also asked to provide feedback and recommendations about a variety of Senate matters and administrative directives.

CAP's goal is to assure that its recommendations are based on rigorous application of the academic personnel procedures in the CALL and the APM, and to assure that decisions are based on a fair and thorough evaluation of evidence in the file.

CAP met on 47 occasions during the 2015-16 academic year. Meetings were approximately 2.5 hours in length. CAP again is appreciative of the efforts of staff and faculty alike for their efforts in the academic personnel review process.

By the final May submission date in the CALL, there were only 4 outstanding files campuswide. CAP attributes this success to strict adherence to the deadlines set forth in the CALL and to the effort by all involved in the personnel review process.

I. Personnel Actions

a. Summary of Reviews

CAP reviewed 320 personnel actions during 2015-16 and sustained an average turn-around time of 16 days from the time a file is received at CAP from the Academic Personnel Office to the time the CAP recommendation is forwarded to the administration. Committee work during this period includes (a) receipt of the file in the Academic Senate Office by the CAP Analyst, who reviews the file to assure that it is complete for CAP review; (b) assigning of primary and secondary readers to each file by the CAP Chair, who serves as the third reader; (c) announcement to all CAP members that the file is available for their review online; (d) thorough review of the file by the assigned readers in preparation for discussion by the full committee at the next CAP meeting; (e) presentation of the file and discussion/vote by the full committee; (f) preparation of the draft CAP recommendation by the primary and secondary readers; (g) review and signature by the CAP Chair, who forwards the CAP report to the CAP Analyst to be finalized and forwarded to the Academic Personnel Office.

The Academic Senate office also maintains data reflecting the processing time (including the percentage of files that are forwarded according to due dates in the CALL) by department and school/college, as well as turn-around time for files reviewed by ad hoc committees. These data are available from the Academic Senate Office.

A decision of the Chancellor's office is defined as an over-rule if it is contrary to the majority recommendation from CAP on rank, step, or the awarding of an off-scale.

- Of the 170 merit actions reviewed by CAP, CAP endorsed 152. The final decision of the Chancellor's office over-ruled CAP's rank/step recommendation on 11 cases and disagreed on off-scale recommendations in 4 instances.
- Of the 36 accelerated merits proposed, CAP and the administration disagreed in 6 instances.
- Of the 44 promotions to Associate Professor or Professor, CAP supported 40. The Chancellor's office overruled CAP's recommendation in 2 cases.
- Of the 13 cases proposed for advancement to Professor Step VI or to Professor Above-Scale, CAP endorsed 12. The Chancellor's office disagreed with CAP on off-scale recommendations in 2 instances.
- Of the CAP 18 fifth year appraisals proposed, CAP and the administration disagreed in 3 instances.
- CAP and the administration agreed on the 52 proposed new appointments.
- CAP and the administration were in agreement on all reappointments. The two requests received were supported.
- CAP and the administration agreed on 7 of the 8 career reviews processed. Two cases resulted in a one-step merit increase. Two cases resulted in a two-step merit increase. One case resulted in a three-step merit increase. Two cases resulted in a four-step merit increase and one case resulted in a promotion plus an off-scale.
- Of the 12 quinquennials reviewed, the Chancellor's Office and CAP agreed on all cases.

A detailed table summary of CAP's personnel reviews merits, promotions, advancements, appraisals, appointments, career reviews, and quinquennial reviews, is appended.

b. Follow up to the cases listed as pending in the 14-15 CAP Report

Of the 49 promotions to Associate Professor or Professor submitted for review in the 14-15 AY, three cases were noted as pending a final decision. Two cases resulted in a positive tenure decision and one case was denied. Of the 27 proposed new appointments, one case was noted as pending. The pending case was finalized and the appointment approved. Of the 5 career review cases submitted, one was noted as pending a final decision. The case was approved and resulted in a four-step merit increase. Of the 11 quinquennials reviewed, one case was noted as pending. The candidate retired and the case was canceled at APO.

c. Ad hoc Committees

The Committee on Academic Personnel continued to act as its own ad hoc for a large majority of promotion to tenure and Advancement to Above-Scale cases, a process which results in early decisions for the majority of these promotion cases. During the 15-16 review year, CAP utilized three ad hoc committees for cases of promotion to full professor and career review. CAP was also asked to recommend an ad hoc slate for a University Professor appointment.

d. Shadow CAP

To avoid conflict of interest, the personnel actions for current CAP members and their spouses/partners are reviewed by Shadow CAP, a 6-person committee appointed by the Committee on Committees from a pool of former CAP members from the previous five years. During 2015-16, Shadow CAP reviewed 5 cases. The 2015-16 Shadow CAP members were the following:

George Haggerty, Chair
Jan Blacher
Walter Clark
Jianying Gan
Sarjeet Gill
Erika Suderburg

e. Assistant Professor Appointments

In January 2008, final decisions for appointments to Assistant Professor Step I-III were delegated to the deans, with the proviso that CAP would conduct a *post hoc* audit/review of the appointments and submit recommendations about continuing with the delegation. In fall 2013, CAP reviewed 42 appointments made at this level for the 11-12 and 12-13 years. Noting a number of procedure irregularities, CAP rescinded its waiver of review for all appointments for Acting Assistant Professor, Step III and clarified the expectation that all reappointments for Assistant Professor Step I-III will continue to be reviewed by CAP. The Committee recommended that the delegation be continued for appointments to Assistant Professor Step I-III followed by another CAP review in one to two years. The 2016-2017 CAP will conduct a post-appointment audit of all 13-14 and 14-15 dean's level hires. In the 2015-16 AY CAP was asked to consider waiving its right to review appointment files for Assistant Professor in Residence and Assistant Professor of Clinical X (Step I to III) series which have been delegated to the deans for final decision authority. CAP considered this request and elected to continue reviewing these cases in advance of the final decision.

f. eFile

CAP reviewed 300 of its 320 cases via the eFile system (94%). This compares to the 259 of 283 eFiles reviewed in 2015-16 (92%).

g. Other Personnel Actions (not included in the total number of files reviewed by CAP)

- Dickson Emeritus Professorship: CAP reviewed and endorsed two nominations for the 2015-16 Dickson Emeritus Professorship, sent forward by the Committee on Faculty Welfare.
- Emerita/us titles: CAP reviewed and provided feedback to the administration on the use of Emerita/us titles for one non-Senate faculty.
- Professor of the Graduate Division appointments: CAP reviewed 5 files for appointment/reappointment as Professor of the Graduate Division. All appointments were approved.
- Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Transfer of Appointment: CAP considered and

provided recommendations on three requests to transfer a portion of a filled FTE appointment from one department to another.

II. CAP Discussions with and Policy Recommendations to the Administration

In addition to regular CAP meetings to review personnel cases, CAP met on occasion with the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost, the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, the College/School and Divisional Deans, and with Departmental Chairs. CAP participation in these joint administrative sessions is especially helpful in assuring a shared understanding of the review process and guidelines, and of the expectations at every level of review. CAP is grateful for the spirit of cooperation of the campus administrators. CAP provided advice to and initiated or participated in discussions with the administration on the following issues:

a. Revisions to the CALL

CAP reviewed and provided feedback to the VPAP on change requests received by the campus at large and recommended that the language and grammatical inconsistencies (i.e. would, should, shall, etc.) be realigned for consistency and to avoid misinterpretation in the 16-17 AY CALL.

b. CAP Review of Proposed Department Chair Appointments

CAP reviewed the list of proposed department chair appointments for the 2016-2017 academic year and expressed no concern about the recommendations submitted.

c. Endowed and Presidential Chair Appointments

CAP reviewed and provided recommendations on appointments to the following Endowed and Presidential Chair positions:

BCOE

Marlan & Rosemary Bourns Endowed Presidential Chair

CNAS

Tokuji and Bettie L. Furuta Endowed Chair

Givaudan Citrus Variety Collection Endowed Chair

Ernst and Helen Leibacher Endowed Chair in Botany and Plant Sciences

Wilbur W. Mayhew Endowed Chair in Geo-Ecology

Cy Mouradick Endowed Chair in Desert Agriculture

Mir S. Mulla Endowed Term Chair in Entomology

Donald T. Sawyer Endowed Founder's Chair in Chemistry

CHASS

Holstein Endowed Chair in Religious Studies

John Gleason McSweeney Endowed Chair in Rhetoric and Teaching Excellence

GSOE

Ted and Jo Dutton Endowed Presidential Chair

SoBA

Albert O. Steffey Endowed Chair in Marketing

SOM

Danial Hays Endowed Chair

William R. Johnson and S. Sue Johnson Endowed Chair

d. Administrative Appointments – other Appointment “pre-reads”

As per campus administrative appointment procedures, CAP provided a preliminary professorial assessment on the candidates for the Dean positions in the School of Medicine and the Bourns College of Engineering. CAP also completed a “pre-read” on seventeen Target of Excellence candidates (5 CNAS, 9 CHASS, 3 GSOE) and one rank and step consideration.

e. Additional Local Issues

Administrative review of merit and promotion files, request for advice to be communicated to new deans regarding review periods, and suggested topics for the department chair spring forum.

III. CAP Advice to the Academic Senate

CAP is asked to provide feedback and recommendations about a variety of Senate matters and administrative directives. In addition to reaffirming its policy on Conflict of Interest, the Committee reviewed and provided comments on the following items:

a. CAP Representation at Systemwide Senate and the Executive Council

CAP continued its active participation on the systemwide University Committee on Academic Personnel. The 2015-16 CAP representative was David Lloyd. CAP Chair Warnke represented the committee on the UCR Academic Senate’s Executive Council.

b. CAP Review of Proposed Revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual and other personnel processes

Proposed Revisions to APM Policy Sections 278, 210-6, 279, 112 and New APM – 350

Revisions to the existing policies and the creation of new policy were proposed in response to academic administrator requests to update these policies. Proposed revisions strengthen and refine criteria for appointment and advancement depending on type of academic clinician and differentiate policy language for volunteers (APM - 279) and policy for salaried and without salary faculty (APM - 278 and APM - 210-6). New policy (APM - 350) proposes to repurpose the Clinical Associate title, a non-faculty academic title, to be used for 1) without academic salary and paid staff clinicians with no teaching duties, and 2) without academic salary, volunteer appointees employed by University health system network sites and satellite facilities.

The Committee carefully considered the second round of proposed revisions to APM sections 278 - Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series, 210-6 – Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on Actions Concerning the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series, 279 – Volunteer Clinical Professor Series, 112 – Academic Titles and the creation of the new APM section 350 – Clinical Associate. Finding the changes to be reasonable, CAP supported the revisions without further recommendations.

Proposed Revisions to APM - 360, Librarian Series and APM - 210-4, Instructions to Review Committees

Proposed revisions update policy so that the terms and conditions affecting non-represented librarians are consistent with those affecting represented librarians. Policy revisions cover the definition and criteria for appointment, terms of service, merit increases, promotion, advancement to career status, personnel review procedures, and the new point-based salary scale.

The Committee considered the proposed revisions to APM 360- Librarian Series and APM 210-4

Instructions to Review Committees to fall outside its charge and elected not to opine.

Guiding Principles: Search Waivers for Academic Appointees at the University of California

The document describes new UC system-wide minimum standards for the consideration of the use of search waivers and allows campuses to set further restrictions as needed.

The Committee considered the Guiding Principles for Search Waivers for Academic Appointees at the University of California and unanimously approved the document. The Committee did not have any substantial comments to add.

Report from the Joint Committee of Administration and Academic Senate

President Napolitano established the Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate to review the disciplinary processes for faculty related to sexual violence, sexual assault and sexual harassment. She tasked the Joint Committee with creating recommendations around the following areas: 1) investigation, adjudication and sanctions processes in cases involving faculty, 2) University policies and procedures, 3) reporting mechanisms for all members of the University and 4) interim measures. The report provides draft recommendations around these areas.

The Committee considered the report from the Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate and opined that it is not sure that the document adequately resolves tension between the liability and trusts of the University and protecting all members of the university community.

UCR's Five-Year Planning Perspectives for 2016-21

Perspectives consist of information on proposals to establish new programs, schools and colleges as well as to transfer, consolidate, discontinue or disestablish those already in existence. Given the importance of periodically examining the academic planning pipeline-both in aggregate and via its component parts, the Perspectives process is being continued. Once gathered from all campuses, information reported on the form will provide an updated picture of academic plans and allow for analysis of trends since these were last collected.

The Committee was not certain what it was being asked to consider since the documents the committee received did not contain enough information for it to provide meaningful input. CAP therefore respectfully requested further clarification on the intent of feedback. If CAP was being asked to comment on the reasonableness of the campus plan for the next five years, it would need to know what each item involves in terms of staffing, support and the like as well as its projected impact.

Campus Proposal to Modify APM 245 – Department Chairs

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity reviewed APM 245 regarding the Duties of Department Chairs (or Equivalent Officers) and discussed how well department chairs were keeping diversity issues at the forefront of faculty's minds in the hiring process. It was determined that some colleges are doing very well while others seem to struggle in diversifying their faculty profile. CoDEO feels that to succeed in these areas there needs to be strong leadership that is willing to promote diversity and create awareness among the rank of faculty as

well as language in the APM that may require chairs to ensure their faculty are receiving information regarding the goals of diversity.

The Committee considered the proposed modification of APM 245 Appendix A regarding duties of department chairs. Finding the changes to be reasonable, CAP supported the revisions without further recommendations.

Proposed Changes to iEval

iEval as a Tool to Collect Student Evaluations of Teaching. The submitted report identifies current issues and possible improvements.

The Committee discussed the proposed changes to iEval and opined as follows:

- 1) The proposal recommends expanding the number of choices on the Likert scale from five to seven. CAP disagrees with this recommendation. A five-point scale mirrors a normal grading rubric and is sufficient to express a student's evaluation of the course. A seven-point scale is confusing and requires students to try to distinguish between numerical scores with no clear distinctions. A review of appointment files indicates that other institutions use a five-point scale similar to our current one.
- 2) The proposal suggests rewording the current item about supplemental materials to exclude specifically electronic resources while, at the same time, adding one or two items to address the use of this kind of technology in the classroom. CAP disagrees with this recommendation. It intrudes on issues of pedagogy and insinuates that professors not using electronic media are not good teachers. CAP recommends removing question #18 stating "Supplementary material (e.g. films, slides, videos, demonstrations, guest lectures, iLearn, web pages, etc) were informative".
- 3) The proposal suggests removing most or all of the items related to student behavior and attitudes. CAP supports consolidating some of these questions to reduce their number. However, it does not recommend eliminating these questions entirely as they set the framework for a student's evaluation and may also help identify the student's initial expectations about the course.
- 4) The proposal suggests removing some items about instructor behavior and course materials. With regard to question 6, "instructor was prepared and organized," CAP recommends removing one of the words; either prepared or organized.
- 5) The proposal suggests removing the five items where the text of the question is not provided. CAP supports this suggestion.

CNAS Reorganization Proposal

The Interim Dean of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences presented a proposal for the reorganization of the college. The main components of the proposal are (i) the establishment of two new departments "Molecular, Cellular and Structural Biology" (MCSB), and "Evolution, Ecology and Organismal Biology" (EEOB), followed by (ii) the voluntary relocation of the

faculty from the departments of Cell Biology & Neuroscience (CBNS) and Biology to the new departments; (iii) the disestablishment of the departments of Cell Biology & Neuroscience and Biology once they are empty; and finally (iv) renaming of the department of Environmental Sciences to “Environmental and Ecosystem Sciences”.

The Committee considered the proposal for reorganizing the College of Natural and Agricultural Science and does not support the proposal as presented. Members think that it fails to demonstrate how the proposed changes will make CNAS a stronger or more highly ranked college. To the contrary: among other deficiencies, CAP found that the proposal fails to address the concerns of the physical and mathematical sciences; fails to consider the impact of unknown numbers of faculty moving from one department to another; fails to account for potential negative effects on existing established and well-recognized departments; fails to deal with the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure and fails to address the increase to administrative costs that the changes will incur.

School of Medicine (SOM) Request for Exception to APM 275-16-f(3)

The Interim Dean of the School of Medicine put forward an exception request to APM 275-16-f(3), which in essence states that in order to maintain a balance between research and education and clinical service appointees in the Professor of Clinical X series should not exceed 1/6 of all local Senate members in all clinical departments on the campus. The request seeks the Academic Senate’s review of the appropriateness of adding new members to the Professor of Clinical X series without being unreasonably constrained by the 1/6 ratio rule.

The Committee considered the exception request from the School of Medicine to APM 275-16-f(3), a 1/6 limitation on appointments to Professor of Clinical X series in conjunction with potential caveats provided by the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel. The Committee unanimously supported the initial request from SOM with the two caveats presented by the VPAP.

Academic Senate Consultation on Professors Assigning Their Own Texts to Students

CAP was asked to review and opine on UCR’s position regarding the requirement of a text authored by the faculty member teaching the course and measures that should be in place to avoid the conflict of interest or appearance thereof.

The Committee considered the matter of professors assigning their own texts to students and felt this should be at the discretion of the individual instructor, but would encourage faculty to place copies of the text on reserve for copying.

Academic Senate Consultation on Recording “Works in Progress” in the Merit & Promotion Process

Work in progress is assessed in several personnel actions at UCR such as in reappointment of an assistant professor, fifth year appraisals, and by crediting book chapters published as journal articles. CAP was asked to provide its opinion on allowing credit in merit actions for work in progress that is submitted and under review.

In its assessment, the Committee considered current practices at other UC’s and well as the

concerns expressed in the material received. CAP agrees with the majority of the concerns raised in the memo and thinks the inclusion of works in progress and chapters in yet-to-be published books would overly complicate the personnel process. As outlined in the CALL, that process focuses on research achievements and allows for accelerations once works in progress are published. For this reason, CAP thinks that the current process works effectively and appropriately.

Establishment of Endowed and Presidential Chairs

CAP reviewed the material submitted and enthusiastically supported the establishment of the four Endowed Founder's Chair proposals in Chemistry: Donald T. Sawyer, Hartland H. Schmidt, Harry W. Johnson Jr., and George K. Helmkamp.

c. Bylaw 55 delegations

CAP continues rely on each department to send its Bylaw-55 delegations and departmental voting procedures to the Senate. Departmental Bylaw-55 designations are collected each year through the end of October.

Finally, CAP thanks all who have contributed to the personnel process. The process works as well as it does only because of the hard work and dedication of all involved.

Respectfully submitted,

Georgia Warnke, Chair
Vyjayanthi Chari
Ann Goldberg
John Heraty
Russ Hille
Yingbo Hua
David Lloyd
Thomas Patterson
Richard Smith
Jory Yarmoff

TABLE I: SUMMARY OF PROMOTIONS AND ADVANCEMENTS

PROMOTIONS TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR:

Total Proposed: 27
 Total Reviewed by CAP: 27
 Total Reviewed by Chancellor 26 1 file canceled at APO
 Total Approved by Chancellor 25 Approval % 0.962

Department			Ad Hoc			Dean			CAP							Chancellor							
Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Split	AHS	AOS	NOS	ALS	LOS	Yes	No	AHS	AOS	NOS	ALS	LOS
25	1	1	0	0	0	24	1	2	20	1	1	3	1	1	0	0	21	1	2	1	1	0	0

PROMOTIONS TO PROFESSOR:

Total Proposed: 17
 Total Reviewed by CAP: 17
 Total Reviewed by Chancellor 16 1 file pending final decision
 Total Approved by Chancellor 13 Approval % 0.813

Department			Ad Hoc			Dean			CAP							Chancellor							
Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Split	AHS	AOS	NOS	ALS	LOS	Yes	No	AHS	AOS	NOS	ALS	LOS
15	1	1	1	0	0	12	4	1	13	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	12	3	1	0	0	0	0

ADVANCEMENTS TO PROFESSOR VI & ABOVE-SCALE:

Total Proposed: 13
 Total Reviewed by CAP: 13
 Total Reviewed by Chancellor 13
 Total Approved by Chancellor 13 Approval % 1.00

Department			Ad Hoc			Dean			CAP							Chancellor							
Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Split	AHS	AOS	NOS	ALS	LOS	Yes	No	AHS	AOS	NOS	ALS	LOS
13	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	1	0	2

Note: Ad hoc committees used on advancement to AS only, not to step VI.

Key to Abbreviations:

- CAP = Committee on Academic Personnel
- CHAN = Chancellor or Executive Vice Chancellor
- SPLIT = CAP not clearly positive or negative
- AHS= Recommended/Approved Step Higher than initially recommended by Department
- AOS= Recommended/Approved OS salary in addition to merit advance recommended by Dept.
- NOS= Recommended/Approved merit advance but not additional OS salary recommended by Dept.
- ALS= Recommended/Approved Step Lower than initially recommended by Department
- LOS=Recommended/Approved Step Lower than initially recommended by Department and an off-scale

Table II: SUMMARY OF MERIT ACTIONS*

Total Proposed: 170
 Total Reviewed by CAP: 170
 Total Reviewed by Chancellor 170
 Total Approved by Chancellor 152 Approval % 0.894

Rank	Department			Dean			CAP							Chancellor							
	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Split	AHS	AOS	NOS	ALS	LOS	Yes	No	AHS	AOS	NOS	ALS	LOS
Assistant Professor	67	2	0	66	2	1	63	3	1	0	0	1	0	1	63	5	0	0	1	0	0
Associate Professor	42	0	0	36	2	4	32	4	0	0	1	1	3	1	37	2	0	1	0	0	2
Professor	51	0	0	38	7	6	29	10	2	2	1	5	1	1	32	10	2	2	4	0	1
within AS	6	0	0	6	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0
LPSOE/SOE	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Merits	168	2	0	148	11	11	131	18	3	2	2	7	4	3	139	18	2	3	5	0	3

*does not include advancement to VI or advancement to A/S

TABLE III: SUMMARY OF APPOINTMENTS

Total Proposed: 52
 Total Reviewed by CAP: 52
 Total Reviewed by Chancellor 52
 Total Approved by Chancellor 52 Approval % 1.00

Rank	15-16 Actions
Assistant Professors	13
Associate Professors	9
Professors	18
Professor Above Scale	1
LPSOE/LSOE/SOE	10
Professors in Residence	1
TOTAL APPOINTMENT ACTIONS	52

Key to Abbreviations:

CAP = Committee on Academic Personnel

CHAN = Chancellor or Executive Vice Chancellor

SPLIT = CAP not clearly positive or negative

AHS= Recommended/Approved Step Higher than initially recommended by Department

AOS= Recommended/Approved OS salary in addition to merit advance recommended by Dept.

NOS= Recommended/Approved merit advance but not additional OS salary recommended by Dept.

ALS= Recommended/Approved Step Lower than initially recommended by Department

LOS=Recommended/Approved Step Lower than initially recommended by Department and an off-scale

TABLE IV: MISCELLANEOUS ACTIONS

Appraisals:

Total Proposed: 18

Decision			
Fifth-year Appraisals	Positive	Qualified	Negative
CAP	8	7	3
EVC/Chancellor	7	8	3

Quinquennial Reviews

Total Proposed: 12

Decision		
Quinquennial	Satisfactory	Negative
CAP	9	3
EVC/Chancellor	9	3

Total Merits & Promotions:	214
Total Advancements:	13
Total Appointments:	52
Total Misc. Actions:	41
TOTAL PERSONNEL ACTIONS	320

Career Reviews:

Total Proposed: 8

- 2 Resulted in a merit of 1 step
- 2 Resulted in a merit of 2 steps
- 1 Resulted in a merit of 3 steps
- 2 Resulted in a merit of 4 steps
- 1 Resulted in a promotion plus an off-scale

Assistant Professor Reappointments:

Total Proposed: 2

Total Approved: 2

University Professor Appointment:

Total Proposed: 1

Table V: SUMMARY OF OFF-SCALE SALARIES APPROVED BY CHANCELLOR (OR DESIGNEE)

New off-scale awards were distributed as below for each college or school.

College/School	Merit Based	Appointment	A/S Appointment
BCOE	4	2	0
CHASS	7	17	1
CNAS	3	6	0
GSOE	0	5	0
SoBA	0	1	0
Joint CHASS/SPP	0	1	0
SPP	0	4	0
SOM	0	0	0
Totals	14	36	1

Total o/scales awarded = 51