

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
December 5, 2017**

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 48 occasions during the 2016-17 academic year. Meetings were approximately 2.5 hours in length. By the final May submission date in the CALL, there were 4 outstanding files campuswide with 86 files to be routed to CAP for review. CAP again is appreciative of staff and faculty alike for their efforts in the academic personnel review process.

I. Personnel Actions

a. Summary of Reviews

CAP reviewed 319 personnel actions during 2016-17 and sustained an average turn-around time of 22 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 196 merit actions reviewed by CAP, CAP endorsed 175. The final decision of the Chancellor's office over-ruled CAP's rank/step recommendation on 7 cases and disagreed on off-scale recommendations in 14 instances.
- Of the 44 accelerated merits proposed, CAP and the administration disagreed in 12 instances.
- Of the 37 promotions to Associate Professor or Professor, CAP supported 35. The Chancellor's office overruled CAP's recommendation on 3 cases, and disagreed on off-scale recommendation in 1 instance.
- Of the 18 cases proposed for advancement to Professor Step VI or to Professor Above-Scale, CAP endorsed 15. The Chancellor's office overruled CAP's recommendation on 2 cases.
- Of the 16 fifth year appraisals proposed, CAP and the administration disagreed in 2 instances.
- CAP reviewed 29 of the 30 proposed new appointments. Administration approved 27 of the 30 files with 1 file pending full review, 1 candidate withdrawing, and 1 file pending a final decision. The Chancellor's office overruled CAP's recommendation on 2 cases.
- CAP and the administration were in agreement on all reappointments. The four requests received were supported.
- CAP and the administration agreed on the 4 career reviews processed. Two cases resulted in a one-step merit increase. One case resulted in a two-step merit increase and one case resulted in a nine-step merit increase.
- Of the 12 quinquennials reviewed, the Chancellor's Office and CAP disagreed on 1 case.

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 15-16 CAP Report

Of the 44 promotions to Associate Professor or Professor submitted for review in the 15-16 AY, one case was noted as pending a final decision. The pending case was finalized and the promotion denied.

c. Ad hoc Committees

The Committee on Academic Personnel continued to act as its own ad hoc for 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 16-17 review year, CAP did not utilize an ad hoc committee.

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 2016-17, Shadow CAP reviewed 5 cases. The 2016-17 Shadow CAP members were the following:

George Haggerty, Chair
Jan Blacher
Walter Clark
Jianying Gan
Sarjeet Gill
Mark Springer

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. 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. The 2016-2017 CAP was scheduled to conduct a post-appointment audit of all 13-14 and 14-15 dean's level hires. However, CAP was unable to complete the post-audit because a response to the request for files was not received.

f. eFile

CAP reviewed 312 of its 319 cases via the eFile system (98%). This compares to the 300 of 320 eFiles reviewed in 2015-16 (94%).

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

- Dickson Emeritus Professorship: CAP reviewed and endorsed one nomination for the 2016-17 Dickson Emeritus Professorship, sent forward by the Committee on Faculty Welfare.
- Professor of the Graduate Division appointments: CAP reviewed 8 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 ten requests to transfer an entire or a portion of a filled FTE appointment from one department to another. CAP also commented on a request to change the home department for a candidate with a split FTE.
- Pre-Emptive Retention Cases: CAP provided recommendations on one pre-emptive retention case.

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. CAP agreed with the majority of the modified language and provided further recommendations. CAP's suggested changes can be found on the committee webpage <http://senate.ucr.edu/committee/4/Archive.html>

b. CAP Review of Proposed Department Chair Appointments

CAP reviewed the list of proposed department chair appointments for the 2017-2018 academic year and expressed no concern about the recommendations submitted.

c. Endowed and Presidential Chair Appointments

CAP reviewed and provided comments on appointments/reappointments to the following Endowed and Presidential Chair positions:

BCOE

Winston Chung Endowed Term Professorship in Energy Innovation

CNAS

MacArthur Term Chair

Jane S. Johnson Chair in Food and Agriculture

GSOE

Presidential Chair in the Graduate School of Education

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 position in the Bourns College of Engineering. CAP completed a “pre-read” on eight Target of Excellence candidates (5 BCOE, 2 CHASS, 1 CNAS) and reviewed proposed changes to the TOE program.

e. Additional Local Issues

Administrative review of merit and promotion files, request for advice to be communicated to deans and department chairs regarding period of review, and suggested topics for the department chair forums.

Request for Data on 3 Years of 1.5% Campus-Discretion Salary Increases

The 1.5% campus-discretionary funds provided by President Napolitano were intended to address issues related to equity, inversion, compression, and exceptional merit. The Committee on Academic Personnel was interested in learning how the funds were applied at UCR. CAP was particularly interested in understanding how, if any, funds were applied on the basis of “exceptional merit” and how the criteria used differ from the campus merit and promotion

process.

Specifically, CAP requested the criteria used by each dean in distributing the 1.5% campus-discretion salary increases, with the aggregated data broken down by rank, step, gender, and ethnicity. CAP wanted to see the salaries associated with each rank, step, gender and ethnicity before and after the application of funds as well as an explanation on how the faculty were informed of the application for each plan. In addition, CAP requested the 2016-2017 plan for each school/college and the rationale for its intended distribution.

In the material received there was great disparity of how exceptional merits funds were distributed across the colleges. Only BCOE and SOM explicitly noted a percentage of funds used for this purpose. CAP was concerned with the potential for doubling up on merit increase recommendations through the regular process of accelerations and additional o/s made at the CAP level. As such, CAP requested a more detailed explanation of how funds were applied in each college on the basis of “exceptional merit” and how the criteria used differ from the campus merit and promotion process.

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 2016-17 CAP representative was David Lloyd. CAP Chair Heraty 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 285, APM 210-3, APM 133, and APM 740

Proposed revisions modify language intended to make the title more accurately reflect the requirements for advancement in the series and make hiring, evaluation, and promotion practices more consistent across the UC system.

The Committee considered, but had no substantial comments to offer on the recommended title change and numerous editorial and organizational changes found in APM sections 285, 210-3, 133 and 740. The Committee supported the proposed revisions.

Presidential Nondiscrimination Policy and APM 015

Proposed revisions modify language to comply with: California state law (AB 1433), by extending non-discrimination and non-harassment, protections to individuals applying for or engaged in positions as “volunteers, unpaid interns and trainees;”, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) Pay Transparency Rule, prohibiting certain employers from discharging or discriminating against employees and job applicants for discussing, disclosing or inquiring about compensation; and amendments to the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA), requiring employers to develop and distribute anti-harassment and discrimination

policies with certain required elements.

The Committee unanimously approved the proposed changes to the draft Presidential Nondiscrimination Policy and APM 015 with two recommendations.

- 1) CAP recommends the definition of terms and grammatical inconsistencies found in both documents be realigned for consistency and to avoid misinterpretation.
- 2) CAP recommends the placement of semicolons and comas found under Types of Unacceptable Conduct in APM 015 be revised to reflect the following:

Types of Unacceptable Conduct

5. Discrimination, including harassment, against University employees or individuals seeking employment, providing services pursuant to a contract, or applying for or engaged in an unpaid internship, volunteer capacity, or training program leading to employment, for any of the following reasons: on political grounds, or for reasons of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender, gender expression, gender identity, ethnic origin, national origin, ancestry, marital status, pregnancy, physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer-related or genetic characteristics), genetic information (including family medical history), or service in the uniformed services as defined by the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA), as well as state military and naval service, or, within the limits imposed by law or University regulations, because of age or citizenship or for other arbitrary or personal reasons.

Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy: Business & Financial Bulletin (BFB) G-28 - Travel Regulations

Proposed revisions allow reimbursement, in limited circumstances, for travel (including childcare) expenses for spouses, domestic partners, dependent-care providers, and dependents of employees traveling on University business and candidates for employment at the University of California traveling to UC locations for recruitment purposes.

The Committee considered the proposed revisions to the Presidential Policy Business and Finance Bulletin (BFB) G-28 – Travel Regulations to fall outside its charge and chose not to opine.

Proposed Technical Revisions to APM 190 Appendix G – Retirement Contributions on Academic Appointee Summer Salary

Proposed technical revisions modify summer salary retirement contributions language to include the Defined Contribution Plan (DC Plan) Supplemental or Savings Choice contributions to the DC Plan under the 2016 retirement Choice Program. In addition, policy is modified to reflect that the summer salary retirement benefit will be transferred, prospectively, from the DC Plan to the Tax Deferred 403(b) Plan. The changes are applicable to future contributions only (effective November 1, 2016); existing summer salary benefit amounts will remain in the DC Plan.

The Committee considered the proposed revisions to APM – 190, Appendix G – Retirement

Contributions on Academic Appointee Summer Salary to fall outside its charge and chose not to opine.

Second Review of Revisions to APM 278, APM 210-6 Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series

The Proposed revisions in Academic Personnel Manual Sections 278 – Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series and 210-6 – Instructions to Review Committees Which advise on Actions Concerning the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series differentiate the Health Sciences Clinical Professor title from the Volunteer Clinical Professor title, identify responsibilities for faculty appointed to a Health Sciences Clinical Professor title, and strengthen and refine review criteria for appointment and advancement.

CAP noted several concerns provided in the first round of review that have not been addressed with the current proposed revisions. It seems the intent of revisions to APM 278 was to provide clarity on the criteria to be used when evaluating the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series; however, the suggested changes are at times inconsistent, highly repetitive, and add confusion rather than clarity. CAP further questioned decisions that are at odds with the evaluation of other Academic Senate rank faculty. In CAP's opinion, streamlining the draft to the essential components would be very beneficial to all parties. Specific concerns expressed during CAP's evaluation of the documents are outlined below. Items marked in bold are considered substantial and affect how files will be presented and evaluated by the Committee on Academic personnel.

210-6c (p. 2-3 redline): It is unclear why external review letters "may not be required" for promotions to the Associate Professor or Professor ranks, whereas they are required for advancement to Step VI or Above Scale. Especially in the evaluation of scholarly or creative activity, it seems that outside evaluation is necessary at all levels to be comparable to other ladder rank evaluation across the Academic Senate.

210-6b (p. 1 redline) /**278-10** (pg. 6 redline): "The Dean or Department Chair": does this refer to the concept that only one or the other will be appropriate at most campuses? Normally, if there is a Dean and Department Chair, then letters and evaluations should come from both sources. Language should be change to "Department Chair and/or Dean as appropriate". Note that this is the phrase used in APM-278c.

210-6b (p. 1 redline) /**278-10** (p. 6-7 redline): Are there minimum limits set for each of the four areas of evaluation such that an individual can have a negotiated zero contribution in a particular area. There are no explicit guidelines on this. At least some contribution in all four areas should be mandated.

210-6b (p. 2 redline): The Chair "should also indicate" should be changed to "will indicate". It is essential to include this information for clarity.

210-6-2 Teaching (p. 6 redline): Adding phrases such as "capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge" is an example of information that can be consolidated to make review more simple not more complex.

210-6-2 Teaching (p. 8 redline): The second and third paragraphs are highly repetitive and could be consolidated.

210-6-2 Professional Competence and Activity (p. 10 redline): It is unclear why the formatting has changed in comparison to all other listed evaluation criteria. This section can be consolidated.

210-6-4 University and Public Service (p. 12-14 redline): The last paragraph: section redundant to previous paragraph and can be deleted.

At times the renumbering of the redline version is inconsistent. The wording in the final copy does not match the suggested changes provided in the redline version.

Appendix 7 Transfer of Program: Proposed Transfer of the Public Policy Major from CHASS to SPP

CAP was asked to review the documents on the proposed transfer of the Public Policy Major from CHASS to SPP. The committee does not think that the implications of the proposed policy have a direct bearing on the merit and promotion process. However, as faculty some CAP members wonder about the impetus behind the transfer.

The SPP Executive Committee denies that transferring the public policy major to SPP adds to the professionalization of undergraduate education. Yet this claim requires clarification, as SPP is a professional school. The SPP Executive Committee also argues that interaction between CHASS and pre-professional majors “strengthens the diversity of our student body.” This claim also requires clarification since it seems to suggest that the proposed transfer *does* make the major a pre-professional one. Finally, the SPP Executive Committee notes that most of the courses for the major remain CHASS courses. Again, clarification is needed. If the courses remain CHASS courses, why does the major not remain a CHASS major? Given the new budget model, the transfer will direct the benefits of the major to SPP while CHASS retains the instructional burden.

Some CAP members think that this shift towards pre-professional undergraduate degrees overlooks the importance of a liberal arts education. If CHASS is to become a service enterprise meant to serve the professional degree programs, its mission will be lost. Maintaining the public policy major within CHASS demonstrates that a liberal arts education remains a core value for the university as a whole.

Proposed Policy: VPUE Proposal to Allow Enrollment in Research and Internship Courses for Zero Units

CAP was asked to review the VPUE proposal to allow enrollment in research and internship courses for zero credits. The Committee found the review item to be outside its purview, as the implications of the proposed policy does not have a direct bearing on the merit and promotion process. However, CAP was inclined to provide a faculty perspective and offers the following comments.

Overall the members were supportive of the use of the zero-credit option for research credits (197 and 199 courses). The zero-credit proposal was seen as a benefit for students to work with credit hour caps and also to gain recognition for their research involvement on the campus. The option may allow administration to better track research involvement, but likely it will always be an underestimate based on faculty and students that choose not to participate. One member cited the blurred line between student research and student employment, and the potential for inadvertent or deliberate abuse.

Proposed Policy: Teaching Credit for Faculty-Led Internship Courses

CAP was asked to review the proposed policy concerning teaching credit for faculty-led internship courses. The Committee found the review item to be outside its purview as the implications of the proposed policy does not have a direct bearing on the merit and promotion process. However, CAP was inclined to provide a faculty perspective and offers the following comments.

At issue seems to be the lack of teaching recognition (as teaching load) or salary compensation for faculty directing internship courses. While a majority of members were in support of the increased recognition of both the internships and the faculty workload for directing these internship course credits, it is unclear how this can be evenly implemented across the different types of internships being offered (e.g. mentorship vs active engagement). The difference in how teaching credit would be assigned for the different internships is also unclear as internship credits are currently reflected in the number of students and units assigned under their teaching record data (as 198I or 198G).

Request from the Special Committee regarding the Provost

CAP considered the request received from the Special Committee and provided substantive feedback regarding concerns that affect the timely promotion and tenure of UCR faculty.

Campus Review: Proposed SOM Bylaw Change: ME2.1 to ME5.8.3

CAP found the proposed changes to be reasonable and unanimously supported the modifications without further recommendations.

Department Name Change Proposals

CAP reviewed the proposals for departmental name changes in CNAS and CHASS. Agreeing with the rationale found in each proposal and finding no CAP specific issues, the Committee unanimously supported the proposed name changes listed below with no further recommendations:

- 1) Department of Cell Biology and Neuroscience to the Department of Molecular, Cell and Systems Biology
- 2) Department of Biology to the Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology
- 3) Department of Plant Pathology and Microbiology to the Department of Microbiology and Plant Pathology

4) Department of Comparative Literature and Foreign Languages to the Department of Comparative Literature and Languages

SoBA Name Change Proposal

CAP reviewed the proposal for the school name change from School of Business Administration to School of Business. Finding no CAP specific issues, the Committee voted in favor of the proposed name change with no further recommendations.

Establishment of Endowed and Presidential Chairs

Teresa & Byron Pollitt Endowed Chairs for Interdisciplinary Research & Learning in Humanities and Social Sciences

CAP reviewed the documents for the Teresa & Byron Pollitt Endowed Chairs for Interdisciplinary Research & Learning in Humanities and Social Sciences. CAP was enthusiastic about the establishment of the three Endowed Term Chairs and voted unanimously in favor of the proposal. CAP believes that they will make an important contribution to enhancing both CHASS faculty research and UCR's practical and intellectual contribution to the region and its communities.

However, concern was expressed by several CAP members that the current strategic priorities listed in the proposal do not adequately represent the kinds of research and teaching that many CHASS faculty actually engage in or the contributions that they might make to such a program. The priority "New Voices and Visions – expressing and celebrating our humanity through the visual and performing arts, and nurturing voices from across the rich tapestry of society" appears to foreclose the contribution of CHASS faculty in the critical and interpretive disciplines or to demand a too extensive reframing of their actual research agendas in order to address the priority. CAP feels that it is of great importance to acknowledge in the proposal the potential contribution that the socially and culturally critical work of many CHASS faculty might make to such program.

Stapleton Presidential Chair in Innovation and Entrepreneurship in the School of Business Administration

CAP reviewed the documents supporting the Stapleton Endowed Presidential Chair in Innovation and Entrepreneurship in the School of Business Administration. CAP was enthusiastic about the establishment of this Presidential Chair and voted in favor of the proposal without any further recommendations.

Shrimad Rajchandra Endowed Chair Proposal in Jain Studies

CAP reviewed the Endowed Chair proposal and appreciates the efforts of the Dean of CHASS to attract donations to support the development of the academic program at UCR. However, CAP has a number of serious concerns that prevent the committee from considering the proposal as currently presented.

Firstly, as it is proposed, the wording in the proposal does not guarantee academic freedom in the selection and oversight of either the candidate or the research being undertaken. CAP focused on two core issues within the proposal.

A) Section II.A. paragraph 2 is inappropriate and should be removed. This statement is too detailed with regard to the direction of research and the need to focus research on specific principles of the religion. The chosen chair must have the freedom to conduct research in any topic within the area of Jain studies. Paragraph 3 is short, succinct and implies no such boundaries.

B) under the Exhibit A Stewardship agreement, CAP perceived there to be too much oversight implied in the creation of an advisory council by the donors that would be involved with the process and progress of the Chair's recruitment, and require regular engagement by the Chair with the Jain community. This goes beyond reporting the activities of the Chair to the donors and toward an inappropriate requirement of mandatory engagement.

While the standard language in the Dean's proposal on page 2 indicates that "the intellectual independence of the chair holder's scholarly independence is assured", such language does not appear explicitly in the body of the Memorandum of Understanding.

Secondly, the proposal also raised concerns with regard to its potential impact on UCR's reputation. CAP noted that a similar Jain Chair position was proposed and rejected at UC Irvine: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/02/22/uc-irvine-moves-reject-endowed-chair-gifts-donor-strong-opinions-about-study>. In that case, the Jain Chair donors were associated with a set of endowed chairs that had direct ties to the Dharma Civilization Foundation, which was found to seek inappropriate control over the academic study of Hinduism. A UCI committee found the endowment proposal to be inconsistent with the values of the university and the Dean decided not to proceed with the chairs. The UCI Jain Chair was also withdrawn for further consideration. CAP requires independent assurance that the current Endowed Chair in Jain Studies would not be subject to similar restrictions on the research agenda and scholarly findings of any Chair appointed under the terms of the endowment, and seeks assurance that due diligence has been undertaken to guarantee the independence of the holder of the Chair.

Further, the identified donors of this Chair, Dr. Jasvant Modi and Dr. Meera Modi, were in September 2016 implicated in an illegal Patient-Transfer Medicare scheme to defraud Medicare and Medi-Cal through the illegal recruitment of Skid Row residents: <https://www.justice.gov/usao-cdca/pr/la-nursing-home-two-physicians-pay-over-35-million-resolve-allegations-they>. UCR may be tainted by that scandal.

While recognizing that the claims resolved by the settlement are allegations only and that there has been no determination of liability, CAP feels that it is of the utmost importance that UCR should ensure that its donors' reputations do not bring that of the university into question.

c. Topics Suggested for Future Senate Consideration

LPSOE/LSOE appointments and review

Over the last three years, CAP has seen a large increase in the number of LPSOE/LSOE (Professor of Teaching) appointments. We have been asked to approve these only at the general level (untentured or tentured) with no proposed step/level of appointment that would allow us to

compare these to the regular research professor series or even to each other. CAP feels that it might be considered as a priority for the Executive Council to consider making LSOE appointments and review criteria as a discussion point over the coming year. One question might focus on the target numbers for the Colleges and University in terms of the number and balance of LSOE appointments. Does the university have a plan and is there coordination between colleges on acceptable overall numbers? Another issue is development of comparable metrics and evaluation criteria for LSOE appointments so that they can be treated in a comparable manner to ladder rank faculty. This may be an appropriate topic for discussion by both Faculty and Welfare and CAP. This may not be an overriding issue at the moment, but it may be a good time to establish baseline comparisons to evaluate the impact of any shift to greater numbers of LSOE faculty in the future.

d. 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,

John Heraty, Chair
Alicia Arrizon
Vyjayanthi Chari
Rajiv Gupta
Nalo Hopkinson
David Lloyd
Adam Lukaszewski
Richard Smith
Georgia Warnke
Jory Yarmoff

TABLE I: SUMMARY OF PROMOTIONS AND ADVANCEMENTS

PROMOTIONS TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR:

Total Proposed: 23
 Total Reviewed by CAP: 23
 Total Reviewed by Chancellor: 23
 Total Approved by Chancellor: 23 Approval % 100%

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
21	2	0	0	0	0	20	1	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	19	0	0	0	0	4	0

PROMOTIONS TO PROFESSOR:

Total Proposed: 14
 Total Reviewed by CAP: 14
 Total Reviewed by Chancellor: 14
 Total Approved by Chancellor: 12 Approval % 86%

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	1	0	0	0	0	10	3	1	8	2	1	1	0	0	2	0	8	2	1	0	0	2	1

ADVANCEMENTS TO PROFESSOR VI & ABOVE-SCALE:

Total Proposed: 18
 Total Reviewed by CAP: 18
 Total Reviewed by Chancellor: 18
 Total Approved by Chancellor: 14 Approval % 78%

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	3	0	0	0	0	13	4	1	13	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	13	4	0	0	0	1	0

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:	198		
Total Reviewed by CAP:	196	1 file CAP recused, 1 file canceled	
Total Reviewed by Chancellor:	197		
Total Approved by Chancellor:	177	Approval %	90%

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/ In-Residence	79	2	0	77	2	2	65	7	0	0	0	3	5	0	69	6	0	0	2	3	1
Associate Professor	46	0	0	42	1	3	33	6	0	0	0	2	4	1	34	5	0	0	2	2	3
Professor	59	1	0	50	3	7	37	5	1	0	1	8	8	0	40	6	0	2	4	3	5
within AS	9	1	0	8	2	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0
LPSOE/SOE	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Merits	194	4	0	178	8	12	142	21	1	0	1	13	17	1	150	20	0	2	8	8	9

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

TABLE III: SUMMARY OF APPOINTMENTS

Total Proposed:	30		
Total Reviewed by CAP:	29	1 file pending review	
Total Reviewed by Chancellor:	27	1 candidate withdrew, 1 file pending final decision	
Total Approved by Chancellor:	27	Approval %	100%

Rank	16-17 Actions
Acting Assistant Professors	1
Assistant Professors	7
Associate Professors	6
Professors	9
Professor Above Scale	1
LPSOE/LSOE/SOE	6
TOTAL APPOINTMENT ACTIONS	30

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: 16

Fifth-year Appraisals	Decision		
	Positive	Qualified	Negative
CAP	10	5	1
EVC/Chancellor	8	7	1

Career Reviews:

Total Proposed: 4

- 2 Resulted in a merit of 1 step
- 1 Resulted in a merit of 2 steps
- 1 Resulted in a merit of 9 steps

Quinquennial Reviews

Total Proposed: 12

Quinquennials	Decision	
	Satisfactory	Negative
CAP	9	3
EVC/Chancellor	8	4

Assistant Professor Reappointments:

Total Proposed: 4

Total Approved: 4

Total Merits & Promotions:	235
Total Advancements:	18
Total Appointments:	30
Total Misc. Actions:	36
TOTAL PERSONNEL ACTIONS	319

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	5	0	0
CHASS	12	6	0
CNAS	10	6	1
GSOE	0	3	0
SoBA	0	1	0
SPP	0	3	0
SoM	0	0	0
Joint SPP/CHASS	0	1	0
Totals	27	20	1

Total o/scales awarded = 48