



Committee on Academic Personnel
Annual Report 2006-2007

Joel Karliner, MD
Chair

During the 2006-07 academic year, the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) met as a Committee on 35 occasions and reviewed 344 files for appointments, promotions, merits, appraisals, five-year reviews, changes in series as well as multiple, ongoing stewardship reviews.

Statistical data for CAP 2006-07 reviews break down as follows:

Total files reviewed	344
Merits	74
Promotions	147
Change In Series	52
Appraisals	20
Accelerations	57
Decelerations	39
Merit to Step 6 reviews	30
Merit to Above Scale	4
Files involving additional information	28
Ad Hoc Committees formed	13

CAP Vice Chair Margaret (Peggy) Walsh served as the UCSF representative to the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). M. Walsh reported to and consulted the Committee on various issues being discussed on the systemwide level, including revisions to the APM concerning off-scale salaries (APM 620), and paid sick leave, reasonable accommodation, medical separation and constructive resignation (APMs 700, 710, 711, and 080). Other UCAP topics included CAP practices and the ongoing examination of the use of the Professional Research and Project Scientist series across the UC campuses.

Three Academic Senate Task Forces were formed over the academic year to recommend divisional responses to systemwide issues pertaining to academic personnel. Margaret Walsh, as CAP representative, chaired the task forces reviewing and recommending comment to Proposed Changes to APM 700, 710, 711, and 080 (regarding paid sick leave, reasonable accommodation, medical separation and constructive resignation) and the task force reviewing and recommending comment to Policy Recommendations for UC Faculty Compensation and Proposed Modification to Academic Personnel Policies (APM) 220-18b, (4) (regarding advancement to Professor Step VI and Above Scale).

Stephen Kahl, as CAP representative, chaired the task force reviewing Proposed Changes to APM 620 (proposed policy for off-scale salaries).

The Committee on Academic Personnel held an annual retreat bringing together Vice Provost, Academic Affairs Sally Marshall, the Director of Academic Affairs Cynthia Leathers, and academic personnel representatives from each of the four schools. At this retreat, CAP and attendees discussed a variety of issues including the voting policy regarding the promotion of Department Chairs, delays in the transmission of files, Department Chairs' letters, instructions to outside letters of support, the evaluation of collaborative research, appraisals, accelerated advancement, and stewardship reviews.

The Committee was also responsible for forming the Distinction In Teaching Award Selection Committee, this year chaired by CAP Member Russell Pieper, and honored the two recipients for 2006-07. This year's recipients of the Distinction in Teaching Award were Gurpreet Dhaliwal (Category 1) and George Sawaya (Category 2).

Systemwide Issues

CAP Member and Vice Chair Margaret Walsh served as the UCSF CAP representative to the systemwide University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). Margaret Walsh gave regular reports to UCSF CAP regarding issues at the systemwide level. The following issues were of particular interest to CAP:

1. Systemwide policies regarding paid sick leave, reasonable accommodation, medical separation and constructive resignation (APMs 700, 710, 711, and 080).
2. Policy recommendations for UC Faculty compensation and proposed modification to Academic Personnel Policies - Advancement to Professor Step VI and Above Scale (APM 220-18b, (4))
3. Proposed policy for off-scale salaries (APM 620-18).

Three Academic Senate task forces, chaired by CAP members, were formed to review and recommend divisional responses to these issues.

The Communications from these task forces summarizing the issues and concerns are attached, in order, as [Appendix 1](#), [Appendix 2](#), and [Appendix 3](#).

UCSF Committee on Academic Personnel

The primary work of the Committee is review and make recommendations regarding academic personnel actions including all promotions, merits accelerated or decelerated two or more years, advancement to Step 6 or Above Scale, Appointments, Appraisals, Five-Year Reviews, and Stewardship Reviews.

The Committee discussed campus-wide issues, including Strategic Plan development and Stewardship Review policies.

The Committee also hosted a retreat with Vice Provost, Academic Affairs Sally Marshall, the Director of Academic Affairs Cynthia Leathers, and academic personnel representatives from each of the four schools.

Strategic Plan Development

On September 13, 2006, the Committee on Academic Personnel reviewed the document “UCSF - Strategic Planning Phase III, Strategy Development.” The Committee drafted a Communication to Academic Senate Chair Greenspan to suggest an additional goal: “to demonstrate the value of clinician educators, and to benefit recruitment and retention of faculty, faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series should be included in the Academic Senate.” ([Appendix 4](#))

Stewardship Review Policies

The Committee discussed the potential need for post-Stewardship Review “interim” or “follow-up” reviews to add oversight and accountability to the recommendations set forth in the formal Stewardship Review Report. The Committee expressed this need in a Communication to the Vice Provost, Academic Affairs dated November 8, 2006 ([Appendix 5](#)).

Following the potentially premature termination of the Stewardship Review process for a School Dean (after the Stewardship Review Committee had completed its report and before the Dean had separated from the University), the Committee strongly felt that the findings and recommendations of the Stewardship Review Committee should be shared constructively, while preserving confidentiality, with any interim Dean and the search committee for the incoming dean. This recommendation was expressed in a Communication to the Vice Provost, Academic Affairs dated May 23, 2007 ([Appendix 6](#)).

CAP Retreat

In addition to the regular Committee Members, VPAA Sally Marshall, and Director of the Office of Academic Affairs (OAP) Cynthia Leathers, the CAP Retreat was attended by the following:

- B. Alldredge, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs, School of Pharmacy
- C. Damsky, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs, School of Dentistry
- D. Ferriero, Vice Dean, Academic Affairs, School of Medicine
- C. Miaskowski, Associate Dean, School of Nursing
- Z. Mirsky, Associate Dean, Administration, School of Nursing
- R. Navarro, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs, School of Medicine

The following sections summarize the Retreat discussion items. Minutes of the CAP Retreat are attached to this Annual Report as [Appendix 7](#). A communication to VPAA Marshall following up on these discussion items is attached as [Appendix 8](#).

Voting Policy Regarding the Promotion of Department Chairs

The Committee requested clarification of the voting policy in departments when the Department Chair is the subject of the action. The group discussed the various practices within each school. The School of Medicine reported that the action goes through the promotion committee as usual, the Vice-Chair votes, and the Associate Dean writes the letter, and prepares the file.

In the School of Nursing and Pharmacy, the smaller departments do not use a promotion committee. The School of Dentistry does not hold department votes. In the School of Nursing, for actions when the Chair is the candidate, the department votes as usual, and the Chair's letter is written by the Vice-Chair if the Vice-Chair is a Senate member, else the Associate Dean. In the School of Pharmacy, the department votes as usual, and the letter is written by the Associate Dean or the Vice-Chair of the department.

Delays in Transmission of Files, Potential Causes and Solutions

The Committee noted that many files appear to have been delayed or have languished in some offices for purely administrative delays. CAP asked if such delays were a result of poor training in the departments, antiquated information and processing systems, or perhaps a function of understaffing.

D. Ferriero provided data and information regarding the processes and submissions of the School of Medicine. The paperwork processes in the SOM still uses carbon paper, which slows the process considerably. As does November payroll, which in effect shuts the office down for personnel actions. Usually packets are returned to the SOM Vice-Dean's office with items missing, which results in other delays. Packets are almost always received incomplete. Millie Ng is addressing these issues and holding additional trainings to avoid problems in production and review of packets. D. Ferriero also provided data regarding the academic personnel process and file workload in the School of Medicine.

A concern was raised regarding timelines for initial submission (considered by faculty to be too early) and the time of ultimate submission to OAP and CAP, by which time the CV is usually outdated and absent of approved grants or accepted publications. The Committee discussed the possible submission of updated information at the end of the School process. D. Ferriero noted that allowing last minute submission of additional information may overwhelm the office. It was suggested that additional information may be solicited or accepted if it is significant, relevant information and such information is limited to a single page. Such an update will need a specific limitations and instructions regarding content.

This, however, does not address the issues of delay.

An organized, efficient electronic personnel system would help to solve these problems. It was noted that all other UC campuses already utilize an electronic system.

Issues of Concern Regarding Department Chairs' Letters

Accuracy of Information Related to Candidate

The Committee noted that it is not uncommon for a Department Chair's letter to contain information inconsistent or irrelevant to the candidate involved. These cases appear to be caused by oversight or casual "cutting and pasting" from other letters. The Committee requests that the Department Chairs be mentored regarding accuracy and completeness of these letters, and that such inconsistencies be filtered at the Dean's level prior to coming to CAP.

The Associate Deans discussed holding Chairs Workshops, and all agreed that Department Chairs, incoming and existing, would benefit from such workshops. It was suggested that such workshops be initiated by the VPAA, and an incentive be attached.

Inclusion of Specific Results of Department Vote

The Committee requested that Department Chairs include in their letters the specific nature and outcome of the departmental votes. Some letters include language such as “the appropriate members of the faculty were consulted.” However, some series do not require a faculty vote. The SOM has been sending back files that do require a vote but did not report the results.

Description of Unique Contribution to Collaborative Effort

To better address and evaluate a candidate’s research and creative activity in a collaborative effort, the Committee requested that Department Chairs’ letters include a description of the candidate’s unique contribution to the collaborative research effort. This will be included in the additional/supplemental training to Department Chairs.

Statements of Justifications for Accelerated Advancement

The Department Chair’s letter should include a specific statement of justification for acceleration based on the campus Guidelines for Accelerated Advancement. This will be included in the additional/supplemental training to Department Chairs.

Overall

It was suggested that Department Chairs be required to submit a separate sheet specifically explaining (1) the justification for acceleration (if any) and (2) statement of contribution to collaboration. Each item may only be a single paragraph. The Deans suggested that additional paper may be problematic.

The Committee agreed that including bold headings in the Department Chair’s letter covering these topics is sufficient.

Instructions to Outside Letters of Support

Evaluation of Acceleration Component in the Letter Content

Revision of Instructions Regarding Independence

Instructions to letter writers will be revised to include the need to address the “unique contribution to the collaborative research effort” and to recognize and support an accelerated advancement in the cases of accelerated actions.

Evaluation of Collaborative Research

C. Damsky raised the issue of how to measure the campus’ presumed increased valuation of collaborative research as a result of the recommendations of the Chancellor’s Task Force on Collaborative Research. Discussion continued regarding the nature of evaluation of collaborative research by CAP and Department Chairs.

VPAA Marshall suggested that faculty members who are collaborative and may appear to blend into a field of authors should submit a statement asserting or clarifying their role in the collaborative research. The Committee agreed that the more information CAP receives regarding the collaboration, the better it may evaluate their research/creative activity.

“Favorable” Appraisals Accompanied by Qualifications

VPAA Marshall requested that for appraisals which are evaluated as “Favorable,” they not also include a list of criticisms or suggestions for improvement. If there are suggestions for improvement, the evaluation should be “Favorable but Qualified.” The Committee may submit constructive suggestions as a sidebar letter which will not be included in the official record.

Stewardship Reviews: Policy of Administrative Holds and Faculty Concerns

R. Redberg raised faculty concerns regarding the recent Stewardship Review of a School Dean. VPAA Marshall pointed out that the Stewardship Review is not a program or a School review, but a review of an individual as an administrator. As such the review needs to be confidential. While the report may contain information relevant to the school or program, it is not a review or assessment of the school or program and should not be considered, or treated, as such.

It has been campus practice if not a formal policy that if a Chair or leader does not wish to undergo the review process, they are free to step down (and often do). When the subject of a Stewardship review steps down, the process stops.

The major concern in this case is that the Dean has announced that he is departing, but he has not yet stepped down and continues to be an active Dean. He is naming Department Chairs and will be appointing the interim Dean. It is also a concern of CAP that the process was suspended prior to the Dean’s stepping down, with the appearance that it was done so for political reasons.

P. Fox stressed the importance of shared governance and process, and that CAP should have been trusted to complete its work and maintain the confidentiality.

VPAA Marshall reported that she understood and supported these concerns, but recognized that it is, ultimately, the purview and decision of the Chancellor.

Issues for the 2007-2008 Academic Year

1. Revision of the document *Brief Descriptions of the Different Academic Series Used at UCSF for Use In Correspondence with External and Internal Referees*.
2. Continued development of guidelines for evaluating collaborative research.

Respectfully submitted,

Committee on Academic Personnel

Joel Karliner, MD, Chair, School of Medicine
Margaret Walsh, EdD, Vice Chair, School of Dentistry
Claire Brett, MD, Member, School of Medicine
James Cleaver, PhD, Member, School of Pharmacy
Patrick Fox, PhD, Member, School of Nursing
Stephen Kahl, PhD, Member, School of Pharmacy
Russell Pieper, PhD, Member, School Medicine
Rita Redberg, MD, Member, School of Medicine
Peter Wright, MD, PhD, Member, School of Medicine

Prepared by:
Wilson Hardcastle, Senate Analyst
(415) 476-4245, wilson.hardcastle@ucsf.edu

APPENDICES

- [Appendix 1:](#) Communication from the Task Force Reviewing Proposed Revisions to APM -700, Leaves of Absence/General and APM -710 Leaves of Absence/Sick Leave; Proposed new APM -711, Reasonable Accommodation for Academic Appointees with Disabilities and Proposed new APM -080, Medical Separation (June 2, 2006)
- [Appendix 2:](#) Communication from the Task Force Reviewing and Recommending Divisional Response to Present Status of UC Merit and Promotion System and Principles and Policy Recommendations for UC Faculty Compensation and Proposed Modification to Academic Personnel Policies (APM) 220-18b, (4) - Advancement to Professor Step VI and Above Scale (November 21, 2006).
- [Appendix 3:](#) Communication from the Task Force Reviewing Proposed Changes to APM 620; Proposed Policy for Off-Scale Salaries (May 30, 2007).
- [Appendix 4:](#) Communication from CAP to Academic Senate Chair Greenspan Regarding Strategic Plan Development (September 13, 2006).
- [Appendix 5:](#) Communication to VPAA Sally Marshall Regarding Assessment of Recommendations of Stewardship Review Committees
- [Appendix 6:](#) Communication to VPAA Sally Marshall Regarding Suspension of a Stewardship Review
- [Appendix 7:](#) Minutes from the June 6, 2007 CAP Retreat.
- [Appendix 8:](#) Follow-up Communication to VPAA Sally Marshall Regarding the June 6, 2007 CAP Retreat (July 2, 2007).