The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) was called to order by Chair Guglielmo on May 11, 2005 at 12:15 P.M. in S-30. A quorum was present.

**Evaluation of Independence Related to Merit and Promotion Actions in the Ladder Rank, In-Residence, Adjunct and Research Series**

**A. Evaluation of Collaboration and Independence in Research**

Background: Collaboration is critical toward the ultimate success of research. The unique contributions of each collaborative researcher must be clarified and subsequently acknowledged and evaluated by academic reviewing agencies. At the present, the only reference toward evaluation of the collaborative researcher in the University Academic Personnel Manual appears in APM 210-1-d(2) which states, “when published work in joint authorship (or other product of joint effort) is presented as evidence, it is the responsibility of the Department Chair to establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in the joint effort.....When the candidate is such a collaborator, it is the responsibility of the Department Chair to make a separate evaluation of the candidate’s contribution and to provide outside opinions based on observation of the work while in progress.” Candidates, depending upon series, might be expected to be both collaborative and independent in their research. The APM contains no reference to requirements for independence in research in the
Professor series (APM 220), Professor in Residence (APM 270), Professor of Clinical X (APM 275) or Adjunct Professor (APM 280). The only reference to independence exists in the Professional Research series which states (APM 310-4a) “The Professional Research series is used for appointees who engage in independent research equivalent to that required for the Professor series…”

Action:

1. Effective immediately, Associate Deans will contact respective Department Chairs and inform them of the above quoted APM section which state that it is the responsibility of the Department Chair to establish a candidate’s contributions in collaborative research. It was suggested that Department Chairs modify their request letters to both internal and external referees, requesting documentation of independence in collaborative research efforts.

2. A campus Committee for Collaborative Research Evaluation has been created which will develop guidelines by which (a) faculty and Department Chairs can optimally describe their contributions toward collaborative research and (b) reviewing agencies, including CAP, can evaluate the unique creative contributions of an individual faculty member toward collaborative research.

3. Proposed changes in APM wording specific to independence and collaborative research have been initiated by UCSF representatives at UCAP.


Background: As described above, the APM section that is specific to the Professional Research series, APM 310-4(a), states, “The Professional Research series is used for appointees who engage in independent research equivalent to that required for the Professor series and not for appointees whose duties are limited to making significant and creative contributions to a research project or to providing technical assistance to a research activity.” In contrast, the Project Scientist series APM 311-4(c) states, “Appointees in this series are not required to carry out independent research or develop an independent research reputation.” Historically, previous CAPs did not evaluate promotions in the Research series strictly by this APM. However, the current CAP has adhered to the APM language, including acceptance of independent and unique research contributions as outlined in the Department Chair letter. Differences of opinion were presented regarding the requirement to evaluate the Research series as per the APM.

Action:

1. Effective immediately Associate Deans will contact respective Department Chairs and inform them of the above quoted APMs which state that it is the responsibility of the Department Chair to establish the unique research contributions for individuals who are candidates for promotion in the Research series.

2. The recently formed campus Committee for Collaborative Research Evaluation will provide guidelines regarding identification and evaluation of the unique scholarly contributions of faculty in the Research series.

3. Proposed changes in APM wording specific to evaluation of the Research series have been initiated at UCAP.

The Use of Ad Hoc Committees – Criteria for Use and for CAP Acting as Own Ad Hoc
Background: “CAP Guidelines for Use of Ad Hoc Committees” (UCSF Academic Senate CAP Manual Section 22) states, the following “typically may warrant referral to an Ad Hoc Committee”: Appointment at or above the level of Associate Professor, including change in series to membership in the Academic Senate at or above this level, Appraisals of readiness for promotion to Associate Professor, Promotion to Associate or Full Professor, Advancement to Above Scale, and Stewardship Review.

Previous CAPs have generally used these guidelines and always used Ad Hocs in the promotion process. At the start of the 2003-04 academic year, in consultation with Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Dee Bainton and Diane Dillon, Director of the Office of Academic Affairs, use of Ad Hocs was identified as the step in the review process that most prolonged the review process with inconsistent benefit. One reason for the delay associated with Ad Hocs was the frequency with which faculty declined the invitation to participate and the need for CAP to create new Ad Hocs. In response, the 2003-04 CAP and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs elected to change the practice of utilizing Ad Hoc reviews in cases that “typically may warrant referral to an Ad Hoc Committee” as outlined above. CAP currently uses Ad Hocs for any review in which unanimity does not exist within CAP (or between CAP and any of the other reviewing agencies) and in some, but not all, negative reviews.

Retreat discussion included differences of opinion as to whether Ad Hocs prolonged or shortened the review process and whether all cases should receive an Ad Hoc as per the previously mentioned guideline, i.e. cases that “typically may warrant referral to an Ad Hoc Committee.” Opinions also were expressed regarding the potential benefits of Ad Hocs in providing additional understanding of culture that might be provided by departmental faculty and others. Others opined that all tenure decisions, all merits from Professor V to VI, and all merits from Professor IX to above scale should have mandatory Ad Hocs. It was stated that the UCAP experience confirmed that the practice of using Ad Hoc committees varied widely from campus to campus.

Action: CAP will review its current practice regarding the use of Ad Hoc committees taking into account the above discussion. The Academic Senate office will provide CAP with information regarding the number of faculty in each series who are at Step VI or above in order for CAP to evaluate the feasibility of establishing ad hoc review committees composed only of these senior ranking faculty. After full discussion, CAP will submit recommendations to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs regarding the use of ad hoc review committees.

Stewardship Reviews: Timeliness of Completion, Adherence to Policies and Practices and Accountability of Reviews

Background: CAP expressed several concerns regarding stewardship reviews. First, CAP has observed significant delays from the time CAP has finalized the reviews to the time the report is presented to the department. Secondly, the CAP representative often is not invited to the departmental presentation. Lastly, CAP requested a review of existing mechanisms to ensure that the Stewardship Review/CAP recommendations are implemented.

Action: the Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs will add specific timelines to include the departmental presentation of the stewardship review and reinforce the need for CAP representation at the departmental meeting. It is the responsibility of the Dean to ensure that stewardship review recommendations are implemented.
**Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest Issues**

Background: Concerns regarding confidentiality and conflict of interest were presented to the group and the specific incidents of concern were reviewed. Substantial discussion took place regarding the incidents and their resolution. It ultimately was concluded that any interaction between an active CAP member and a Dean or Department Chair potentially is a conflict of interest or perceived conflict of interest even if the discussion centers upon policy or process and not a specific promotion file. It also was agreed that potential for conflict of interest was not unique to interactions between CAP members and administration and all individuals involved in the promotion process must consider their potential conflict of interest in promotion matters.

Action: Active CAP members will have no communication with any Dean or Department Chair or any member of the faculty regarding any topic associated with the academic review process. The Associate Deans of the respective schools will answer all questions regarding the promotion process.

**Curriculum Vitae and/or the Educator’s Portfolio**

Background: The School of Medicine has developed an Educator’s Portfolio to be used in the promotion packet. However, questions exist whether the concomitant use of the Portfolio and the UCSF Curriculum vitae result in redundancy and inefficiencies in the presentation of teaching accomplishments.

Action: The School of Medicine will review this issue and explore mechanisms for increased efficiencies in the presentation of teaching activities. Based upon this evaluation, other schools can evaluate the potential benefit of the Educator’s Portfolio for their respective schools.

**Possible Faculty Summary Sheet for Areas of Review**

Background: The previous discussion of the Educator’s Portfolio resulted in additional discussion regarding the potential use of a Summary Sheet created by the individual faculty member. As actively used in other institutions, these summaries allow the individual to summarize all aspects of review, including teaching, scholarship, professional competence, and University and public service. Theoretically, the use of such a review, might allow the individual faculty member to more effectively describe themselves professionally, including all areas of review.

Action: The feasibility of a faculty summary sheet will be considered subsequent to resolution of the redundancies associated with the Educator’s Portfolio/curriculum vitae.

**Issues Related to CAP Suggestions for Changes in Series/Faculty Feedback**

Background: CAP reviews include an assessment whether the scope of activities (teaching, professional competence, scholarship, University and public service) is consistent with the series. This assessment is particularly important in reviewing individuals in the Adjunct and Clinical Professor series when the scope appears more consistent with In Residence or Clinical X. Concern was expressed specifically with respect to CAP recommendations regarding potential change in series from Clinical to Clinical X. More specifically, the cases of concern have involved individuals in the Clinical Professor series who have demonstrated moderate evidence of scholarship. At times, CAP has suggested that an increase in scholarship might result in a future change to the Clinical X series. Some suggested that this recommendation was intimidating or demeaning to faculty. Furthermore, some expressed that the views of today’s CAP may be inconsistent with that of a future CAP reviewing the possible change to Clinical X.
Action: CAP will continue to assess each file to determine whether the scope of activities is consistent with the series and make recommendations to change series when appropriate. While CAP may still recommend the possibility of a future change in series in some cases (e.g. increased scholarship in the change from Clinical to Clinical X), it understands that the Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs may elect to not include such a recommendation.

**Consideration of Diversity Issues in the Academic Review Process**

Background: CAP had denied promotions for some individuals of underrepresented minority groups specifically in one of the schools. It was also noted that new language had been proposed in the APM to consider contributions that promote diversity in the promotion process. UCSF representatives contributed toward the UCAP and UCAAD creation of this APM language and these recommendations officially will become part of the APM as of July 1, 2005. Independent of this discussion, it was reinforced to the group that CAP evaluates scholarly productivity in the following research disciplines differently: social and behavioral science, clinical science, educational science, health policy, epidemiology, and basic science. CAP recognizes that each of these disciplines has different scope, duration, and intensity of research and evaluates scholarly productivity accordingly. However, CAP does not change the requirements for excellence in the promotion process based upon the individual school.

Action: CAP will review the changes in APM 210, which is effective July 1, 2005 regarding advice to review and appraisal committees specific to valuing diversity in teaching, research and creative work, professional competence, and University and public service.

**Moving Merit and Promotion Packets Through the System and Establishment of a Timeline for Receipt of Proposed Merits and Promotions**

Background: The primary impetus for this agenda item centered upon the recently suggested CAP enforcement of the previously agreed upon campus deadlines. While enforcement of these deadlines was deemed appropriate by some schools, it was considered unfair by others. In addition, it was suggested that the current CAP was taking too long reviewing files, in contrast to the efficiency of previous CAPs. The benefits/detriments of Ad Hoc review committees once again was discussed with disagreement with respect to their impact on the timeline.

Action: CAP will assess the current review process and determine where it can improve in the efficiency of file review.

**Review of Volunteer Faculty Files—Determination of CAP/ Office of Academic Personnel’s Involvement**

Background: The School of Medicine forwarded a memorandum notifying the Office of Academic Affairs of its intent to evaluate merits and promotions for volunteer clinical faculty within the School, i.e. the Office of Academic Affairs will no longer be involved in the review process.

Action: CAP has no role in these reviews and the issue was considered to be irrelevant to the retreat. The issue will be handled between the School of Medicine and the Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

**Discussion Related to Concept of Undifferentiated Series for Assistant Professors**
Background: The concept of undifferentiated series for Assistant Professors was discussed, a proposal originally suggested by Dr. Margaretten when he was Dean of Academic Affairs for the School of Medicine. In short, appointing all assistant professors to undifferentiated series might increase efficiencies and allow each individual to develop over time into a researcher, clinician, and/or teacher, respectfully. Once more developed in scope, these individuals subsequently would be appointed to In Residence, Clinical, Adjunct, Clinical X, depending upon the eventual scope of academic activities. In reviewing the opinions of the various schools, it appeared the School of Medicine was unique in considering this proposal to have potential value. At the same time the Academic Senate Faculty Recruitment, Retention, and Promotion Task Force states that all faculty should be appointed in the series that is most consistent with the scope of activities proposed for their position, e.g. if the individual faculty member is active in all areas of review, then the in residence series may be more appropriate than the Adjunct or Clinical series. If the individual is strongly unbalanced toward research, then the Adjunct series may be more appropriate; if the individual primarily provides clinical service and teaching, the Clinical series might be optimal. In addition, certain departments continue to use series other than In Residence, specifically Adjunct or Clinical, to determine over time whether these individuals can be successful in all areas of review. If an individual ultimately is considered successful in all areas of review, a switch to In Residence is proposed. Lastly, at the present, appointments at the Assistant level (I through III) are handled at the Dean level and CAP does not review these appointments.

Action: CAP will review this issue and provide an opinion to the Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

These minutes were prepared by the Committee on Academic Personnel and approved by the Committee June 1, 2005.