Chair Karliner called the retreat of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) to order on Wednesday, May 24, 2006 at 12:30 P.M. in Room S-30. A quorum was present.

The Committee, the Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, and representatives of Academic Affairs from each of the four schools discussed the following issues.

**Accelerated Advancement Criteria and Related Issues**

The Committee discussed five issues regarding accelerated advancement:

- **Deans’ Oversight for Stated Reasons in Chair’s Letter**
  The UCSF Guidelines for Accelerated Advancement (Attachment 1) require that the Department Chair’s letter provide an express justification for the accelerated action. The Guidelines read, “A dossier proposing accelerated advancement should always include a discussion of the reasons for the action.”

  CAP requested that the oversight for this requirement be assumed by the Dean’s office, and if the justification is absent from the Chair’s letter, the Dean should return the file to the department for correction before the file is sent on to CAP. The Deans agreed that this indeed should be the practice.

- **Justifications for Accelerated Advancement**
  The Committee reviewed the justifications for accelerated advancement as stated in the UCSF Guidelines for Accelerated Advancement. The Guidelines read as follows:
Criteria:

1. Exceptional performance is defined as work that exceeds departmental expectations in one or more of the following categories: teaching, research or other creative activities, professional competence and activities, and University and public service.

2. In addition, the faculty member being considered for acceleration must meet departmental criteria for advancement in all other categories of evaluation.

Examples of Exceptional Performance:

1. Award of a prestigious, competitive grant representing achievement beyond that expected for advancement within the individual’s academic series.

2. Receipt of a competitive professional service award to recognize outstanding national or international contribution to the profession, to a discipline, or to professional education.

3. A sustained level of outstanding achievement over a period of years in one or more of the four categories listed above, i.e., exceptional teaching evaluations, teaching awards, or service to the University and/or the public that is far and above that of expectations.

4. Unusual productivity in publishing original work in scholarly, peer-reviewed publications exceeding those expectations normally held for the individual’s academic series.

5. Extraordinary service or development of innovative programs that further the fundamental missions of the Department, School, or the University.

The Committee discussed justifications for accelerated advancement with the academic affairs representatives present. AVC Marshall commented on her reluctance to advance packets with a stellar research record, but poor teaching evaluations. CAP has noticed in its reviews that the School of Medicine often appears to accelerate basic scientists as a way to bridge the salary gap. AVC Marshall added that our colleagues at the other UC campuses are getting ahead of us as it is not uncommon for them to be paying 50% off scale. Further, it is the junior faculty who are more likely to be off scale. According to her, the largest discrepancy seems to be at associate level and the first few years of professorship.

Retention and Accelerated Advancement
The Committee noted that this year there has been some confusion regarding retention as an acceptable justification for accelerated advancement. Based on discussions at last year’s CAP retreat, CAP understood that they were expressly prohibited from considering retention issues for matters of advancement or accelerated advancement. However, the UCSF Guidelines for Accelerated Advancement (Attachment 1) state that “Accelerated advancement may be proposed as a retention strategy when a highly-valued faculty member is being recruited elsewhere.”

Where retention is concerned, AVC Marshall stated that retention can be a reason to consider the packet; however, the candidate must be exceptional and retention cannot be a stand-alone reason.
She also agreed to revise the call to reflect this policy. The Committee queried as to whether the
general practice of the Schools and the departments should be to encourage acceleration. AVC
Marshall expressed that she believed that departments should be encouraged to accelerate faculty
when warranted, and that faculty need to be made more aware of the possibility.

ACTION: AVC Marshall agreed to revise the Call to clarify criteria related to accelerated
advancement when retention of faculty is the reason for the personnel action.

· Inconsistency of Policy By Some Department Chairs
The Committee has noted that policies or practices for submitting a faculty member for an
accelerated advancement have often been applied inconsistently amongst various UCSF
departments. Chair Karliner requested that there be some institution of uniformity by the deans to at
least cover these points and ensure that the department chairs be made aware of these issues.

· Gender Bias for Accelerated Advancement
The Committee has noted that for files which have been submitted for accelerated advancement, far
fewer of them have been for women. The Committee has noted that in most cases, when a female
candidate has submitted her packet for accelerated advancement, it has been of a female candidate
with a male counterpart with an appointment with the University who may have made this option
known to her. CAP is concerned about possible gender bias at the department level regarding
encouraging female faculty to apply for an acceleration when appropriate.

ACTION: D. Ferreiro will gather figures related to accelerated advancement by gender and
minority.

Frequency and Concentration of “Unfortunate or Unavoidable Administrative Delays”

The Committee discussed the frequency and concentration of “unfortunate or unavoidable
administrative delays” as the reason for an action’s late submission, deceleration, or retroaction.
CAP noted that this is particularly prevalent in packages coming from the Department of Psychiatry.

D. Ferreiro responded that she has met twice with the department and that CAP should see an
improvement in this shortly. She also reported that this year, her office is sending out advancement
lists indicating what files they are expecting and which ones they have not yet received. She is
hoping this technique will also reduce the number packets with delays.

Department Inclusion of Grant Scores Relative to Pay Lines For Review

While grants and extramural funding are not required by the APM for advancement, it can be an
indicator of independence, professional competence and creative activity. However, in the current
national fiscal climate, many grant applications which would have been successful are now denied.
CAP members suggested the possible inclusion of grant scores relative to pay lines into an academic
personnel packet for review and consideration by CAP and the Associate Vice Chancellor of
Academic Affairs. Regarding the imminent problem of people not getting funding, AVC Marshall
suggested taking this issue to Executive Vice Chancellor Gene Washington so that he can forward
these concerns to the Chancellor’s Executive Committee. The group as a whole was supportive about including the grant scores in the packet.

ACTION: AVC Marshall agreed to revise the call to reflect this change and communicate this area of concern to Executive Vice Chancellor Gene Washington so that he can forward these concerns to the Chancellor’s Executive Committee

**Mentoring of Department Chairs**

During regular review of academic personnel files, CAP has noted that there are several areas in which Department Chairs might benefit from additional mentoring by the Dean’s Office, the Office of the Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, or the Committee on Academic Personnel. Faculty new to the position of Department Chair would particularly benefit from such mentoring. Suggested mentoring topics included:

1. What specifically to include in the Chair’s letter, particularly an explanation of independent contributions to collaborative research, justification (if any) for accelerated advancement, and the relevance and significance of dissemination venues should they be esoteric or niche (print or electronic) publication venues.

2. How CAP functions, its overall role, and how it fits into the packet review process.

The suggestion was made to invite new department chairs to observe several CAP meetings in order to become familiar with the process. AVC Marshall agreed and will work with CAP to determine the feasibility of such a program.

**Dissemination of Creative Activity: Avenues and Recommendations**

As set forth in APM 210, the four criteria by which a candidate is evaluated are (1) teaching, (2) research and other creative work, (3) professional activity and (4) University and public service. CAP has expressed its support for electronic and open-access avenues for dissemination of creative work (see the Communication from the Committee on Academic Personnel dated January 31, 2006, Attachment 2). The Committee would also like to make sure that Department Chairs and faculty are aware that for the Professor and Clinical X series, evidence of dissemination of creative work can include an array of options in addition to hypothesis-driven such as published scientific papers, such as reviews, case studies, clinical Web sites, presentations, books, and book chapters.

ACTION ITEM: D. Ferriero suggested adding this sentence to the online CV guidelines as well as the Faculty Handbook.

**Cap Suggestions for Change In Series and Financial Implications**

AVC Marshall expressed concern that when CAP suggests a change of series, departments are reluctant to do so due to actual or potential increased costs. The fundamental question becomes: would the faculty member prefer to be in the wrong series or not have a position at all? Most
attendees agreed that this issue is not easy to resolve. AVC Marshall requested clarification as to whether the letters from CAP recommending a change in series are actual recommendations or just observations. Chair Karliner responded that generally they are CAP’s observations. AVC Marshall requested clarification on whether an approved change in series recommendation needs to come back to CAP. Chair Karliner clarified that in instances when CAP has recommended the change in series and it is granted, that the packet does not need to return to CAP.

Appraisals: “Favorable” Versus “Favorable But Qualified”

The AVC Marshall expressed her concern regarding files she receives from CAP, where CAP has served as its own ad hoc and given a faculty member a “favorable” rating, but has also included a list of areas that needed to be addressed by the faculty member in order to achieve tenure. AVC Marshall indicated that when she receives these types of files, she will change the ranking to “Favorable But Qualified”. She asked if CAP had a problem with this. CAP indicated that they did not.

ACTION: CAP will recommend a rating of “Favorable but Qualified” for candidates for whom they recommend areas for improvement.

Conflict of Interest: Dean’s Letters and Chair’s Letters

The Committee noted that from time to time, a Dean’s Letter or Department Chair’s letter may be drafted by someone who has collaborated or published with the candidate being reviewed. The Committee is concerned that this may represent a conflict of interest and should be avoided. AVC Marshall expressed concern with collaborations that occurred many years ago and whether those should be considered a conflict. The group discussed at what point a collaboration would no longer be considered a conflict.

ACTION: The group jointly decided that a collaboration which occurred more than five years ago will no longer constitute a conflict.

Clarification of Teaching in the Research Series

The Committee has been operating with the understanding that teaching is not only not necessary but prohibited for those with appointments into the Professional Research series. APM 310 is in fact not expressly clear in this, as it states that “Appointees with Professional Research titles do not have teaching responsibilities.” The question is: does this mean that those in the Professional Research series are not required to teach, but may do so; or does this mean that those in the Professional Research series do not teach, should not teach, and are prohibited from teaching? M. Croughan, Vice-Chair of CAP and Vice-Chair of UCAP, reported that this has been a discussion systemwide, and that the other divisional CAPs have been operating with the understanding that those in the Professional Research series are prohibited from teaching. The opinion at UCAP is that those persons meeting the criteria for the Professional Research series, but with an interest or assignment in teaching, are better suited to the Adjunct series which allows for an imbalance in areas of review as well as teaching.
The group discussed the nuances of “teaching.” For example, laboratory mentoring or a workshop need not be considered teaching. The fundamental problem is that persons in the research series, are supposed to be 100% supported by grants. Failure to do so could expose the University to an NIH audit. The group acknowledged that many add their teaching responsibilities because they want to showcase these skills. B. Alldredge reported that he insists they remove the references or fill out the paperwork to get WOS status for a secondary appointment into the Adjunct series. The group agreed that this needs to be the practice.

ACTION: The Deans will begin offering additional WOS Adjunct appointments to members of the Professional Research Series who wish to teach.

**Future Implications of the Project Scientist Series**

At the systemwide level, UCAP has been in discussion regarding the Project Scientist Series. C. Lynch-Leathers reported that this series will be in effect at UCSF starting July 1. The Office of Academic Affairs is currently drafting procedures for the roll out.

ACTION: Until otherwise instructed, CAP agreed to review actions in the Project Scientist Series the same way they review the Research series.

**CAP Review of New Appointments at the Assistant Level**

The Committee discussed the possibility of CAP reviewing all new appointments at the Assistant level. Concerns and issues included whether this type of review would be redundant and how effective it would really be. AVC Marshall commented that during her tenure on CAP, they tried this level of review and it greatly affected efficiency. CAP opted to decline review at Steps 1 and 2.

**File Review Process When New Hire Checklist Is Absent**

CAP has been reviewing files for new appointments and noting the inclusion or exclusion of the New Hire Checklist and whether the checklist has been signed by all required parties. The Committee does not know what the proper procedure is when it receives a file in which the New Hire Checklist is absent.

ACTION ITEM: The vice deans expressed to CAP that they would like the file returned if the New Hire Checklist is not included.

**Use of the Educator’s Portfolio**

The Committee discussed the role of the Educator’s Portfolio in the academic review process. The Committee noted that the information contained therein is also called for in the recommend CV format, and that the inclusion of the Educator’s Portfolio in addition to a CV is redundant and may be avoided. The main issue with portfolios is the amount of time they require from the reviewer. D.
Ferreiro commented that since so much work has been put into the portfolio that they should be included and CAP can do what they like with the portfolio. M. Croughan, who is a member of the Academy of Medical Educators, agrees that creation of the portfolios is laborious. However, she debates the necessity for CAP to review these portfolios. M. Croughan and C. Lynch-Leathers informed the group that some faculty are encouraging others to create a portfolio.

**Inconsistent Scoring Scales for Teaching Evaluations**

Although the Committee recognizes that neither this Committee nor the representatives of the administration present have any control over this issue, the Committee would like to discuss the issues which arise from different schools using different methods for evaluating teaching.

ACTION: AVC Marshall agreed to look into the inconsistencies as the process moves online.

**Reviewing Agencies**

D. Ferreiro queried the group to determine who constitutes “the reviewing bodies” as stated in the letters from Academic Affairs. AVC Marshall responded that the reviewing bodies are: Academic Affairs, the school, and CAP. D. Ferreiro requested that as a reviewing body, she would like to see the school’s comments in the letters as well. AVC Marshall was amenable to this request.

ACTION: AVC Marshall will include comments from the School’s reviewing agencies in her final letters.

There being no more business, Chair Karliner adjourned the meeting at 2:21pm.