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The Retreat of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) was called to order by Chair Walsh on June 25, 2008 at 12:15 p.m. in room S-30. A quorum was present.

Chair Walsh recognized Sally Marshall, the Associate Deans, the CAP members, and the Analyst for their extraordinary service and cooperation this year.

Update on the Stewardship Review Task Force
Chair Walsh asked D. Ferriero, Chair of the Stewardship Review Task Force, and Vice Provost, Academic Affairs Sally Marshall, to report on the progress of and issues raised by the Stewardship Review Task Force examining the Stewardship Review process.

Issues under discussion include:
- Composition of the review committee
- Input from the steward under review
- Rebuttal/Answering Process
- Outside and prior reviews
- Sampling process

The Professional Research Series: APM Requirements and UC Practices
The Committee reviewed with those present the APM requirements for the Professional Research series (Attachment 1) and the actual practices system-wide and on this campus.

While the APM requires that those in the Professional Research series demonstrate research independence consistent with that of the Professor (Ladder rank) series, and not limited “to making significant and creative contributions,” it is the practice (as reported by the University Committee on Academic Personnel, UCAP) across the UC campuses and San Francisco that campuses may be flexible in their interpretation and those in this series may be collaborative or contributive researchers (which is in fact the level of the independence required for those in the Professor series).
N. Hylton volunteered to draft local language to provide guidance to the departments (and language possibly to be included in the call) that could express campus practice and yet avoid conflict with the explicit language of APM 310-4. E. Froelicher, UCSF representative to UCAP, expressed that this would be consistent with UCAP decisions on this issue.

**Accelerated and Decelerated Actions**

Those present discussed issues concerning accelerated and decelerated personnel actions.

1. **How is the availability or recommendation for acceleration or deceleration communicated to the faculty?**

Based on discussion, the consensus is that accelerations are generally raised by the Department Chairs, and decelerations are generally the result of faculty not submitting their packets for review. At the VA, it tends to be the opposite case; accelerations are put forth by faculty and decelerations are decided by the Department Chair. However, VA faculty are not as motivated to put forth appraisal or advancement packets as UCSF advancement is not tied to their VA advancement or compensation.

It was suggested that encouragement for merited accelerations be pushed via the mentoring program.

2. **What does the language “deceleration at the request of the faculty” really mean?**

In many cases, faculty just either fail to put together a packet or do not want to go through the trouble of doing so. VA faculty do not have the same incentive to put themselves forward for advancement and therefore do so at a lower rate than their campus counterparts.

3. **Quantifying and Qualifying Accelerations: What constitutes 1-, 2-, or 3-year Accelerations?**

The Committee discussed the general issues surrounding accelerations, reasons for accelerations, and when such an action falls in an individual's career process.

CAP has exercised flexibility and recommended advancement when CAP believed it merited, even though an acceleration action was not requested. This is (with a single exception) welcomed by the deans and the departments.

Opportunities for acceleration will be communicated via the schools and newsletters and suggested to M. Feldman to include in the mentoring program.

**Reviews at Step 6 and Above Scale: Revised Criteria Review (Attachments 2, 3, and 4)**

The Committee and those present reviewed the currently approved APM language adopted 01/06 (Attachment 2), the black-lined documents which resulted in these changed (Attachment 3), and the clarifications proposed by the Academic Council in January of 2008 (Attachment 3). S. Marshall indicated that Attachment 3 is out of date and new language will be forthcoming from UCOP and put forward though the regular review and approval process.

It was noted that the APM 220 PDF on the UCOP Web site does not match the APM blacklines distributed to the campuses December 2006 and adopted January 2006. VPAA S. Marshall will check UCOP on this issue in her meeting next week.

Going forward, CAP will consider that advancement to Step 6 **does** include a career review and **does** require “sustained and continuing excellence.”

**Recommendation that Department Chairs be Required to Attend an Orientation Regarding the Requirements for Advancement Every Two Years**
To remain up-to-date on the current criteria for advancement for the different series, and for Step 6 and Above Scale, and to be better educated regarding information which should be addressed in the Department Chairs’ letters, the Committee recommended that Department Chairs be required to attend an academic advancement orientation, hosted by the Office of Academic Personnel, every two years.

Feedback indicates that this is not a feasible proposition. However, academic personnel in all departments are regularly informed by newsletters and workshops. C. Leathers has developed a training program for academic personnel staff that has been very successful. CAP Members and the Senate staff are welcome to attend.

**Inclusion of a Timeline of Advancement, including years at each rank and step and previous actions.**
The Committee noted that often during file review, it is difficult to confirm if an action is on-time, decelerated, or accelerated. A timeline of previous actions would be beneficial to understanding the appropriateness or timeliness of proposed actions.

D. Ferriero indicated that this is available from the School of Medicine and will be included in the packets. Such information may or may not be included in packets from the smaller schools. This issue will be resolved in the future electronic system.

**Regarding the Recording of Department Votes**
The Committee requested, where possible, that Department Chairs record the details of departmental votes regarding proposed actions. This is another issue that will be addressed by the new electronic system (construction is scheduled to begin July 1, 2008).

It will be helpful for Department Chairs to include a comment addressing negative votes if they are able to elucidate the concern.

**(CAP Members do not vote in their departments. The questions was posed: Are CAP members being counted as abstentions or merely excluded as ineligible to vote?)**

There is no consistency across departments. CAP members should recuse themselves from voting at the department level if they are voting in CAP on an action.

**Policy for Reviewing Academic Appointments for Administrators**
There have been more cases recently wherein, on their own merits, a faculty member may not meet the criteria for appointment or advancement to a Series, rank, or step, but CAP is asked to approve an action as this is related to an administrative appointment.

Those present discussed relevant issues. While the administrative load is significant, the deans look for some hook on which to justify academic advancement, even though it may be below the usual level expected. Administrative duties are also considered in some cases to be University service. Creative activity or teaching is also expected.

S. Marshall noted that the language in APM 245-11 related to Chairs may also apply to administrators.

*Academic leadership is, in itself, a significant academic activity. Therefore, distinguished leadership and effective discharge of administrative duties by a department chair shall be considered as appropriate criteria in evaluating the performance of a department chair for a merit increase, accelerated increase, or promotion. It is expected that a department chair will remain active in both teaching and research in order to maintain his or her capabilities in the appropriate field of scholarship. However, a chair who discharges his or her duties as a chair*
effectively may have reduced time for teaching and research. Reduced activity in these areas that results from active service as a department chair should be recognized as a shift in the type of academic activity pursued by the department chair rather than a shift away from academic pursuits altogether. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate to award a merit increase, or, if performance warrants it, an accelerated increase, primarily for demonstrated excellence in service in the chair appointment when accompanied by evidence of continued productive involvement in scholarly activities.

The following topics were added to the agenda at the request of the Vice Provost Academic Affairs.

**CAP Approved Promotions with Additional Recommendations**
The VPAA and the Associate Deans find the additional advancement recommendations helpful and are useful to support faculty and educate or motivate Department Chairs. Of the additional recommendations offered by CAP this year, only one was not accepted by the department.

Letters of approval with additional recommendations, such as a candidate needs to do X, Y, or Z in the future are not welcome by the departments or candidates. Such language needs to be phrased so that it is not a “wet blanket” to the good news of advancement, but that it is considered constructive. To this end, CAP is requested to provide this constructive criticism in the same letter of recommendation to the Office of Academic Personnel but with a distinct paragraph indicating “Information for the Department Chair.” This information will not be forwarded to the candidate.

**CV Modifications for Mentoring and Multiple PIs on Grants**
The VPAA would like to call for letters not just from students but form recent protégés for those whose primary teaching activity is mentoring.

Candidates who are one of multiple-PI should be considered “genuine” PIs (multiple PIs are distinguished by the NIH as equal PIs and not co-PIs). Candidates will be mentored to indicate themselves as PI (without the other(s)) if they are one of a multiple PIs. It should also be made clear to candidates that this does not apply to Co-PIs.

**Career Reviews: A Single Document for All Series**
Currently, there is not a single source document defining requirements and process for a proper Career Review action. C. Leathers posed that a single document be devised, included in the call, and posted on the Web site. UC Riverside devised such a document which may be helpful.

C. Brett will draft a proposal for such a process this summer and present it CAP in the fall.

**Ad Hoc Committees: Possible Appointment and Reporting Management by CAP**
VPAA S. Marshall suggested that the appointment and management of ad hoc committees be managed by CAP. The Committee noted that for issues of distance, conflict of interest, authority, and resources, the ad hoc committee process should continue to be managed out of the Office of Academic Personnel.

Those present continued to discuss the issues of faculty suggested for ad hoc committees. This is another process which would be greatly improved by an electronic administration system.

It was suggested that CAP could consult the Committee on Committees for appropriate members of Stewardship Committees at the beginning of each year.
**Evaluation of Journal Quality**
It is extremely valuable for CAP review for the candidate or the Department Chair to indicate if a particular publication, including electronic publications, is a high impact publication in their field.

**Information Items: Requests from the Committee on Academic Personnel**
1. Voting details should be included in the letter from the Department Chair. Some departments have a habit of not recording voting details and that should be remedied.
2. To avoid confusion from “alphabet soup,” CAP asks that the principle of prior definition apply to acronyms in the curriculum vitae and letters.
3. CAP requests that at the beginning of each academic year, the Academic Deans submit to CAP their School-specific guidelines for advancement and promotion, inclusive of requirements to Step 6 and Above Scale should they differ from the APM. Particularly, it is not so much the School criteria that CAP needs but department criteria. The deans have a similar difficulty in getting copies of departmental criteria from the departments. The VPAA and the Deans are more than happy to pass along a CAP request for departmental guidelines to the Department Chairs.

CAP will generate such a request.

If CAP does not receive copies of these policies they will abide by the requirements of the APM.

Chair Walsh adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m.
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