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Total Files Reviewed: 409
Stewardship Reviews: 3 completed, 5 in process

Statistical Comparisons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>05-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total files</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerations</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decelerations</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change In Series</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Hoc Committees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits to Step 6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits to Above Scale</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy Review Items:
- Criteria for Advancement to Step 6 and Above Scale
- Criteria for the Professional Research Series
- Stewardship Review Processes
- Creating the Distinction In Mentoring Award
- Procedure for Career Reviews

Task Forces:
- Task Forces Reviewing Amendments to APMs (220, 335, 740, 350) and (740, 758)
- Task Force Reviewing the Proposal for a New Department of Emergency Medicine
- Task Force Reviewing the Proposal for the Department of Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences

Issues for Next Year (2008-2009)
- Continued participation on the Stewardship Review Process Task Force
- Designing the criteria and process for Career Reviews

2007-2008 Members
Margaret (Peggy) Walsh, Chair (SOD)
Erika Froelicher, Vice Chair (UCAP Rep) (SON)
Claire Brett (SOM)
James Cleaver (SOM/P)
Nola Hylton (SOM)
Stephen Kahl (SOP)
Russell Pieper (SOM)
Rita Redberg (SOM)
William Shore (SOM)

Number of Meetings: 36
Senate Analyst: Wilson Hardcastle
**Systemwide Business**

Regarding system-wide concerns, the Committee (CAP) reviewed proposed amendments to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM), either as members of a divisional task force or as a committee reviewing matters on behalf of the Division.

**Systemwide Review of Changes to APMs 220, 335, 740, and 350**
The proposed revisions applied to Academic Personnel Policy 220-85-b, Professor Series; Academic Personnel Policy 335-10-a, Cooperative Extension Advisor Series; and Academic Personnel Policy 740-11-c, Leaves of Absences/Sabbatical Leave; and Proposed Rescission of Academic Personnel Policy 350, Postgraduate Research (e.g. Physicist).

These modifications were largely administrative and were supported by the task force reviewing the changes and the Division.

**Systemwide Review of Changes to APMs 740, and 758**
The Committee reviewed and discussed proposed policies for transitional leave for members of the Senior Management Group. The Academic Council presented three options (Appendix 2), and the Committee supported the adoption of Policy Option 3 as expressed in the document: the application of standard faculty sabbatical leave policy for those in the Senior Management Group (Appendix 3).

**Review Policy for Senior Administrators; SMG Policy 505**
The Committee was asked to review the proposed review policy for senior administrators (SMG Policy 505) on behalf of the Division (Appendix 4).

In its response to Senate Chair Gardner (Appendix 5), CAP recommended inserting additional language in Section III to clarify the differences between the Five Year Leadership Review and the Annual Performance Reviews, if they are indeed distinct in form and function.

Furthermore, the Committee noted that the definition of “exception” in Section II of the document is understandably very broad. The Committee was concerned that Regents’ approval of exceptions to policy, as expected to be allowed under Section IV, may create loopholes and possibly render these important policies ineffective. The Committee suggested that either in Section II or under Section IV, Approval Authority, Subsection C, that language be inserted to provide guidance (perhaps in the form of an example) on what might constitute an exception and to clarify the conditions under which exceptions might be granted.

**Divisional Business**

This year, Members of the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel participated on divisional task forces and worked closely with the Vice Provost Academic Affairs Sally Marshall and the Office of Academic Personnel on several policy issues.

**Distinction In Mentoring Award**
The Committee met with VPAA Sally Marshall and Director of the Faculty Mentoring Program Mitchell Feldman on multiple occasions to hear the request and proposal for an Academic Senate award recognizing outstanding mentoring of junior faculty by senior faculty. This award would be comparable to the Academic Senate Distinction In Teaching Awards.

After much consideration and discussion, the Committee supported the creation of a Distinction In (Faculty) Mentoring Award in a communication to VPAA Marshall (Appendix 6).

The Distinction in Mentoring Award (DIM) will be similar to but distinct from the Academic Senate Distinction In Teaching Award (DIT). The Distinction In Teaching Award will recognize excellence in teaching and mentoring of students, fellows, and post-docs. The Academic Senate Distinction in
Mentoring Award will recognize excellence in mentoring by (senior) UCSF faculty to (junior) UCSF faculty. In other words, the DIT award recognizes excellence in teaching and mentoring by faculty to students, and the DIM award will recognize excellence in teaching and mentoring by faculty to faculty.

Nomination Forms for both the DIT (Appendix 7) and DIM (Appendix 8) were redesigned to reflect these distinctions.

**Stewardship Reviews**

Over the 2007-2008 academic year there was a Stewardship Review which was pulled from the process by the Chancellor in a fashion that was troublesome for the Committee. According to the APM, authority for Stewardship Reviews does lie with the Chancellor. The Academic Senate and the Committee on Academic Personnel are involved in the process in the spirit of shared governance and faculty participation in review of its leadership, but the authority for determining the process for Stewardship reviews does not lie with CAP. (Descriptions and a flowchart of the current process are available online.) There is also a general concern (and misconception) among the faculty that the Stewardship review process is insubstantial and ineffective.

VPAA Sally Marshall convened a task force of academic administrators and faculty members (suggested by CAP) to review the current process for Stewardship Reviews and to propose revisions to the process and form of Stewardship Reviews. This task force is being chaired by SOM Vice Dean Donna Ferriero.

Rita Redberg has been serving as the CAP representative to this task force and will continue to do so. The discussion of this issue will continue into the 2008-2009 academic year.

**Ongoing Review and Revision of the Criteria for Advancement to Step 6 and Above Scale**

The past several years have seen many reviews and proposed revisions to the criteria for advancement to Step 6 and Above Scale. This matter is complicated by the fact that the “authoritative” version of the APM online does not reflect the changes adopted in 2006 (Appendix 9). Revisions to the revisions were sent out by the Academic Council January 8, 2008 and we reviewed and noted by the Committee (Appendix 10).

This issue of criteria for advancement to Step 6 and Above Scale was again raised at the annual AP retreat. Upon discussion, VPAA Sally Marshall was able to tell the Committee that the January 8, 2008 changes were not in fact formally adopted as there were objections from senior academic administration and compromise and clarifying language was forthcoming.

The cover memo (Appendix 11) to the "Final review of Proposed Revised APM-280-18-b(4) – Criteria for Advancement to Professor, Step VI, and to Professor, Above Scale," (Appendix 12) was issued on June 27, 2008 and shared with the Committee.

The cover memo describes the revisions “initially proposed by the Academic Senate and further revised by a work group comprised of Vice Provosts for Academic Personnel.” It summaries the changes as follows: "The modifications to the policy clarify that an overall career review is necessary for advancement to Professor, Step VI as well as for advancement to an above-scale rank. Also, greater emphasis is given to teaching and creative activity in determining advancement than is service."

Review, discussion, and possible approval of these proposed modifications to APM 220-18 by UCAP, the Divisions and CAP will continue into the 2008-2009 academic year.

**Interpretation and Clarification of Campus Policy on the Professional Research Series**

During the course of the year and at the annual retreat, the Committee discussed the disconnect between the APM requirements and the campus practice for appointment and advancement in the Professional Research series.

C. Brett, M. Walsh, and E. Froelicher all reported similar discussions at UCAP, and that UCAP decided that appointing and advancing collaborative researchers in this series may appear contradictory to the
APM but is approved practice for the campuses. The language of APM 310 has not gone through the necessary process to be revised for clarification, which has resulted in confusion at the campus and departmental level. Further complicating matters is that the language of 310 states “independent research equivalent to that required for the Professor series,” however no independence is required for the Professor series. Section 310 of the APM is outdated and inconsistent with policy and practice. This is understood by UCAP, CAP and the Office of Academic Personnel, but unfortunately it takes years to effect changes in the APM to make things clear across the board.

To that end, the VPAA asked if CAP could issue a letter of clarification regarding the Professional research series which could be shared across the campus.

The relevant language is as follows:

The Professional Research series is used for appointees who engage in independent or collaborative research equivalent to that required for the Professor series. Professional Researchers may or may not be Principal Investigators. Candidates in the Professional Research series do not have teaching responsibilities.

Advancement in this series requires meritorious contributions in the area of creative activity and professional competence. Candidates at the Assistant rank are not required to participate in University and/or public service; however at the Associate level or above, candidates are expected to participate in some form of service.

Appointments in this series can be made to individuals who contribute unique and essential expertise to a research program. Letters—internal, external, or from a Department Chair—written in support of an appointment to or an advancement within this series should include reference to the unique and essential contribution a candidate provides to a collaborative research effort (in the cases where the candidate is not working independently as a Principal Investigator).

This clarifying communication is linked as Appendix 13.

Series Descriptions and Instructions for Letter Writers

The campus document “Brief Descriptions of the Different Academic Series Used at UCSF for Use in Correspondence with External and Internal Referees” was drafted by CAP in July of 1998 and is woefully out of date.

The Committee drafted new descriptions of each series and suggested instructions for letter writers to be distributed internally and externally. The revised (July 2008) Instructions and Series Descriptions for Letter Writers is linked as Appendix 14.

Career Reviews

There are currently no set practices, procedures, or requirements for a Career Review, nor is there a description available for faculty to invoke such a review. The APM gives only minimal guidance for Career Reviews, and inconsistent information has been included in the Annual Call for Personnel Actions over the years. This matter was discussed at the CAP Retreat.

CAP Member Claire Brett agreed to continue her investigation into career review practices and policies at other campuses and will report back to the Committee with her recommendations in the fall.

CAP Retreat

The Committee held its annual retreat with the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, Director of the Office of Academic Personnel, and the academic deans from the four schools on June 25, 2008. All CAP members were present (Erika Froelicher joined via telephone from Jordan), as were Sally Marshall, Vice Provost Academic Affairs; Cynthia Leathers, Director of Academic Personnel; Associate Dean Brian Alldredge (SOP), Associate Dean Renee Binder (SOM), Associate Dean Caroline Damsky (SOD), Vice
Dean Donna Ferriero (SOM), Associate Dean Christine Miaskowski (SON), and Associate Dean Joan Voris (Fresno).

Many issues were discussed. The notable and action items have been noted in the body of this Annual Report. Minutes from the 2008 CAP Retreat are linked as Appendix 15.

Task Forces and Other Committee Service

This year members of the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel served on the following Academic Senate task forces or other campus committees as representatives of CAP or the Academic Senate. Where possible, the reports from these task forces or committees are linked to or attached to this Annual Report.

- Task Force Reviewing the Proposal for a New Department of Emergency Medicine
- Task Force Reviewing the Proposal for the Department of Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences
- VPAA's Steering Committee for Academic Affairs Information Systems Initiatives (Ongoing)
- Stewardship Review Task Force (Ongoing)

Going Forward

Ongoing issues under review or actions which the Committee will continue into 2008-2009:

**Stewardship Review Process Task Force**
VPAA Sally Marshall convened a task force of academic administrators and Senate faculty members to review the current process for Stewardship Reviews and to propose revisions to the process and form of Stewardship Reviews. This task force is being chaired by SOM Vice Dean Donna Ferriero, and Rita Redberg is serving as the CAP representative to this task force.

**Career Reviews**
Claire Brett is continuing her investigation into Career Review practices and policies at other campuses and will report back to the Committee with her recommendations in the fall.
Appendices

Due to the extensive nature of these appendices, these documents will not be embedded into the PDF of this Annual Report, nor will paper versions be attached to hard copies. This Annual Report is posted on the CAP Web page on the Academic Senate Web site, and all appendices are linked below to the corresponding PDF document online.

Appendix 1: Communication from the CAP Regarding Systemwide Review of Changes to APMs 220, 335, 740, and 350 (April 23, 2008)

Appendix 2: Communication from Academic Council to the divisions Regarding Proposed Transitional Leave Policy for Members of the Senior Management Group (January 24, 2008)

Appendix 3: Communication from CAP to Senate Chair Gardner Regarding Proposed Transitional Leave Policy for Members of the Senior Management Group (February 12, 2008)

Appendix 4: Senior Management Group (SMG) Policy 505 Governing Performance Management Review Process


Appendix 6: Communication from CAP to the Vice Provost Academic Affairs Regarding New Distinction In Mentoring Award (June 11, 2008)

Appendix 7: Distinction In Teaching (DIT) Nomination Form for 2008-2009

Appendix 8: Distinction In Teaching (DIM) Nomination Form for 2008-2009

Appendix 9: Proposed Revisions to APM 220-18, Advancement to Step 6 and Above Scale, drafted December 14, 2005 and adopted in January of 2006

Appendix 10: Proposed Revisions to APM 220-18, Advancement to Step 6 and Above Scale (January 8, 2008)

Appendix 11: Cover Letter to Proposed Revisions to APM 220-18, Advancement to Step 6 and Above Scale (June 27, 2008)

Appendix 12: Proposed Revisions to APM 220-18, Advancement to Step 6 and Above Scale (June 27, 2008)

Appendix 13: Communication from CAP to the Vice Provost Academic Affairs Regarding the Professional Research Series (July 15, 2008)

Appendix 14: Instructions and Series Descriptions for Letter Writers (July 2008)

Appendix 15: Minutes from the 2008 CAP Retreat

Appendix 16: CAP Meeting Attendance Record
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