



Committee on Academic Personnel

2001-02 Annual Report

Donna Ferriero, MD Chair

During the 2001-02 academic year, the Committee on Academic Personnel met as a Committee on 37 occasions, reviewing approximately 405 files for appointments, promotions, five-year reviews or changes in series as well as multiple, ongoing stewardship reviews.

The Committee reviewed and acted on the following issues:

University - System-wide

- Proposed CAP bylaws for UC Merced
- Proposal to Institute a Phased Retirement Program
- Proposal to Assess Step VI and above Appointments by Gender
- Proposal to Divide the Professional Research Series into Two Series
- Proposal to Title Above-Scale as 'Distinguished Professors'
- Proposal to Establish Criteria for Advancement in Executive Positions
- Lateral Movement from In Residence to Ladder Rank

UCSF Division

- Stewardship Review Procedures
- Professional Research Series Salary Scales
- Proposed APM Criteria for Clinical Series
- Five-Year Review Procedures
- Career Review Concept
- Searched Appointments
- Revisions to Faculty Handbook
- Proposed APM 137, 140, 145 and 150 governing Non-Senate Academic Appointees
- Selection of the 2002 Distinction in Teaching Award Recipient
- Academic Appointee Inventory
- CAP Retreat with Associate Deans
- Inconsistent Calculation of Teaching Hours
- Inconsistent Criteria for Promotion Across Departments and Schools
- Inclusion of Mentoring in Evaluation for Promotion
- Consistency in Criteria for Accelerated and Decelerated Merits and Promotions

Systemwide Issues

Sandra Weiss, Vice Chair of the UCSF Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) served as the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) representative and reported to CAP on matters considered by UCAP during 2001-02.

UC Merced Bylaws: Each Divisional Committee on Academic Personnel was asked by UCAP to review the proposed CAP bylaws for UC Merced. UCSF CAP reviewed and supported the proposed bylaws.

Phased Retirement: Dr. Weiss also reported that UCAP is in the process of developing a full proposal for a phased retirement program whereby faculty could retire and return to the University and if they work at 50% time and remain for five years or more, the additional post retirement time worked would be credited to their retirement base. A full proposal will be put together with the opportunity for all Divisional CAPs to review and comment.

Female Faculty Numbers: UCAP reviewed and considered preliminary statistics indicating that on a system-wide basis, compared to male faculty members, only a small percentage of female faculty members ever reach Step VI or above. UCAP is considering requesting a formal statistical assessment, by gender of all appointments, system-wide and preparing an analysis of the results in order to ascertain the reason for this alleged disparity in promotions. UCSF CAP voiced its support for such efforts.

Proposed Policy Changes re: Professional Research Series: UCAP considered the proposal to split the professional research series into two series. The first would be a series for independent researchers and the second for project scientists who make more collaborative contributions as part of a team. UCAP asked for input from each Divisional Committee on Academic Personnel. The UCSF CAP expressed some concern regarding the proliferation of series and suggested the current adjunct and research specialist series may serve the same purpose.

Proposal to Title Above-Scale Professors as ‘Distinguished Professor’: UCAP considered the proposal to title all above scale professors as ‘Distinguished Professors’ and asked each Divisional Committee on Academic Personnel to review the proposal. UCSF CAP was opposed to this proposal, indicating that all full professors are distinguished.

Criteria for Advancement in Executive Positions: UCAP asserted a position in favor of establishing criteria for advancement in executive positions, such as deans, chancellors, vice presidents, etc, similar to those criteria set for advancement in academic series. The position was that individuals in executive positions should not receive large increases to adjust their salaries based only on holding a certain position. Instead, they should be reviewed on specific criteria related to their stewardship. The Academic Council took this position after the President gave large increases in salaries to the

Chancellors and Vice Presidents during a time when staff and faculty were receiving less than two percent COLAs. UCSF CAP supported this position.

In Residence and Ladder Rank Faculty: UCAP considered whether a faculty member with an in residence appointment should be considered qualified for a lateral move to the ladder rank. UCSF CAP discussed this question and concluded that the requirements for the two series are the same, therefore a faculty member should be able to move laterally without issue.

UCSF Academic Personnel Issues

The Committee worked on many important issues at the Division level.

Stewardship Review Procedures

Continuing work started in the 2000-01 academic year, the Committee worked throughout the 2001-02 academic year with Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Dorothy F. Bainton, and the Office of Academic Personnel to finalize revised stewardship review procedures. The Committee began this work last year out of concern related to the lack of timeliness of reviews (some were begun past the five year mark), confidentiality of faculty participating in the reviews, and the ultimate efficacy of the stewardship review committee's work. As of the writing of this report, the Committee is hopeful that the new agreed upon procedures will be finalized by the end of July 2002. The Committee has also created a template for stewardship reports and has reviewed and made suggested edits to all the form letters relating to stewardship reviews. ([Attachments 1 and 2.](#))

Professional Research Series Salary Scales

The Committee considered and supported the proposed increases in Professional Research series salary scales. The Committee also supported the proposed schedule, which appeared to allow sufficient time for most investigators to bring their grant requests in line with the proposed salary scales. ([Attachment 3, 9/20/01.](#))

Proposed APM Criteria for Clinical Series

On a request from Divisional Senate Chair Lawrence H. Pitts carried over from 2000-01, the Committee discussed, at length, APM 278 and 279, which are the proposed new Sections defining criteria for the Clinical series. The Committee strongly supported a promulgation of system-wide criteria for this series. However, the Committee felt the proposed criteria needed clarification and that the APM needs to provide more detail regarding the review process. In addition, the Committee submitted several additional editorial recommendations. ([Attachment 4, 10/2/02.](#))

Five-Year Review Procedures

At the request of Diane Dillon, Director of the UCSF Office of Academic Personnel, the Committee discussed procedures for "Five-Year" reviews of faculty who had not been considered for advancement in over five years. Departments had concerns that the

documentation required for these reviews was excessive. The suggested substitution was a University-formatted curriculum vitae with a cover letter from the department chair. The Committee supported this change and also noted that appropriate additional documentation should be assembled if the department or any reviewing agency recommends consideration for advancement. The Committee also discussed and supported retaining the three categories of outcomes ('performance satisfactory, advancement warranted,' 'performance satisfactory, no advancement warranted,' and 'performance unsatisfactory'). ([Attachment 5](#), 10/24/01.)

Since supporting these procedures in October 2001, the Committee has had the opportunity to review many "Five-Year" review files. As it reviews more Five-Year files, the Committee will continue to evaluate whether the current procedures are adequate.

Career Review Concept

Continuing work from academic year 2000-01, and at the request of Vice Chancellor Bainton, the Committee considered the concept of a "career review." Career reviews are intended as procedures by which a faculty member is able to initiate review of his or her file to determine whether he or she has been appropriately advanced. Such reviews are available to varying degrees on some of the other UC campuses, including UC Davis. However, the Committee felt that any career review process implemented on this campus would need to differ substantively from those processes in place on other campuses.

The Committee's recommendations included making the career review process available to faculty in all series. Although it recommended that faculty be required to first request their chair's support, if that support is not forthcoming, then the faculty member should have the ability to ask the associate dean of academic affairs, or the equivalent, to put his or her packet forward for advancement. The Committee also recommended that the associate dean offer the chair another opportunity to support the advancement and include a letter in the packet explaining either the support or lack thereof. In addition, the Committee felt that it would help clarify the review process if the faculty member was required to provide a letter with his or her rationale for the review which includes confirmation of the series, rank and/or step he or she wishes to be considered. ([Attachment 6](#), 12/4/01.)

This matter was discussed further at the CAP Retreat held on June 17, 2002. At that meeting, Vice Chancellor Bainton proposed a two-year pilot program implemented as outlined in [Attachment 6](#). Dr. Bainton requested that the proposal be modified, for the duration of the pilot, to delete a request for change in series as a faculty option for initiating a review, noting that none of the other UC campuses include this option and because the burden of including a change in series option could be significant. Dr. Bainton recommended that the career review procedure be included in the revisions to the UCSF Faculty Handbook for Advancement currently under revision and that it outline the remedial mechanisms available – compensatory acceleration as well as the ability of faculty to apply for vacant positions in their schools. CAP sent a revised policy letter to Vice Chancellor Bainton for inclusion in the 2002 Annual Call. ([Attachment 7](#), 8/02.)

Searched Appointments

The Committee reviewed a proposed appointment for which no search was done. Although the Committee supported the appointment in light of extenuating circumstances, it reiterated to Vice Chancellor Bainton, under separate cover, the Committee's strong feelings that searches should be conducted, regardless of departmental retention strategies. ([Attachment 8](#), 2/4/02.)

Advancement and Promotion at UCSF: A Faculty Handbook for Success

The Committee reviewed Sections 1 and 2 of the Handbook and provided detailed editorial suggestions to the SF Academic Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity, which is charged with revising the Handbook. The Committee also forwarded its sample appointment inventory for inclusion in the Handbook.

Proposed APM 137, 140, 145 and 150

The Committee considered the proposed APM sections 137, 140, 145 and 150 regarding non-Senate appointees relative to term appointments, grievances, layoff and involuntary reduction in time, corrective action and dismissal. (The Committee reviewed an earlier draft of these proposed APM sections in 2000-01 as well.)

Although the Committee noted several concerns with these proposed sections, its greatest concern overall was the potential for administrative bias to result in almost every level of the grievance process as currently outlined in proposed APM 140. The Committee stated that Senate Bylaw 335 (re: grievances) offers a more objective approach to the grievance process. The Committee then recommended that the APM process outlined for non-Senate academic appointees model the relevant Senate bylaws as closely as possible.

In addition, the Committee stated that 60 days notice of non-reappointment was insufficient and recommended at least 6 months notice for non-Senate faculty who have served at least 50% time for eight or more consecutive years. ([Attachment 9](#), 6/14/02.)

2001-2002 Distinction in Teaching Awards

The Distinction in Teaching Award (DIT) is given annually by the Academic Senate. A nine-member DIT subcommittee is appointed by CAP, which consists of a member of CAP who serves as the chair, one faculty member and one student from each School (selected from a pool of students and faculty nominated by each of the Schools). For 2001-02, the DIT Selection Committee recommended, and CAP concurred, that the following recipients be honored:

2001-2002 Distinction in Teaching Award:

Henry Sanchez, MD
Department of Pathology

Honorable Mentions:

Glenn Chertow, MD
Department of Medicine

*Volker Doetsch, PhD
Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry*

*Andrew Goldberg, MD
Department of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery*

Dr. Sanchez and all Honorable Mention recipients were honored by the Academic Senate at its Division meeting of June 13, 2002 and by the Chancellor at the Founders Day Banquet held on April 25, 2002.

Annual CAP Retreat

The annual CAP retreat was held on June 17, 2002 at which All CAP members were in attendance, Vice Chancellor Bainton and Academic Personnel Director Diane Dillon and Associate Deans from each of the four schools.

The agenda included discussion related to the following topics:

- Consistency and criteria for the calculation of teaching hours
- Inconsistent promotion criteria across departments and schools
- Inclusion of mentoring in the evaluation process
- CAP's proposed appointment inventory
- Career review concept

In addition, retreat participants also discussed accelerated and decelerated advancements. ([Attachment 10](#), Minutes.)

Calculation of Teaching Hours

The Committee has observed that files vary widely in the manner in which faculty calculate their total teaching hours. At the CAP retreat, the group discussed whether the calculation of teaching hours should be more uniform since total hours vary widely on CVs, and often without explanation for the variance. It was noted that the UCSF Academy of Medical Educators has created sample formats for educators' portfolios that might assist in determining how best to calculate teaching hours. It was decided that CAP would obtain those sample formats and forward recommendations regarding the standardization of calculating teaching hours to Vice Chancellor Bainton. In addition, retreat participants discussed identifying teaching hours in three categories: didactic, clinical and laboratory.

Inconsistent Criteria for Promotion across Departments and Schools

The inconsistency in application of promotion criteria across departments and schools is an issue that was continued from the CAP retreat in held in March 2001. At that retreat, the Associate Deans agreed unanimously that, by the beginning of academic year 2001-02, every Department in each School would provide CAP with Departmental criteria used (in addition to the APM) for advancement in that Department. The criteria requested by

CAP would be used to assist the Committee in its evaluations related to, at a minimum all promotions to Associate Professor and to full Professor in the Ladder Rank, In Residence and Clinical X series.

Because CAP had not, as of the June 2002 CAP retreat, received responses from all Departments within all schools, this issue was once again discussed. CAP members reiterated that they continue to need clarification from some departments on this issue. CAP also noted that any criteria different than the APM should be in writing and distributed so that all faculty have a complete understanding regarding the full criteria which is applied to their future advancements. In addition, having clear information regarding additional standards applied by some departments will help CAP to apply all standards in a fair and consistent manner. Some of the Associate Deans noted that it is the responsibility of the department to educate and mentor its faculty on the standards the department uses beyond the APM criteria.

After the retreat, CAP concluded that issue required written communication from Vice Chancellor Bainton. As CAP's greatest concern is the criteria in some departments that requires an National Institute of Health R01 grant or equivalent funding for promotion, this is the issue that will be directly addressed in the letter from Vice Chancellor Bainton. ([Attachment 11](#), 7/02.)

Academic Appointee Inventory

In 2001, CAP considered numerous recommendations contained in the Report of the Academic Senate Task Force on Clinician Scientists. Many concerns raised in this report related to the lack of clear and complete information provided to new faculty upon hire at UCSF. In response to this, CAP proposed an appointment checklist that would have required chairs to discuss particular issues with new academic appointees and to sign off on the checklist to indicate that discussion occurred. After feedback from Vice Chancellor Bainton and the Associate Deans, the Committee revised the Inventory to address legal concerns raised and instead developed a document entitled: "Important Points for Discussion between Department Chairs and New Faculty Members." On March 11, 2002, CAP member Barbara Gerbert presented this list at a hearing on "Gender Disparity in UC Faculty Hiring" before the California State Senate Select Committee on Government Oversight, testifying that this "list" could serve as a valuable tool related to gender equity in UC hiring practices. In addition, the Committee forwarded this list to the Committee on Equal Opportunity for inclusion in the revised handbook, *Advancement and Promotion at UCSF: A Faculty Handbook for Success*.

This inventory "list" was re-distributed and discussed at the CAP retreat. The "list" was discussed and conditionally supported by the group, with the caveat that if any of the Associate Deans had recommended changes, they would forward them to CAP. CAP will incorporate any requested modifications before sending the final inventory "list" to Vice Chancellor Bainton for inclusion in the 2002 Annual Call. ([Attachments 12-13](#), 8/02.)

Evaluation of Mentoring

CAP has discussed that mentoring should be formally included in the evaluation of advancement and stewardship review files. At the CAP retreat, Vice Chancellor Bainton reported that the Blue Ribbon Committee had recommended mentoring be a separate, fifth criteria (along with research, teaching, professional competence, and University and public service) for promotion. Both at the retreat and at subsequent meetings, CAP discussed the Blue Ribbon Committee proposal. Although CAP agreed that mentoring is a vital responsibility of all faculty that is worthy of evaluation, the Committee members ultimately recommend that it should fall under the current criterion for teaching, rather than be an independent criterion. CAP recommends, however, that the evaluation of mentoring be formalized, as with teaching, and the 'Teaching' category should ultimately be re-named 'Teaching and Mentoring.' ([Attachment 14](#), 7/02.)

Consistency in Accelerated and Decelerated Merits and Promotions

The CAP retreat participants also discussed the need for consistency in, and understanding of, the criteria for accelerated and decelerated merits and promotions. CAP asked that the Deans' letters be more interpretive so that CAP can clearly understand the reasons for the acceleration or deceleration. CAP also encouraged the Associate Deans to have their departments distribute the criteria for accelerations and decelerations to all faculty in the department. The Associate Deans agreed to CAP's request that they ensure their Chairs clearly specify their rationale for accelerations and decelerations.

Issues for the 2002-03 Academic Year

Continuing Matters 2002-03 Include:

- Transmitting revised career review policy to Vice Chancellor Bainton for inclusion in the 2002 Annual Call.
- Monitor implementation of revised stewardship review procedures.
- Follow-up regarding consistency in calculation of teaching hours.
- Follow-up on inclusion of academic appointee inventory –gg this name should be the name used in the body of the report for consistency 'list' in 2002 Annual Call.
- Follow-up on inclusion of mentoring in advancement evaluation process.

New topics for next year include:

- Distinction in Teaching Award 2002-03
- Review criteria for DIT Award (e.g., should eligibility rule be changed to include Clinical and Adjunct Faculty?)
- Review process related to ad hoc appraisal letters and CAP's concern that the letters are not reviewed with appraisees
- Review and revise CAP policies for use of Ad Hoc Committees

Respectfully submitted,

Committee on Academic Personnel

Donna Ferriero, Chair

Sandra Weiss, Vice Chair

Carol Basbaum

Barbara Gerbert

B. Joseph Guglielmo

Maria Pallavicini

Nelson B. Schiller

Senate Staff:
Gretchen Gende
Sr. Senate Analyst
476-4245
ggende@senate.ucsf.edu