



Committee on Academic Personnel

2002-03 Annual Report

Sandra Weiss, PhD, DNSc Chair

During the 2002-03 academic year, the Committee on Academic Personnel met as a Committee on 38 occasions, reviewing approximately 435 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 Revisions to APM 740 Sabbatical Policy
- Proposal to Extend Equivalent Rank Status for Cooperative Extension Specialists
- Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) sections 310 and 311
- Proposed Revisions to APM sections 278, 279, 210 and related sections
- Proposal to Modify Review Procedures for Advancement from Professor, Step 5 to Step 6
- Proposal to Use the Distinguished Professor Title for Above Scale Advancements
- Response to the University Committee on Academic Personnel Division CAP Activity Survey Compilation.

UCSF Division

- Stewardship Review Procedures
- Revisions to the CAP Checklist on "Important Points for Discussion Between Department Chairs and New Faculty Appointees"
- Five Year Review Procedures
- Career Reviews
- Guidelines for Use of Ad Hoc Review Committees & Criteria for Membership of Ad Hoc Committees
- Proposed Guidelines on the Use of the Clinical X Series in the Department of Medicine
- Guidelines for Preventing Conflict of Interest in CAP Members' Reviews
- Proposed Guidelines to Faculty for Preparing a Curriculum Vitae (CV) for Academic Review and Revised CV Template
- CAP Database Improvements

- Review Procedures for Appointment of Faculty at Assistant Professor, Step 3 in all Series
- Faculty Peer Review Process
- Documenting and Evaluating the Mentoring Component of Faculty Teaching
- Selection of the 2003 Distinction in Teaching Award Recipients

Systemwide Issues

Sandra Weiss, 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 2002-03. This report addresses only those issues where the UCSF CAP provided comment to UCAP on specific matters.

Proposed Revisions to APM Sabbatical Policy 740: UCAP discussed proposed revisions to Academic Personnel Policy 740 on sabbatical leave. Three major revisions were (1) allowing faculty to substitute significant University service for some or all of the teaching requirement for sabbaticals in residence; (2) allowing recipients of a sabbatical leave at less than full salary to receive compensation for research from another university; and (3) allowing faculty who hold a full-time administrative position for five years or more to take a sabbatical immediately after that service based on the pay rate for the administrative position. UCSF CAP supported the first two revisions but questioned the third, indicating that sabbatical focused on the academic role and not the administrative role. In addition, there was concern that the Department would be responsible for the salary augmentation since the policy was silent on this issue. Lastly, CAP questioned why Department Chairs were not included in the extensive list of administrators who would be eligible for this extra salary. For more information on the proposed revisions, please see <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/rev-apm-740.html>.

Proposed Equivalent Rank Status for Cooperative Extension Specialists: UCAP asked for input on a proposal submitted by UC Davis to extend ladder rank privileges to Cooperative Extension Specialists. The primary rationale for the proposal was the stable funding of these specialists through agricultural research monies provided by the State. UCSF CAP voiced its opposition to this proposal, expressing concerns that the agricultural monies could be cut during this problematic economy and the University would be left to subsidize their positions. In addition, some of the specialists appear to meet ladder rank criteria but others (who have no research involvement) do not qualify.

Proposed Revisions to APM 310, 311: In the 2001-2002 academic year, UCAP considered a preliminary 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 comment from each Divisional Committee on Academic Personnel. Last year, UCSF CAP expressed some concern regarding the proliferation of series and suggested that the current adjunct and research specialist series serve the purpose for which the new series is being proposed. This year, the University Office of the President (UCOP) brought

forward an official proposal to revise APM 310 and 311 and create the new “Project Scientist” series. UCSF CAP again discussed the pros and cons, ultimately opposing the creation of this new series out of a continued concern regarding the proliferation of series, the potential for significant confusion between series, and perceived ambiguities regarding the responsibilities of current appointees in the Professional Research series. [Appendix 1.](#)

Proposed Revisions to APM 278, 279 and 210: The Committee discussed APM 278 and 279, which are the proposed new sections defining criteria for the Clinical series. Last year, the Committee strongly supported the development of system-wide criteria for this series. However, this year, the UCSF CAP voiced concerns about the proposed title of “voluntary faculty” for the new non-salaried Clinical series. CAP also suggested that provisions for notification of termination that were proposed for non-salaried clinical professors should be extended to salaried clinical professors as well. CAP also noted that research and creative activity should not be defined as an indicator of professional competence because of its confusion with the criterion for research and creative activity. Lastly, CAP recommended that teaching and professional competence be the required criteria for evaluation in the series, while service and research/creative activity should be desirable but not essential in the clinical professor series. This is the current policy on the UCSF campus but not the one proposed in this systemwide policy. [Appendix 2.](#)

Advancement Procedures for Professor Step 5 to Step 6: The systemwide Faculty Welfare Committee (UCFW) proposed moving the major review that occurs during the Professor rank to a later step such as Step 7 to Step 8. Their concern was that the inability to achieve this major advancement had implications for the retirement income of many faculty. UCSF CAP expressed concern about the idea of having campuswide review of a full professor’s productivity so late in his or her career (i.e., 18 years at rank).

Proposal Regarding Distinguished Professor Title: UCAP requested discussion of UC Davis’s proposal to use the title of Distinguished Professor for all faculty advanced to above scale. UCSF CAP noted that this title was currently being used for different purposes across different campuses, posing major difficulties if such a proposal took effect. In addition, CAP noted that the title could imply that other faculty were not distinguished, even if those faculty had more distinguished careers than individuals above scale.

UCSF Academic Personnel Issues

The Committee worked on many issues at the Division level.

Stewardship Review Procedures

In the 2000-01 and 2001-02 academic years, the Committee began working with Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Dorothy F. Bainton, and the Office of Academic Personnel to revise stewardship review procedures. The Committee began this work out of concern for the 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. New procedures were established last year. The

Committee also created a template for stewardship reports ([Appendix 3](#)) and made suggested edits to all the form letters relating to stewardship reviews. The template and procedures were included in the Annual Call for Academic Personnel Actions Effective 2003-2004 and 2003 Academic Appraisal. This year, the Committee continued improvements in this process by defining the responsibilities of the CAP representative on Stewardship Review Committees. [Appendix 4](#). With the support of the Vice Chancellor's office, this document is now included in the packets provided to the chairs of Stewardship Review Committees. In addition, a number of changes in stewardship review procedures were agreed upon by the Vice Chancellor, Vice/Associate Deans for Academic Personnel and CAP at this year's CAP retreat. These changes are as follows: 1) In the future, all review committees will be asked to interview the reviewee as the final interview in the review process, allowing him/her to comment on issues that may arise during the review. The committee may choose to interview the reviewee early in the process as well. 2) It was decided that a Department or ORU representative would no longer be included on the review committee. Instead, the Department Vice Chair (for Chair reviews), Associate Director (for ORU Director reviews), or Associate/Vice Dean (for Dean reviews) would be interviewed as needed during the process to provide a more in depth understanding of Department issues and context. This decision was made based upon the many stewardship reviews monitored by CAP over the last few years. CAP representatives noted that it is not possible to assure that the person from the unit who serves on the committee is not viewed by faculty as being biased for or against the reviewee. As a result, those who are interviewed by the review committee often seem inhibited in expressing their comments when the unit representative is present and often express their reservations regarding confidentiality to the CAP representative. 3) It was agreed that it is the Dean's responsibility to follow up on the specific recommendations in the Stewardship report of Department Chairs and ORU Directors, and the Chancellor's responsibility for follow up to assure that recommendations in a Dean's Stewardship review are addressed. 4) Lastly, the Vice Chancellor's office will take steps to provide more education to all Department, ORU or School faculty whose steward was under review in order to increase the faculty's understanding of the review process and its confidentiality requirements. CAP offered to assist in identifying specific types of information that would be useful.

Revisions to the CAP Checklist on "Important Points for Discussion Between Department Chairs and New Faculty Appointees"

Last year, CAP developed a checklist of items for department chairs to discuss with new faculty appointees. [Appendix 5](#). The purpose of the Checklist is to help ensure that new faculty receive complete information upon hire at UCSF. CAP's vice chair, Barbara Gerbert, presented information about the Checklist at hearings on "Gender Disparity in UC Faculty Hiring" before the California State Senate Select Committee on Government Oversight. For more information on this Select Committee, please see the Announcements on <http://www.ucsf.edu/senate/indexmain.html>. The Checklist was included in the UCSF Annual Call for Academic Personnel Actions Effective 2003-2004. This year, the UCSF Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion offered suggestions for improving the Checklist. [Appendix 6](#). CAP agreed with most of these suggestions and also decided to include another section in the Checklist, entitled

“Identification of Specific Resources Available for Mentoring.” [Appendix 7](#). CAP has forwarded the suggested changes to Vice Chancellor Bainton, requesting that the revised Checklist be included in the 2003-2004 Call. In addition, the Checklist will be included in the upcoming revision of the faculty handbook, *Advancement and Promotion at UCSF: A Faculty Handbook for Success*.

Five-Year Review Procedures

CAP reviewed 11 Five-Year Reviews this academic year. In the main, it is the consensus of CAP, the Vice Chancellor, and the Vice/Associate Deans that this review process is an effective strategy for monitoring and evaluating the progress of faculty whose academic progression has been decelerated. However, a few issues arose during these reviews that CAP brought to the CAP retreat and a follow-up meeting with the Vice Chancellor and Deans. After discussion of these issues, it was decided that faculty undergoing the Five Year Review would be asked to write a one page statement describing their perspective on why their advancement was not on time and any extenuating circumstances. The faculty member would not be required to submit this statement, but would be encouraged to do so. In addition, the Call for 2003-2004 would emphasize more strongly the importance of the Department Chair addressing in his/her letter all of the criteria relevant to the reviewee’s series because information in the CV was sometimes limited or not current.

Career Reviews

Career reviews are intended as procedures by which a faculty member is able to initiate an overall review of his or her file to determine whether he or she is at the appropriate rank and step. CAP noted at a meeting with the Vice Chancellor and Vice/Associate Deans that no career reviews had been requested during the 2002-2003 academic year. All participants at the meeting discussed the potential reasons and supported better information to faculty about availability of this review opportunity. The Director of Academic Personnel indicated that she will assure that the Career Review process is again noted in the Call, with some additional information to Chairs regarding the need to inform faculty of this opportunity. In addition, information about career reviews will be included in the revised faculty handbook and placed on the academic personnel web site.

Guidelines for Use of Ad Hoc Review Committees and Criteria for Membership of Ad Hoc Committees

The Committee reviewed and discussed its practices regarding situations in which the use of ad hoc review committees could occur, and developed guidelines for the use of such review committees. In addition, CAP clarified the criteria for membership of ad hoc review committees. [Appendix 8](#).

Proposed Guidelines on the Use of the Clinical X Series in the Department of Medicine

The Department of Medicine forwarded a confidential draft of guidelines they developed for a new approach to the use of the Clinical X Series and asked that CAP provide its comments. CAP complied, indicating strengths as well as problematic aspects of the proposal.

Guidelines for Preventing Conflict of Interest in CAP Members' Reviews

The Committee discussed conflict of interest issues relating to CAP members who may participate in Departmental Reviews of faculty who are subsequently reviewed by CAP. Chair Weiss discussed with UCAP the issue of whether CAP members at other campuses recuse themselves from participating in departmental review committees. On several campuses, there are policies disallowing CAP members from participation in departmental deliberations on academic personnel files (e.g., UCSD, UCD); while at others, this is left to the CAP member's individual discretion (e.g., UCI).

After significant CAP discussion, Chair Weiss asked Frederic Waldman to chair a working committee composed of three former CAP members to make recommendations for the UCSF CAP. The working committee prepared a report, including proposed guidelines for Departmental review, which state that CAP members may not participate in departmental reviews of personnel actions, may not be a member of a departmental review committee, and should recuse themselves from departmental discussion and voting on candidates. In addition, the report recommended that CAP members should recuse themselves from CAP discussion if they have written a letter for a candidate, if they collaborate with an individual in some way, or if circumstances would lead the CAP member to believe they could not participate in CAP deliberations in a disinterested manner. CAP voted unanimously to support this report and put these guidelines into effect for all current and future CAP members. [Appendix 9](#).

Proposed Guidelines to Faculty for Preparing a Curriculum Vitae (CV) for Academic Review and Revised CV Template

CAP noted that curricula vitae (CV) were sometimes not up to date and often were missing information that is important to the faculty member's academic review. The lack of updated and complete information can cause delays in the review process. With primary responsibility assumed by Walter Miller and Frederic Waldman, the Committee created guidelines for faculty in preparing a CV, after reviewing several existing CV templates. The revised CV template includes a section on mentoring, since last year it was agreed that mentoring would be included in evaluating the teaching criterion in all advancements. The Vice/Associate Deans have reviewed the CV guidelines and offered useful comments during its development. [Appendix 10](#).

CAP Database Improvements

CAP began discussions this year concerning the need to improve the database it uses to follow faculty progress and to form ad hoc review committees. Initial work has identified problems with the current system's technological capacity as well as the accuracy and breadth of information in the database. Martin Bogetz and Frederic Waldman have taken major responsibility for moving these changes forward next year.

Review Procedures for Appointment of Faculty at Assistant Professor, Step 3 In All Series

At the CAP retreat and a follow-up meeting, the Vice Dean of the School of Medicine proposed that all appointments from Assistant Professor, Step 1 through 3 in all academic series (including the Professional Research series) be delegated to the Dean's office in

each School. Appointments at Steps 1 and 2 in the Adjunct and Clinical series are already delegated to the Schools through a past agreement. Appointments at Steps 1 and 2 in the Senate series are delegated also except that one CAP member reviews the file. If the CAP member's review raises concern regarding the appropriateness of the appointment, a full CAP review is then completed. CAP discussed Dean Cohen's proposal and agreed to support the delegation of Step 3 of the Assistant rank in all series (including the Professional Research Series) under the condition that currently exists for all appointments at Assistant Professor, Steps 1 and 2 in the Senate series. This condition requires that one CAP member review the file within a 2 to 3 day period. Using this procedure, only one file has come to the full CAP over the last few years.

Faculty Peer Review Process

CAP members identified concerns this year regarding both Department peer reviews and ad hoc committee reviews at the campus level. These concerns were raised at the CAP retreat. First, some faculty are unclear about different expectations for the different series. Such misunderstanding could lead to uninformed reviews at both the Department and campus level. At the CAP retreat, there was agreement that a brief but more detailed summary of the different expectations across series would be useful for discussion with and distribution to review committees. Vice Dean Brian Alldredge informed everyone that his office had been developing an academic personnel review packet to better educate faculty and serve as a resource to Department Chairs. He has shared this document with CAP, which will review it carefully during the coming year as a potential guide for use with all faculty on campus. In addition, more comprehensive and accurate information about the different series will be included in the revised faculty handbook that is currently under development. A second issue was the importance of fair and objective peer reviews at the Department level. Reviews can be compromised if a faculty member's file is not carefully reviewed by those who vote in the Department or if a Department review committee is constituted from persons who have mentoring roles, collaborative research relationships, or other potential positive or negative biases. The Vice Deans indicated that they will address this issue with their Chairs, reminding them of important review considerations and monitoring the Department review process over this next year.

Documenting and Evaluating the Mentoring Component of Faculty Teaching

CAP began preparing for the review of mentoring expectations that will be part of faculty files in the 2003-2004 reviews. Mary Croughan, co-chair of the Senate's Mentoring Task Force, was invited to a CAP meeting to discuss the recommendations of that group. The Task Force Report is forthcoming. In addition, the Graduate Division's Guidelines for Faculty Mentoring of Postdoctoral Fellows offers important information regarding the mentoring role. CAP supports use of both of these documents by Departments in cultivating the mentoring component of the faculty member's teaching role. CAP also has developed a section in its guidelines for preparing a curriculum vitae that suggests specific types of information to include regarding mentoring.

Selection of the 2002-2003 Distinction in Teaching Award Recipients

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). CAP member Joseph Guglielmo served as Chair of the Committee in both 2002 and 2003. This year, for the first time, there were two major changes to the award process. First, the award was extended to some non-Senate series, including clinical and adjunct faculty. Second, two categories of award were created: Category 1 is for faculty who have been at UCSF for five years or less, and Category 2 is for faculty who have been at UCSF for more than five years. Nearly three times as many applications for the award were received this year as compared with last year. A number of issues were raised this year regarding the DIT process. Potential change in the committee membership may be warranted so that faculty from all series being nominated are represented on the review committee. In addition, the method for nomination of student committee members (by the Vice/Associate Deans) needs to be reexamined as well as the requirement that all nominations must go through the Department Chair. CAP will address these and other DIT issues next year.

For 2002-03, the DIT Selection Committee recommended, and CAP concurred, that the following recipients be honored:

2002-2003 Distinction in Teaching Award

Category 1 (at UCSF 5 years or less):

Igor Mitrovich, MD
Department of Physiology and Stomatology

Honorable Mention:

Margo Vener, MD, MPH
Department of Family and Community Medicine

Category 2 (at UCSF 5 years or more):

Susan B. Masters, PhD
Department of Cellular and Molecular Pharmacology

Melvin M. Scheinman, MD
Department of Medicine

Honorable Mention:

Ellen M. Scarr, RNC, MSN, FNP, WHNP
Department of Family Health Care Nursing

All Award and Honorable Mention recipients were honored by the Academic Senate at its Division meeting of June 19, 2003 and by the Chancellor at the Founders Day Banquet held on April 23, 2003.

Annual CAP Retreat

As noted throughout the discussion above, a number of important issues were addressed at the annual CAP retreat held on June 16, 2003. This retreat was attended by CAP members, Vice Chancellor Bainton, the Associate/Vice Deans for Academic Personnel from each of the four schools, and key academic personnel and senate staff.

The agenda included discussion related to the following topics:

- Stewardship Reviews (including the role of CAP members, the timing of a reviewee's interview by the Committee, the consistency and approach to the discussion of the findings and recommendations in the Report, follow-up regarding the reviewee's response to recommendations, and the service of department representatives on Stewardship Review Committees)
- Faculty Peer Review Process (including department procedures, eligibility of voting faculty and the faculty's understanding of the review criteria)
- "Protected Time" in the Adjunct Series
- Delegation of Additional Reviews to the Schools
- New Mentoring Expectations (including the process for informing faculty about mentoring expectations, criteria for evaluating mentoring and approaches to documentation of mentoring)
- CV Format (including a proposed CV format)
- Effectiveness of the Five-Year Review Process
- Effectiveness of the Career Review Process

[Appendix 11](#). A follow-up meeting was held on July 15, 2003, to complete the discussion of items on the CAP Retreat agenda.

Issues for the 2003-04 Academic Year

- Monitor Implementation of Revised Stewardship Review Procedures
- Follow-up on the Effectiveness of Mentoring Evaluations in the Review Process
- Potential Modification in Procedures for Distinction in Teaching Award
- Discussion with the Vice Chancellor and Associate Deans about the Nature and Quality of Follow-up on Recommendations made by CAP and Ad Hoc Committees in Faculty Appraisals and Advancements
- Implementation of Improvements to CAP Database
- Monitoring and Evaluation of the Process of Single CAP Member Review of Appointments to the Assistant Rank, Step 3 for all Academic Series
- Continued Monitoring of the Five Year and Career Review Mechanisms
- Development with the Vice Chancellor's Office of More Detailed Information for Faculty Conducting Peer Reviews
- Monitoring of the Time Required for Progression of Files through the Academic Review Process

Respectfully submitted,

Committee on Academic Personnel

Sandra Weiss, Chair

Barbara Gerbert, Vice Chair

Martin Bogetz
B. Joseph Guglielmo
Walter L. Miller
Douglas Schmucker
Frederic Waldman

Prepared by:
Sandra Weiss, PhD, DNSc
Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel
476-3105
sweiss@itsa.ucsf.edu

Senate Staff:
Melanie Fisch
Sr. Senate Analyst
476-4245
mfisch@senate.ucsf.edu

APPENDICES

- [Appendix 1:](#) Letter from CAP to Dorothy Bainton, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, Regarding Proposed Changes to APM 310, 311 (4/15/03)
- [Appendix 2:](#) Letter from CAP To University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) Regarding Proposed Changes to APM 278, 279 and 210 (5/9/03)
- [Appendix 3:](#) Template for Stewardship Review Reports (10/02)
- [Appendix 4:](#) Responsibilities of the CAP Representative on the Stewardship Review Committee (11/02)
- [Appendix 5:](#) Important Points For Discussion Between Department Chairs and New Faculty Appointees (10/02)
- [Appendix 6:](#) Letter from Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention, and Promotion to CAP Regarding Suggested Changes to “Important Points for Discussion Between Department Chairs and New Faculty Appointees” (1/28/03)
- [Appendix 7:](#) Letter from CAP to Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention, and Promotion Regarding Task Force’s Suggested Changes to “Important Points for Discussion Between Department Chairs and New Faculty Appointees” (5/5/03)
- [Appendix 8:](#) CAP Guidelines for Use of Ad Hoc Committees, and Criteria for Membership of Ad Hoc Committees (6/03)
- [Appendix 9:](#) Report to the UCSF Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) from the CAP Conflict of interest working Group (6/9/03)
- [Appendix 10:](#) Guidelines to Faculty for Preparing a Curriculum Vitae for Academic Review and Revised Curriculum Vitae Template (7/03)
- [Appendix 11:](#) Minutes, CAP Meeting of 6/16/03