



Committee on Academic Personnel

2003-04 Annual Report

Joe Guglielmo, PharmD
Chair

During the 2003-04 academic year, the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) met as a Committee on 24 occasions, reviewing 314 files for appointments, promotions, merits, appraisals, five-year reviews or changes in series as well as multiple, ongoing stewardship reviews. In order to ensure thorough reviews, the Committee called for the creation of 31 ad hoc committees.

Due to problems related to the finalization of appointments to the Committee, the Committee met once in September 2003, but did not convene again until December 2004. From October – November 2004, files were reviewed and approved by a Select Committee comprised of former Chairs and senior members of the Committee on Academic Personnel who were appointed by the Committee on Committees to ensure that files were reviewed in a timely manner. This Select Committee met 5 times, reviewed 63 files, and called for the creation of 10 ad hoc committees.

The Committee reviewed and acted on the following issues:

University - System-wide

- APM 278 – Proposed Evaluation Criteria for Clinical Professor Series
- APM 210-6 – Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on Actions Concerning the Clinical Professor Series
- APM 133 – Proposed Changes on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles
- APM 279 - Community Health Professor Series
- APM 260 – University Professor Appointments
- Report of the Professorial Step System Task Force - Reviewing/Considering a Change in Criteria for Promotion from Step V to VI

UCSF Division

- New Advancement Criteria for Without Salary Faculty in the Department of Clinical Pharmacy
- Department of Medicine Academic Appointment Procedures
- Department of Medicine Guidelines on the Use of the Clinical X Series
- Efficiencies in Review Process
 - Associate Dean's Narrative Comments in File
 - CAP Review of Assistant Step 1 & 2
 - Normal Merits in the Professional Research Series

- Receipt of External Letters
- Use and Effectiveness of Important Points for New Faculty (“Checklist”)
- Communication of Reviewing Agency Comments
- Evaluation of Independent vs. Collaborative Researchers
- Definition of Dissemination of Scholarship
- Career Review Modification
- Information Available to CAP During Review Process
- Faculty Participation in Campus Mentoring Program
- CAP Database Improvements
- Selection of the 2004 Distinction in Teaching Award Recipients

Systemwide Issues

Joe Guglielmo, 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 2003-04. This report addresses only those issues where the UCSF CAP provided comment to UCAP on specific matters.

Proposed Revisions to APM 278, 210-6, 133, and 279

CAP’s response is summarized below:

- **APM 278.** CAP strongly agreed with the proposed evaluation criteria requiring excellence in professional competence and teaching for the clinical professor series. The Committee recommended various changes in wording to ensure consistency.
- **APM 210-6.** CAP disagreed with the proposal to consider extramural referee letters optional for new appointments and promotions. The Committee also recommended various changes in wording to ensure consistency.
- **APM 133.** CAP had no additional comments regarding the proposed changes on total period of service with certain academic titles.
- **APM 279.** CAP was divided regarding the need for the creation of such a series. If implemented, the Committee did not support the name Community Health Professor as the title for these faculty. They also found the proposed evaluation criteria for appointment and promotion to be vague, and suggested more clear language regarding review criteria.

([Appendix 1.](#))

Proposed Revisions to APM 260

CAP generally agreed with the suggested changes in the wording of APM 260, University Professor. The Committee did have concerns regarding the proposed limit for the number of University Professors per campus and also the process in the event that a University Professor is no longer fulfilling the obligations associated with the position. ([Appendix 2.](#))

Report of the Professorial Step System Task Force

The Professorial Step System Task Force is a systemwide task force charged with reviewing the placement or number of special reviews or “barrier” steps within the full professor ranks, with particular emphasis on the barrier review between Professor, Step V and Professor, Step VI. In March of 2004, the Task Force made a number of recommendations about UC’s current process for advancement in the Professorial series. Included were recommendations to eliminate the special criteria associated with the review for advancement

from Step V to Step VI, to retain the special criteria used in review for advancement from Step IX to Above-Scale, and that all campuses should institute regular, non-delegated review of personnel cases of full professors by CAP, including a full CAP review of at least every other merit following promotion to full professor (full report located at http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/underreview/profstep_report.pdf).

In reviewing this report, UCSF CAP noted that UCSF was not included in the survey “due to the special medical school orientation of the campus.” In fact, the survey data only included four campuses (Irvine, Santa Barbara, San Diego and Santa Cruz) with respect to the length of time served at Step V. Additionally, the survey only included ladder rank professors, and thus did not include data for the In-residence, Clinical X, Clinical, or Adjunct series, or any other series.

As a result, CAP responded that the incompleteness of the survey data do not allow for meaningful conclusions regarding elimination of the Step V to VI review, and that systemwide data (including UCSF) are needed for all series (Ladder rank, In-residence, Clinical X, Clinical, and Adjunct), including years at step and rank to evaluate the need for special criteria at Step VI review. ([Appendix 3.](#))

UCSF Academic Personnel Issues

The Committee worked on many issues at the Division level.

New Advancement Criteria for Without Salary Faculty in the Department of Clinical Pharmacy

CAP reviewed the Department of Clinical Pharmacy’s proposed new advancement criteria for without salary faculty. CAP approved the criteria as written with no suggested modifications.

Department of Medicine Academic Appointment Procedures for the Adjunct Series

Per request from the Department of Medicine, CAP reviewed a draft communication to their Assistant Adjunct Professors regarding Department academic appointment procedures for the Adjunct series. This communication was the Department of Medicine’s effort to clarify that for their Department, an appointment as an Assistant Professor in the Adjunct series is not usually a precursor to promotion in the Adjunct series, but rather a period during which a faculty member may be selected by a search committee for an appointment in the In-Residence series, may be proposed for a change in series to the Clinical or Clinical X series, or may separate from the Department and the School for a position elsewhere.

CAP noted advantages to the proposal, including the fact that the time spent in the Adjunct series will not count toward the 8 year limit and the inclusion of a voluntary appraisal of faculty who are in the Adjunct series for more than three years. CAP also noted potential problems to appointing junior MD faculty as Assistant Adjunct rather than Assistant Professor in Residence or Assistant Professor of Clinical X, including the inability of Adjunct faculty to supervise graduate students and difficulty competing for certain grants without a waiver. CAP also noted the possibility that initiating these junior faculty in the Adjunct series will result in a slower learning curve toward fully understanding the need for accomplishment in all areas of review for Academic Senate faculty, including teaching, professional competence, scholarship, and University and public service.

CAP recommended that the conclusions of the recently completed Task Force on Mentoring and the Task Force on Recruitment, Retention and Promotion be integrated into the memorandum prior to finalization,

allowing faculty to fully understand the pros and cons of this proposal. CAP also recommended that a parallel document be considered for Assistant Adjunct PhD faculty. ([Appendix 4.](#))

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

In 2002-2003, the Department of Medicine forwarded a 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. The Department made a number of changes and resubmitted the document for review in 2003-2004.

CAP noted that the new draft better reflected the differences between the Clinical series and Clinical X, and appreciated the increased clarity defining creativity as including dissemination outside the University. However, CAP still had questions regarding some aspects of the document, including the suggestion the creativity is required in all three areas of teaching, clinical care and research. Additionally, as previously mention CAP was also concerned with the Adjunct series appointment and the resulting potential for a faculty member to be less prepared to appreciate requirements for accomplishment in all areas of review for Academic Senate faculty, including teaching, professional competence, scholarship, and University and public service. CAP also recommended that the findings of the Task Forces on Mentoring and Recruitment, Retention and Promotion should be incorporated into this document. ([Appendix 4.](#))

Efficiencies in Review Process

The Committee agreed to the following changes to increase efficiency in the academic review process.

- School Vice/Associate Deans for Academic Affairs will continue to review all advancement packets, and will continue to complete the “check box” evaluation. However, narrative comments will only be provided when the comments add substantive new information not included elsewhere in the file; when there is a lack of unanimity about the proposed action; or when the Vice/Associate Dean believes additional clarification or explanation is necessary. The Vice/Associate Deans from each School agreed to establish a uniform “check box” evaluation to be used by all schools, and ensure that the chart is completed with consideration given to the specific rank, series and step of the faculty member being reviewed.
- CAP will no longer review appointments at the Assistant, Step 1 or 2 level in the Ladder Rank, In Residence, Professor of Clinical X, Clinical or Adjunct series. Review and approval of these appointments will be delegated to the Deans. CAP will continue to provide a “rush” review (i.e. review by only one CAP member) for appointments at the Assistant, Step 3 level. CAP members who review these files will have the option to initiate a full CAP review if deemed necessary.
- Review and approval of normal, on time merits in the Professional Research Series (with the exception of merit from Step V to VI) will be delegated to the School.

Additionally, per request from the Office of Academic Personnel, CAP and all schools agreed to allow external and internal reference letters to be received by facsimile or e-mail.

Use and Effectiveness of Important Points for New Faculty (“Checklist”)

CAP and the Associate Deans agreed that in order to ensure that a full discussion occurs between all new appointees and the designated department representative (Department Chair, Division Chief, designate), a completed copy of the Important Points For New Faculty (i.e. the “checklist”) will be included in each file

which comes to CAP for review. The checklist will be modified as follows, and will be released with these changes with the 2004-05 Annual Call:

- The names of both parties (new appointee and department representative, i.e. Department Chair, Division Chief or designate) will be included on the document.
- Item “Sources of Compensation” will be adjusted to read: “Sources of Compensation (first two years).”
- Items “Total Negotiated Annual Salary” and “Covered Compensation” will require only a check to indicate discussion, rather than indicating specific figures on the document.

Communication of Reviewing Agency Comments

As a result of concern that faculty members did not uniformly receive the suggestions and comments made by the reviewing agencies (CAP, ad hoc committees, etc.) during appraisal, all schools agreed that a hard copy of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs’ communication, which shall include an overview of the findings of the reviewing agencies, should be sent to all faculty members who are appraised. The Vice Chancellor will include language in the letter to the effect of “This letter is to be shared with the faculty member being appraised”.

Evaluation of Independent vs. Collaborative Researchers

CAP felt strongly that UCSF does not have an appropriate mechanism to advance faculty researchers who serve in a “collaborative” role as opposed to one considered to be independent. In instances where evidence of independence is lacking, the existing criteria outlined in the Academic Personnel Manual only serve to complicate the evaluation for promotion. CAP uniformly supported developing a process through which merit and promotion can take place for the many UCSF faculty researchers serving in a collaborator role. In response, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Dorothy Bainton asked CAP Chair Guglielmo and Donna Ferriero to co-chair a task force to determine mechanisms by which faculty who serve in the research collaborator role potentially could be rewarded through merit and promotion for their contributions toward research.

Definition of Dissemination of Scholarship

In an attempt to clarify to faculty (especially those in Clinical X series) how to demonstrate scholarship in ways other than through publication in peer-reviewed journals, CAP requested that the Vice/Associate Deans inform faculty of the need to clearly indicate on their CV’s how and where their scholarly contributions are valued and used/adopted outside of the University. Examples of such contributions could include teaching methods adopted nationally or internationally, development of informatics, websites, CD Roms that are recognized and used nationally or internationally, etc.

Career Review Modification

CAP supported VC Bainton’s recommendation that the Career Review process be modified to not only allow a faculty member to request a review of rank and step (within series), but also to initiate a review for a change in series. This issue is particularly relevant to the recently released report of the Task Force on Recruitment, Retention, and Promotion (located at <http://www.ucsf.edu/senate/2002-2003/v2-FRRP-12-17-03-Report.pdf>) and would provide faculty who believe they are in the wrong series with a vehicle by which to initiate a formal review.

Information Available to CAP During Review Process

CAP requested details about the information that was available to them during the review process, including specifics about previous accelerations/decelerations, previous leave, etc. Academic Personnel Director D. Dillon informed CAP that the Committee can request any information they believe is pertinent to a fair review, and that requests will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. D. Dillon also indicated that she would regularly provide to CAP information about all approved one-year accelerations for actions not currently reviewed by CAP.

Faculty Participation in Campus Mentoring Program

CAP communicated concerns that departments were providing varying levels of mentoring to faculty, and that some might be doing an inadequate job. CAP will communicate these concerns to the Mentoring Office, once it is formally established and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will evaluate the concerns as the program advances.

CAP Database Improvements

Per requests by CAP members, Senate Office staff made significant improvements on the FilemakerPro database used by the Committee to create ad hoc committees. Additional data was entered, current data was made more complete and consistent and the design was updated to allow for more efficient and accurate searching. Senate Office staff is currently attempting to obtain the requisite information which will allow purging of faculty who have separated from the University. Improvement of this database will continue in 2004-2005.

Selection of the 2003-2004 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 Mary Croughan served as Chair of the DIT Selection Committee in 2003-2004. The Committee reviewed multiple nominations in each of the two award categories – faculty who have been at UCSF for less than five years and faculty who have been at UCSF for more than five years.

For 2003-04, the DIT Selection Committee recommended, and CAP concurred, that the following recipients be honored:

Category 1 (at UCSF 5 years or less):

Douglas R. Fredrick, MD
Department of Ophthalmology

Category 2 (at UCSF 5 years or more):

Betty-ann Hoener, PhD
Department of Biopharmaceutical Sciences

Kanu Chatterjee, MB, FRCP, FACC, FCCP, MACP
Department of Medicine

All award recipients were honored by the Academic Senate at the Distinction in Teaching Award Ceremony on April 29, 2004 in Cole Hall and by the Chancellor at the Founders Day Banquet on April 27, 2004. ([Appendix 5.](#))

On-Going Issues for the 2004-05 Academic Year

- Continue to participate in systemwide discussion regarding Step V to Step VI review.
- Monitor usage of Important Points for New Faculty (“Checklist”) and ensure inclusion in all review packets.
- Communicate with new Task Force relating to collaborative researchers and keep apprised of progress.
- Look for Career Review modifications to appear in Annual Call which will allow faculty to request an additional level of review pertaining to whether or not they are in the correct series.
- Monitor departmental effectiveness of mentoring and roll out of Mentoring Office/Program. Continue to work with Executive Vice Chancellor on mentoring issues.
- Consider streamlined procedures for the selection of Distinction in Teaching Award recipients.
- Continue implementation of improvements to CAP database.
- Continue to identify improvements and efficiencies in the academic review process.

Respectfully submitted,

Committee on Academic Personnel

B. Joseph Guglielmo, Chair

Gary Armitage*

Martin Bogetz*

Mary Croughan

Erika Froelicher

Doug Schmucker

Fred Waldman

Margaret Walsh*

*Martin Bogetz served 9/1/03-3/1/04; Margaret Walsh served 3/8/04-8/31/04; Gary Armitage served 1/5/04-8/31/04

Prepared by:

Erica Jamin

Assistant Director

415-476-4245

ejamin@senate.ucsf.edu

APPENDICES

- [Appendix 1:](#) Letter from CAP to Leonard Zegans, Chair of the Academic Senate, Regarding Proposed Changes to APM 278, 210-6, 133, and 279 (4/26/04)
- [Appendix 2:](#) Letter from CAP to Leonard Zegans, Chair of the Academic Senate, Regarding Proposed Changes to APM 260 (4/27/04)
- [Appendix 3:](#) PowerPoint Presentation on the Report of the Professorial Step System Task Force (6/01/04)
- [Appendix 4:](#) Letter from CAP to VC Bainton Regarding Department of Medicine Proposed Academic Appointment Procedures in the Adjunct Series and Revised Guidelines on the Use of the Clinical X Series (1/20/04)
- [Appendix 5:](#) Distinction in Teaching Award Ceremony Program (4/29/04)