



Committee on Academic Personnel

2004-05 Annual Report

Joe Guglielmo, PharmD
Chair

During the 2004-05 academic year, the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) met as a Committee on 40 occasions, reviewing 375 files for appointments, promotions, merits, appraisals, five-year reviews or changes in series as well as multiple, ongoing stewardship reviews. In addition, the Committee called for the creation of 35 ad hoc committees.

The Committee reviewed and acted on the following issues:

University - System-wide

1. Proposed Changes to the Academic Personnel Manual regarding Family Friendly Policies, covering APM Sections 133-17, 210-1, 220, and 760.

UCSF Division

1. Changes to Division Bylaw 110(A): Increasing the Number of CAP Members from seven to nine.
2. Clarification from the Director of the Academic Senate Regarding Communications between CAP and Department Chairs or Vice Deans
3. Discouragement of Faculty Grant Applications by an Institute.
4. The Use or Misuse of Faculty Series by UCSF Schools
5. Potential Conflict of Interest of Associate Deans of Academic Affairs Participating in Peer Review
6. Inclusion of Department Faculty Voting Details in Promotion Packets
7. Review of School of Nursing Guidelines for Appointments and Promotion in the Clinical Professorial Series, Salaried
8. Clarification as to Authorship of Chair's Letter When the Chair is the Subject of an Action
9. Selection of the 2004 Distinction in Teaching Award Recipients
10. Chancellor's Committee for Collaborative Research Evaluation
11. CAP Notification of Stewardship Reviews

Systemwide Issues

Mary Croughan served as the representative to the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) from UCSF and reported to CAP on matters considered by UCAP during 2004-05. This

report addresses only those issues where the UCSF CAP provided comment to UCAP on specific matters.

Proposed “Family Friendly” Revisions to APM Sections 133-17, 210-1, 220, and 760

UCSF Academic Chair Len Zegans formed the Task Force Reviewing APM Policies Related to Work and Family, featuring representatives from Faculty Welfare, CAP and each of the four School Faculty Councils. CAP Chair J. Guglielmo served as the CAP representative to this Task Force. This Task Force recommended several additions and alterations to APM Sections, which were provided to CAP for review and comment. In the meeting of April 20, 2005, Chair Guglielmo solicited suggestions or approval from CAP to the changes recommended by the Task Force. These comments were integrated into the final recommendations of the Task Force. The recommendations of the Task Force were communicated to Chair Zegans, and ultimately to George Blumenthal, Chair of the Academic Council. The Communication from the Task Force Reviewing APM Policies Related to Work and Family and the suggested changes to the Academic Personnel Manual Sections 133-17, 210-1, 220, and 760 are attached hereto as [Appendix I](#).

UCSF Academic Personnel Issues

The Committee worked on many issues at the Division level as summarized below.

Changes to Division Bylaw 110(A): Increasing the Number of CAP Members from seven to nine

At the November 18, 2004 meeting of the Divisional Senate, a change to Divisional Bylaw 110(A) was proposed to increase the number of members on the Committee on Academic Personnel from seven to nine ([Appendix 2](#)). Following adoption by the Division of the expansion of the size of CAP, the Committee on Committees appointed two new members: Tom Scanlan, PhD, Professor, Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, School of Pharmacy; and Peter Wright, MD, PhD, Professor In Residence, Department of Anesthesia and Perioperative Care, School of Medicine. Both began service in February 2005.

Communications between CAP and Department Chairs or Vice Deans Related to Confidential Files

Clarification was provided to the UCSF Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) related to whether or not it is appropriate for communications from CAP to use language that compares a proposed action against other faculty files reviewed by the Committee when making their recommendation(s) to the Executive Vice Chancellor. Additionally, information was provided on whether or not it is appropriate for the Chair or any member of CAP, outside of a Committee meeting, to discuss a file or proposed action with a Department Chair or Vice Dean.

Senate CAP staff researched these matters and requested information from both faculty and administrators involved in the academic personnel process at UCSF, and additionally surveyed CAP staff from all other UC campuses for their input and experience with this matter. Based on the practices and procedures of the Academic Personnel Committees on other campuses, as well as the historical practices of UCSF CAP, the Office of the Academic Senate communicated the following recommendations:

1. Committees on Academic Personnel should not make written comparisons between files or faculty members. If CAP does not agree with a proposed action, it should simply provide a different recommendation along with a clear explanation as to why.
2. Members of the Committee on Academic Personnel, including Chairs, should not communicate directly with Department Chairs, Vice Deans, or any one outside of the Office of Academic Personnel or Senate office. Clarification should always be requested through official channels and should become part of the official file. Subsequently, the issue of direct CAP communications between Department Chairs, Vice Deans, or anyone outside the OAP or Senate office was discussed at the CAP Retreat. Considering the potential for conflict of interest or even perceived conflict of interest, it was decided that no discussion of academic personnel issues, including that associated with the basic policies and procedures regarding the merit and promotion, will take place between CAP and Department Chairs, Vice Deans or anyone outside the OAP or Senate office. CAP will direct all questions regarding the merit and promotion process to the Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and the Associate Deans.

Discouragement of Grant Application

During file review, the Committee noted a letter from leadership in a campus Institute explicitly stating that it actively discourages faculty from applying for grants. In response, CAP drafted a communication to the EVC dated November 17, 2004, which included the following: “While the Committee appreciates the efficiencies associated with such a practice, the Committee has serious concerns regarding the active discouragement of Institute faculty applying for grants. The Committee concludes this practice results in serious restrictions upon both academic freedom and the merit and promotion process. The Committee strongly recommends the Institute eliminate its practice discouraging faculty to apply for grants and in its place actively encourage faculty to participate in this important scholarly activity.” ([Appendix 3](#))

Use of Faculty Series by UCSF Schools

Per the recommendations of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion, the Committee on Academic Personnel has been reviewing all appointments at the Associate level and above and promotions with respect to correct series. Specifically, the Committee noted several Adjunct and Clinical professors with job descriptions more consistent with the In Residence or Clinical X series. In these cases, the Committee has recommended that a change in series be considered. However, it was noted that the one school does not, or rarely, uses the Clinical X series and this practice results in an inability to place School faculty in more appropriate series. In a communication to the EVC dated January 5, 2005, CAP recommended that all schools be advised to use all series, including In Residence and Clinical X. ([Appendix 4](#))

Conflict of Interest of Associate Deans in Peer Review

It had been reported to the Committee on Academic Personnel that some of the Associate Deans for Academic Affairs in the schools participated in peer review at the Departmental level, including casting a vote on an academic personnel file. In a communication to the EVC dated January 5, 2005, CAP noted that this creates a conflict of interest and recommended that the Associate Deans be advised against participating in any peer review at the Departmental level. ([Appendix 5](#))

Department Faculty Voting Details

The Committee noticed that with increasing frequency, the details of a faculty vote regarding a personnel action were absent in the letters from Department Chairs. In a communication dated February 14, 2005, CAP requested from the EVC that all letters from Department Chairs include the precise voting results, i.e. the number of yes, no, and abstaining votes. ([Appendix 6](#))

Review of School of Nursing Guidelines for Appointments and Promotion in the Clinical Professorial Series, Salaried

At the request of Associate Vice Chancellor Sally Marshall, CAP reviewed the School of Nursing's "Guidelines for Appointments and Promotion in the Clinical Professorial Series Salaried." CAP's concerns and suggestions for corrections were communicated to Dr. Marshall in writing on May 26, 2005 ([Appendix 7](#)).

Authorship of Chair's Letter When the Chair is the Subject of an Action

On June 1, 2005, CAP reviewed a request for promotion for a Department Chair. This file was submitted with a Chair's Letter written by a Dean (as the subject of the action was the Chair of the department). This file also included a Dean's Assessment from the same Dean. However, this Dean held a secondary appointment in the same department as the subject of the action, which might constitute a conflict of interest. In a communication to AVC Sally Marshall dated June 1, 2005, CAP requested clarification as to who should write the Chair's Letter when the Chair is the subject of an action. CAP received a reply July 11, 2005, stating, "In this situation, the Chair's letter is the Dean's assessment of the Department Chair, and it is written by the Dean. If the Dean has an appointment in the same Department as the Chair who is the subject of the proposed for an action, then another Dean should write the Chair's letter." ([Appendix 8](#))

Selection of the 2005 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, and one faculty member and one student from each of the four Schools (selected from a pool of students and faculty nominated by each of the Schools). CAP member Margaret Walsh served as Chair of the DIT Selection Committee in 2004-2005. The Committee reviewed multiple nominations in each of the two award categories – faculty who have been at UCSF for five years or less and faculty who have been at UCSF for more than five years.

For 2004-2005, the DIT Selection Committee recommended, and CAP concurred, that the following recipients be honored:

Category 1 (at UCSF 5 years or less):

Tracy Fulton, PhD

Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics, School of Medicine

Category 2 (at UCSF more than 5 years):

Martin S. Bogetz, MD

Department of Anesthesia and Perioperative Care, School of Medicine

Both award recipients were honored by the Academic Senate at the Distinction in Teaching Award Ceremony on April 28, 2005 in Cole Hall. ([Appendix 9](#)).

Chancellor's Committee for Collaborative Research Evaluation

The Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs appointed a Committee for Collaborative Research Evaluation consisting of representatives from all four schools and the Academic Senate. Chair Guglielmo served as Chair of the Committee and Mary Croughan, also a CAP member, served on this Committee as the Senate faculty representative. The recommendations of this Committee were submitted for CAP for review and inclusion in the 2005-2006 Annual Call for Personnel Actions. ([Appendix 10](#)) The significant language inserted into the Annual Call is as follows:

Pending changes to the APM, we recommend that Department Chairs, Directors of large laboratories who oversee other faculty, and faculty candidates should include a description and evaluation of the faculty candidate's unique, essential and creative contributions to collaborative research. Department Chairs should take note of the current wording of APM 210-1-D (2), which reinforces the need for the Chair to clearly establish the role of the candidate in collaborative research. To assist in this evaluation faculty candidates should recommend, and the Chair should select, both internal and external references who are familiar with the candidate's essential and creative contributions to collaborative research such that the unique contributions of the candidate can be assessed.

Notification of Stewardship Review Presentations

Over the past year, there have been many positive changes to the Stewardship Review process. CAP remains committed to ensuring that the entire process is followed, including the important step of presentation of findings and notice to the Academic Senate so that the CAP member may attend the presentation to the Department or ORU. The Committee noted for that some Stewardship Reviews, there appeared to be extended delays in the presentation of the findings of the Review. In other cases, neither the Senate Office nor CAP were copied on the notice of the presentation. The Committee worked with the Associate Vice Chancellor to ensure that schools and departments schedule Stewardship Review presentations in a timely fashion and that both the office of the AVC and the Office of the Academic Senate would be notified of the time and place of the presentation.

CAP Retreat

On May 11, 2005, the Committee met with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Director of the Office of Academic Personnel and Vice-Deans from all four schools in the annual CAP Retreat. Minutes from that meeting are attached as [Appendix 11](#). The primary matters discussed in this meeting and the relevant action items (if any) include:

1. **Evaluation of Collaboration and Independence in Research:** Resolved by the recommendations of the Committee for Collaborative Research Evaluation
2. **Use of Ad Hoc Committees—Criteria for Use and for CAP Acting as Own Ad Hoc:** CAP will continue to determine the benefit of an ad hoc committee on a case by case basis, but will be more sensitive to the potential need for more senior reviewers for more senior actions, such as merit increases to step six or above scale.

3. **Stewardship Reviews—Timeliness of Completion, Adherence to Policies and Practices and Accountability of Reviews:** Vice-Deans and Department Chairs will make sure that stewardship reviews presentations will be scheduled in a timely fashion and notify the Office of Academic Affairs as well as CAP as to these presentations.
4. **Curriculum Vitae and/or the Educator’s Portfolio:** The School of Medicine will review this issue and explore mechanisms for increased efficiencies in the presentation of teaching activities. Based upon this evaluation, other schools can evaluate the potential benefit of the Educator’s Portfolio for their respective schools.
5. **Possible Faculty Summary Sheet for Areas of Review:** The feasibility of a faculty summary sheet will be considered subsequent to resolution of the redundancies associated with the Educator’s Portfolio/curriculum vitae.
6. **Issues Related to CAP Suggestions for Changes in Series/Faculty Feedback:** CAP will continue to assess each file to determine whether the scope of activities is consistent with the series and make recommendations to change series when appropriate. While CAP may still recommend the possibility of a future change in series in some cases (e.g. increased scholarship in the change from Clinical to Clinical X), it understands that the Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs may elect to not include such a recommendation.
7. **Consideration of Diversity Issues in the Academic Review Process:** CAP will review the changes in APM 210, which is effective July 1, 2005 regarding advice to review and appraisal committees specific to valuing diversity in teaching, research and creative work, professional competence, and University and public service.

On-Going Issues for the 2005-06 Academic Year

- Use Ad of Hoc Committees: The Committee is continuing to evaluate when it is most appropriate for CAP to suggest the formation of an ad hoc review committee and when CAP should act as its own ad hoc.
- Curriculum Vitae and the Educator’s Portfolio: CAP will continue to evaluate the use of the Educator’s Portfolio and work with the AVC for Academic Affairs to determine when the Educator’s Portfolio may be used in lieu of a CV for personnel actions.
- Consideration of Inclusion of a “Faculty Summary Sheet for Areas of Review” in Academic review Submission Packets
- Continued Consideration of Undifferentiated Series for Assistant Professors

In Memoriam

The Committee would like to express its gratitude for the contributions of its dear member Carol Basbaum, who left this life April 2, 2005. Her service to the University and to the causes of life and laughter is much appreciated, and sorely missed.

Respectfully submitted,

Committee on Academic Personnel

B. Joseph Guglielmo, Chair

Joel Karliner, Vice Chair

Carol Basbaum*

Mary Croughan

Erika Froelicher

Tom Scanlan*

Doug Schmucker

Margaret Walsh

Peter Wright*

*Carol Basbaum served until February 9, 2005. Tom Scanlan and Peter Wright began their service February 16, 2005

Prepared by:
Wilson Hardcastle
Senate Analyst
415-476-4245
whardcastle@senate.ucsf.edu

APPENDICES

- [Appendix 1](#): Communication from the Task Force Reviewing APM Policies Related to Work and Family and the suggested changes to the Academic Personnel Manual Sections 133-17, 210-1, 220, and 760.
- [Appendix 2](#): Changes to Divisional Bylaw 110(A) increasing the number of members on the Committee on Academic Personnel from seven to nine.
- [Appendix 3](#): Letter from CAP to the EVC (11/17/04) regarding the grant application process within the Institutes.
- [Appendix 4](#): Letter from CAP to the EVC (01/05/05) regarding the use of all faculty series by all UCSF schools.
- [Appendix 5](#): Letter from CAP to the EVC (01/05/05) regarding the conflict of interest of Associate Deans in peer review.
- [Appendix 6](#): Letter from CAP to the EVC (02/14/05) regarding department faculty voting details
- [Appendix 7](#): Letter from CAP to the AVC (05/26/05) regarding the School of Nursing's "Guidelines for Appointments and Promotion in the Clinical Professorial Series Salaried."
- [Appendix 8](#): Letter from CAP to the AVC (06/01/05) regarding authorship of Chair's letter when the Chair is the subject of an action.
- [Appendix 9](#): Distinction in Teaching: List of Nominees, Selection Committee Members, and Award Ceremony Program (04/28/05).
- [Appendix 10](#): Minutes and recommendations of the Committee for Collaborative Research Evaluation (06/02/05).
- [Appendix 11](#): Minutes of the CAP Retreat (05/11/05).