



## Committee on Academic Personnel 2005-06 Annual Report

**Joel Karliner, MD**  
**Chair**

During the 2005-06 academic year, the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) met as a Committee on 38 occasions and reviewed 385 files for appointments, promotions, merits, appraisals, five-year reviews, changes in series as well as multiple, ongoing stewardship reviews.

Statistical data for CAP 2005-06 reviews break down as follows:

Total files reviewed	385
Merits	102
Promotions	161
Change In Series	57
Appraisals	22
Accelerations	61
Decelerations	40
Merit to Step 6 reviews	47
Merit to Above Scale	6
Files involving additional information	21
Ad Hoc Committees formed	28

The Committee was also requested by UCSF Academic Senate Chair Greenspan to review and to reply with comment to the White Papers Regarding Scholarly Communication from the Academic Council’s Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (SCSC). UCSF Academic Senate Chair Greenspan also requested that CAP participate on two task forces reviewing and commenting on the changes to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) proposed by UCAP and transmitted from the Academic Council to the campuses for comment.

The Task Force Reviewing APM 220-18-b(4) examined the proposed changes to the APM related to advancement to Step VI and Above Scale in the Professor Ladder Rank series and was chaired by CAP Vice Chair (and UCAP Vice Chair) Mary Croughan. The Task Force Reviewing APMs 700, 710, 711 and 080 examined the proposed changes related to paid sick leave, reasonable accommodation, medical separation, and constructive resignation, and was chaired by CAP Member and UCAP Representative Margaret Walsh.

During the 2005-06 year, the Committee was addressed by other Academic Senate Committees regarding campus issues regarding academic personnel. The Committee on Equal Opportunity addressed two meetings of the Committee on Academic Personnel regarding the changes to APM

sections 210, 240, and 245 regarding diversity and equal opportunity, which became effective July 1, 2005. The Committee on Library addressed the Committee on Academic Personnel regarding the issues of scholarly communication facing the Library and the University, and the issues of the role and form of scholarly communication in the academic personnel review process.

The Committee on Academic Personnel also held an annual retreat bringing together the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Sally Marshall, the Director of Academic Affairs Cynthia Lynch Leathers, and academic personnel representatives from each of the four schools. At this retreat, CAP and attendees discussed issues including Department Chairs' letters, accelerated advancement, the prevalence of "unavoidable administrative delays," grant scores relative to pay lines, the mentoring of Department Chairs, dissemination of creative activity, changes in series, appraisals, conflicts of interest, teaching and the Professional Research series, the soon-to-be implemented Project Scientist series, CAP review of new appointments at the Assistant rank, the new hire checklist, the educator's portfolio, and teaching evaluations.

Through UCAP representative Margaret Walsh, and CAP Member and UCAP Vice Chair Mary Croughan, UCSF CAP considered and provided feedback on a variety of academic personnel issues being addressed at the systemwide level. Among the issues discussed by CAP and UCAP were the evaluation of the role of the collaborative researcher, the level of review for "barrier step" advancements to Step 6 and Above Scale, the issue of teaching in the Professional Research series, the use of the Project Scientist series at other campuses, and proposed revisions to the APM regarding sick leave, reasonable accommodation, medical separation, and constructive resignation.

The Committee was responsible for forming the Distinction In Teaching Award Selection Committee, chaired by CAP Member Peter Wright, and honoring the two recipients for 2005-06. This year's recipients of the Distinction in Teaching Award were Marieke Kruidering-Hall, PhD (Category 1) and Michael McMaster, PhD (Category 2).

## **Systemwide Issues**

Through UCAP representative Margaret Walsh, and with the additional contribution of UCSF CAP Member and UCAP Vice Chair Mary Croughan, the Committee discussed the following Systemwide issues:

### **Evaluation of the Collaborative Researcher in the Academic Personnel Review Process**

While UCAP was addressing this issue at the Systemwide level, it did so with the benefit of the experience of UCSF faculty members Mary Croughan and Margaret Walsh. UCSF CAP had addressed this issue during the 2004-05 year. CAP addressed the issue of evaluation of independence for the collaborative researcher by working together with AVC Marshall, the Office of Academic Affairs, the relevant Deans in each school, and following the recommendations of the Chancellor's Committee for Collaborative Research Evaluation ([Appendix 1](#)). Department Chairs have been advised to describe clearly in their letters the independent contributions made by candidates to the collaborative research effort. CAP notes that this practice has been widely adopted by the Department Chairs, although such information remains absent in some instances.

## **Review of Step VI and Above Scale as “Barrier Steps” in the Academic Review Process**

UCAP discussion and evaluation of the academic personnel review practices and criteria for advancement to Step VI and Above Scale at all UC campuses resulted in proposed changes to the Academic Personnel Manual section 220-18-4(b). UCAP Vice Chair Mary Croughan presented these proposed changes to UCSF CAP. UCAP submitted these proposed modifications to Academic Council, who passed them on to the campuses for comment.

## **Teaching in the Research Series**

APM Section 310 regarding the Professional Research Series is unclear as to whether faculty with appointments in the Professional Research series are not required to teach but may be allowed to do so, or whether faculty with appointments in the Professional Research series are prohibited from teaching. The relevant language in APM 310 reads “Appointees with Professional Research titles do not have teaching responsibilities.”

UCAP is continuing its discussion of its interpretation of this language and has not yet reached a consensus or a recommendation. At the local level, UCSF CAP addressed this issue at its annual CAP Retreat with AVC Marshall and the academic affairs representatives present at the retreat and devised a means of resolving the issue on this campus. This resolution is discussed in the retreat portion of this Annual Report.

## **Project Scientist Series**

UCAP discussed the use of the Project Scientist series at other UC campuses. Through its campus representatives, UCAP recommended the use of the Project Scientist series at all campuses with health sciences schools as it alleviates the difficulty in evaluating non-independent researchers who may currently hold appointments in the Professional Research series. APM 310 speaks to the Professional Research series. APM 311 addresses the Project Scientist series. The Project Scientist series does not have teaching responsibilities and does not require independence in research.

## **Review of APM Section V- Benefits and Privileges**

UCAP reviewed Section V of the Academic Personnel Manual and recommended modifications to APM 700, 710, 711 and proposed a new section 080. The modifications addressed sick leave, reasonable accommodation, medical separation, and constructive resignation. UCAP Representative Margaret Walsh presented and explained the reasons behind these modifications to UCSF CAP. UCAP submitted these proposed modifications to Academic Council, who passed them on to the campuses for comment.

## **Campus Issues**

The Committee reviewed and acted upon the following campus issues:

## **Contributions to Divisional Responses to Systemwide Issues**

The Committee was asked to provide comment to UCSF Academic Senate Chair Greenspan on three issues submitted to the campus by the systemwide Academic Council.

- CAP Vice Chair Mary Croughan served as the CAP Representative and chaired the Task Force Reviewing APM 220-18-b(4) (related to regarding advancement to Step VI and Above Scale in the Professor, Ladder Rank series). The Communication from this Task Force is attached as [Appendix 2](#).
- Margaret Walsh served as the CAP representative and chaired the Task Force Reviewing APMs 700, 710, 711 and 080 (related to paid sick leave, reasonable accommodation, medical separation, and constructive resignation). The Communication from this Task Force is attached as [Appendix 3](#).
- CAP reviewed and provided comment to UCSF Senate Chair Greenspan on the White Papers on Scholarly Communication from the Academic Council Special Committee on Scholarly Communication ([Appendix 4](#)).

## **Dissemination of Creative Activity in Electronic Media**

The Committee heard a presentation from Tom Newman, Chair of the Committee on Library, and Karen Butter, University Librarian, regarding issues of scholarly communication, electronic avenues of dissemination of creative activity, and academic review. On January 31, the Committee sent a communication ([Appendix 5](#)) to AVC Marshall expressing the following:

It has come to the attention of the Committee on Academic Personnel that, in the future, publication in electronic or open access journals may constitute an increasing proportion of faculty members' bibliographies. CAP wishes to emphasize that publication in such electronic or online journals will be considered in the same light as publication in traditional print journals. As with the latter, open access journals will be viewed in the light of their peer review processes and standing in their particular field of scholarship.

This position was endorsed by AVC Marshall, who was also present for the presentation from T. Newman and K. Butter.

## **Consultation to Committee on Equal Opportunity (EQOP) Regarding Response to Changes of APMs 210, 240 and 245**

Francis Lu, Chair of the Academic Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity, addressed the Committee on Academic Personnel regarding EQOP's proposed response to the changes to APMs 210, 240, and 245 pertaining to Affirmative Action Guidelines regarding Appointment and Promotion within the University of California. F. Lu provided the Committee with a series of spreadsheets which EQOP proposed to assist monitoring bodies and faculty promotion and tenure committees in abiding by the recommendations of the modified APMs. These tracking documents included campus-level action steps, school-level action steps, Department-level action steps, and faculty-level action steps.

CAP reviewed these sheets with Chair Lu and informally voiced their support for such mechanisms, but also expressed concerns with the logistical practicality of imposing these tracking sheets into the already complicated process.

## **CAP Retreat**

During the annual CAP Retreat, CAP met with Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs Sally Marshall, Director of Academic Personnel Cynthia Leathers and the Academic Affairs representatives from each of the four schools and to discuss issues regarding academic personnel review process.

The representatives from Academic Affairs were B. Alldredge, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs, School of Pharmacy; C. Damsky, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs, School of Dentistry; D. Ferriero, Vice Dean, Academic Affairs, School of Medicine; Z. Mirsky, Associate Dean, Administration, School of Nursing; and R. Navarro, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs, School of Medicine.

### **Accelerated Advancement Criteria and Related Issues**

The Committee discussed five issues regarding accelerated advancement:

#### **1. Deans' Oversight for Stated Reasons in Chair's Letter**

The UCSF Guidelines for Accelerated Advancement ([Appendix 6](#)) require that the Department Chair's letter provide an express justification for the accelerated action. The Guidelines read, "A dossier proposing accelerated advancement should always include a discussion of the reasons for the action."

CAP requested that the oversight for this requirement be assumed by the Dean's office, and if the justification is absent from the Chair's letter, the Dean should return the file to the department for correction before the file is sent on to CAP. The Deans agreed that this should be the practice.

#### **2. Justifications for Accelerated Advancement**

The Committee reviewed the justifications for accelerated advancement as stated in the UCSF Guidelines for Accelerated Advancement. The Guidelines read as follows:

Criteria:

1. Exceptional performance is defined as work that exceeds departmental expectations in one or more of the following categories: teaching, research or other creative activities, professional competence and activities, and University and public service.
2. In addition, the faculty member being considered for acceleration must meet departmental criteria for advancement in all other categories of evaluation.

Examples of Exceptional Performance:

1. Award of a prestigious, competitive grant representing achievement beyond that expected for advancement within the individual's academic series.
2. Receipt of a competitive professional service award to recognize outstanding national or international contribution to the profession, to a discipline, or to professional education.
3. A sustained level of outstanding achievement over a period of years in one or more of the four categories listed above, i.e., exceptional teaching evaluations, teaching awards, or service to the University and/or the public that is far and above that of expectations.
4. Unusual productivity in publishing original work in scholarly, peer-reviewed publications exceeding those expectations normally held for the individual's academic series.
5. Extraordinary service or development of innovative programs that further the fundamental missions of the Department, School, or the University.

The Committee discussed justifications for accelerated advancement with the academic affairs representatives present. AVC Marshall commented on her reluctance to advance packets with a stellar research record, but poor teaching evaluations. CAP has noticed in its reviews that the School of Medicine often appears to accelerate basic scientists as a way to bridge the salary gap. AVC Marshall has data indicating that it is not uncommon for other campuses to be paying 50% off scale. Furthermore, it is the junior faculty who are more likely to be off scale. According to AVC Marshall, the largest discrepancy seems to be at the Associate level and during the first few years of professorship.

### **3. Retention and Accelerated Advancement**

The Committee noted that this year there has been some confusion regarding retention as an acceptable justification for accelerated advancement. Based on discussions at the CAP retreat in 2005, CAP understood that they were expressly prohibited from considering retention issues for matters of advancement or accelerated advancement. However, the UCSF Guidelines for Accelerated Advancement state that "Accelerated advancement may be proposed as a retention strategy when a highly-valued faculty member is being recruited elsewhere."

Where retention is concerned, AVC Marshall stated that retention can be a reason to consider the packet; however, the candidate must be exceptional and retention cannot be a stand-alone reason. AVC Marshall also agreed to revise the [Annual Call for Academic Personnel Actions and Academic Appraisal](http://acpers.ucsf.edu/acapers/annualcall.php) (<http://acpers.ucsf.edu/acapers/annualcall.php>) to reflect this policy. The Committee queried as to whether the general practice of the Schools and the departments should be to encourage acceleration. AVC Marshall expressed that she believed that departments should be encouraged to accelerate faculty when warranted, and that faculty need to be made more aware of the possibility.

AVC Marshall agreed to revise the Annual Call for Academic Personnel Actions and Academic Appraisal to clarify criteria related to accelerated advancement when retention of faculty is the reason for the personnel action.

#### **4. Inconsistency of Policy by Some Department Chairs**

The Committee has noted that policies or practices for submitting a faculty member for an accelerated advancement have often been applied inconsistently amongst various UCSF departments. Chair Karliner requested that there be some institution of uniformity by the Deans to at least cover these points and ensure that Department Chairs be made aware of these issues.

#### **5. Gender Bias for Accelerated Advancement**

The Committee has observed that for files which have been submitted for accelerated advancement, more packets are submitted for male than for female faculty members. The Committee speculates that for the cases wherein a female candidate has submitted her packet for accelerated advancement, the female candidate has a male counterpart with an appointment with the University who may have made this option known to her. CAP is concerned about possible gender bias at the department level regarding encouragement of faculty to apply for an acceleration when appropriate.

School of Medicine Vice Dean for Academic Affairs D. Ferriero indicated that she would provide AVC Marshall with statistics related to accelerated advancement by gender and minority in the School of Medicine.

#### **Frequency and Concentration of “Unfortunate or Unavoidable Administrative Delays”**

The Committee discussed the frequency and concentration of “unfortunate or unavoidable administrative delays” as the reason for an action’s late submission, deceleration, or retroaction. The Committee also noted the frequency of such language in packets submitted from a specific department. D. Ferriero responded that she has addressed this issue with the department in question and that CAP should see an improvement in this shortly. She also reported that, this year, her office is sending out lists to all departments indicating what files they are expecting and which ones they have not yet received. She is hoping this practice will reduce the number packets with delays.

#### **Department Inclusion of Grant Scores Relative to Pay Lines For Review**

While grants and extramural funding are not required by the APM for advancement, it can be an indicator of independence, professional competence and creative activity. However in the current national fiscal climate, many grant applications which would have been successful are now being denied. To assist faculty members who face this challenge, CAP members suggested that such candidates include their grant scores, relative to pay lines, with their academic personnel packets for review and consideration by CAP and the Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. Regarding the imminent problem of people not getting funding, AVC Marshall suggested taking this issue to Executive Vice Chancellor Gene Washington so that he can forward these concerns to the Chancellor’s Executive Committee. The group as a whole was supportive about including the grant scores in the packet.

AVC Marshall agreed and will revise the call to reflect this change and communicate this area of concern to Executive Vice Chancellor Gene Washington so that he can forward these concerns to the Chancellor’s Executive Committee.

### **Mentoring of Department Chairs**

During regular review of academic personnel files, CAP has noted that there are several areas in which Department Chairs might benefit from additional mentoring by the Dean's Office, the Office of the Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, or the Committee on Academic Personnel. Faculty new to the position of Department Chair would particularly benefit from such mentoring. Suggested mentoring topics included:

1. Specific items to include in the Chair's letter, particularly an explanation of independent contributions to collaborative research, justification for accelerated advancement, and the relevance and significance of dissemination venues should they be esoteric or niche (print or electronic) publication venues.
2. How CAP functions, its overall role, and how it fits into the packet review process.

The suggestion was made to invite new Department Chairs to observe several CAP meetings in order to become familiar with the process. AVC Marshall agreed that this was a good idea and will work with CAP in 2006-07 to determine the feasibility of such a program.

### **Dissemination of Creative Activity: Avenues and Recommendations**

As set forth in APM 210, the four criteria by which a candidate is evaluated are (1) teaching, (2) research and other creative work, (3) professional activity and (4) University and public service. CAP has expressed its support for electronic and open-access avenues for dissemination of creative work (see the Communication from the Committee on Academic Personnel dated January 31, 2006, [Appendix 5](#)). The Committee would also like to make sure that Department Chairs and faculty are aware that for the Professor and Clinical X series, evidence of dissemination of creative work can include an array of options in addition to hypothesis-driven works, such as reviews, case studies, clinical Web sites, teaching materials and methodology, presentations, books, and book chapters.

This sentence will be added to the online CV guidelines as well as to the Faculty Handbook for Success, Advancement and Promotion at UCSF (<http://www.ucsf.edu/senate/facultyhandbook/>).

### **CAP Suggestions for Change In Series and Possible Financial Implications**

AVC Marshall expressed concern that when CAP suggests a change of series, departments are reluctant to do so due to actual or potential fiscal impact. The fundamental question becomes: would the faculty member prefer to be in the wrong series or potentially not to have a position? Most attendees agreed that this issue is not easy to resolve. AVC Marshall requested clarification as to whether the letters from CAP recommending a change in series are actual recommendations or just observations. Chair Karliner responded that generally they are CAP's observations unless expressly recommended. AVC Marshall requested clarification on whether an approved change in series recommendation needs to come back to CAP. Chair Karliner clarified that in instances when CAP has recommended the change in series and it is granted, that the packet does not need to return to CAP.



### **Appraisals: “Favorable” Versus “Favorable But Qualified”**

The AVC Marshall expressed her concern regarding files received from CAP in the cases where CAP has served as its own ad hoc and given a faculty member a “favorable” rating but has also included a list of areas that need to be addressed by the faculty member in order to achieve tenure. AVC Marshall indicated that when she receives these types of files, she will change the ranking to “Favorable But Qualified.” CAP agreed to recommend a rating of “Favorable but Qualified” for candidates for whom they recommend areas for improvement.

### **Conflict of Interest: Dean’s Letters and Chair’s Letters**

The Committee noted that from time to time, a Dean’s Letter or Department Chair’s letter may be drafted by someone who has collaborated or published with the candidate being reviewed. The Committee is concerned that this may represent a conflict of interest and should be avoided. AVC Marshall expressed concern with collaborations that occurred many years ago and whether those should be considered a conflict. The group discussed at what point a collaboration would no longer be considered a conflict. The group jointly decided that a collaboration which occurred more than five years ago will no longer constitute a conflict.

### **Clarification of Teaching in the Research Series**

The Committee has been operating with the understanding that not only is teaching not required but also prohibited for those with appointments in the Professional Research series. The language in APM 310 is not expressly clear, as it states that: “Appointees with Professional Research titles do not have teaching responsibilities.” The question is: does this mean that those in the Professional Research series are not required to teach, but may do so if they wish; or does this mean that those in the Professional Research series do not teach, should not teach, and are prohibited from teaching? M. Croughan, Vice-Chair of CAP and Vice-Chair of UCAP, reported that this has been a discussion systemwide, and that the other Divisional CAPs have been operating with the understanding that those in the Professional Research series are prohibited from teaching. The opinion at UCAP is that those persons meeting the criteria for the Professional Research series, but with an interest or assignment in teaching, are better suited to the Adjunct series which allows for an imbalance in areas of review and allows teaching.

The group discussed the nuances of “teaching.” For example, laboratory mentoring or a workshop need not be considered teaching. The fundamental problem is that persons in the Research series, are supposed to be 100% supported by grants. Failure to do so could expose the University to an NIH audit. The group acknowledged that many add their teaching responsibilities to their CVs because they want to showcase these skills. B. Alldredge reported that he insists candidates remove these references or fill out the paperwork for WOS status for a secondary appointment into the Adjunct series. The group agreed that this needs to be the practice and the Deans will begin offering additional WOS Adjunct appointments to members of the Professional Research Series who wish to teach.

### **Future Implications of the Project Scientist Series**

At the systemwide level, UCAP has been in discussion regarding the Project Scientist Series. C. Lynch-Leathers reported that this series will be in effect at UCSF starting July 1. The Office of Academic

Affairs is currently drafting procedures for the roll out. Until otherwise instructed, CAP agreed to review actions in the Project Scientist Series the same way they review the Research series.

### **CAP Review of New Appointments at the Assistant Level**

The Committee discussed the possibility of CAP reviewing all new appointments at the Assistant level. Concerns and issues included whether this type of review would be redundant and how effective it would really be. AVC Marshall commented that during her tenure on CAP, they tried this level of review and it greatly affected efficiency. CAP found the contrary to be the case and opted to decline review at Steps 1 and 2.

### **File Review Process When New Hire Checklist Is Absent**

CAP has been reviewing files for new appointments and noting the inclusion or exclusion of the New Hire Checklist and whether the checklist has been signed by all required parties. The Committee does not know what the proper procedure is when it receives a file in which the New Hire Checklist is absent. The Vice Deans expressed to CAP that they would like the file returned if the New Hire Checklist is not included.

### **Use of the Educator's Portfolio**

The Committee discussed the role of the Educator's Portfolio in the academic review process. The Committee noted that the information contained therein is also called for in the recommend CV format, and that the inclusion of the Educator's Portfolio in addition to a CV is redundant and may be avoided. The main issue with portfolios is the amount of time they require from the reviewer. D. Ferriero commented that since so much work has been put into the portfolio that they should be included and CAP can do what it likes with the portfolio. M. Croughan, who is a member of the Academy of Medical Educators, agrees that creation of the portfolio is laborious. However, she debates the necessity for CAP to review these portfolios. M. Croughan and C. Lynch-Leathers informed the group that some faculty are encouraging others to create a portfolio. CAP accepted that Educator's Portfolios will still be submitted, but asked that materials in the files not be redundant.

### **Inconsistent Scoring Scales for Teaching Evaluations**

Although the Committee recognizes that neither this Committee nor the representatives of the administration present have any control over this issue, the Committee would like to discuss the issues which arise from different schools using different methods for evaluating teaching. AVC Marshall agreed to look into the inconsistencies as the academic personnel review process moves online.

### **Reviewing Agencies**

D. Ferriero queried the group to determine who constitutes "the reviewing bodies" as stated in the letters from Academic Affairs. AVC Marshall responded that the reviewing bodies are: Academic Affairs, the school, and CAP. D. Ferriero requested that as a reviewing body, she would like to see the school's comments in the letters as well. AVC Marshall was amenable to this request. AVC Marshall will include comments from the School's reviewing agencies in her final letters.

## **Matters for Review/Consideration in 2006-07**

- Continued review of personnel actions, Five-Year reviews, and Stewardship reviews.
- Implementation of the Project Scientist Series.
- Mentoring of Department Chairs.

**Respectfully submitted,**

### **Committee on Academic Personnel**

Joel Karliner, MD, Chair

Mary Croughan, PhD, Vice-Chair

Claire Brett, MD,

James Cleaver, PhD

Erika Froelicher, RN, PhD, FAAN

Rita Redberg, MD

Thomas Scanlan, PhD

Margaret Walsh, RDH, EdD

Peter Wright, MD, PhD

Prepared by:

Wilson Hardcastle

Senate Analyst

415-476-4245

whardcastle@senate.ucsf.edu

## Appendices

- [Appendix 1:](#) Minutes from the Chancellor's Committee for Collaborative Research Evaluation, June 2, 2005.
- [Appendix 2:](#) Communication from the Task Force Reviewing APM 220-18-b(4) (related to regarding advancement to Step VI and Above Scale in the Professor, Ladder Rank series).
- [Appendix 3:](#) Communication from the Task Force Reviewing APMs 700, 710, 711 and 080 (related to paid sick leave, reasonable accommodation, medical separation, and constructive resignation).
- [Appendix 4:](#) Communication from the Committee on Academic Personnel (March 15, 2006) to UCSF Senate Chair Greenspan Commenting on the White Papers Regarding Scholarly Communication..
- [Appendix 5:](#) Communication from the Committee on Academic Personnel (January 31, 2006) to Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Sally Marshall Supporting Electronic Venues for Dissemination of Creative Work.
- [Appendix 6:](#) UCSF Guidelines for Accelerated Advancement.



## Communication from the Task Force Reviewing APM 220-18-b(4) Mary Croughan, PhD, Chair

March 7, 2006

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS  
UCSF Academic Senate Chair  
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Dear Chair Greenspan,

The Task Force Reviewing Proposed Changes to APM 220-18-b(4) regarding advancement to Step VI and Above Scale in the Professor, Ladder Rank series was comprised of the Chairs of the Faculty Councils from all four Schools and myself as Vice Chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel. The Task Force solicited responses from each Faculty Council, who in turned solicited responses from their respective faculty. In addition to this review, the UCSF Committee on Academic Personnel reviewed the proposed changes to APM 220-18-b(4). Both CAP and the Task Force recommend approval of the changes as modified by UCAP on February 7, 2006. The approved modifications read as follows:

APM 220-18-b

(4) Professor: The normal period of service at step is three years in each of the first four steps. Service at Step V may be of indefinite duration. Advancement to Step VI usually will not occur after fewer than three years of service at Step V, involves a career review, and will be granted on evidence of sustained excellence in scholarship or creative achievement, University teaching, and service. In addition, great academic distinction recognized nationally or internationally, will be required. Service at Professor Step VI or higher may be of indefinite duration. Advancement from Professor Step VI to Step VII, from Step VII to Step VIII, and from Step VIII to Step IX usually will not occur after fewer than three years of service at the lower step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step VI.

These proposed changes were ultimately submitted by the Task Force with the support of CAP to the Coordinating Committee on February 21, 2006, who unanimously voted to approve these modifications.

The Task Force respectfully submits the approval of these modifications to you for submission to the Academic Council.

### Task Force Reviewing Proposed Changes to APM 220-18-b(4)

Mary Croughan, PhD, Chair, CAP Vice Chair  
Betty Davies, RN, PhD, FAAN, Chair of the School of Nursing Faculty Council  
Peter Loomer, DDS, PhD, Chair of the School of Dentistry Faculty Council  
Matt Jacobson, PhD, Chair of the School of Pharmacy Faculty Council  
Daniel Bikle, MD, PhD, Chair of the School of Medicine Faculty Council



## Communication from the Task Force Reviewing Proposed Changes to APM 700, 710, 711, and 080 Margaret Walsh, RDH, MS, EdD, Chair

Deborah Greenspan, DSc,BDS  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate  
Campus Box 0764

June 2, 2006

RE: Proposed Revisions to APM -700, Leaves of Absence/General and APM -710 Leaves of Absence/Sick Leave; Proposed new APM -711, Reasonable Accommodation for Academic Appointees with Disabilities and Proposed new APM -080, Medical Separation

Dear Chair Greenspan:

During the week of May 29, 2006 the Task Force Reviewing Proposed Changes to APM 700, 710, 711, and 080 formally reviewed proposed changes to APM – 700, Leaves of Absence/General and APM – 710 Leaves of Absence/Sick Leave. We also reviewed the proposed new policies APM – 711, Reasonable Accommodation for Academic Appointees with Disabilities and APM – 080, Medical Separation. Due to scheduling challenges this discussion took place electronically. The Task Force consisted of the two members from each school’s Faculty Council and two members from the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). Margaret Walsh, Member of the Committee on Academic Personnel, served as Chair of the Task Force.

The Task Force supports the proposed changes and additions with the following comments or exceptions:

1. APM 700: We understand that, currently, if a faculty member decides not to return without leave approval, he/she can continue to receive salary for up to one year as the process takes about one year to terminate a faculty member, even though failure to show up for assigned duties is cause for termination. The inclusion of the concept of “constructive resignation” is meant to alleviate the costs and frustration experienced by this salary loophole—that a faculty member may continue to be paid but who by choice (not for health reasons or for a family crisis) has decided not to show up for assigned duties and does not formally resign. Given this intent, the Task Force recommends the following:

That the language in the first sentence of APM 700 be modified to specify a set period of time (e.g., no more than 60 days). Without a specified time, this sentence reads as if a faculty member who takes a day off without securing prior approval could risk dismissal. Specifically, the Task Force recommends the following modification (bold) of the first sentence: “If an academic appointee is absent **for more than 60 days from assigned duties** without an approved leave or does not return to assigned duties after an approved leave **for that period of time**, the University may presume that the academic appointee has resigned from his or her appointment with the University.” (Again, “60 days” is only an *exempli gratia* and not an assertion of the Task Force.)

2. As faculty at UCSF are covered by the Health Sciences Compensation Plan and not by the provisions of APM 710, the Task Force makes no comments or recommendations regarding this section.

3. APM 711-0-a Policy, line 4: The Task Force recommends that the University specify at what level it will participate in the interactive process. For example, should it be at the level of Disability Management, Faculty Relations, and/or the Division of Occupational Health? This recommendation also applies to APM 711-5 The Interactive Process, lines 2 and 4.
4. APM 711-80b, line 15: The APM should specify a resolution mechanism in the event that the recommendations of the appointee's healthcare provider are inconsistent with the University-selected healthcare provider.
5. APM 080-0 Policy, line 5: The term "reasonable period of time" needs to be specified. The Task Force recommends a timeframe of three (3) to twelve (12) months.
6. APM 080-1 Basis for Medical Separation Review, Paragraph 1: The Task Force recommends the disability management office be involved early in the process, as opposed to at the end with the medical separation review. The disability management office should to be involved before medical separation is even considered.
7. APM 080-1, Paragraph 3: Regarding the statement, "A medical separation review also may be initiated based on notice of approval of disability income from a retirement system to which the University contributes or approval of University long-term disability insurance benefits": The issue of medical separation initiation and approval of disability income or long-term disability insurance benefits may be a deterrent to individuals deciding to go out on disability. This language should be clarified, as some may perceive these approvals to be a step toward medical separation, even though in some cases it might be warranted.
8. APM 080-1-b, Line 1: The Task Force recommends review by the Chair, Dean, *and* Unit Head. We also suggest oversight by The Committee on Privilege and Tenure as medical separation may involve loss of tenure for a faculty member.

The Task Force appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on these proposed APM modifications.

Yours sincerely,

**THE TASK FORCE REVIEWING PROPOSED CHANGES TO APM 700, 710, 711, AND 080**

Margaret Walsh, RDH, MS, EdD, Committee on Academic Personnel, Chair of the Task Force

Claire Brett, MD, Committee on Academic Personnel

Fritz Fizen, DDS, School of Dentistry Faculty Council

Caroline Shiboski, DDS, MPH, PhD, School of Dentistry Faculty Council

Hugo Quin Chang, MD, School of Medicine Faculty Council

Lawrence Pitts, MD, School of Medicine Faculty Council

Mary Engler, PhD, RN, MS, FAHA, School of Nursing Faculty Council

Jean Ann Seago, PhD, RN, School of Nursing Faculty Council

Matthew P. Jacobson, PhD, School of Pharmacy Faculty Council

Norman Oppenheimer, PhD, School of Pharmacy Faculty Council



## Communication from the Committee on Academic Personnel Joel Karliner, MD, Chair, School of Medicine

March 15, 2006

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, DBS  
UCSF Academic Chair  
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Dear Chair Greenspan,

On March 15, 2006, the Committee on Academic Personnel reviewed the white papers *Responding to the Challenges of Scholarly Communication*, and supports these policies with the following comments:

Regarding *Evaluation of Electronic Publications in the Academic Review Process*:

In section 2.a, the requirement as to referees is unclear. It may be that this refers to the editorial board. For individual issues or articles, the identities of referees are nearly always confidential and would not, and in most cases should not, be indicated. It should be explicit that any required list of referees should not be linked to individual articles.

It is already the practice of CAP to consider electronic publications in the academic review process. CAP equally values press, electronic and open source publications and asserts that electronic dissemination of creative activity is considered equivalent to print dissemination. CAP notes that the consideration of electronic publications has been a topic at UCAP; all campuses appear to be valuing electronic publications as equivalent to printed publications.

CAP believes it can evaluate electronic publications as easily as press publications. Impact factor remains the best metric. CAP maintains that Chair and/or Department letters submitted during the academic personnel process should indicate the relevance and quality of candidates' dissemination venues should they be esoteric or narrowly-focused.

Regarding the issues of copyright:

CAP believes that individual authors should not be put in the position to negotiate copyright individually with publishers. There should be a University responsibility or the University should provide the support mechanisms and the strength of the collective University for such negotiations.

### Committee on Academic Personnel

Joel Karliner, MD, Chair, School of Medicine  
Mary Croughan, PhD, Vice-Chair, School of Medicine  
Claire Brett, MD, Member, School of Medicine  
James Cleaver, PhD, Member, School of Medicine  
Erika Froelicher, RN, PhD, FAAN, Member, School of Nursing  
Rita Redberg, MD, Member, School of Medicine  
Thomas Scanlan, PhD, Member, School of Pharmacy  
Margaret Walsh, RDH, EdD, Member, School of Dentistry





## **Communication from the Committee on Academic Personnel**

January 31, 2006

Sally Marshall, PhD  
Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs  
C-116, Box 0652  
San Francisco, CA 94143-0652

**RE: Committee on Academic Personnel Position on Electronic and Open Access Publications**

Dear Dr. Marshall,

It has come to the attention of the Committee on Academic Personnel that, in the future, publication in electronic or open access journals may constitute an increasing proportion of faculty members' bibliographies. CAP wishes to emphasize that publication in such electronic or online journals will be considered in the same light as publication in traditional print journals. As with the latter, open access journals will be viewed in the light of their peer review processes and standing in their particular field of scholarship.

Sincerely,

### **Committee on Academic Personnel**

Joel Karliner, MD, Chair, School of Medicine  
Mary Croughan, PhD, Vice-Chair, School of Medicine  
Claire Brett, MD, Member, School of Medicine  
James Cleaver, PhD, Member, School of Medicine  
Erika Froelicher, RN, PhD, FAAN, Member, School of Nursing  
Rita Redberg, MD, Member, School of Medicine  
Thomas Scanlan, PhD, Member, School of Pharmacy  
Margaret Walsh, RDH, EdD, Member, School of Dentistry  
Peter Wright, MD, PhD, Member, School of Medicine

## UCSF Guidelines for Accelerated Advancement

Accelerated advancement is an important form of recognition that rewards faculty who perform at an exceptional level over a sustained period. Within this context, “accelerated advancement” means merit increases or promotions that are awarded one or more years earlier than the normal, *on-time* schedule for such advancements.

Merits that are accelerated by more than one year, as well as promotion to the next rank, must be submitted to the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) for review. Merits that are accelerated by one year are reviewed at the Department level and do not require review by CAP. All advancements, both normal and accelerated, are subject to approval by the Dean and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

### Normal, On-Time Schedules for Advancement

At UCSF, advancement from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, Step I normally occurs after 6 or 7 years at the rank of Assistant Professor, or 2 years of service at Step IV. Advancement from Associate Professor to Professor, Step I normally occurs after 6 years at rank or 2 years of service at Associate Professor Step III. The normal period between each step is 2 years for Assistant and Associate Professors and 3 years for Professors. This time schedule is the same for salaried faculty in all series.

### Guidelines for Accelerated Advancement

A recommendation for acceleration is usually made following review of a faculty member’s performance by departmental faculty at a peer review meeting. Any member of the faculty, including the department chair, may propose that a particular faculty member be evaluated for accelerated advancement. Additionally, any member of the faculty can request that his or her name be placed in consideration for accelerated advancement. Such requests should be made in writing to the department chair and submitted before the date of the peer review meeting.

#### For Department Chairs

Accelerated advancement may be proposed as a retention strategy when a highly-valued faculty member is being recruited elsewhere. In this circumstance, the faculty member must still meet standards for *exceptional* performance. A dossier proposing accelerated advancement should always include a discussion of the reasons for the action.

#### Criteria:

- *Exceptional* performance is defined as work that exceeds departmental expectations in one or more of the following categories: teaching, research or other creative activities, professional competence and activities, and University and public service.
- In addition, the faculty member being considered for acceleration must meet departmental criteria for advancement in all other categories of evaluation.

#### Examples of Exceptional Performance:

- Award of a prestigious, competitive grant representing achievement beyond that expected for advancement within the individual’s academic series.
- Receipt of a competitive professional service award to recognize outstanding national or international contribution to the profession, to a discipline, or to professional education.
- A sustained level of outstanding achievement over a period of years in one or more of the four categories listed above, i.e., exceptional teaching evaluations, teaching awards, or service to the University and/or the public that is far and above that of expectations.
- Unusual productivity in publishing original work in scholarly, peer-reviewed publications exceeding those expectations normally held for the individual’s academic series.
- Extraordinary service or development of innovative programs that further the fundamental missions of the Department, School, or the University.



ACADEMIC SENATE

**CAP Meeting Attendance Record – 2005-2006 Academic Year**

MEMBERS	09/07/05	09/14/05	09/21/05	09/28/05	10/5/05	10/12/05	10/19/05	10/26/05	11/02/05	11/09/05	11/16/05 Canceled	11/23/05	11/30/05
Joel Karliner, Chair	X	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	X	X
Mary Croughan, Vice Chair	X	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	RSVP'd Absent	Arriving 1:00
Claire Brett	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	Arriving after surgery
Erika Froelicher	RSVP'd Absent	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	Leaving early	X
James Cleaver	X	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent (Illness)	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X
Rita Redberg	X	X	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	RSVP'd Absent	X
Tom Scanlan	X	RSVP'd Absent	RSVP'd Absent	X	RSVP'd Absent	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	RSVP'd Absent	X
Margaret Walsh	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X
Peter Wright	X	X	X	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	X	-	X	RSVP'd Absent

(Continued on next page)

MEMBERS	12/07/05	12/14/05	01/04/06	01/11/06	01/18/06	01/25/06	02/01/06	02/08/06	02/15/06	02/22/06	03/01/06	03/08/06	03/15/06
Joel Karliner, Chair	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	X
Mary Croughan, Vice Chair	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	RSVP'd Absent	X	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	X
Claire Brett	X	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	X	X
Erika Froelicher	RSVP'd Absent	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
James Cleaver	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Rita Redberg	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Tom Scanlan	X	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	X	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	X
Margaret Walsh	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	RSVP'd Absent	X
Peter Wright	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	RSVP'd Absent

(Continued on next page)

MEMBERS	03/22/06	03/29/06	04/05/06	04/12/06	04/19/06	04/26/06	05/03/06	05/10/06	05/17/06	05/24/06 RETREAT	05/31/06	06/14/06	
Joel Karliner, Chair	X	X	X	X	X	DIT	RSVP'd Absent	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	X	X	
Mary Croughan, Vice Chair	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	X	RSVP'd Absent		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Claire Brett	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Erika Froelicher	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	RSVP'd Absent	RSVP'd Absent		RSVP'd Absent	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	X	Sabbatical	
James Cleaver	X	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Rita Redberg	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Tom Scanlan	RSVP'd Absent	Via Phone	X	RSVP'd Absent	X		RSVP'd Absent	X	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	No longer w/ UCSF	
Margaret Walsh	X	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	RSVP'd Absent		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Peter Wright	RSVP'd Absent	X	X	RSVP'd Absent	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	

Senate Staff:  
Wilson Hardcastle  
whardcastle@senate.ucsf.edu  
476-4245  
www.ucsf.edu/senate