

**Committee on Academic Personnel**  
**Russell Pieper, PhD, Chair**

# ANNUAL REPORT 2010-2011

**Total Files Reviewed:** 387 (which represents all that were submitted for review)  
**Stewardship Reviews:** 6 completed, 13 in process

**Statistical Information:**

	10-11	09-10	08-09	07-08
<b>Total Files Reviewed</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>526</b>	<b>424</b>	<b>361</b>
Merits	60	98	87	66
Promotions	162	195	149	151
Accelerations	63	71	57	61
Decelerations	19	23	27	33
Change In Series	57	110	84	53
<b>Ad Hoc Committees</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>
Merits to Step 6	32	47	29	23
Appraisals	27	31	28	26
Merits to Above Scale	5	16	13	6

These numbers are not expected to calculate to the total files reviewed as a file may feature more than one descriptor, and these descriptors do not represent all forms of review.

**Policy Review Items:**

- Technical Changes to the APM
- Process and Policy for Stewardship Reviews
- Policy for Five Year Reviews
- UCSF Policy on Academic Searches and Search Waivers
- Ongoing Design of the Advance System

**Task Forces:**

- Chair Kahl served on the Advance System Steering Committee
- Paul Garcia served on the Task Force on Academic Senate Membership
- Nola Hylton served on the Joint Administration-Academic Senate Task Force to Review, Assess and Revise the Camus Process for Five Year Reviews of Faculty

**Issues for Next Year (2011-2012)**

- Implementation of the Advance System
- Expanding Senate Membership to Include Certain Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical Professors

---

**2010-2011 Members**

**Russell Pieper, Chair** (UCAP Rep) (SOM)  
**Paul Garcia, Vice Chair** (SOM)  
Ann Bolger (SOM)  
Jeanette Brown (SOM)  
Pat Fox (SON)

Stephen Kahl (SOP)  
Art Miller (SOD)  
Jean Olson (SOM)  
Liz Watkins (SOM)  
(Nola Hylton served until Watkin's appointment)

**Number of Meetings: 30**

**Senate Analyst:** Wilson Hardcastle

## Systemwide Business

Regarding system-wide concerns, the Committee (CAP) reviewed and responded to the system-wide Report from the Task Force on Senate Membership. CAP also reviewed and responded to proposed amendments to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM), either as members of a divisional task force or as a committee reviewing matters on behalf of the Division.

### **Task Force on Senate Membership**

As part of the response from the Division, CAP drafted a response to the system-wide Task Force on Senate Membership and submitted it to Division Chair Fuentes Afflick in a communication dated December 15, 2010 ([Appendix 1](#)).

### **System-wide Review of Technical Changes to the APM**

CAP reviewed the [Proposed Technical Revisions](#) to Academic Personnel Policies APM-075, Part III, C. 1, Termination for Incompetent Performance; APM-110-4, Academic Personnel Definitions; APM-140-33(b.)(2.)(a), Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Grievances; APM-230, Visiting Appointments; APM-240, Deans and APM-246, Faculty Administrators (100% Time); APM-240-60 (c.), Deans, Benefits and Privileges, APM-246-60 (b.), Faculty Administrators (100% Time), Benefits and Privileges; and APM-500-16 (c.), Recruitment - General, Restrictions submitted to the San Francisco Division for review and comment (dated February 3, 2011) and sent a communication to the Chair of the Division (dated February 16, 2011) recommending supporting the approval of these proposed modifications ([Appendix 2](#)).

### **UCAP Divisional CAP Activity Survey**

The Committee also responded to the UCAP Divisional CAP Activity Survey which documents local practices of each campus' Committee on Academic Personnel. The UCSF CAP response to this survey is attached as [Appendix 3](#).

## Divisional Business

This year, Members of the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel worked closely with the Vice Provost Academic Affairs Sally Marshall and the Office of Academic Personnel on several policy issues.

### **The Advance System**

Members of the Advance Design gave an informational presentations regarding the developing Advance system for online academic advancement process management. The Committee supports its continued financial support from the University.

### **Distinguished Faculty Awards: The Distinction In Teaching and the Distinction In Mentoring Awards**

This year's Distinction In Teaching Award Selection Committee was Chaired by CAP Member Paul Garcia. The 2010-2011 recipients of the Distinction In Teaching Awards were Kenny Banh, MD, Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor, Emergency Medicine (Category 1) and Timothy Berger, MD, Professor of Clinical Dermatology, Dermatology (Category 2).

This year's Distinction In Mentoring Award Selection Committee was Chaired by CAP member Art Miller. The 2010-2011 recipients of the Distinction In Mentoring Awards were Mallory O. Johnson, PhD, Associate Professor In Residence; Medicine (Category 1) and Jeanette Brown, MD, Professor In Residence; Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Sciences (Category 2).

The poster announcing the awards ceremony is attached as [Appendix 4](#).

### **UCSF Policy on Academic Searches and Search Waivers**

The Committee on Academic Personnel with the VPAA Sally Marshall and Director of OAP Cynthia Lynch Leathers reviewed and provided feedback in developing the updated (November 2010) UCSF Policy on Academic Searches and Search Waivers ([Appendix 5](#)). This is particularly important for cases where the Committee recommends a change in series for a faculty candidate. Often, such a change in series would trigger a search process which puts certain time and financial burdens on the department (a disincentive) or may in fact be disadvantageous to the candidate.

### **Camus Process for Five Year Reviews of Faculty**

Nola Hylton, who served on CAP for three years prior to this one, and served through December 2010 until Liz Watkins could be appointed, served on the Joint Administration-Academic Senate Task Force to Review, Assess and Revise the Camus Process for Five Year Reviews of Faculty. The report from this task force is attached as [Appendix 6](#).

### **CAP Retreat**

The Committee held its annual retreat with the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, Director of the Office of Academic Personnel, and the academic deans from the four schools on March 31, 2010. All CAP members were present save for the Chair who was unavoidably detained, and so the meeting was Chaired by Vice Chair Paul Garcia. Also present were Sally Marshall, Vice Provost Academic Affairs; Cynthia Leathers, Director of the Office of Academic Personnel; Brian Alldredge, Associate Dean Academic Affairs, School of Pharmacy; Renee Binder, Associate Dean Academic Affairs, School of Medicine; Chris Miaskowski, Associate Dean Academic Affairs, School of Nursing; Zina Mirsky, Associate Dean Administrative Affairs, School of Nursing; Peter Sargent, Associate Dean Academic Affairs, School of Dentistry.

Many issues were discussed, and the significant items are presented below. Minutes from the 2011 CAP Retreat are linked as [Appendix 7](#).

### **Discussion of Peer Letters**

For appointment actions for external candidates CAP noted that internal letters from faculty who are unfamiliar with the candidate may not be as helpful as a letter from the search committee. This request of the search committee members will be balanced against the desire to minimize additional work for search committee members. The lack of relevant internal letters can be balanced with additional external letters, which will be reiterated in the call.

The Committee asked that internal and external peer-review letters be from faculty at the proposed level of the action or higher if possible. This will be phrased as a preference but not a requirement in the call for action materials. There may be cases where faculty peers at the level below the action have the expertise and experience to make the best recommendation.

### **Valuation of Administrative Activities and Contributions in the Different Series**

Those present discussed how to best value significant administrative accomplishments for faculty whose primary appointment is not as a member of the administration and whose accomplishments rise above the level of professional competence or service activities. Certain language in APM 245 relating to Department Chairs is relevant in recognizing academic administrative contributions as valued creative activity.

It is entirely appropriate to award a merit increase, or, if performance warrants it, an accelerated increase, primarily for demonstrated excellence in service in the chair appointment when accompanied by evidence of continued productive involvement in scholarly activities.

The discussion centered on means of expanding the specific concept of rewarding service as a Department Chair to other extraordinary leadership in an administrative capacity. There was general

agreement that such consideration should apply exclusively to demonstrably successful, impactful leadership. It was noted that creating such programmatic or clinical excellence in the University which drives the reputation of UCSF and attracts external professionals, referrals and new students is in fact a form of dissemination.

The Committee suggested some leeway in consideration of creative activity beyond the strict interpretation of peer-review publication. It was suggested that actual and successful creative activity that would not manifest in typical dissemination should be noted as such in the Chair's letter and then appropriately valued by reviewing agencies.

Faculty members have the right to review their packet before it leaves the department and have the opportunity to include a personal statement, which would be an excellent opportunity to include such information. This step and functionality is being built into the new Advance system.

The Committee asked that this be shared in some fashion, if only so far as the Chair level, that real, valuable service in the way of program building can be valued as creative activity.

#### **Change in Series Recommendations from CAP**

The Associate Deans noted would be helpful if language recommending changes in series include softer language recognizing the advisory nature of the recommendation as well as the basis in APM guidelines rather than specific departmental criteria.

#### **Presentation of Teaching Information and Valuation in the Review Process**

The Committee noted that in merit and appointment packets, teaching hours are often oddly or randomly calculated and are therefore largely useless in evaluating teaching activities. Descriptions of teaching in the form of mentoring, bedside, clinical or bench teaching are more helpful. Often hours can only directly relate to classroom or didactic teaching.

Candidate CVs include myriad teaching awards, and some may be significant and some may be considerably less prestigious. Without knowledge or description of these awards, teaching awards may or may not be all that indicative of excellent teaching depending on the frequency and quality of the award. The Chair's notes are important in this evaluation.

#### **Increasing Efficiency: Excepting Certain Files from CAP Review**

Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical Processors who are WOS and *not* paid by an affiliate would no longer come to CAP for review. Full appointment and review packets would be required upon paid appointment.

The Committee discussed excepting from CAP review faculty in any series with appointments less than 50% Time (CAP would continue to review WOS and affiliate-paid appointments with 50% time or greater appointments.). All agreed to a pilot program with the caveat that the candidate, chair, and dean may always request a full CAP review if they would like one.

#### **Discussion of the Varied Expectations of Creativity in the Clinical X Series.**

Those present discussed the varying criteria and expectations within the Clinical X series, differentiating between the requirements for the Collaborative Researcher and the Clinician Educator and recognizing that many faculty members in this series could benefit from consideration of successful program leadership as creative activity.

#### **Consideration of National and International Reputation for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series**

The Committee noted that a faculty member in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series may be excelling in teaching and clinical care, the requirements for advancement in this series, but due to the

nature of clinical care and clinical teaching, may not have the international reputation necessary for advancement to Step 6 or Above Scale. It was also noted that in this era, for many clinical disciplines excellence and a national reputation in the United States is a de facto international reputation.

Those present encouraged the Chair's letter include recognition of their international reputation through their work regardless of their actual appearance in other nations. Those present agreed to a little leeway in consideration of the international requirement while continuing to require documentation of a national reputation.

### **Task Forces and Other Committee Service**

This year members of the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel served on the following Academic Senate task forces or other campus committees as representatives of CAP or the Academic Senate.

- VPAA's Steering Committee for Academic Affairs Information Systems Initiatives (Advance)
- The Academic Senate Task Force on Academic Senate Membership
- The Joint Administration-Academic Senate Task Force to Review, Assess and Revise the Campus Process for Five Year Reviews of Faculty

### **Going Forward**

Ongoing issues under review or actions which the Committee will continue into 2011-2012:

#### **Implementation of the Advance System**

The 2011-2012 year will see the first packets reviewed through the Advance System. The Committee will continue to offer recommendations regarding the form and function of the system and will begin to develop best practices and new workflow for the assignment, review, report and recommendation process of CAP academic review.

#### **Ongoing Review of Department Authority in Setting Criteria for Advancement.**

After review of the Chancellor's response to the Report from the Task Force following up on the Armitage Report, CAP may request that UCAP formally discuss and make a recommendation regarding the authority of campus departments to set criteria for advancement that differ from the Academic Personnel Manual.

#### **Stewardship Reviews**

Several Stewardship reviews are still underway and CAP members are required to participate and ensure that proper procedures are followed in these reviews.

#### **Expanding Senate Membership on the San Francisco Campus**

As the San Francisco Division attempts to incorporate the majority of faculty in the Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical series, additional reviews will flow through CAP, particularly appraisals for faculty at the Assistant level and entering their fourth year. CAP is looking forward to having fully-committed and participatory faculty in these series eligible for CAP service and contributing their experience and perspective to the academic advancement peer-review process.

## Appendices

- [Appendix 1:](#) Communication to the Chair of the Division expressing
- [Appendix 2:](#) Communication to the Chair of the Division expressing Committee approval of the Proposed Technical Revisions to Academic Personnel Policies (02/16/11)
- [Appendix 3:](#) Poster Announcing the 2011 Distinction In Teaching and Distinction In Mentoring Awards
- [Appendix 4:](#) Minutes from the CAP Retreat April 20, 2011.
- [Appendix 5:](#) UCSF Policy on Academic Searches and Search Waivers
- [Appendix 6:](#) Report from the Joint Administration-Academic Senate Task Force to Review, Assess and Revise the Camus Process for Five Year Reviews of Faculty (April 13, 2011).
- [Appendix 7:](#) Minutes from the CAP Retreat April 20, 2011.
- [Appendix 8:](#) CAP Meeting Attendance Record

Senate Staff:  
Wilson Hardcastle, MLIS, Senior Analyst  
wilson.hardcastle@ucsf.edu; 415/476-4245