

**Committee on Academic Personnel**  
**Paul Fox, PhD, Chair**

**ANNUAL REPORT**  
**2012-2013**

**Total Files Reviewed:** 432  
**Stewardship Reviews:** 4 completed, 12 in process

**Statistical Information:**

	12-13	11-12	10-11	09-10
<b>Total Files Reviewed</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>526</b>
Merits	67	69	60	98
Promotions	176	188	162	195
Accelerations	40	61	63	71
Decelerations	24	8	19	23
Change In Series	52	55	57	110
Ad Hoc Committees	0	0	1	4
Merits to Step 6	33	19	32	47
Appraisals	19	34	27	31
Merits to Above Scale	12	9	5	16

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:**

- Review of Guidelines for Promoting Faculty Efforts in Sustainability
- Review of Draft Position Paper on Departmental Recommendation Letters
- Use of the Advance System for Stewardship Reviews

**Task Forces and Subcommittees:**

- Pat Fox served on the Subcommittee to Review and Revise the “Criteria for Accelerated Advancement Guidelines”

**Issues for Next Year (2013-2014)**

- Expanding Senate Membership to Include Certain Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical Professors
- Judy Yee will serve on the Subcommittee to Review and Revise the “Criteria for Consecutive Advancement Guidelines”

---

**2012-2013 Members**

<b>Pat Fox, Chair</b> (SON)	Art Miller (SOD) [Served June – July 2013]
<b>Thomas Kearney, Vice Chair</b> (SOP)	Jean Olson (SOM)
Ann Bolger (SOM)	Octavia Plesh (SOD)
David Glidden (SOM)	Lynn Pulliam (SOM) & UCAP Representative
Peter Loomer (SOD) [Served until May 2013]	Judy Yee (SOM)

**Number of Meetings: 33**

**Senate Analyst:** Alison Cleaver

## Systemwide Business

Regarding system-wide concerns, the Committee (CAP) reviewed and responded to the system-wide Report from the Task Force on Senate Membership.

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

Former CAP Chair Garcia continued to serve on the UCSF Academic Senate Membership Task Force and updated members on the status of proceedings.

Several rule and policy changes for the SF Division have been proposed for non-Senate faculty (i.e. Health Science Clinical and Adjunct) to provide comparable rights and privileges afforded to Senate faculty. These include having all full-time faculty members reviewed by their peers for academic actions and all faculty being able to fully participate in voting matters pertaining to UCSF campus. In addition:

- Graduate Council is revising Regulation V to allow all faculty to be sole chairs of student committees.
- All faculty will have access to P&T processes for grievances and disciplinary actions.
- VPAA is working towards a more streamlined application process to confer Emeritus status to HS Clinical and Adjunct faculty.
- To allow recognition of those HS Clinical and Adjunct faculty who sit on Systemwide committees. Limited-term without-salary Senate series appointments are being discussed within CAP.
- It is being proposed that as of July 1, 2016, UCSF will apply the eight-year rule for Assistant Adjunct and HS Clinical Science faculty appointed at 100% time.

UCSF R&J Committee and Legal Affairs are reviewing these proposed changes to ensure that they conform with all Divisional and Systemwide rules.

## 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.

### **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 Lynn Pulliam, PhD. The 2012-2013 recipients of the Distinction In Teaching Awards were Thuan Le, DDS, PhD, MD, Assistant Professor, Pediatric Dentistry (Category 1) and Sharad Jain, MD, Professor of Clinical Medicine, Medicine (Category 2).

This year's Distinction In Mentoring Award Selection Committee was Chaired by Thomas Kearney, PharmD. The 2012-2013 recipients of the Distinction In Mentoring Awards were Shari L. Dworkin, PhD, MS, Associate Professor; Social & Behavioral Sciences (Category 1) and R. Adams Dudley Professor In Residence; Departments of Medicine and Epidemiology & Biostatistics (Category 2).

The poster announcing the awards ceremony is attached as [Appendix 2](#).

### **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 May 2, 2012. All CAP members were present save for Thomas Kearney and Octavia Plesh. Also present were Sally Marshall, Vice Provost Academic Affairs; Cynthia Leathers, Director of the Office of Academic Personnel; Brian

Allredge, Associate Dean Academic Affairs, School of Pharmacy; Renee Binder, Associate Dean Academic Affairs, School of Medicine; Peter Sargent, Associate Dean Academic Affairs, School of Dentistry; and Renee Navarro, Vice Chancellor, Diversity.

Many issues were discussed, and the significant items are presented below.

#### “At Rank or Higher” Reference Letters

CAP members raised the issue of reference letters, specifically for HSC Series faculty, that come from incorrect rank faculty. Discussion focused on the fact that many HSC faculty don't know academics of the required rank. CAP member Pulliam advised that reference letters from not-appropriate rank faculty are dismissed upon packet review. Exceptions are made for Appointments as it's anticipated they may not have any contacts within the University.

CAP pointed out that if faculty members have long-standing collaborators—and those individuals don't provide a reference letter—it's often a “red flag” for them that there may be a potential issue.

AVP Leathers read out the end of APM 210-6b(2) which provides clarification on the issue of extramural referee letters.

*“...As a general rule, for appointment and promotion at the level of Health Sciences Associate Clinical Professor, faculty may demonstrate local or regional recognition for their clinical and teaching activities. For advancement to the Health Sciences Clinical Professor rank, faculty may demonstrate a regional or national reputation and should demonstrate highly distinguished clinical expertise, highly meritorious service, and excellence in teaching....Extramural referee letters may be requested for new appointments and promotions if required by campus procedures.”*

#### Department Chair Letters

- a. CAP members raised the question of who authors this letter when it's the Department Chair themselves who are up for an action? Assistant Vice Provost Leathers advised that this could be made easier to accomplish in Advance: a Chair letter can be created by the Associate Dean and put into Advance – with notification of the true author. In other cases, the Dean themselves do the letter. CAP would prefer if the Advance Chair letter be used rather than attach a separate letter.
- b. Question: what role should the Service Centers have in drafting Chair Letters? Per the APM, the Chair letters must be drafted by an academic, a faculty member, and not by staff. It's understandable that Service Center may cut/paste certain sections of the CV into a Chair letter—but not responsible to request or expect that they provide evaluative comments on a faculty member's standing and achievements. VP Leathers will draft a positional letter from Academic Affairs on the topic; she would like CAP members to review and provide feedback before they proceed with distributing to departments. ([Appendix 3](#))

#### Diversity

Vice Chancellor Navarro provided an overview of her office including compliance with sexual harassment and affirmative action and LGBT and community partnerships. She advised that her office doesn't have funds to adequately support recruitment efforts. They are exploring a survey to determine retention rates.

NIH Minority Supplements doubled last year with UCSF using APeRecruit to bring in top-notch recruits. In terms of women, there are more women in leadership position at UCSF than in the past. They have the data for Academic Senate series and FTE but need to extrapolate statistics.

Next year an “unconscious bias” Initiative will be rolled out. Likewise salary equity especially for women will be explored.

Other topics discussed include:

- The Office of Federal Compliance began a federal audit over two years ago. Another audit came from EEOC -- looking specifically on hiring for RSAs - so we have an ample pool of people from which to hire from. They've asked for information on 48K applicants.
- UCAP Update: Other campuses wanted language added to APM 210 that if you research diversity you automatically receive a “diversity nod” in the promotion process.
  - UCSF declined to have it "count as equal weight" but do agree that it matters. VP Marshall advised that Academic Council has come up with a new version and is determining the next steps.
  - If you examine committee service, you can see a “minority tax”. This can be seen as taking advantage of minorities.

#### Faculty Decelerations and Those Not Advanced On-Time Due to Administrative Error

CAP members discussed—and showcased some examples—of faculty who had been mis-appointed at the start of their UCSF career. VP Marshall advised that faculty could always request a Career Review although CAP cannot suggest as a recommendation. CAP can suggest a “re-appointment” at the accurate level; OAP will send back and leave it up to the department what they want to do.

In cases where CAP thinks a Career Review should be done, CAP can suggest that the faculty member talk to their Department Chair about doing a Career Review. As such a review is a one-time thing, faculty have to consider if they want to go that route ultimately.

#### Sustainability Guidelines Proposed by Sustainability Task Force

The Academic Affairs Office and the Schools support the Guidelines as drafted, save for 3e which doesn't fit into academic review and may actually hinder a junior faculty's ability to network—if they opt out of attending conferences so as to Skype or videoconference in.

All present declined to have sustainability receive a separate category within the Advance System as it is included in public service. ([Appendix 4](#))

#### WOS Appointments for Non-Senate Faculty

Paul Garcia, former CAP Chair and current Chair, Senate Membership Task Force presented on this topic, which specifically affects those non-Senate faculty who have Systemwide Senate obligations. CAP Chair Fox commented that this was designed to allow faculty to participate more fully in Senate service at a Systemwide level.

Those present discussed the implications of assigning WOS Senate appointments for non-Senate faculty who qualify and have Systemwide Senate obligations. All schools were satisfied with doing so, however they expressed concern that Department Chairs may block in some cases. It did raise some ethical concerns around the question: “if someone is eligible to be in this series (at an WOS appointment) why aren't they in it full-time?”

Also distinguished was that this isn't designed to be a workaround for a Change in Series. Task Force Chair Garcia pointed to APM 245-11 “creative contributions and activity” as a way to give a WOS appointment without violating ethics. SOM Assoc Dean Binder recommended this be labeled as an “exception”, so that it's not seen by faculty-at-large as a permanent pathway to Senate series membership.

The Academic Affairs Office pointed out that someone with a pre-existing appointment at a Professor Adjunct level cannot also hold a WOS appointment Senate at the Assistant Professor-level.

## 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.

- The Academic Senate Task Force on Academic Senate Membership
- Subcommittee to Review and Revise the Criteria for Accelerated Advancement in Rank Professorial Series

## Going Forward

Ongoing issues under review or actions which the Committee will continue into 2013-2014:

- Use Expanding Senate Membership to Include Certain Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical Professors

## Appendices

[Appendix 1:](#) Communication from UCSF Academic Senate Chair Robert Newcomer to UCSF Faculty on Academic Senate Membership

[Appendix 2:](#) Poster Announcing the 2012 Distinction In Teaching and Distinction In Mentoring Awards

[Appendix 3:](#) Academic Affairs Positional Letter on Drafting of Departmental Letters

[Appendix 4:](#) Guidelines for Sustainability Review within Faculty Promotion Process

Senate Staff:  
Alison Cleaver, Senior Analyst  
Alison.cleaver@ucsf.edu; 415/476-3808



**Academic Senate**  
senate.ucsf.edu

July 2, 2012

Dear UCSF Faculty Colleagues,

This is an update on the status of our campus plans to extend Senate membership to HS Clinical and Adjunct Professors at the rank of Associate or Full Professor beginning July 1, 2012. This proposed action was initially discussed at the UC Systemwide Academic Council meeting on March 21. It was then referred to the UC Rules & Jurisdiction (UCR&J) committee for review. Their preliminary ruling was received by the Academic Council (the membership of which includes the Senate Chairs from all campuses) and discussed at the June 27 meeting. UCR&J rejected the arguments put forward by UCSF claiming our right to determine Senate membership of our faculty. UCR&J either did not consider, or failed to acknowledge the position suggested by the UC Office of General Counsel (OGC) that the Standing Orders of the Regents are ambiguous on the question of whether these orders delegate the authority to our campus Senate to determine its own membership. OGC suggests that this issue should be resolved by the Regents.

Where does this leave us? First, we have to delay implementation of the extension of 'Senate' membership on our campus to Health Sciences Clinical and Adjunct professor series faculty that had been announced in our March 20 letter. We continue to pursue this issue on several fronts and hope for clarification by the end of the 2012-13 fiscal year. More immediately, we are continuing to identify and will be working to amend the bylaws and other rules that have historically been barriers to equal rights and privileges for all full time faculty members.

Key among these rights are the following, all of which are in the process of being addressed at the appropriate campus or Systemwide level.

- Access to Privilege and Tenure Committee reviews
- Assignment to UCSF Senate Committees
- Ability to chair dissertation committees

The right to vote on faculty hire and promotions and to be voted upon

Three rights and privileges are subject to additional Systemwide criteria. These are eligibility for MOP loans, automatic awarding of Emeritus Professor status upon retirement and the right to vote as a UCSF representative on Systemwide Senate Committees. These rights, along with Senate membership itself, may require Regents approval. We will be working with our campus leadership to have these issues brought before the Regents for discussion, if needed.

If you have questions or need more information, please contact me at [robert.newcomer@ucsf.edu](mailto:robert.newcomer@ucsf.edu)

Sincerely,

**Robert Newcomer, PhD**  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate

**Departmental Recommendation Letter  
("Department Chair's Letter")  
For Academic Actions**

The hallmark of the academic appointment and advancement process is peer-reviewed assessment. As noted in Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 210-1a, "The quality of the faculty of the University of California is maintained primarily through objective and thorough appraisal, by competent faculty members, of each candidate for appointment or promotion."

The Departmental Recommendation Letter ("Department Chair's Letter") is a critical component in the academic appraisal process because it represents peer assessment and highlights the candidate's academic accomplishments. This document seeks to provide guidance and clarification regarding the Department Chair's Letter.

**ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR:**

The Academic Personnel Manual (APM) highlights the important role of the Department Chair in providing academic assessment of faculty in his/her Department.

APM 245 Appendix A (Duties of Department Chairs):

"The appointee [Department Chair] is responsible for the recruitment, selection, and evaluation of both the faculty and the staff personnel of the department. In consultation with colleagues, the chair recommends appointments, promotions, merit advances, and terminations. The appointee is responsible for maintaining a departmental affirmative action program for faculty and staff personnel, consistent with University affirmative action goals. The appointee is expected to make sure that faculty members are aware of the criteria prescribed for appointment and advancement, and to make appraisals and recommendations in accordance with the procedures and principles stated in the President's Instructions to Appointment and Promotion Committees...

...In performing these duties, the chair is expected to seek the advice of faculty colleagues in a systematic way, and to provide for the conduct of department affairs in an orderly fashion through department meetings and the appointment of appropriate committees. The chair also is expected to seek student advice on matters of concern to students enrolled in the department's programs. In large departments, the chair may be assisted in the tasks involved in carrying out the responsibilities of the chair by a vice chair or other colleagues, and, when desired, by an executive committee chosen in an appropriate manner; however, the responsibilities themselves may not be delegated."

APM 220-80 e. (Appointment and Promotion: Recommendations and Review):

The departmental recommendation is made in accordance with the procedural regulations of the Academic Senate and established governance practices of the department. The chair initiates a personnel action for an appointment, promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment, non-reappointment, or terminal appointment by addressing a letter setting forth the departmental recommendation to the Chancellor (or to the Dean, Provost, or Vice Chancellor, according to the applicable campus procedure). This departmental letter shall

discuss the proposed personnel action in the light of the criteria set forth in APM - 220-10, and shall be accompanied by supporting evidence. The chair shall report the nature and extent of consultation on the matter within the department (including any vote taken) and present any significant evidence and differences of opinion which would support a contrary recommendation. The chair should ensure that individuals who have provided confidential letters of evaluation are not identified in the departmental letter except by code. The department shall adopt procedures under which the letter setting forth the departmental recommendation shall be available, before being forwarded, for inspection by all those members of the department eligible to vote on the matter or by a designated committee or other group of such members. Pursuant to campus procedures, the chair may also, in a separate letter, make an independent evaluation and recommendation, which may differ from the departmental recommendation.

**UCSF ACADEMIC REVIEW PROCESS:**

In the past two years, there have been significant changes to the academic review process at UCSF. Currently, all academic actions are initiated, reviewed, and approved electronically in the Advance system and academic packets are now assembled by HR Service Center staff. These administrative changes have highlighted the existence of varying and sometimes non-compliant practices among Departments and Schools with respect to the Department Chair's Letter.

ADVANCE:

The Department Chair's letter has been reformatted to streamline and facilitate the documentation of the candidate's academic accomplishments. This new version was available to Departments in a paper format prior to the implementation of Advance and is now the standard format used in Advance for electronic files. Evaluative comments must be written in each section as appropriate to the criteria required for the academic series of the candidate under review. The evaluative comments should be an assessment of the candidate's academic accomplishments. Additionally, these comments should provide further explanation, if needed, for any of the advancement criteria that are not readily apparent in the supporting documentation.

HR SERVICE CENTERS:

Some Departments have asked (or expected) that personnel in the HR Service Centers draft the Department Chair's Letters. Based on an informal analysis of data provided by the Service Centers, almost 60% of the Department Chair's letters were drafted by staff members rather than faculty members. The assignment of the Department Chair's letter to a staff member erodes the quality of the Department Chair's letter because HR staff are not qualified to provide evaluative comments about a candidate's academic achievements.

While it could be appropriate for HR Personnel in the Service Centers to retrieve recent activities from the candidate's CV and paste this information into the relevant sections of the Chair's letter, the value of these sections is the assessment of achievement, not a repetition of CV information. The "filter CV" function in Advance already allows one to easily access recent activities from the CV. In addition, HR Personnel should not be expected to draft evaluative statements regarding these accomplishments as that level of

assessment can only be provided by academics familiar with the candidate and their field of expertise.

While departmental staff may have drafted the Department Chair's letter in the pre-Advance period, policy requires that an academic provide the evaluative assessment of accomplishments.

Many academic action packets with a July 1, 2014 effective date have already been initiated by the Service Centers, so the 2013-14 review cycle will be considered a transition year in which the Service Center will continue to assist Departments in transitioning the preparation of Department Chairs' letters to the appropriate faculty in the Departments. For actions effective July 1, 2015 or later, neither HR Service Center personnel nor Departmental staff should draft or provide evaluative comments in the Department Chair's letters. Our goal is efficient and informed reviews of academics, which is the responsibility of the Department Chair with assistance from other faculty members as appropriate.

Endorsed by:  
Vice Provost, Academic Affairs  
Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel  
Vice and Associate Deans, Academic Affairs



Guidelines for Documenting Sustainability Activities  
Associated with Faculty Merits and Promotions

As a campus, UCSF is committed to protecting the health and safety of our faculty, staff, students, patients, and the communities in which we work. Campus efforts to reduce waste, minimize our carbon footprint, be more efficient and conserve limited natural and economic resources are of the utmost importance.

Sustained as well as outstanding individual faculty efforts that support these goals should be recognized and encouraged. As part of University and Public Service, Teaching, Professional Competence and/or Research and Creative Activities, faculty pursuits to protect the environment and support sustainable practices in support of these goals should be documented in merit and promotion materials.

To this end, the following guidelines may be used in preparing merit and promotion packets:

1. Documenting service on department/unit, school, campus or system-wide sustainability committees or task forces such as the following:
  - Chancellor's Advisory Committee
  - Academic Senate Sustainability Committee
  - Sustainability Steering Committee
  - Sustainability Steering Committee Work Group
  - School/department/unit Green Committee
2. Documenting efforts at leading and/or contributing substantially to operational changes that promote sustainable work site practices such as the following:
  - Increasing recycling or composting rates
  - Reducing energy, paper and water waste
  - Increasing rates of carpooling, bicycling or public transit for work commuting
  - Attaining certification as a LivingGreen Lab or LivingGreen Office
  - Hosting a certified LivingGreen event
3. Documenting active engagement in university and public educational efforts focused on sustainability and environmental health issues such as the following:
  - Presenting on sustainability and environmental health topics at grand rounds and/or other campus or system-wide venues
  - Incorporating sustainability content into course curricula
  - Educating the public and policymakers on sustainability and environmental health issues through formal presentations, letters to the editor (while adhering to UCSF Communication Policies), and government testimony and related venues

University of California  
San Francisco



**Academic Senate**  
senate.ucsf.edu

- Contributing to a regular column/section in their department/unit newsletter educating faculty and staff about sustainability issues and practices
  - Minimizing work-related travel by substantially contributing to an uptake in the utilization of video or tele-conferencing technologies within unit(s), across the campus, or in professional or scholarly societies, particularly as an alternative to airplane travel.
  - Substantively contributing to unit or campus-wide efforts to reduce work-related paper use such as use of the Collaborative Learning Environment tool to move to a zero paper curriculum
4. Undertaking and disseminating research related to environmental health and/or related to reducing the economic or environmental footprint of healthcare (in general or in one's own discipline).

April 2013  
Sustainability Task Force  
UCSF Academic Senate