

Committee on Academic Personnel
Lundy Campbell, MD, Chair

ANNUAL REPORT

2019-2020

Total Files Reviewed: 613
Stewardship Reviews: 6 in progress; 6 completed
Statistical Information:

	19-20	18-19	17-18	16-17	15-16
Total Files Reviewed	613*	536	534	475	479
Total No. of Meetings	48**	43	46	38	38
Merits	102	96	79	70	65
Promotions	318	231	228	191	204
Accelerations	110	82	89	50	45
Decelerations	12	18	12	16	11
Change In Series	61	44	59	56	55
Merits to Step 6	40	31	29	21	25
Appraisals	40	37	30	33	23
Merits to Above Scale	13	10	8	7	13

* 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. ** Numbers include files reviewed by Backup CAP which met nine times from January – August, 2020.

Campuswide or Divisional Task Forces and Subcommittees:

- Lundy Campbell served on the Academic Senate Executive Council
- Lundy Campbell/Sandy Feng/Steven Hetts alternated as the CAP Rep to the Backup CAP Committee. This ad hoc committee was chaired by former CAP Chair J. Leung (SOM), with S. Kayser (SOP), A. Miller (SOD), P. Finley (SOP), and R. Redberg (SOM). Dorothy Porter attended the two August 2020 meetings.
- Mallory Johnson (2019) and Margaret Wallhagen (2020) served as the divisional representative to the UCAP Senate Committee

Issues for Next Year (2020-2021)

- Addressing review disparity between Backup CAP and primary CAP by including Backup CAP members in September overview meetings, and in the CAP Retreat held in in January 2021.
- Continuing to work with EQOP Committee, VPAA Office, and Associate Deans to develop a Memo to faculty stressing the value and importance of including Diversity Contributions in personnel packets

2019-2020 CAP Members

Lundy Campbell, Chair (SOM)
Sandy Feng, Vice Chair (SOM)
Mary Helen Barcellos-Hoff (SOM)
Anne Chang (SOM)
Steven Hetts (SOM)
Mallory Johnson (SOM)

Dorothy Porter (SOM)
Andrew Posselt (SOM)
Francis Szoka (SOP)
Meg Wallhagen (SON)
Torsten Wittmann (SOD)

Number of Meetings: 39 (& 9 Backup CAP Meetings) **

Senate Analyst: Alison Cleaver

Systemwide Business

Regarding system-wide concerns, the Committee (CAP) reviewed and responded to the following system-wide inquiries.

UCAP Discussions

Systemwide University Committee on Academic Personnel met quarterly at the UC Office of the President in Oakland, CA. UCSF UCAP Representative David Saloner attended. Discussions focused on Systemwide review of the above listed revision as well as the following:

APM – 120, Emerita/Emeritus Titles

Members agreed that granting emeritus status will have minimal impact on UC resources. UCAP members submitted a memo recommending that the policy is as inclusive as possible. (Appendix 1)

CAP Evaluation of Faculty in the Health Sciences

UCAP members discussed issues related to CAP evaluations of health sciences faculty. The goal was for UCAP members to gain a better understanding of the issues for faculty at the medical centers such that the committee may identify best practices for how CAPs address those issues. Consistent ongoing education by deans and other campus leaders on the criteria for advancement and promotion seemed key across several campuses. This topic was discussed throughout the year.

Dean Delegated Files

The Committee was asked to determine how many types of personnel actions and the number of files can be dean-delegated before it is “too many.” UCAP members discussed how such files are handled at various UC campuses, and also advised that there may be deans to whom a CAP would not want to delegate authority. This topic will be discussed more in depth at a later date.

Task Force on Teaching Evaluations

Throughout the year UCAP heard reports from this task force which was put together at the request of systemwide committees on Graduate Council (CCGA), and Committees on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity; Educational Policy, and Faculty Welfare. The charge was to look specifically at student course evaluations but this has been broadened to teaching evaluations overall. At issue is that student course evaluations should not be the sole form of assessment and the evaluation should include peer observation and a personal statement. A question remains on how to make other forms of evaluations more robust. Also raised was the pattern of poor evaluations, which CAP overall pays closer attention to than a single bad evaluation.

Student Mentoring (Consultation with CCGA)

CCGA Chair Balasubramaniam reminded UCAP of their discussion during 2018-2019 academic year on newly proposed language for APM 210 involving mentoring. Many faculty in the social sciences do not receive as much credit for student mentoring as those in the STEM fields, due to documentation, and the inability of social science faculty to give co-authorship to mentees. Women and URM faculty do significant mentoring without credit. While overall UCAP members recognized the issue as having merit, they declined to make it a separate category within APM 210. They will discuss ongoingly how to make it more prominent.

Divisional Business

This year, Members of the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel worked closely with the Vice Provost Academic Affairs Brian Alldredge and the Office of Academic Personnel on academic personnel file review. Other business conducted is listed below.

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, Margaret Wallhagen, RN, PhD, FAAN. The 2019-2020 recipients of the Distinction In Teaching Awards were Erica M. Gastelum, MD, Health Sciences Associate Clinical Professor, Department of Pediatrics, School of Medicine (SOM) at UCSF Fresno (Category 1) and Katherine Hyland, PhD, Adjunct Professor, Department of Biochemistry & Biophysics, SOM and a member of the UCSF Institute for Human Genetics and the Haile T. Debas Academy of Medical Educators, and Director of the Medical Genetics Theme in the UCSF SOM Bridges Curriculum (Category 2).

This year's Distinction In Mentoring Award Selection Committee was Chaired by CAP member, Dorothy Porter, PhD. The 2019-2020 recipients of the Distinction In Mentoring Awards were Naomi Bardach, MD, MAS, Associate Professor of Clinical Pediatrics, Department of Medicine, SOM (Category 1). Dr. Bardach is Core Faculty at the Philip R. Le Institute for Health Policy Studies, and Faculty at the Center of Healthcare Value. In Category, 2, the award winner was Monica Gandhi, MD, MPH, Professor of Clinical Medicine, Department of Medicine, SOM. Dr. Gandhi also serves as Associate Chief of Clinical Operations & Education, Division of HIV, Infectious Diseases & Global Medicine at ZSFG.

Due to the COVID-19, the in-person celebration for these awardees—usually held in the spring—was moved online. The Senate's Committee on Educational Policy and the Academic Affairs Mentoring Office posed a single question to the respective Teaching and Mentoring award winners. Short lectures, of upwards of 10-15 minutes, on the questions were presented via Zoom and uploaded to the Senate's website. The poster announcing the online awards ceremony can be found in Appendix 2.

Statement on Modification of Review Process Due to COVID-19

In partnership with the VPAA Office and EVCP Office, the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) advised that disruptions to usual academic matters would be taken into consideration during next year's (2020-2021) academic review process and beyond. Faculty were advised to include a personal statement in their personnel packets detailing the COVID-19 impact, and that will be taken into consideration during the review process. (Appendix 3)

Retreat (CAP, VPAA Office, & Associate Deans, Schools)

The Committee held its annual retreat with the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, both Assistant Vice Provosts of Academic Affairs, and the academic associate deans from the four schools on January 29, 2020. The CAP Annual Retreat was moved from June to January. This change will allow matters arising related to A/P matters to be implemented or modified in mid-year. Support CAP Analyst Kirstin McRae, Academic Senate Office, was also in attendance. CAP members Posselt and Barcellos-Hoff were absent. Significant items are presented below.

Declaration of Use of Journal Name and Impact Factor in Academic Review (attachment 1)

Guests Dyche Mullins, PhD, Professor, Cellular Molecular Pharmacology, SOP and EVCP Dan Lowenstein attended to discuss the declaration submitted for CAP and Academic Affairs review. The proposed intention was that CAP, Academic Affairs, and Associate Deans support the declaration to leave journal names off of CVs under personnel action review.

Members and guests present advised that there is no way to judge value of any article, save from either the Chair's letter – which is often not filled out in depth – or by the Journal name. Including the Journal name speaks to peer review, which in addition to Chair's letter and the letters of support, CAP relies on to explain the significance and value and detail of the faculty member's work efforts. The conclusion was that the declaration as presented is an oversimplification of the actual issue and also an over-emphasis on the CV in the review of a faculty member's personnel packet. Academic Affairs and CAP look at the overall packet – the gestalt—of the packet, rather than checking specific items off of a list.

Guest Mullins advised that upon reflection the matter should be divided in half, with the outwards-facing portion being focused on hiring and the declaration, which emphasizes the work rather than the glamour of specific journals. And separate from that is the internal portion handled by academic affairs/CAP which needs subjective information to understand the relevance of work under review.

Guest Lowenstein provided some historical context for the drafting of the declaration. Historically, when and where papers were published was important. Students are motivated to publish, but the time to publication is much longer now than it has been previously. So the fact that CAP, or other Universities are looking at the quality of work is really important to students/trainees, who may believe they won't get employment without those publications. Sending a message to the general public that it's the work that's valued, not the publication, is vitally important for students/trainees. This is the message that needs to be disseminated.

Next step: CAP will work with the Associate Deans and VPAA Office to discuss and revise the current declaration, so it better fits how journal names are used in personnel review. Implementation of this will require more in-depth language be included in the Chair's letter, such that the work faculty under review are doing is placed in context.

Participation with/Service to Predatory/Vanity Publications and Conferences

While CAP has raised this issue, guests advised that because of how quickly the publishing landscape is changing, it's difficult to assess between up-and-coming journals and vanity/predatory publications. CAP stated that it is under the impression that there is quality control before the files come to CAP, but in several instances it was clear that such a review wasn't completed. The Associate Deans raised the issue of implementation of such guidelines.

Next step: CAP will develop an educational statement which can be delivered to departments on predatory/vanity journals. CAP will advise within this statement that this is an ongoing issue that CAP is examining. Within the statement will be encouragement of this at a departmental level. Department Chairs will be encouraged as well to contact their relevant Associate Dean for guidance.

Consistency in File Volume for CAP

CAP Chair Campbell requested consistency wherever feasible in the volume of files coming to CAP. In fall 2019, there were two meetings back-to-back cancelled due to lack of files. The issue with volume had to do with the HR Service Centers, not with VPAA Office. CAP recognizes some of this is beyond the control of either of those offices, but CAP/Backup CAP is trying to avoid being deluged with files in the next year by addressing as many as possible in as steady a manner as it can.

Asst Provost Emerald Light advised that part of the issue with this is that the VPAA Office has no authority to shift the deadlines. So if personnel packets come in late—not due to the faculty’s actions—the file is still reviewed. It may not be completed by the July 1 deadline however. This has given faculty and departments extra time. The bigger issue however is as UCSF joins UC Path, we cannot pay people retroactively within payroll. That is, while your packet will be reviewed late (even if effective July 1 of a given year), if it goes through after July 1, faculty cannot be paid back to July 1. VPAA Office routinely reviews its operations to insure smooth activities; they will be paying even closer attention when UC Path goes into effect.

Changes in Series

Members and guests discussed the perception that not all series are the same. While the reality is that the series run parallel and are there to benefit faculty by allowing them to focus on areas that they are stronger in. Associate Deans advised that assessment has changed over the years. The bars used to be very different within the series based on the department. Now, the bar is the same across the departments. However what does vary is the consultation with HSC or Clinical X Series faculty. Members posed the question also of how do you evaluate faculty who work eighty hours a week? That section of the CV is summarized and doesn’t indicate the true work effort that goes into working those kind of hours over an annual basis.

Those present concluded that the best way forward is to be consistent in language. To advise faculty that the series are there to serve them, and decisions about a change in series should focus on:

- Whatever’s right for the faculty member.
- There’s no external evaluation of one series being better than the other.
- To explore further a standard of evaluation for clinicians who work upwards of 85% of their time in clinics. CAP members noted that such faculty could be fantastic clinicians, or they could be terrible. Criteria need to be defined further for accelerations for HSC Series faculty.

Clinicians and the In Residence Faculty Series

Clinicians who are In Residence Series are less and less. Vice Chair Feng noted the few number of In Residence clinicians in her own department. It’s a sign of the times and it’s more difficult to become that due to pressures put on clinicians, in addition to the pressure to get NIH funding. Some departments have begun putting faculty into general appointments and then differentiating them at a later date based on their accomplishments; this used to be how the Department of Medicine assigned faculty. Implementation-wise, that makes it difficult to develop a job description for faculty to apply for. You also then put faculty at risk for having to apply for a searched position and not get it. Further, it brings into question how resources are allocated within departments. CAP members said they’re not interested in setting faculty up for failure, with these especially high standards which faculty cannot meet.

Associate Deans advised that over the years, the assessment of faculty has changed. It used to be that assessment differed by department and expertise. That doesn't appear to be the same any longer. Now the bar is the same for everyone in a respective department/division. Those present also advised it becomes difficult to assess clinicians who are eighty-five percent in a clinic, and there aren't metrics for this assessment: this is the same question that UCAP has with the growth of UC Health, and being able to evaluate clinical series. Perhaps metrics should be developed that clinical series can be measured against.

They also advised that students who become faculty in the coming years will have a very different idea of work-life balance so the series choice they make will be based off that personal principle. Members agreed that the series are equivalent and it ultimately comes down to what is accurate for the faculty member in their career. The hierarchy exists due to the APM which advises that some faculty get some benefits, while other faculty don't.

Changes in Series – How Does This Change a Faculty Member's Involvement in the Department?

It's the intention of CAP that this process is as seamless as possible. CAP's concern is that a change in series is what's for the faculty, however the message that gets back to the faculty member is that you get promoted in one series and not in another, therefore one series is better than the other. Members also advised that while someone might look exceptionally strong on the academic side, but from a medical staff point of view, they're trying to get you out the door.

UCAP Update

Current UCAP Rep Meg Wallhagen provided a short overview on key items being discussed at systemwide. These include:

- Standardized testing. This is forthcoming to all divisional CAPs later on this academic year.
- Teaching evaluations and the use of these to develop/obtain quality data across the divisions. These aren't just student evaluations of faculty's teaching. More information on this is forthcoming as well.

EQOP/Diversity Matters – with Christine Glastonbury, EQOP Chair (attachment 2)

Guest Glastonbury, EQOP Chair, provided an overview of the process leading up the creation of the EQOP DEI document.

As of July 2019, all new hires must have a diversity statement within the packet. These are variably written, and it's anticipated CAP sees that as well. It has been proposed that by 2021-2022, all promotion packets will have DEI Statements.

While all EQOP members agree to this, they wanted to develop some guidelines to help faculty in drafting such statements. The document provided (attachment 2) is what EQOP has developed. They added in specific statements from each member and examples from Schools. VC Navarro has also contributed to the document. The goal is to have this document published and then develop small cards to hand out at Faculty Development Day. They'd like to present starting in fall 2020.

To date, all School of Nursing packets must have DEI Statements, SOM Departments of Radiology (next cycle), and Anesthesia & Perioperative Care.

Members present encouraged language from this statement being incorporated into Advance, under the rollover Information features. Members also appreciated the multiple examples as encouraging faculty to list something. Associate Deans also suggested EQOP offering 'drop-in hours' or a session for helping

faculty in crafting this section, perhaps as part of the Town Hall. Also this will help Department Chairs to differentiate diversity contributions, rather than use boilerplate language.

CAP Chair Campbell advised that part of the goal is to prompt faculty to start thinking about if/how they can frame their work through DEI. Many faculty don't list anything. VPAA Alldredge praised the document, and stressed that it's important for faculty to understand the process and the reasoning behind it (why are DEI Statements required? How does UCSF interpret or evaluate this information?) The group discussed potentially adding to Advance a box for faculty to click if they are deliberately leaving the DEI Statement blank – so faculty are conscious of this. Further, extraordinary contributions can be considered for a basis for accelerations. The intention is that the inclusion of a DEI Statement is always a plus, never a minus.

Associate Deans advised that those faculty who complete the Diversity Champion training from SOM, should be encouraged to list it on their CV as a DEI contribution.

VPAA Office Inquiries

Evaluation Criteria when Multi-year Accelerated Advancement Actions are Proposed

Members discussed what the justifications were when CAP is faced with a two- or three-year acceleration, for example. UCSF Guidelines advise one year for an exceptional accomplishment in each different area. CAP takes this advised approach so that it doesn't perform a career review with each of these files. Associate Deans requested the approach to be more consistent, and less 'additive' and that the CAP responses to say the same thing to faculty.

Discussion raised the issue of when a multi-year acceleration is proposed in cases of retention. Associate Deans advised that what is promised to faculty is that their file will be put forth – not that the faculty will receive a particular multi-year acceleration. Associate Deans requested that in cases of an exceptional performance, a multi-year acceleration may be appropriate for a single achievement – and that in those situations an additive approach will work against the faculty member.

VPAA Alldredge encouraged CAP members to use the *Communication to the VPAA box* in Advance to convey issues that arose during discussions. Also, the Campus Guidelines which CAP has used shouldn't be used as a definitive rule; this document was also revised to include language about exceptional single performances can be and should be acknowledged with a multi-year acceleration.

CAP advised that they use the 'bean counting' method to justify the multi-year acceleration, not the other way around. VPAA Alldredge advised that there's no problem for an item that can't be granted an acceleration for a current action due to the effective date, it can be used for an action in the future – as long as there is an explanation that it was included in the prior action.

Alignment on Promotion Criteria for Faculty in the Adjunct Series

Use of independent funding as a review criterion for promotion in the Adjunct and In Residence Series

Members discussed that faculty in the Adjunct Series aren't being put up for promotion due to lack of independent funding. However, in some cases, this isn't true as the departments have funding, and adjunct series are permitted to have an unbalanced portfolio. VPAA Office also advised that they've seen this language in some CAP letters last academic year, citing 'lack of independent funding' as a reason for recommending a modification. The preferred language is to cite 'lack of independence in research' as a concern. If the Chair's letter cites the faculty contributions made to the department and the faculty member's expertise, that also can answer the issues related to independence in research funding.

The concern is doubly difficult for Adjunct who without funding may not have a job. For In Residence Series, lack of funding also could mean they have only one year worth of funding from the department before being potentially terminated. In these situations, CAP would recommend two alternatives in their letter: either a Step x, or a change in series to another series.

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.

- Executive Council
- Backup CAP
- Shadow CAP (Former CAP members)

Going Forward

Ongoing issues under review or actions that the Committee will continue into 2020-2021:

- Addressing increase in personnel action files by maintaining the number of Backup CAP meetings at nine and having those meetings be held in January, March, and then May - July. CAP will continue to explore the creation of a separate Clinical CAP which will run parallel to the main CAP during the academic year. Senate Office Resources issues and the ability to find qualified faculty members interested in serving on the committees is an issue, plus Senate Office staff able to staff both.
- Development of a Faculty Communication with EQOP, Associate Deans, and CAP members to highlight the importance of including diversity contributions within their CVs.
- Modifying the DIT-DIM Award Ceremony to host it online or longer as needed.
- Including Sustainability Efforts in personnel file review moving forward. Efforts will include working with the ad-hoc Sustainability Committee to make current their 2012 recommendations.

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Formal Communication to systemwide Academic Senate in re APM-120
- Appendix 2: Distinction in Mentoring and Distinction in Teaching Event Poster
- Appendix 3: Memo on the Modification of the Review Process Due to COVID-19