

Committee on Academic Personnel
Sandy Feng, MD, PhD, Chair

ANNUAL REPORT

2020-2021

Total Files Reviewed: 572
Stewardship Reviews: 3 in progress; 15 completed
Statistical Information:

	20-21	19-20	18-19	17-18	16-17	15-16
Total Files Reviewed	572*	588*	536	534	475	479
Total No. of Meetings	48**	46**	43	46	38	38
Merits	112	100	96	79	70	65
Promotions	271	310	231	228	191	204
Accelerations	120	102	82	89	50	45
Decelerations	14	12	18	12	16	11
Change In Series	75	59	44	59	56	55
Merits to Step 6	39	39	31	29	21	25
Appraisals	28	36	37	30	33	23
Merits to Above Scale	11	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 six times from January – July 2021.

Campuswide or Divisional Task Forces and Subcommittees:

- Sandy Feng served on the Academic Senate Executive Council
- 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), R. Redberg (SOM), D. Porter (SOM).
- Margaret Wallhagen (2021) served as the divisional representative to the UCAP Senate Committee

Issues for Next Year (2021-2022)

- Addressing review issues caused by COVID-19 pandemic impact on productivity.
- 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

2020-2021 CAP Members

Sandy Feng, Chair (SOM)

Steven Hetts, Vice Chair (SOM)

Anne Chang (SOM)

Pedram Aleshi (SOM)

Vaikom Mahadevan (SOM)

Number of Meetings: 33 (& 8 Backup CAP Meetings) **

Senate Analyst: Alison Cleaver

Richard Souza (SOM)

Andrew Posselt (SOM)

Francis Szoka (SOP)

Meg Wallhagen (SON)

Torsten Wittmann (SOD)

UCAP Discussions

Systemwide University Committee on Academic Personnel met via Zoom quarterly, with UCSF UCAP Representative Meg Wallhagen attending. Systemwide discussions included:

1. Impact of Pandemic: Academic Reviews and Progression (Part A)
These discussions will continue as there is still concern about the long-term impact on academic careers, especially women and URM, and the way to consider these longer terms affects but without altering the focus on meeting the criteria for review and advancement. Considering files in a holistic manner was supported as was having individuals include “COVID Statements” but the timeframe of the modifications considered and implemented still remain somewhat unclear.
 - a. The Office of the President advised end of 2020 that a Committee has been appointed to examine the impact of COVID-19. It will include nine appointees who have been nominated and seven from the academic administration side. It will commence meeting in June. UCAP will see representation on this committee if not asked to participate.
2. Impact of Pandemic: Effect on Salaries (Part B)
Dealing with the impact of the pandemic also raised the question of the impact on salaries. Some campuses use half-steps and discussed strategies to assure faculty are not negatively impacted by a lack of advancement if “almost there” to meet requirements for specific advancements, but. These discussions continue but different strategies seemed to be considered and used on different campuses. UCSF doesn’t use half-steps in advancement and promotion.
3. Open Access
UCAP examined how to fairly allocate resources to support Open Access during the pandemic and beyond, and how this allocation would impact faculty in various professions (like the arts or other such areas) and how to fairly allocate resources to support open access. This will continue be on the agenda for next year.
4. Conflict of Commitment
This topic has been mandated for review due to an audit and is linked with concerns of foreign influence. Any engagement in a foreign agency—including as key personnel on a contract or grant whether covered part time or full time—will be category 1: one will have to report and get permission in advance. A planned report will focus on how to promote or allow persons in their entrepreneurial efforts to loosen up issues around this area. Systemwide Senate is putting together a task force to look at how to manage and what faculty want to recommend. The intention is to have policy language distributed for review/input in fall 2021. Topics raised:
 - a. Visiting scholars. Will these individuals be affected” It will depend on the definition of “foreign agent”.
 - b. Will this impact on-line collaborations? This also is not clear at this point.
 - c. What about qualitative or other “non-threatening research”? It was noted that they have to look at unintended consequences.
 - d. What about lectures? Concerns are that new regulations could stifle impact or stifle collaborations.

5. Review and Proposed Revisions to APM 715

Proposed revisions discussed the current language being too restrictive. As authored, the leave supports faculty who intend to pursue other work that gets at innovation and entrepreneurial in nature. Further discussions will follow in 2021-2022.

6. Valuation of Mentorship

UCAP members discussed if the APM as authored appropriately acknowledges and recognizes the contributions of mentorship. Some effort was put into ways to include mentorship more prominently in the APM. However, issues were raised about the quality of the mentorship provided and to who (student vs. other faculty). One campus is developing possible criteria to consider and there were ideas raised around teaching mentorship. Questions included:

- a. How mentorship responsibilities often fall especially hard on URM faculty or others who are asked to be on all kinds of committees and impact of this on their careers.
- b. How is mentorship reported and the criteria for a faculty member lists as their mentee?
- c. Should such criteria be best addressed at a department or division level?

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.

Communication on Pre-print Publications & Guidelines on Metrics for Quality Improvement/ Quality Assessment Projects

CAP authored a communication to the VPAA Office regarding preferred placement of pre-print publications within the Advance CV for review purposes. Included in that was a separate section on developing guidelines for CAP members on how to assess quality improvement or quality assessment projects, especially those handled by HS Clinical series faculty. (Appendix 1)

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

The 2020-21 recipients of the Distinction in Teaching Awards were Andrew D. Penn, RN, MS, CNS, NP, Health Sciences Associate Clinical Professor, Department of Community Health Systems, School of Nursing (SON) [Category 1], and Vanja Douglas, MD, Associate Professor of Clinical Neurology, Department of Neurology (SOM) [Category 2].

The 2020-2021 recipient of the Academic Senate Distinction In Mentoring Award for faculty at the rank of full Professor is Julene Johnson, PhD, Professor, Institute for Health & Aging, School of Nursing [Category 2]. Despite extending the call for nominations, the UCSF Academic Senate received no nominations for the Distinction of Mentoring Award in the Associate Professor category [Category 1]. We expect this is an exception due to the worldwide pandemic. The Senate will be conducting additional outreach next fall 2021, to insure we receive applicants in this category.

Due to the pandemic, the in-person celebration for these awardees was held online in spring 2021. The Senate's Committee on Educational Policy and the Academic Affairs Mentoring Office posed a series of questions to the respective Teaching award winners. Former DIM Award winners provided questions for

current Distinction in Mentoring Award winner to respond to. 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) advising that disruptions to usual academic matters would be taken into consideration during next year's (2021-2022) 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. This document will be reviewed and revised as the situation progresses. (Appendix 3)

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

1. COVID-19 Review & Impact on AA matters – All in attendance anticipate giving upwards of four to five years to see a full return of all faculty to the pre-pandemic levels.

DISCUSSION: Plus, how do we assess in this interim period to insure fairness? How do we assess when it's not a justified explanation for lack of productivity, when, for example, it's six years down the road from the pandemic? It's helpful for Department Chairs to explain this – to provide context. And then the long-standing impact, and effect on career – which will be difficult to assess in 3-5 years. When the issue isn't a delay of a career, but instead a derailment of career.

Aside from COVID, there have been various faculty throughout UCSF who have suffered hardships. The campus have already taken a holistic approach to support faculty hardship. The criteria will still be expected to be met – but it will help AA and CAP to assess patterns in departments/divisions; this will help determine where the person felt they “should” have been, vs. where they are. The goal is to couch this as the ‘special circumstances pathway’ which has always been in existence. But COVID has exerted a broader impact; this isn't a departure. Some sort of limit should be placed on the type of verbiage.

For the non-Senate clinical faculty, there are a lot of infrastructure issues especially for clinical trials, etc. There are some bottleneck capacity issues in OR, etc. which need to be taken into context in the review. These matters are beyond the control of an individual. If the entire department/division has been impacted in the same manner, that would be up to the Chair/Chief to advise on that.

Committee on Faculty Welfare: There remain issues around privacy and tension where faculty don't want to reveal private details. Further how should we balance that with a need for faculty to explain their productivity level. Expressing to the faculty member how that information will be used would be appreciated. Plus explaining that there is a period of time that this will be reviewed, after which it won't be available for review.

VPAA Office: UCSF is used to applying the criteria in a flexible manner, and taking context into account. We are quite concerned with the disparate impact especially for women and URM faculty, both of whom are going to take on a bigger burden. On the disparate impact, VPAA Office has been looking at how this will be assessed at a campuswide level, but cannot influence the departmental/divisional level. If we apply the same type of principle to review in these circumstances, that we often apply to faculty new to UCSF or junior faculty--namely that people's initial performance will be minimal and then the trajectory will take off—might be the right

direction. We would hope that this issue can be explored at incremental steps to assure the campus is addressing it adequately and fairly.

NEXT STEPS: VPAA Office will work with Associate Deans to develop a more nuanced message. It will route to CAP for review once a draft has been developed.

2. Committee on Academic Personnel Inquiries

a. In Residence Faculty

CAP member raised the item that Independent funding used to be a UCSF measure for a/p review for In Residence faculty. Is that still the case, and if not, what is?

For SOM, it isn't independent funding that's needed, but research independence – either with outside funding or internal funding. A faculty member may have to be very creative to find funding without external grants, i.e. gun violence or reproductive rights, but it can be accomplished.

CAP asked if there was now a blurring between In Residence or Clinical X series? Associate Deans and VPAA Office advised that both categories of faculty are required to have independent contributions to research that contribution doesn't have to be independent funding.

Overall, one (funding) is how to bring in salary, and the other is promotion criteria: these are different issues. The APM doesn't require funding to advance, but if you're in the In Residence Series and you're the sole source of funding, then you may not be able to advance without it.

Another area of issue for CAP is junior faculty who are still publishing with their mentors. How should this be assessed? Associate Deans advised they rely on reference letters to determine if independence has been established. This doesn't apply to team science faculty who fall under the policy regarding collaborative efforts. When it arises in an Appraisal, it's easier for CAP to be 'harsher' to send a message that something is missing. First/last authorship in peer-reviewed publications is another measure of independence.

b. Teaching Evaluations

CAP noted that these need to be helpful in CAP review. At present they're often a mix of different types of evaluations. Can a uniform summary of them—the same across schools and divisions--be developed? It's difficult to assess across the differences.

CAP noted that there's such a variety of the type of evaluations often within a single packet, with no metric on how to assess the different evaluations within a packet. Or there are very few evaluations to assess.

Associate Dean Binder and Garcia advised that when they've checked in with the evaluation groups within the SOM, and they've agreed there is collective concern about the variety and lack of value in current teaching evaluations. VPAA Alldredge also confirmed the variability in teaching evaluation instruments across the schools, and the issue of context these differing assessments present in the academic review process.

SOM Associate Dean's advised that it's been made worse with MedHub. Comparing MedHub to E-Value, the evaluative questions aren't consistent. If the educational domain could address these varied evaluations from the ground up within each School, this will help immensely. This has been conveyed already to MedHub and UCSF is already addressing it internally.

A tangential issue is the graduate programs and how to assess their effectiveness within a teaching model. This also in development within the various schools but the topic will be tabled for future discussion.

c. Diversity Efforts

All present support the inclusion of the EQOP Guidance on DEI Statement document being included in the next Call for Personnel Packets, or at least included in the VPAA website as a document of interest for faculty. (Attachment 1)

One question moving forward is interest in making a DEIT Statement a requirement in each A/P packet. If this is required, how do should CAP evaluate it? At present, CAP views these in a holistic manner, but also recognizes that it is a subjective review.

For those present, there is hope that the DEI Guidance document will eliminate faculty including comments about "serving a diverse population", and encourage them to focus on specific areas where they're making a DEI impact.

d. Diversity Issues Related to Initial Appointment– *Should a line be added in Advance in the Chair's Letter to ask why a particular series was chosen at appointment, and if the candidate was informed of the differences in expectations and benefits associated with the various series?*

- i. Is the appointment rationale for a particular faculty series discussed with the candidate at the point of hiring? There is a Points of Interest document included in many files, but is it gone over by the hiring committee or department chair? CAP is curious if it should request within the Chair's letter why a particular series/step was chosen?

1. VPAA Alldredge advised this is also gone over at the Faculty Development Day, and during Mentoring Month. Associate Deans advised that they are sometimes consulted, but often not. Departments are different, so issues in one may not be consistent with others.

- ii. At the level of recruitment, job listings specify expectations, not faculty series type. When applying for the job, applicants can request additional information and it can be provided. There is no attempt to not provide, but at hiring, applicants are usually more interested in duties and expectations. The jobs are very different (from clinicians to basic scientist), and one group doesn't want to be the other.

- iii. Further, are female and URM candidates hired in non-Senate faculty series proportionately more often than male candidates? Associate Deans and VPAA Office offered that the question might be rephrased. Namely: is UCSF recruiting enough female and URM faculty in basic science fields? Statistically UCSF hires

both URM and female faculty when they're within the applicant pool; but they are often not.

- iv. *Request for Information:* Can it be tracked to determine if particular series have more URM faculty and if that's at a hiring level? Or does it become that way due to attrition? Does this differ by school?

e. Issues Related to Changes in Series

CAP also encouraged discussion within departments of Changes in Series, that these actions shouldn't be viewed as failures in one series. However in the review process, CAP must assess what a faculty member does, not what they aspire to do; so a faculty member will be reviewed based on the new series expectations for advancement, not the current series. If what they do is more appropriate in another series, then they should be moved so as to be successful. The Associate Deans also advised that there's a difference in the financial commitment for a Senate v. non-Senate faculty appointment.

Associate Deans advised that there's a difference between the information provided during onboarding, and the in-depth discussion at Faculty Development Day on the differences in the series. The Faculty member would need to actively seek this information.

f. Teaching Expectations for HSC Faculty at Affiliates

CAP is concerned that the expectation of a minimum of fifty teaching hours isn't communicated to faculty at affiliates (VAMC, BCHO, UCSF Fresno). Those present advised that it is communicated, as is the expectation of letters of reference within personnel packets.

But it is also recognized that those faculty at affiliates aren't exposed to the same number of students or colleagues as those at UCSF campuses. This permits those reviewing packets from faculty at affiliates to make some exceptions. CAP noted that if you're permitting exceptions in some cases, then shouldn't all faculty have such exceptions? VPAA Office advised that the expectations are also tempered by percent time appointment and also the affiliate agreement. Not on a case-by-case basis.

If a faculty member is parttime VAMC and parttime UCSF, this should be taken into consideration because combined it's a full-time appointment, so the original expectation of fifty hours should still be met. VPAA Office/Associate Deans advised that CAP won't see any packets where faculty members didn't have the opportunity to teach.

3. VPAA Office/Associate Dean Inquiries

a. Consideration of prior years of service outside UCSF at times of proposed promotion

SOM Associate Deans advised that they have no control over the level of initial appointment. Some faculty get appointed after having been an Assistant Professor at another institute. When going up to Associate Professor within Advance, they're

categorized as an acceleration because of prior years of service. CAP's follow-up question related to fellowships and how those are counted in the promotion A/P action.

b. Consecutive accelerations for service on specific committees, e.g., IRB, IACUC, etc.

SOM Associate Deans support consecutive A1s for consistent long-term service on specific labor-intensive campuswide committees. i.e. multiple 3-year terms are eligible to receive multiple A1s.

CAP would like it to be equitable and automatic – because some faculty don't apply for A1s because they don't know about. Further, sometime people serve for upwards of 20 years on the same committee, and receive multiple A1s. CAP would encourage a limit being placed on those who serve long-term on these kinds of accelerations.

Next steps: SOM wants to change the language in accelerations. It currently states that three years of service is a minimum; SOM would like that altered to read "at least 3 years". The Senate has a strong interest in having this happen, and will happily partner with the VPAA and Associate Deans to disseminate this information upon request.

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:

- Executive Council
- Backup CAP
- Shadow CAP (Review of Current CAP Member Files)

Going Forward

Ongoing issues under review or actions that the Committee will continue into 2021-2022:

- Continuing to explore and address the COVID impact on advancement and promotion personnel actions. This will be accomplished in partnership with VPAA Office and the Schools' Associate Deans of Academic Affairs.

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Communication to VPAA in re Pre-print Publications & Guidelines on Metrics for Quality Improvement or Quality Assessment Projects
- 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

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