

TO: ALL UCSD FACULTY

FROM: Senate Committee on Academic Personnel

John W. Newport, 2004-05 Chair  
Robert R. Bitmead, 2005-06 Chair

DATE: October 24, 2005

SUBJECT: Where CAP Stood, 2004-05

Each fall, CAP submits a detailed Annual Report of the file review statistics and policy issues considered by the committee. 'Where CAP Stood', a supplement to the Annual Report, provides an explanation of the committee's interpretation of personnel policies during the previous year, highlighting areas of concern with regard to the preparation of academic files. Appendix A provides specific details on how the academic files move through the review process. Appendix B explains the principal file preparation issues that cause delays in the process.

A standing committee of the Academic Senate, the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) consists of 10 to 12 members appointed by the Committee on Committees to represent the faculty in the academic personnel review process. Faculty participate in the University's shared governance with the Administration through committees such as CAP. CAP's recommendations are advisory to the Chancellor and his/her designee, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (SVCAA). In advancing personnel recommendations, CAP relies on the criteria outlined in the UCSD Policy and Procedures Manual (PPM). However, the application of those criteria often involves interpretation and judgment. Faculty, department chairs, deans – and at certain career points – provosts, campus ad hoc reviewers, and outside reviewers, all weigh in with their own understanding of the review criteria and the merits of the cases. Thus, all preliminary assessments and final personnel actions that included CAP's review also included extensive campus review. For this reason, the SVCAA's communications to departments always note that "campus reviewers" concluded that the proposed action was or was not justified. CAP's role in this process is to synthesize the assessments of various reviewers in relationship to CAP's own view of the performance record, striving always to guarantee that everyone is treated fairly and equitably while maintaining the high academic standards articulated in the PPM.

New faculty and faculty involved in the academic review process are encouraged to review previous 'Where CAP Stood' reports located on the web at:

<http://www-senate.ucsd.edu/committees/cap.htm>.

The Office of Academic Personnel web site provides specific information on the review process, including due dates, links to policies, and tips for the preparation of academic files.

<http://academicaffairs.ucsd.edu/offices/apo/ReviewProcess.htm>.

## **Topics for Clarification**

This year, CAP identified the following topics as areas requiring detailed clarification:

- Advancement to Step VI and Above Scale
- Acceleration
- Biobibliography
- Collaborative Research
- Crossover Steps
- External Letters
- Market Off-Scale Salaries
- Recruitment/Searches
- Retention

### **Advancement to Step VI and Above Scale**

The 2004-05 University of California Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) reviewed APM 220-18 that defines the criteria for advancement to Step VI and to Above Scale (the ‘barrier steps’). UCAP determined that the vagueness of the language led to differing interpretations and practices at different campuses and proposed modifications to assist CAP in making decisions more consistent across campuses.

The following summarizes UCAP’s proposed revised criteria:

- 1) Evaluation of service for advancement to Above Scale
- 2) Both Step VI and Above Scale evaluations “involve a career review”.
- 3) “Sustained excellence” in scholarship or other creative activity is a standard for both evaluations.
- 4) For advancement to Step VI, scholarship or other creative activity of “great distinction” that is “recognized nationally or internationally” is required. For advancement to Above Scale, the work must be internationally recognized and have “broad acclaim” and “wide impact”.

UCAP’s recommendations have been sent to the University of California Senate Academic Council for approval.

Normal advancement through the step system is recommended for faculty based on success in the three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. If any one of the areas is lacking, it may be difficult to justify advancement to Step VI or Above Scale, unless it is compensated by extreme excellence in another area.

### **Acceleration**

Acceleration occurs when an individual is advanced, via a merit increase or promotion, after serving fewer years at a given step than is normal for that step. It also occurs when, through advancement, an entire step is skipped.

CAP, again, found it very helpful to post-audit regular merit increase files from previous years from various departments (rotated by year). Such reviews have helped CAP to understand better the justification for and to calibrate appropriately proposals for accelerated merit increases.

#### Accelerated Advancement to Step VI or Above Scale

Advancement to Step VI usually will not occur after less than three years of service at Step V and will be granted on evidence of highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, and excellent University teaching. There must be evidence of continuing achievement in all areas at the prescribed level. Continuing great distinction in scholarly and creative achievement should be recognized nationally or internationally. The file must reflect a critical career review.

Advancement to Professor, Above Scale, is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction, whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed and whose teaching performance and service are excellent. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at Step IX. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX are not a justification for further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step IX was based. The file must reflect a critical career review. (*PPM 230-28.VIII.1*)

Accelerated advancement rewards extraordinary accomplishments. Historically, CAP has maintained a high threshold in evaluating proposals for acceleration to these 'barrier steps'. This year, CAP could not endorse such proposals if any one of the areas of scholarship, service, and teaching was lacking, regardless of a candidate's high stature in the field. CAP felt that one way acceleration to 'barrier steps' could be justified was when a candidate had an outstanding review period as well as meeting the criteria for advancement.

Departments should note that if acceleration to Step VI or Above Scale is not approved, the external letters obtained may be re-submitted at the time of the next merit review. New letters may be obtained in support of the advancement, but are not required.

#### Off-Cycle Accelerated Merits

Off-cycle accelerated merits are particularly difficult to judge, and CAP remains of the opinion that they should be discouraged. Cumulative above-average performance can be rewarded more appropriately with acceleration at the time of the next normal review or through recalibration at the time of a career review.

#### **Biobibliography**

Since CAP is required to perform a comparative analysis of academic performance, the presentation of a biobibliography in an accessible and standardized form is important.

Occasionally, an abstruse, careless or poorly compiled document, has led to difficulties in CAP reviewers assessing the true nature and standard of scholarly endeavor.

A carefully prepared biobibliography is of great benefit to the faculty and aids in CAP's evaluation. Section A must contain peer-reviewed publications and may include items that are "in press" (i.e., accepted for publication in final form) or formally "accepted" (i.e., publisher's binding acceptance of entire corpus has been received). Such items should clearly indicate "in press" or "accepted" somewhere in the citation. Since the importance of conference publications varies among fields, their impact in the field should be addressed in the file, usually in the departmental letter with some supporting evidence. In the Arts, it would be helpful for departments to assess the relative merits of performance/exhibition versus published materials.

It would be helpful if the chair's letter specifies what counts as a refereed, archival publication in a particular discipline. (For example, in the natural sciences, chapters in edited books may not be peer reviewed, but in some of the humanities and social sciences, edited book chapters from university presses might be rigorously peer reviewed.) It is also important for the chair's letter to address the relative importance of each publication venue listed in the biobibliography.

### **Collaborative Research**

The candidate's individual scientific or creative contribution to collaborative research needs to be described or documented thoroughly. CAP recognizes that the form this documentation takes will vary amongst disciplines; however, the importance of the candidate's collaboration must be based on evidence, such as the testimony of other collaborators, evidence from the text itself, or the conventions of a particular discipline.

Collaborators should not serve as chairs or co-chairs of ad hoc committees, nor should they be in the line of administrators assessing a candidate's file. If their expertise is especially critical, they could be a member of an ad hoc committee. Since the expertise of such a collaborator is always useful, or in some cases even necessary, the total exclusion of collaborators from the entire review process is not required.

### **Crossover Merits**

Crossover merits may be granted in lieu of promotion and require documentary evidence demonstrating timely progress on the kind of substantial scholarly or creative projects that are likely, when completed, to lead to promotion. Acceptable evidence of 'timely progress' might include a number of manuscripts listed in Section C of the biobibliography along with a fully articulated statement of research from the candidate.

CAP noted instances where departments proposed initial appointments at the level of Assistant Professor, Step III, to compensate for the salary scale. Appointment at such a high initial step would put the candidate in the second year of Step IV in the fourth year following the appointment. Consequently, a tenure evaluation might be advanced based on only three years of work. In many cases, departments would view this as too soon to make a tenure recommendation and, instead, propose a crossover merit increase to Step V. Crossover merits, however, require special justification beyond that required for a regular merit increase.

In CAP's view, an acceptable solution is for departments to follow the guidelines in the PPM when proposing appointment levels, and to use market off-scale salary components to provide appropriate compensation. (See the Market Off-Scale Salaries discussion below.)

### **External Referee Letters**

Departments should use the templates provided by the office of Academic Personnel that explain titles, ranks, and steps when soliciting external referee letters for appointments, promotions, and advancements. Outside letters should provide detailed information on the candidate's research as well as a critical evaluation of the candidate's abilities and accomplishments.

Totally independent outside referees are not required for appointments at the level of Assistant I and II (since it may be too soon for the candidate to have established an independent reputation in the field), but they *are* required at the level of Assistant III and above.

CAP is aware that some campus units feel it is desirable to have collaborators provide outside letters as they may be in the best position to know the work. Further, it is sometimes argued that it is difficult not to use collaborators in relatively small fields or sub disciplines. While CAP considers all letters in the file, letters from collaborators are not independent and cannot be viewed as providing unbiased evaluations, particularly if the collaboration involved research for which the candidate is best known or the achievement that is primarily driving the departmental recommendation. It is, however, perfectly acceptable to include some letters from collaborators or co-authors, but the preponderance should be from senior faculty—preferably from comparable institutions—unassociated with the candidate. When a department feels it is necessary to include some letters from the candidate's collaborators, co-authors, or mentors, the department letter should be clear about both the fact and the nature of the association. Points to address include whether it is a close and ongoing association or a former one, and whether it includes jointly held funding.

The number of independent external referee letters required per PPM 230-20 is:

- Three (3) for the levels of Assistant/LPSOE
- Five (5) for the levels of Assoc/Full/LPSOE/LSOE/Senior LSOE

### **Market Off-Scale Salaries**

Market-driven off-scale salaries may be used to recruit and retain faculty in disciplines or fields for which it has been established that marketplace considerations necessitate such measures to keep UCSD salaries competitive.

Department chairs are responsible for justifying market-driven off-scale salaries by providing appropriate evidence.

For marketplace off-scale salaries, the department must gather sufficient data from other University of California campuses and other institutions to make its case. (Requests for statistical information on recent UC appointees' salaries may be requested through the Academic Personnel Office; most institutions outside

UC will not provide salary information on individuals but probably will give average salaries, etc.) The department's proposal will be submitted to the Committee on Academic Personnel and, where appropriate, to an ad hoc committee. The Vice Chancellor-Academic Affairs will communicate the final decision to the department chair. The chair will include appropriate documentation regarding the marketplace off-scale agreements in applicable appointee's academic review files. (*PPM 230-41*)

CAP encourages all departments to perform market analyses in their fields and put forth a general proposal for off-scale salaries for entry-level faculty hires using market statistics. Rather than appointing faculty at higher step levels that create problems as candidates proceed through the normal merit process toward promotion, departments should propose appointments at the appropriate step, with a justified market-off scale salary component.

Department chairs need to provide justification for market off-scale salaries when recruiting or competing for candidates from another institution, such as the standing of the institution and the quality of the department within that institution.

### **Recruitment/Searches**

Departments are reminded to document candidate searches in the chair's letter. An explanation of the search, including where positions were advertised, how many applications were received, and how many candidates were interviewed, should be provided. In addition, when no search was conducted, the file should indicate that a waiver was obtained. The search information required by CAP is purely numerical and should not contain confidential information.

### **Retention**

CAP reviewed files proposing accelerated promotions for the purpose of retention. However, accelerations are granted on evidence of extraordinary accomplishment in a review period. If this cannot be demonstrated, the more appropriate response is for a department to propose a market off-scale salary component, which, again, has to be justified based on the market for such a field or scholar.

## **APPENDIX A – THE ACADEMIC REVIEW PROCESS: HOW FILES MOVE**

The Committee on Academic Personnel generally assesses only about a third of all personnel files due for review in any given academic year. In 1992, the faculty decided that CAP would no longer review normal merit cases; the authority for final action, however, remained with the Senior Vice Chancellor-Academic Affairs until 2000, when it was delegated to division/school deans. Cases where a divisional dean or designee is at odds with a department's recommendation are sent to CAP for review.

UCSD has a system of shared governance that requires active Faculty-Administration interaction in all important campus decisions. The academic personnel review process is no different. Faculty peer review begins in departments and is summarized in the chair's letter transmitting the faculty's recommendation to the appropriate Dean's office, and then to the office of Academic Personnel (APO). If input by the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Provosts is required (the latter being particularly attentive to the quality of the candidate's teaching and service at the college level), the files are often routed concurrently, not sequentially, by APO to these offices. This process can (depending on the workload at particular times of the year) take anywhere from days to weeks to complete.

APO determines which files CAP will see in any particular week, prioritizing appointments, retentions, tenure cases, files that may require the formation of campus ad hoc review committees, terminal actions, and then other files, such as 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> year appraisals, accelerations, off-scale proposals not in line with policy (e.g., new/reset bonuses, new/re-justified markets), initial continuing lecturer appointments, and other, less time-sensitive personnel cases. At its busiest time, CAP reviews up to 30 files per week, plus any number of reclaims (reconsiderations).

CAP's agenda, along with the files and accompanying publications and other supporting documentation, are ready for review by the close-of-business every Friday until CAP meets on Thursdays at 1:00 PM. Action is recommended on all files on CAP's weekly agenda. In rare cases, reviews are postponed to the following week when the file requires more time to review or due to the absence of a key member whose input is considered important. CAP tries to avoid such a delay by asking the member who is expected to be absent to read the files -- particularly in his/her disciplinary area, and particularly if urgency of action is indicated -- and leave comments for the rest of the committee to take into consideration.

After each CAP meeting adjourns, APO is apprised of the recommendations CAP has made on each item on the agenda. CAP members draft letters for each file conveying and explaining the committee's recommendations. On the following Tuesday morning, the CAP Chair reports the committee's recommendations to the SVCAA (at a 'ReCAP' meeting) and delivers the finalized CAP file letters. The SVCAA (or designate) issues preliminary and final decision letters that reflect comments not only from CAP, but from reviewers at all levels of the file review process.

CAP reviewed over 570 files this year, with approximately 130 of those requiring additional information or submission for reconsideration. Properly prepared files would reduce the delays.

## **APPENDIX B – FILE PREPARATION**

### **Delays and Problems**

The PPM is very clear about requirements for appointments and advancements. Late, incomplete, or carelessly prepared files do a disservice to candidates. Delays could be avoided if departments:

- obtain sufficient outside letters
- obtain a sufficient number of letters from outside referees who are independent of the candidate (i.e., not from co-authors or close research associates) for appointments at Assistant Professor, Step III and above and tenure-level appointments, promotions, or advancement reviews
- discuss the role of the candidate in collaborative work
- provide teaching evaluations and discuss a proposed teaching plan
- include a correct and properly prepared biobibliography
- provide tangible evidence of any competing or outside offers
- provide adequate and appropriate justification for an off-scale salary component (whether bonus or market) being requested
- discuss potentially troubling aspects of the file, e.g.,
  - a split departmental vote
  - negative comments in the outside letters

It is the responsibility of the department chair to discuss thoroughly the various viewpoints expressed in the file and to offer his/her own assessment of the merits of the case at hand. Neglecting to do so may lead to delays in processing of the file. If a file is incomplete or if further justification for the proposed action is needed, CAP will ask for additional information.

### **Appeals**

The SVCAA (or designate) issues preliminary assessments and final decisions that reflect comments not only from CAP, but also from reviewers at all levels of the file review process. Appeals of preliminary assessments are more likely to be successful if they directly address the deficiencies cited by the SVCAA's letter or if substantial new and compelling evidence is added to the file.