

TO: ALL UCSD FACULTY

FROM: Senate Committee on Academic Personnel

Robert R. Bitmead, 2005-06 Chair
Aleck Karis, 2006-07 Chair

DATE: April 30, 2007

SUBJECT: Where CAP Stood, 2005-06

Each year, 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.

Files presented to CAP are, generally speaking, prepared with diligence, thoroughness, and accuracy. This in part explains CAP's high rate of agreement with requested actions. *Where CAP Stood* is our attempt to impart useful information about areas of perceived or potential issue. We offer this document with the intention of providing further guidance to improve the predictability of action recommendations.

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 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) and, in turn, on the principles detailed in the UC system-wide Academic Personnel Manual (APM). 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 external 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

From 2005-06, CAP identified the following topics as areas requiring detailed clarification. Some of these issues are the subject of proposed modifications of the PPM, but they deserve highlighting here.

General File Preparation

- Departmental *Ad Hoc* Committees
- Department Chair's Letter
- Recusal of Collaborators and Mentors
- Solicitation Letters
- External Referee Letters

Research

- Evaluation of Team Science
- Conference Proceedings, Online Publications and Journals
- The Future of Scholarly Publication

Teaching

- Evaluation Methods
- Evaluation Presentation
- Comparative Teaching Evaluation ("Appelbaum") Plots

Service

- Research Scientists

Biobibliography

- Changes
- Care in Preparation

Salary

- Market Off-Scale Salary Components

Advancement Policies, Criteria, and Standards

- Acceleration
- Advancement
- Barrier Step issues
- Appraisals
- Crossovers
- CAP's use of ad hoc committees
- Participation in CAP

General File Preparation

CAP reviews many files from across campus and is deliberately well positioned to make comparative judgments. Care and attention to detail in file preparation assist CAP in reaching its recommendation. The credibility of individual departments and their chairs is a decided asset.

Departmental *ad hoc* committees: The departmental *ad hoc* committee and the department chair represent the first layers of formal campus review of any file. Normally, the departmental *ad hoc* committee provides critical and technical analysis of the file and includes in its letter to the chair a recommended course of action. There is a tendency for an *ad hoc* committee to be an advocate of the candidate, which is not helpful to downstream analysis. Rather, a thorough and objective study of the “three legs of the stool,” research and creative activity, teaching, and service, is needed in which highlights and issues are identified and addressed. Candidates are served poorly by ad hoc committees that do not comment on evident problems, when closer analysis could have removed any concern or at least provided evidence that it has been recognized and is being addressed.

Department Chair’s Letter: The department chair’s letter should reflect the larger departmental view of the action proposed with respect to a candidate’s file. It should synthesize inputs from the *ad hoc* committee report, departmental votes (if any), dissenting or supporting viewpoints, as well as commentary on creative activity and impact, teaching and service, especially where the chair is an expert in the field. In addition, the department chair is free to submit under separate cover a confidential letter voicing a personal opinion, even when this is at variance from the consensus department opinion. It is important that the chair’s commentary be dispassionate and free from hyperbole. Since the department chair is exposed to more personnel files and actions than most others, his/her letter carries considerable weight with the attendant increased expectation for balanced assessment. For this reason, CAP is keen to understand the personal recommendations of chairs.

Recusal of colleagues, collaborators, and mentors: 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, especially as department chair. 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. An explanation of the collaborative relationship is helpful. Likewise, mentors or other colleagues intimately connected with the candidate’s research should avoid potential conflicts of interest.

Solicitation Letters: Solicitation letters seeking references from external reviewers should follow the standard template available from the Academic Personnel Office web site. Too often, departments use inappropriate or outdated language. Thus, a department is “considering” an action rather than “proposing” it. Likewise, the APO templates contain careful explanations of titles, ranks, and steps.

At Professor Step VI, and Professor Above Scale, the "special nature" of these advancements needs to be made clear in the solicitation letter to reviewers external to the UC System.

External Referee Letters: External letters should provide detailed information on the candidate's research as well as a critical evaluation of the candidate's abilities and accomplishments. The prescribed minimal number of *independent* external referee letters required per PPM 230-20 and PPM 230-28 for appointment or career review is:

- Three (3) for appointment at the levels of Assistant/LPSOE. For appointment at the level of Assistant I or II, *independent* letters are desirable, but not required.
- Three (3) for promotion to Full Professor and for advancement to Professor Step VI or Above Scale.
- Five (5) for appointment at the levels of Assoc/Full/LSOE/Senior LSOE.
- Five (5) for promotion to the level of Associate, regardless of the title series.

There is no corresponding maximal limit, although some departments are apt to solicit many more external letters than are needed to demonstrate the case; this should be avoided.

The purpose of the external letters is to provide independent assessment and verification of the caliber of research or creative work and of its impact and influence in the field. CAP is particularly sensitive to the calibration provided by faculty members from institutions with unimpeachable credentials in the field; letters from individuals from respected major research universities can be highly valuable. Likewise and particularly for the University-of-California-specific questions such as advancement to Step VI or Above Scale, it often helps to have some letters from within the UC System and to have an indication of the academic/professorial level of the writer.

The streamlined appointment of truly unusual and exceptional individuals to Adjunct Professor without external letters was considered by CAP and, indeed, one case was affirmatively handled in this way. Such an appointment and process should be so extraordinary that to request for letters of reference would be regarded as unnecessary or even demeaning for the University. Such might, for example, be the case for Nobel Prize, Kyoto Prize, and Fields Medal winners. Quid pro quo for this, the nominating department needs to be especially diligent in developing the arguments for and evidence of the benefits likely to accrue to the University. This should include an analysis of teaching performance and recent activities. The analysis should be more rigorous and complete than for regular appointees because of the absence of external documentary evidence.

Research

USCD is a major research university and advancement through the academic ranks depends necessarily on achieving appropriate distinction in research or creative activities. The evaluation of this aspect of performance is central to CAP's deliberations and accordingly needs careful and detailed documentation and interpretation. Equally, it is not the only requisite dimension of performance and, while deficiencies in research and creative activity can prevent advancement, excellence in this area needs to be accompanied by at least adequate performance in teaching and service. For non-ladder-rank-professor appointments, similar issues arise in coverage of the complete gamut of the appropriate performance requirements.

Evaluation of Team Science: There is an increasing trend in institutions and funding agencies toward large-scale collaborative science involving many individuals and organizations. This has been evident in high-energy physics for many years, but is becoming more prevalent in medicine, other sciences, and engineering. CAP recognizes the potential benefits of collaborative research; including the opportunities for more impacting science and the economies of scale and competitive advantage achievable in such ventures. However, this does raise an issue in the evaluation of performance and contribution of the individuals within such activities. At the heart of the matter is the requirement to determine the creative contribution of the individual, which is often very difficult to observe from lists of collective publications and aggregated descriptions of achievement. In cases such as this, it is often helpful, even necessary, to have letters from others in the collaborative venture. While such letters cannot substitute for or mitigate the independent letter requirements, there is no proscription against their inclusion to provide analysis capable of shedding light on individual performance. To be of use to campus reviewers, these “dependent” letters should address the specific creative contributions to the research outcomes attributable to the individual in question. Statements such as “without X the research simply could not have happened” might apply as well to the person who pays the electricity bill as to a productive scientist. So more specific detail about the intellectual contributions needs to be included.

Conference Proceedings, Online Publications, and Journals: The world of publication is increasingly fluid and varied and CAP can deal with these changes if they are explained and contextualized reliably. Thus, in some areas of high-performance computing, certain highly selective refereed conference proceedings are regarded as having more academic impact than some journals in the field. With thorough documentation dealing with these general aspects of the specific area and identifying the respective conferences and journals, CAP was able to accommodate these circumstances in the evaluation of the appropriate faculty. The formulation was generalized to the discipline and was supported by good materials and argument; it was not part of just one individual’s specific case. There is increasing movement towards online publication in lieu of traditional print media, oftentimes with the coexistence of and variance between both print and electronic forms to provide differentiation between rapid dissemination and archival qualities. Some journals, such as the Public Library of Science PLoS series, appear only electronically with novel funding and access mechanisms. Other open-access repositories, such as the *arXiv* areas, are unreviewed but provide immediate access. CAP is capable of dealing with these and other variations on the journal theme under the proviso that the nature of the publication, its peer-review process, and of its standing in the field is made clear and supported by sustainable argument. The caveat from CAP is that, once such amended standards are agreed in a field, then they will continue to be applied. So, if one argues that conference publications are more impacting than journals in a field, then the journals articles and editorial board activities will be correspondingly diminished in relative importance for all in that field (or subfield). We reiterate that all articles cited in Section A of the Biobibliography need to be peer reviewed, whatever their medium or type.

The Future of Scholarly Publication: During 2005-06 CAP was co-host of a series of seminars organized by the UCSD Library dealing with the future of scholarly publishing in the electronic era entitled “Scholarly Publishing: Publish or Perish”. Staying abreast of these issues is important to CAP’s ability to respond appropriately to modern academic means of operation.

Teaching

Evaluation Methods: CAP is prepared to accommodate a variety of methods of evaluation of teaching effectiveness and is not constrained to review only CAPE documents. However, there is a need for both evaluation and comparative evaluation. All courses should be evaluated and reported. Alternative approaches to CAPE may be submitted but need to be documented and preferably applied consistently across the department. The omission of evaluations or failure of departments to comment on evident teaching issues creates significant hurdles to favorable actions. CAP is particularly supportive of remedial or ameliorative actions taken in regard to teaching performance.

Evaluation presentation: Where student evaluations are presented, the raw data can be useful for scrutiny by CAP. However, the department must distill these raw materials in their analysis to provide useful commentary for downstream review. Too often CAP was faced with the requirement of reading through many pages of student comments in order to gain an impression of the teaching performance or issues.

Comparative Teaching Evaluation (“Appelbaum”) Plots: Each department is provided with plots for each faculty member. Here the plot shows an individual’s CAPE percentage for professor approval against the logarithm of the class size. On the same plot is shown the scattergram of the department’s teaching as a whole to provide some appropriate calibration. These plots should be included as a matter of course for each candidate.

CAP is aware of the vagaries of the teaching evaluation process and is eager to solicit departmental analysis, which helps to clarify matters. For example, for one candidate scoring an apparently low approval score in a subject, the department was able to compare this performance with the historical scoring to show that the candidate was, in fact, more highly appreciated than most. Such directness makes the evaluation of the case straightforward.

Service

Research Scientists: There is a requirement for appointees in the Research Scientist series to perform some level of service, at least at the Associate and Full ranks. The level of service is not expected to be as high as for ladder-rank faculty. Often, there are funding prohibitions on the amount of university service permissible. Because these senior Research Scientists enjoy the professional benefits from their association with UCSD, there is some expectation of service. This service obligation might be discharged through service to the profession rather than to the University alone. This service is part of normal participation as a research professional. Teaching activities also fall under the service heading for Research Scientists.

Biobibliography

Changes: CAP in association with the Academic Senate Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity has proposed changes to the biobibliography to call for identification of actions taken

to promote diversity on campus. This change was instigated to draw attention to the need to recognize and document activities in this area.

Care in Preparation: CAP was dismayed on occasion by the inclusion of inappropriate items in the Sections A and B and their subcategories of the biobibliography. CAP admonishes faculty to be rigorous in the distinction between archival peer-reviewed journal articles, reviewed conference proceedings, abstracts etc. Attention to detail in the biobibliography can smooth the passage of a file through CAP review.

Salary

There are a limited number of mechanisms through which market off-scale salary components occur or change, other than by periodic cost-of-living adjustments:

- Initial determination of market off-scale salary at appointment time, based on substantiated quantitative evidence of the market or marketability of the candidate. For some departments, a starting discipline-based market off-scale can be proposed to be applicable for entry-level salaries at Assistant Professor II. Appointment at differing levels will typically involve keeping the market off-scale component and shifting the base salary. The case for determining this routine starting salary needs to be presented by individual departments to CAP via the SVCAA and should be widely applicable and expected to be in place for some reasonable period of time.
- Retention cases where faculty have documented firm, quantified offers from competing institutions. The competing institution will be analyzed to determine its comparability (or otherwise) to UCSD in the discipline and the specifics of the offer will be scrutinized again to understand comparability of salary package components.
- The Senior Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs introduced in 2006 a program for disbursement of Salary Equity/Parity Funds from the Office of the President. These were based on a formula recognizing faculty who had been promoted or accelerated within the previous five years, nominations by deans for preemptive retention actions for identified at-risk faculty and within an overall “salary cap”. CAP participated in the formulation of the policy, audited the formulaic results, and scrutinized closely the preemptive retention cases. Money for this program will be available again in 2007-08 and CAP will be involved; the details are still in preparation.

Any market off-scale component is reviewed every six years to determine whether the market factors still pertain.

With this small number of paths to salary increase, CAP is unable to entertain impromptu requests for market off-scale increases which do not fall within the identified categories above. Departments should be aware of these restrictions and avoid inadvertently increasing salary expectations of faculty, and thereby creating dissatisfaction or disaffection.

Advancement Policies, Criteria, and Standards

Acceleration: Accelerated merit advancement is a response to excellent performance in all three categories - research, teaching, and service – and extraordinary performance in some category, especially research. The performance in each category needs to be quantified and calibrated and the acceleration claim justified by comparison to norms. This is explained in the PPM. CAP annually audits a selection of departmental normal merit cases from the previous year in order to calibrate acceleration criteria. Each year a fraction of all departments is analyzed.

Assistant Professors being proposed for promotion to Associate Professor I, no matter their current step in the Assistant Professor scale or their timing in the review cycle, are not considered acceleration cases. Similarly, Assistant Professors at the crossover steps V or VI moving to Associate Professor steps II or III respectively after only one year are not considered acceleration cases.

CAP's view is that the promotion barrier ought to be the only consideration in such cases, since this career review is so important that it ought not be clouded by undue scrutiny of the immediate review period alone. Proposing an Assistant Professor for promotion beyond Associate Professor I, or the equivalent level from a crossover step, is considered an acceleration in addition to the promotion and needs to meet both the promotion criteria and the criteria for acceleration. Off-cycle promotion of Assistant Professors to Associate Professor I (or the equivalent of their current crossover step) will result in a recommencement of the review cycle. For promotion to the next higher step, a one-year acceleration needs to be considered, which would invoke assessment for acceleration. Because of these complications and possible negative effects for candidates (explained immediately below), CAP recommends on-cycle promotion be the norm for Assistant Professor if possible. Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor or advancement to Professor VI or to Professor Above Scale, if this involves early advance or greater than one step increase, is considered an acceleration even though this too involves a career review. This determination of when to apply the acceleration standards is also applied to the other series.

Off-Cycle Acceleration: CAP strongly recommends against off-cycle acceleration requests. This can inadvertently hinder the candidate's progress through the steps. This is best illustrated by example. If a faculty member is proposed for early advancement from Professor II to III after only two years at Step II, then the record is examined for three years' productivity in all categories before this can be recommended. Often, CAP is of the view that, were the faculty member to wait for the completion of the three-year review cycle, they would have been a strong candidate for accelerated advancement to Step IV. Thus the early action potentially has the effect of slowing down the candidate by two years. Likewise, off-cycle requests for acceleration for more than one step require that the record show a full three-year equivalent exceptional productivity for each additional step. Once the personnel action is successful, the research, teaching, and service items on which it is based move to above the line and cannot be reconsidered until the next career review. Thus, a successful one-year acceleration case after two years could have stymied a possible three-year acceleration had the candidate waited for one additional year.

Advancement for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment or Potential Security of Employment: Faculty in these series need to be aware of their criteria for advancement, particularly for acceleration and promotion. These include teaching of a truly exceptional quality; many of our lecturers routinely are the most successful teachers and high quality teaching is expected. There are other aspects of these criteria, however. Professional achievement and activity is required and is part of their maintaining professional currency. This might include participation in scientific meetings and organizations, especially in the educational side but also as contributors to the field. University and public service is expected as for other Senate members. Leadership and contributions to instruction-related activities are essential. For Senior LSOEs, national recognition is required, as might be evidenced by publications or involvement in organization of national events. CAP encourages LSOEs also to develop some aspect of national visibility as part of their career development to Senior LSOE. Departments should factor the need for performance in these non-teaching areas in workload determination and in file preparation.

Barrier Step Issues: Full Professors proposed for crossing the barrier steps at Step VI and to Above Scale need to be aware of the very specific criteria stated in the APM and PPM. The requisite level of impact needs to be demonstrated by the department and by the appropriate external referees. Likewise, the APM and PPM contain proscriptive language concerning acceleration to Step VI and to Above Scale. CAP has interpreted these admonitions very strictly, but not to the level of rejecting all cases. Please be aware that these barrier steps are significant hurdles, which require careful and focused argument addressing the criteria explicitly for success.

Appraisals: CAP makes recommendations on appraisals for Assistant level appointees at the four-year and six-year stages. These appraisals include a “grade,” explained in the PPM, plus commentary. The grades are *Favorable*, *Favorable with Reservations*, *Problematic*, and *Unfavorable*. This year’s CAP used the *Favorable* recommendation for candidates who were very obviously on track to promotion. *Favorable with Reservations* was used even for promising cases, where we thought that areas for improvement remained. The majority of cases fell into this category and it was tough to achieve a *Favorable* recommendation. The other two categories were greatly removed from the first two and indicated very significant issues which remain to be dealt with, with the distinction being whether we thought the problems were possibly addressable or not. *Unfavorable* appraisals were usually accompanied by a recommendation for a one-year terminal reappointment.

Crossover Steps: The PPM contains very precise language concerning crossover steps; in order to advance to a crossover the candidate must have sufficient material in Section C (and must therefore provide documentation of such for review) in preparation likely to suffice for promotion when complete. In some fields faculty who are appointed at Assistant Professor III or higher may need time to establish a new research program at UCSD, especially if this involves a laboratory. If this occurs, the candidate may run into reviews involving crossover steps and their stringent review requirements. CAP reminds departments of the documentation requirements for demonstration of eligibility.

CAP's Use of Campus *ad hoc* Committees: CAP may use campus *ad hoc* committees to provide expert advice on cases before it. Historically, these *ad hocs* were routinely constituted for almost every file, and CAP was charged with the duty of composing these committees. This introduced unpredictable delays due to scheduling and large-scale unwillingness to serve, but provided for more input to CAP and for greater participation of faculty at large in the review process. It also provided an additional large and distracting task for CAP members. However, as commented upon in recent *Where CAP Stood* reports, there has been a strong tendency for CAP not to use campus *ad hoc* committees, unless there is pressing need. Even when *ad hocs* have been used there has sometimes been a problem with the quality of advice received. This application of CAP's prerogative to *act as its own ad hoc* is supported by recent task forces studying the academic review process. The call for *ad hoc* input has diminished greatly over the last few years, seemingly with little effect on actions. This CAP strongly asserts the capacity to use its own prerogative in determining the need for campus *ad hoc* committees.

The diminution of CAP's campus *ad hoc* committees is balanced against the existence of standing advisory committees such as the CAP Advisory Committee on the Arts, which provides detailed and expert examination of the performing and creative arts; SOMCAP, from the School of Medicine; and SIOCAP, from Scripps Institution of Oceanography. Likewise, CAP has generally felt that the caliber of inputs received from departmental *ad hoc* committees, chairs, and deans has been sufficiently high quality.

Participation in CAP: CAP is an interesting, challenging, and ultimately rewarding experience, giving insights into many aspect of the campus as a whole and serving to unite the three sub-campuses in a single quality control exercise. It is a central vehicle of shared governance and a mechanism that sets the University of California apart from all others and, in part, contributes to its extraordinary reputation for quality. While CAP service is demanding in the extreme, it is correspondingly convivial, instructive, and appreciated. We would encourage all faculty invited to serve on CAP to consider any such invitation very seriously.

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 candidate, department, or dean disagree on their recommendations the file is 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 two weeks to complete. In cases where joint appointments in multiple divisions exist, additional routing time may be required. The Academic Personnel Office routes the file firstly to the secondary dean.)

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 appraisals, accelerations, off-scale proposals not fitting under any automatic policy (e.g., new bonuses, new/reset markets), initial continuing lecturer appointments, and other, less time-sensitive personnel cases. At its busiest time, CAP reviews up to 30 new 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) makes the decision on each case prior to issuing preliminary assessment 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 500 files this year and in addition to pre-emptive retention requests. Approximately 35 of the academic review files were returned to the departments for additional information. Properly prepared files would have reduced 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 external letters
- obtain a sufficient number of letters from external 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 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 external letters
 - mixed teaching reviews

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.