

CAP FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

A. About CAP

1. What is the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)?

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is a standing committee of the Academic Senate of UCSD. It is a faculty body that participates in shared governance by making recommendations to the Administration regarding appointments, promotions and other academic personnel actions. The committee members review each candidate's achievements in research, teaching, and service, and make a recommendation regarding the appropriate action in each case. The systemwide **University of California Academic Personnel Manual (APM)** and UCSD's **Policy and Procedures Manual (PPM)** are CAP's governing principles. If something in the APM or PPM is not clear and this resource provides insufficient guidance, a faculty member should ask the Department Chair, the Dean, or Academic Personnel Services.

2. Do CAP members vote twice on a personnel action, once in a department and again as a member of CAP?

No. While a faculty member is a member of CAP, she or he generally no longer participates in personnel actions at a departmental level. If a CAP member has participated in the department's deliberations (such as may occur in a file initiated prior to the beginning of CAP service), he or she does not participate in CAP's deliberations or vote. If the CAP member is closely involved with the candidate, by custom the member recuses him or herself from the case, and leaves the room during deliberations.

3. Who serves on CAP and what are their areas of expertise?

CAP consists of ten to twelve members drawn from the general campus, the Health Sciences, and the Scripps Institution of Oceanography. Members are appointed by the Senate's Committee on Committees. No member represents his or her unit in terms of advocacy for the school, a department, or an individual. All members have the interests of the campus as a whole as their responsibility. The members are therefore representative of their general areas mainly with respect to their expertise and their experience with a particular academic culture. For those aspects of file review requiring expertise in a specific subfield, CAP relies on careful and objective review from the Department, Chair, and Dean, as well as from any external referees. If a campus *ad hoc* committee is formed to evaluate a case, CAP also takes the campus *ad hoc* committee report into account in its deliberations.

4. Can candidates ask CAP questions about the personnel review process?

CAP members may not communicate with individuals about specific personnel cases. All file information is confidential and no individual should have special access to reviewers that others don't have. To prepare your file or find out the status of your own personnel review, talk to your Chair, Dean, Academic Personnel Services, or equity advisor. Everyone should

review the three most recent annual issues of “Where CAP Stood” to be aware of common pitfalls in file preparation.

5. What role do campus *ad hoc* committees play in reviews?

Career reviews can include a campus *ad hoc* committee as an added layer of review. However, because additional review is seldom needed, and it can substantially delay the process, CAP has increasingly acted as its own *ad hoc*. By the time cases arrive at CAP, there is already considerable expertise represented in the file, from the Departmental *ad hoc* committees, from external referees, and from the Dean. However, in cases where there is substantial disagreement regarding the quality of the candidate’s work, and CAP lacks suitable knowledge itself, CAP will request that a campus *ad hoc* committee be formed.

CAP prepares a slate of nominees, offering from three to five names for each of the committee’s positions—Chair, campus members and, in some rare circumstances, member(s) from other UC campuses. CAP has no other role in forming *ad hoc* review committees. The number of members serving on an *ad hoc* committee at UCSD is typically three or five, depending on the action.

6. Does CAP ever recommend a higher step than the one proposed?

Yes.

7. Can CAP discuss personnel cases directly with Deans or Chairs? (Same as #24 in Section D)

No. At some UC campuses, Deans may address their CAPs about individual cases, but not at UCSD. The strongly held view of the UCSD CAP is that speaking to Deans or Chairs can lead to inequity: an especially skillful or relentless verbal advocate of one professor might sway opinion, whereas another professor may have no such advocacy. Deans and Chairs provide their opinions on all files in letters that CAP takes very seriously.

8. Does CAP make the final decision?

No. CAP forwards its recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (EVCAA), the administrative officer chiefly responsible for academic personnel matters at UCSD. Decisions by the EVCAA reflect the input of various levels of review, including the Department, Department Chair, Dean, external referees, and CAP. Decisions for those in the Research Scientist series are made by the Vice Chancellor for Research or Divisional Dean(Main Campus), the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences (Schools of Medicine and Pharmacy), or the Vice Chancellor for Marine Sciences (SIO). Regular merits that are delegated to the Dean do not get reviewed by CAP, though CAP conducts a post audit of regular merit files each year.

CAP FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS (FAQs)

B. General Standards in Faculty Review

Note that the criteria discussed on this page apply mainly to candidates in the Professor (Ladder-Rank) series. Special considerations for candidates in other series reviewed by CAP can be found in Section F of the FAQs.

1. What sets of standards are used for the various ranks?

Candidates at all ranks are evaluated in each of three categories: (1) scholarship or creative achievement, (2) University teaching, and (3) service. For candidates in Professional Schools (e.g., Professor of Clinical 'X'), candidates are also evaluated for their professional achievements, including their clinical contributions.

CAP's main job is to apply academic standards from a university-wide, disinterested point of view, and to maintain equity across the various fields represented in the university.

For promotion to the associate and full levels, the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) specifies, "superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification."

Advancement to Professor, Step VI, involves an overall career review. "(G)reat academic distinction, recognized nationally, will be required in scholarly or creative achievement or teaching." Also required is "evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in each of the three categories of professional responsibility."

Advancement to step VII and beyond "usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the lower step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step VI."

Professor, Step IX is the top of UC's academic scale. Achievement of Step IX is a signature professional accomplishment. Advancement to Above Scale is neither customary nor expected. Thus, many faculty members reasonably remain at Step IX.

Advancement to Above Scale involves an overall career review and is "reserved only for the most highly distinguished faculty (1) whose work of sustained and continuing excellence has attained national and international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact; (2) whose University teaching performance is excellent; and (3) whose service is highly meritorious. ...Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not 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."

2. How is university service weighed?

All faculty members are expected to engage in service activities. At higher ranks there is an expectation of significant service to the campus, university, and field. Departmental recommendation letters should not only list the candidate's service contributions but, when appropriate, should discuss the commitment involved as well as the importance of the service.

Certain administrative duties can reduce one's creative output. Especially heavy service commitments, with documented effective performance, can partially compensate for reduced achievement in other areas. However, normal advancement cannot take place without effective teaching and continuing superior scholarly or creative productivity as well as good service.

Regarding administrative service as a Department Chair, the APM says, "It is entirely appropriate to award a merit increase, or if performance warrants it, an accelerated increase, primarily for demonstrated excellence in the Chair appointment," IF "accompanied by evidence of continued productive involvement in scholarly activities." Further, the APM specifies that advancements above Professor, Step V "should require substantial justification beyond excellence of administrative service" (APM 245-11).

CAP takes these statements to mean that unusually heavy and effective service should count significantly in personnel reviews (and of course all service should be evaluated and given proper weight), but that *even heavy administrative responsibilities cannot compensate for nearly abandoned research or creative activity*. Acceptance of administrative activity that reduces scholarly or creative activity nearly to zero must be rewarded by other means than by advancement in the professorial series. This stricture applies more severely at the point of a major action (promotion to tenure or to full professor), or for any step above Professor, Step V.

3. How is teaching weighed?

Good teaching is essential for any advancement, and can be the deciding factor in cases of acceleration. Poor teaching can sink an otherwise adequate case for a merit increase. At the same time, good teaching cannot be the sole basis for advancement.

CAP gives much more weight to courses for which evaluations are provided. The PPM requires that the Department provide at least one form of evaluation, and encourages two. CAPE evaluations are currently the dominant form of student evaluations included in files for courses taught on the general campus but the use of CAPE evaluations is not required by CAP; other forms of evaluation are welcome if they provide comparable information, including student comments, and they are collected independently of the instructor. Departments should always include student comments in addition to the numerical ratings in order to give reviewers a more complete picture of the candidate's teaching performance. All courses should be reported and evaluated by procedures applied consistently across the department.

CAP typically considers CAPE reviews, student comments, and the CAPE departmental comparison for each candidate (a graphical presentation of each faculty member's teaching effectiveness, as compared with others in the same department). If a course is unusual (e.g., particularly challenging or well outside norms in terms of structure or evaluation), then a comprehensive and impartial comparison with performance by other instructors of the same or similar courses can be especially valuable. CAP notes that CAPE evaluations are not the only type of accepted student evaluations in use at UCSD; some departments and academic units on campus have developed their own forms for student evaluation. CAP encourages a diversity of input on teaching quality, including: 1) reports from observation of classes; 2) written analysis of course materials; 3) reports on interviews with students. No matter the type of evaluation included in a file, all evaluations should be discussed, analyzed, and contextualized in the departmental recommendation letter.

CAP also considers the supervision of graduate students and other forms of mentorship as evidence of teaching effectiveness. The department should provide some form of evaluation of the candidate's effectiveness as a mentor or advisor, rather than a list of mentees.

4. How do activities related to diversity affect the academic review process? (Same as #4 in Section D)

In July 2005 changes were adopted to APM 210-1d, the UC policy that governs faculty appointment, promotion and appraisal reviews. The principle governing these changes is contained in the following statement on the criteria for personnel actions: "Teaching, research, professional and public service contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of a candidate's qualifications."

Faculty in any field may engage in activities that concern diversity and equal opportunity in ways that conform to our research, teaching and service mission as a public university. *Diversity contributions are not required for advancements or promotions, but faculty who engage in such activities that meet the standards of excellence in their field or discipline should be recognized and rewarded.*

Diversity efforts should be described in the designated section (II.f.) of the biography/bibliography. Describe the diversity efforts and their contribution to the research, teaching, or service mission of the university in your personal statement. Chairs are strongly encouraged to highlight these contributions and to evaluate both the effort made and the effectiveness of the activity.

Additional information about the role of diversity in the mission of the University of California can be found in the "Statement on Diversity" adopted by the Academic Council in May 2006. Please visit the link at: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/>

For UCSD specific information, visit

<http://facultyequity.ucsd.edu/>

5. How does CAP evaluate files spanning the broad range of scholarly and creative disciplines at UCSD?

CAP's primary task is to ensure that evidence in the file supports the action proposed by the department. CAP synthesizes the assessments of various reviewers together with that of CAP members to ensure that everyone is treated as fairly and equitably as possible and that the high academic standards articulated in the PPM are maintained.

CAP relies largely on the department's presentation of a candidate's work and on commentary offered by the dean. For major actions CAP also depends on the reports of external referees, and can call upon the advice of an *ad hoc* committee or request that the department provide more extramural letters. Service on CAP is typically for two years; each member will have reviewed over 1,200 files from across the general campus, the Health Sciences, SIO, the Rady School of Management (Rady) and the Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies (IR/PS) by the end of his or her term.

6. What are career reviews and at what points do they normally occur?

A career review is an evaluation of the accomplishments of an individual from the time of initial appointment in the series to the present. There are four career reviews in the University of California professorial series. Two are promotions, the advancement from one rank to a higher rank within a series: Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, and Associate Professor to Full Professor. The other two merit advancements within the professorial series that involve career reviews are advancement beyond Professor, Step V (normally Step V to Step VI) and beyond Professor, Step IX (normally Step IX to Above Scale). Promotions and advancement to Above Scale require evaluation by external referees through letters of evaluation. Beginning in the 2013 – 2014 academic year, external referee letters are no longer required for advancement to Step VI. However, if a Department Chair or candidate believes that a case would be better justified with the inclusion of external referee letters (e.g. when the advancement is based on recently published work, and there has not been enough time to discern the work's impact on the field), external referee letters should be included in the file.

Advancements to Professor, Step VI and to Professor, Above Scale involve the application of significantly more rigorous review criteria than at other ranks. Advancement to Step VI requires national or international recognition for significant research accomplishments (APM 220-18). Advancement to Above Scale is reserved for the most distinguished scholars, creative artists, and clinical researchers whose work achieves international recognition and acclaim. As with other advancements in the professorial ranks, there is also a requirement for a teaching performance that is excellent and service that is highly meritorious.

Once at Professor, Above Scale, a faculty member is reviewed every four years and may receive a “normal” merit increase of 50% or 100% of the salary increment between Step VIII and Step IX, an accelerated increase (merit increase of more than 100% of the salary increment between Steps VIII and IX), or a no-change. CAP takes seriously the requirement that merit increases at Professor, Above Scale be supported by evidence of continued excellence in all three areas of research, teaching and service at a level commensurate with the rank of Distinguished Professor. As stated in the APM, “A further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an above-scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Continued good service is not an adequate justification. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinite, and only in the most superior cases where there is strong and compelling evidence will increases at intervals shorter than four years be approved.”

7. What is the policy on off-cycle reviews? (Same as #6 in Section D)

Off-cycle reviews are not expressly prohibited in policy, but CAP strongly recommends against off-cycle acceleration requests. There are several reasons for this: it is very hard to calibrate the proper levels of service and teaching for a shortened review period; it is often in the candidate’s own interest to wait for a regular review, and be considered for a more significant acceleration; and, it adds work to the already burdensome file-review process without any clear benefit. For any proposed off-cycle review, departments should make very clear the special justification for such an action.

Assistant Professors can be considered for tenure any year without regard to cycles.

8. What is a Career Equity Review and who is eligible? (Same as #7 in Section D)

A Career Equity Review (CER) is an examination of a faculty member’s performance from the initial hiring at UCSD onward to determine whether they occupy an inappropriately low rank and/or step. The purpose of a CER is not to re-open or appeal the decision of any previous action, but to see if the candidate’s performance, when considered over multiple review periods, warrants additional advancement. The goal of a CER is to determine whether a faculty member’s initial appointment was at too low a step; whether over time sufficient productivity has accumulated to warrant additional advancement even though individual merit actions did not call for accelerated advancement; and whether contributions have been overlooked, undervalued, or gained delayed impact.

A CER may be initiated by any faculty member who is a member of the Academic Senate, excluding those at the LPSOE, Assistant, or Above Scale levels. Academic Personnel Services can provide more information on the process of initiating a CER. Per the PPM Section 230-28 VII.C, “a CER may be requested only once while the faculty member is at the Associate Professor level, once while at the Full Professor level prior to advancement to Professor, Step VI, and once after advancement to Professor, Step VI, prior to advancement to Above Scale.” Because promotions as well as advancement to Professor Step VI and Above Scale are career reviews, a CER would be largely

redundant with such reviews. Note that the CER is conducted in parallel with the regularly scheduled academic review. The department must vote on the recommendation regarding calibration on the basis of a CER separately from the regular academic review.

9. Does CAP consider aspects of a Professor's career that fall outside the review period? (Same as #12 in Section D)

At the major actions – promotion to Associate or Full Professor, and advancement to Step VI and Above Scale – CAP evaluates the candidate's career since the last advancement, since the last major action, and across the entire academic career. For actions associated with merit increases CAP focuses on the work accomplished during the review period since the last advancement. For all actions, CAP has access to the file prepared for the prior review.

10. Can work in progress be considered in a personnel review? (Same as #13 in Section D)

Section C of the bibliography is for "Works in Progress." Because items listed in Section C have normally not been subject to peer review or had an impact on the field, they generally do not form the basis for major promotions or advancements. However, they can be useful in 4th year appraisals, and at regular merits when the preparation of a major work, such as a book, takes longer than a single review cycle. Items in Section C can also be useful in establishing that the candidate has a trajectory of continued productivity. The faculty member's department should present and analyze work in progress if it seems appropriate in a particular case.

If work in progress forms a significant part of the basis for the current action, that work cannot again be the sole basis for a future action. In short, work is credited only once. As in many ambiguous matters in personnel reviews, the key here is for the candidate and the department to explain fully and candidly what is taking place. In many departments it is not the custom to submit work in progress for review; it is certainly not required.

11. When is credit given for items that move from Section C to A? (Same as #14 in Section D)

Items are typically placed in section C to provide evidence of continuing productivity as well as a sense as to the direction of ongoing scholarship. Such work does not generally form the basis of the proposed action and will be credited in a future review if and when it appears in section A.

12. How does CAP evaluate collaborative research or creative work?

The department should, with the help of the candidate and other collaborators, explain fully the nature of collaborative work including the proportion of the candidate's individual contribution (see PPM 230-28, VI.A.1). CAP looks for substantial intellectual

contribution, and for evidence of clear and defined creative role in research or artistic production.

For major actions such as promotion to tenure, it is essential to document independent scholarly contributions and leadership. The demonstration of independence may include the publication record itself (authorship), invitations to prestigious conferences to present one's work, or validation from external referees writing for the file. For creative artists, there should be evaluation of the individual's personal contributions to the success of a collaborative work. CAP relies heavily on departmental, Chair, dean and external letter writers' careful assessments of an individual's contribution to collaborative work.

In some cases it may be helpful, even necessary, to have letters from other participants in a collaborative venture. While such letters cannot substitute for the required independent letters, there is no proscription against their inclusion to provide an insider's perspective on the candidate's role in collaborative work. To be of use to campus reviewers, these "dependent" letters should address the specific creative contributions attributable to the individual in question.

13. How does CAP evaluate such impermanent productions as plays, dances, and installations?

As always, the department is the main source of knowledge, and full analysis of creative works is important. CAP, and its Advisory Committee on the Arts (commonly referred to as CAP Arts), cannot consider work that has not been witnessed and judged by others.

CAP and CAP Arts have equipment available to review materials such as videotapes, recordings, DVDs, and digital archives. These may be equivalent to professional publications (as with commercial audio recordings of musical compositions or dramatic readings).

Apart from competitions, juried festivals, and the like, the venues or professional levels of performances may serve as indicators parallel to the rankings of publication venues (journals, selective presses). It is incumbent upon the department to articulate these distinctions. Published reviews are helpful, though the department should articulate the importance of the reviews' publication venues. Publicity material serves as documentation that a production occurred, but is not in itself a form of evaluation. Evidence, rather than just assertions, about the quality of performance venues is critical.

14. In the external letters of evaluation, what distinguishes "department-nominated" from "candidate" letters? (Same as #4 in Section C and #15 in Section D)

Formally, the Department solicits all letters of evaluation. "Candidate" letters are those solicited from an official list of names that the candidate provides. These may include doctoral and postdoctoral advisors, collaborators, and colleagues with whom the candidate may have worked in professional contexts, as well as independent reviewers. "Department-nominated" letters are solicited from referees not on the candidate's list of suggestions. In promotion cases or appointments at the Associate Professor rank or

higher, "department-nominated" letters should be solicited from a slate of expert reviewers who are tenured and at least at the candidate's rank. Letters from Full Professors are preferred.

Of the letters, normally no more than 1 out of 3 (when 3 independent extramural letters are required for the file) or 2 out of 5 (when 5 extramural letters are required for the file) should be from referees selected solely by the candidate [per PPM 230-29, III.D.2.a].

15. How does CAP view publication by way of conference proceedings or electronic media as opposed to "archival" print journals and books? (Same as #19 in Section D)

CAP is broadly aware of the different selectivity and impact of different media and venues of publication in different fields. In some areas, notably, but not exclusively, in Computer Science, certain highly selective refereed conference proceedings are regarded as having the same academic impact as first-rate journal publications. In such circumstances, the department should document the selectivity of the conference and the archival nature of the proceedings. Without such documentation, assertions that "these publications are in highly selective conferences" add little to CAP's deliberations.

Candidates and departments should note that it is not appropriate to count conferences as primary work in fields where such work later appears, in archival form, in journals. In such circumstances, conference presentations can nonetheless be cited as evidence of engagement and impact in the field.

In a related issue, as technology advances and fields expand, publication in less traditional venues is becoming more common. This includes online and open access venues, blogs, or other types of non-traditional publications. CAP recognizes that work in non-traditional venues may be meritorious and impactful; however, it is incumbent on the Department Chair to explain the importance of any non-traditional publication venue, as well as the peer-review process involved in publication.

16. Does CAP take into consideration the quality of the publisher, or the stature of the journal?

Yes. There are many ways of judging the quality of a publication, including peer review at a selective outlet. Publication in a broadly respected and highly selective journal also suggests peer approval and high likely professional impact. For books, publication with an academic press implies selection by expert peer review.

17. How does CAP respond to published reviews of work in scholarly and popular media?

Reviews provided in arts files are expected and helpful. In both the humanities and social sciences, CAP welcomes reviews of a professor's work in respected journals and uses them in the evaluation of the publication, with the department's guidance.

If a book manuscript has been accepted by a publisher and is in production, readers' reports solicited by the press should be included with the file. Readers' reports are one of the most complete and unbiased kinds of assessment of manuscript quality.

Once a book is published, book reviews from the major journals in the field should be included in the file for subsequent reviews. Published book reviews are likely to provide disinterested assessments of the scholarly contribution of a book. As such, they can be a very useful indicator of a book's impact in its field. In all likelihood, the candidate will already have been rewarded for the book by the time such reviews appear, but including book reviews in subsequent career review files will enable CAP to determine whether the total career contributions have been appropriately recognized; and the comparison of reviews to letters from external referees will assist CAP in calibrating future advances. It is important that departments include all reviews from the appropriate scholarly journals - not just a selection of positive reviews to support its case.

CAP recognizes that accident, oversight, or reasons of space may result in some valuable books not having been reviewed in the usual journals. Nonetheless, CAP believes that reviews in leading journals are an important means by which a discipline acknowledges and evaluates the quality and importance of scholarship in a field and are, accordingly, an important measure of scholarly impact.

Trade books and textbooks are generally considered professional activity or as contributions to teaching. Published reviews and the departmental letter can demonstrate otherwise.

18. Is grant funding a basis for advancement?

The awarding of a grant is not itself sufficient for advancement. It can be a secondary sign of scholarly or creative achievement, but the scholarly or creative work itself is the basis for advancement. CAP considers the awarding of a grant to be a promise of future productivity and, for assistant professors, one indication of research independence if the candidate is the Principal Investigator (rather than co-I). Specific comments from departments, Chairs, deans and external referee letter writers on the selectivity of major grants can be helpful.

A lack of funding in a discipline that typically requires grant support for doing research can raise questions about peer acceptance of the investigator's research and the ongoing viability of the research enterprise. Such concerns should be addressed in the departmental letter.

19. Are prizes and awards necessary for advancement?

Not typically. Like success in garnering grants, the receipt of awards, prizes, and honorific positions in societies can be a sign of achievement and recognition. For the Above Scale portion of the professor rank, such indications of professional recognition are expected.

20. Does CAP distinguish and reward dedicated service as opposed to nominal membership on a committee? (Same as #20 in Section D)

Yes, especially with the department's help. CAP welcomes testimony from committee Chairs or other individuals who can comment on the real effectiveness of university service as part of the file. This is especially the case when extensive service is judged to compensate for weakness in other parts of the profile. Mere membership on a committee is not itself a sign of service.

21. What types of course evaluation are required? (Same as #21 in Section D)

The PPM encourages more than one type of evaluation of teaching. It is very helpful if departments summarize the crucial questions (teacher's overall effectiveness, overall quality of course) and provides summary comparisons with other courses. CAP members are conscious of the imperfections of course evaluations as indices of teaching quality. CAP hopes that departments provide other evidence (e.g., classroom visits and comments by other faculty) especially where teaching plays an exceptional role in the decision for or against a merit or promotion. Student comments, if solicited in an unbiased manner and provided *in toto*, are encouraged.

22. Should faculty members provide a self-statement for the file?

This is a matter best judged by the candidate and department. However detailed a candidate's self-statement may be, the department should provide its independent and thorough analysis of all aspects of a professor's academic work. CAP does not require such self-statements, and only a subset of departments at UCSD routinely includes them in the file. Keeping in mind that many readers of the file will not be experts in their field, candidates can use a self-statement to place their work in a broader context. Candidates may also avail themselves of the opportunity to describe the nature of service activities that are given only a brief overview in the biography/bibliography. In departments that embrace a wide range of very different disciplines, a professor's explanation of the character of the work may be helpful to the professor's colleagues in preparing a department letter.

23. What is the policy on the postponement of tenure reviews? (Same as #25 in Section D)

It is generally not in the interest of the candidate, the department, or the university to postpone either promotion or non-reappointment unless there is a compelling reason to do so. Postponement can be justified if the candidate has significant work in progress or under review, the evaluation of which will occur within a year but not in time to be included in the sixth year review.

If a candidate's tenure review is carried out during the 6th year but is not successful, he or she can receive a reappointment with a one-year delay in promotion review or a 1- or 2-year terminal reappointment. If the tenure review in the 7th year is unsuccessful, the candidate receives a one-year terminal reappointment and year 8 is the terminal year.

Reconsideration of the terminal reappointment may be granted by the EVCAA (after consultation with the CAP Chair) during the 8th year if there is substantial evidence of significant improvement in the record of scholarly achievement, particularly with respect to previously identified areas of weakness.

CAP FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

C. Review of Assistant and Associate Professors

1. Is "service" an important category for assistant professors? (Same as #1 in Section D)

Most departments assign a relatively light service responsibility to assistant professors, and CAP regards this as appropriate. Assistant professors, who may be reluctant to decline any service requested of them, should take care not to become overburdened.

A willingness to perform university service is nonetheless welcome, and assistant professors will want to participate in various aspects of academic life. Knowledgeable reports from the department as to whether the service was conscientiously and ably performed is useful to CAP.

Professional service such as refereeing journal articles, chairing a panel at a meeting, or giving invited talks is evidence of impact on the field and therefore considered positively in any review.

2. What are the criteria for tenure in a book field? (Same as #2 in Section D)

In any field, a tenure file should describe a career of a person whose accomplishments match those of an associate professor (see Question #1 in Section B of these FAQs). Evidence of the formal acceptance of books, journal articles and book chapters is essential if the works are not available in published form at the time of the tenure review.

For fields in which book publication is the norm for tenure, a book published or accepted for publication by a prestigious university press remains the gold standard for promotion. That said, changes in book publishing may mean that some assistant professors may have trouble finding a publisher for his or her first book because of market forces, not because of the quality of their research and writing. Given these changes, publication venues beyond university presses may be acceptable. CAP will continue to require evidence of independent evaluation of scholarly quality. Independent reader reports prior to publication, and book reviews after publication, should be submitted in the file as evidence of scholarly quality in addition to external referee letters. The department chair should also provide a description of the peer-review process and the quality of the venue if a non-traditional press or publication venue is used.

Though a book of high quality and significance is essential for promotion, it is not by itself sufficient for promotion. The candidate's service and teaching records must be good. Evidence of other publications, including a second project, is essential. Documentation of the latter could be in the form of a funding award, and article, and/or a well-developed research outline.

Candidates may be proposed for promotion to tenure at any time without the action being considered either off-cycle or an acceleration.

3. What does CAP look for in a fourth year appraisal? (Same as #5 in Section D)

The purpose of the 4th year appraisal is to inform an assistant professor in a thorough and formal way about her or his prospects for tenure. The appraisal thus serves a very different function from the departmental letter for a merit increase. Of utmost importance is a rigorous evaluation and complete candor. If there are weaknesses in the candidate's record, a department's natural reluctance to be the bearer of bad news can do much more harm than good to the candidate and the university.

The most common weakness in an assistant professor's early career is a lack of progress with regard to research publications. The University of California is a research university, and provides generous resources and time for research. A relatively thin publication record (or its equivalent in the arts) cannot be lightly passed over.

Fields vary in their expectations for tenure, and 4th year appraisals reflect this. In the sciences, positive mid-career accomplishments show evidence of research independent from doctoral work (and any mentored postdoctoral work), of research projects that promise leadership in the field, and evidence that research will continue once tenure is granted. The award of competitive grants for research to a candidate as principal investigator can help validate an independent research program, although grants do not in themselves substitute for published scholarship.

Collaboration of a junior faculty member with senior colleagues can present a problem with regard to evaluation for tenure. This is especially true when a junior candidate publishes frequently or exclusively with a small number of more senior collaborators who are always in senior authorship positions. In such cases, establishing the intellectual independence or leadership to warrant promotion above the assistant level in the professorial or research scientist series can be difficult. The assessment of consortium publications can also present a challenge; if most or all of a candidate's scholarly activity is through large-scale consortiums, the department should expend special effort documenting a candidate's intellectual contributions to such activities.

CAP will recommend a *Favorable* appraisal only if it seems clear that maintenance of the trajectory will result in a recommendation for tenure within two years. Note that a *Favorable* appraisal is not a promise of successful promotion; future promotion will also require the appropriate external validation of the candidate's work. CAP is likely to judge prospects as *Favorable with Reservations* in the many cases where reviewers note that there is room for improvement but the candidate is basically on the right trajectory. CAP will recommend a *Problematic* appraisal when there is a significant obstacle to timely promotion. The most common such problem is the demonstration of research independence: publications that all include a senior mentor or that comprise almost exclusively middle authorships will make tenure unlikely. An *Unfavorable* appraisal is indicated only in the most extreme cases in which promotion is highly unlikely to be recommended. Poor teaching can also cause concern at the 4th year appraisal and, if not remedied, provide an obstacle to promotion.

4. In the external letters of evaluation, what distinguishes "department-nominated" from "candidate" letters? (Same as #14 in Section B and #15 in Section D)

Formally, the Department solicits all letters of evaluation. "Candidate" letters are those solicited from an official list of names that the candidate provides. These may include doctoral and postdoctoral advisors, collaborators, and colleagues with whom the candidate may have worked in professional contexts, as well as independent reviewers. "Department-nominated" letters are solicited from referees not on the candidate's list of suggestions. In promotion cases or appointments at the Associate Professor rank or higher, "department-nominated" letters should be solicited from a slate of expert reviewers who are tenured and at least at the candidate's rank. Letters from Full Professors are preferred.

Of the letters, normally no more than 1 out of 3 (when 3 independent extramural letters are required for the file) or 2 out of 5 (when 5 extramural letters are required for the file) should be from referees selected solely by the candidate [per PPM 230-29, III.D.2.a].

5. Is grant funding a basis for advancement? (Same as #18 in Section B)

The awarding of a grant is not itself sufficient for advancement. It can be a secondary sign of scholarly or creative achievement, but the scholarly or creative work itself is the basis for advancement. CAP considers the awarding of a grant to be a promise of future productivity and, for assistant professors, one indication of research independence if the candidate is the Principal Investigator (rather than co-I). Specific comments from departments, chairs, deans and extramural letter writers on the selectivity of major grants can be helpful.

A lack of funding in a discipline that typically requires grant support for doing research can raise questions about peer acceptance of the investigator's research and the ongoing viability of the research enterprise. Such concerns should be addressed in the departmental letter.

6. Are prizes and awards necessary for advancement? (Same as #19 in Section B)

Not typically. Like success in garnering grants, the receipt of awards, prizes, and honorific positions in societies can be a sign of achievement and recognition. For the Above Scale portion of the professor rank, such indications of professional recognition are expected.

CAP FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

D. Information for Departmental Chairs

1. Is "service" an important category for assistant professors? (Same as #1 in Section C)

Most departments assign a relatively light service responsibility to assistant professors, and CAP regards this as appropriate. Assistant professors, who may be reluctant to decline any service requested of them, should take care not to become overburdened.

A willingness to perform university service is nonetheless welcome, and assistant professors will want to participate in various aspects of academic life. Knowledgeable reports from the department as to whether the service was conscientiously and ably performed is useful to CAP.

Professional service such as refereeing journal articles, Chairing a panel at a meeting, or giving invited talks is evidence of impact on the field and therefore considered positively in any review.

2. What are the criteria for tenure in a book field? (Same as #2 in Section C)

In any field, a tenure file should describe a career of a person whose accomplishments match those of an associate professor (see Question #1 in Section B of these FAQs). Evidence of the formal acceptance of books, journal articles and book chapters is essential if the works are not available in published form at the time of the tenure review.

For fields in which book publication is the norm for tenure, a book published or accepted for publication by a prestigious university press remains the gold standard for promotion. That said, changes in book publishing may mean that some assistant professors may have trouble finding a publisher for his or her first book because of market forces, not because of the quality of their research and writing. Given these changes, publication venues beyond university presses may be acceptable. CAP will continue to require evidence of independent evaluation of scholarly quality. Independent reader reports prior to publication, and book reviews after publication, should be submitted in the file as evidence of scholarly quality in addition to external referee letters. The department chair should also provide a description of the peer-review process and the quality of the venue if a non-traditional press or publication venue is used.

Though a book of high quality and significance is essential for promotion, it is not by itself sufficient for promotion. The candidate's service and teaching records must be good. Evidence of other publications, including a second project, is essential. Documentation of the latter could be in the form of a funding award, and article, and/or a well-developed research outline.

Candidates may be proposed for promotion to tenure at any time without the action being considered either off-cycle or an acceleration.

3. What is acceleration and what criteria are applied? (Same as #1 in Section E)

Acceleration takes place when a candidate skips a step in an advancement or promotion. (They can also occur with less than the normal period of service at the preceding rank or step, and these are discussed under “off cycle reviews”)

The standards for acceleration are high and require an exceptional level of academic productivity since the last advancement, coupled with excellence in teaching and service. For acceleration, there is a requirement for research or creative activity beyond the specific disciplinary norm in the period of review. Further, as stated in the PPM, “acceleration cases should not be proposed if there is a weakness in the appointee’s performance in any area of responsibility specified in the review criteria.” In other words, a weakness in teaching or service will prevent acceleration, even though the teaching and service might be sufficient for normal merit advancement.

One-step accelerations are typically granted for research productivity that is on the order of twice that normally expected in a discipline at that rank, together with good or excellent teaching and service. Thus, doubled productivity with little or poor teaching would not constitute a strong case for acceleration. Accelerations at a more senior level will usually require more evidence of exceptional performance than accelerations at a more junior level. Accelerations are possible, but rare, when the exceptional performance is in the domain of teaching or of professional, university, or community service.

Extramural letters are not required for acceleration. However, as stated in the PPM, “For advancement to any level for which external letters are required, the department Chair should explain in the solicitation letter the significance of the advancement and note the degree of acceleration, if applicable, so that the referees may evaluate the appointee’s achievements in relation to the University’s criteria for advancement.” (PPM 230-28 IV.B) In such cases letters from faculty at other UC campuses may be especially useful because “acceleration” may not be well understood outside of the UC system.

Accelerations of more than one step are warranted only in rare circumstances. There should be extraordinary productivity and external validation of professional distinction and achievement, as well as outstanding teaching and service. In such cases, external letters, especially from UC faculty who can speak to the step, are advisable.

Accelerations may sometimes involve career review actions, such as a promotion or advancement to Step VI. When the candidate would normally undergo a career review in the current review, and an acceleration is requested in addition to the career review, then the entire career is examined prior to considering the current review period for the acceleration. In these cases, either the candidate’s performance in the current review period or a recalibration to a higher step may justify the acceleration. When a proposed

acceleration results in a career review (e.g. when an accelerated promotion from Associate Professor, Step II, to Professor, Step I, is proposed), the committee first considers whether the current review period justifies acceleration. If it does not, the career review does not apply. If the current review period justifies acceleration, then the committee considers the career review action.

4. How do activities related to diversity affect the academic review process? (Same as #4 in Section B)

In July 2005 changes were adopted to APM 210-1d, the UC policy that governs faculty appointment, promotion and appraisal reviews. The principle governing these changes is contained in the following statement on the criteria for personnel actions: "Teaching, research, professional and public service contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of a candidate's qualifications."

Faculty in any field may engage in activities that concern diversity and equal opportunity in ways that conform to our research, teaching and service mission as a public university. *Diversity contributions are not required for advancements or promotions, but faculty who engage in such activities that meet the standards of excellence in their field or discipline should be recognized and rewarded.*

Diversity efforts should be described in the designated section (II.f.) of the biography/bibliography. Describe the diversity efforts and their contribution to the research, teaching, or service mission of the university in your personal statement. Chairs are strongly encouraged to highlight these contributions and to evaluate both the effort made and the effectiveness of the activity.

Additional information about the role of diversity in the mission of the University of California can be found in the "Statement on Diversity" adopted by the Academic Council in May 2006. Please visit the link at: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/>

For UCSD specific information, visit

<http://facultyequity.ucsd.edu/>

5. What does CAP look for in a fourth year appraisal? (Same as #3 in Section C)

The purpose of the 4th year appraisal is to inform an assistant professor in a thorough and formal way about her or his prospects for tenure. The appraisal thus serves a very different function from the departmental letter for a merit increase. Of utmost importance are rigorous evaluation and complete candor. If there are weaknesses in the candidate's record, a department's natural reluctance to be the bearer of bad news can do much more harm than good to the candidate and the university.

The most common weakness in an assistant professor's early career is a lack of progress with regard to research publications. The University of California is a research

university, and provides generous resources and time for research. A relatively thin publication record (or its equivalent in the arts) cannot be lightly passed over.

Fields vary in their expectations for tenure, and 4th year appraisals reflect this. In the sciences, positive mid-career accomplishments show evidence of research independent from doctoral work (and any mentored postdoctoral work), of research projects that promise leadership in the field, and evidence that research will continue once tenure is granted. The award of competitive grants for research to a candidate as principal investigator can help validate an independent research program, although grants do not in themselves substitute for published scholarship.

Collaboration of a junior faculty member with senior colleagues can present a problem with regard to evaluation for tenure. This is especially true when a junior candidate publishes frequently or exclusively with a small number of more senior collaborators who are always in senior authorship positions. In such cases, establishing the intellectual independence or leadership to warrant promotion above the assistant level in the professorial or research scientist series can be difficult. The assessment of consortium publications can also present a challenge; if most or all of a candidate's scholarly activity is through large-scale consortiums, the department should expend special effort documenting a candidate's intellectual contributions to such activities.

CAP will recommend a *Favorable* appraisal only if it seems clear that maintenance of the trajectory will result in a recommendation for tenure within two years. Note that a *Favorable* appraisal is not a promise of successful promotion; future promotion will also require the appropriate external validation of the candidate's work. CAP is likely to judge prospects as *Favorable with Reservations* in the many cases where reviewers note that there is room for improvement but the candidate is basically on the right trajectory. CAP will recommend a *Problematic* appraisal when there is a significant obstacle to timely promotion. The most common such problem is the demonstration of research independence: publications that all include a senior mentor or that comprise almost exclusively middle authorships will make tenure unlikely. An *Unfavorable* appraisal is indicated only in the most extreme cases in which promotion is highly unlikely to be recommended. Poor teaching can also cause concern at the 4th year appraisal and, if not remedied, provide an obstacle to promotion.

6. What is the policy on off-cycle reviews? (Same as #7 in Section B)

Off-cycle reviews are not expressly prohibited in policy, but CAP strongly recommends against off-cycle acceleration requests. There are several reasons for this: it is very hard to calibrate the proper levels of service and teaching for a shortened review period; it is often in the candidate's own interest to wait for a regular review, and be considered for a more significant acceleration; it encourages some strategic file timing, taking advantage of the natural waxing and waning of productivity; and it adds work to the already burdensome file-review process without any clear benefit.

Assistant professors can be considered for tenure any year without regard to cycles.

7. What is a Career Equity Review and who is eligible? (Same as #8 in Section B)

A Career Equity Review (CER) is an examination of a faculty member's personnel actions from the initial hiring at UCSD onward to determine whether those actions have resulted in an inappropriately low rank and/or step. The purpose of a CER is not to re-open or appeal the decision of any previous action, but to see if the candidate's performance, when considered over multiple review periods, warrants additional advancement. The goal of a CER is to determine whether a faculty member's initial appointment was at too low a step; whether over time sufficient productivity has accumulated to warrant additional advancement even though individual merit actions did not call for accelerated advancement; and whether contributions have been overlooked, undervalued, or gained delayed impact after particular merit actions.

A CER may be initiated by any faculty member who is a member of the Academic Senate, excluding those at the LPSOE, Assistant, or Above Scale levels. Academic Personnel Services can provide more information on the process of initiating a CER. Per the PPM Section 230-28 VII.C, "a CER may be requested only once while the faculty member is at the Associate Professor level, once while at the Full Professor level prior to advancement to Professor, Step VI, and once after advancement to Professor, Step VI, prior to advancement to Above Scale." Because promotions as well as advancement to Professor Step VI and Above Scale are career reviews, a CER would be largely redundant with such reviews. Note that the CER is conducted in parallel with the regularly scheduled academic review. The department must vote on the recommendation regarding calibration on the basis of a CER separately from the regular academic review.

8. How can the Department Chair avoid common mistakes in file preparation?

- The department is expected to examine the work first hand and provide a full and independent analysis of the candidate's contribution, especially his/her clear and defined contributions in any collaborative work. Extensive paraphrasing of the candidate's self-statement is not useful.
- External referee letters (which CAP reviewers carefully read) should not be quoted at length in lieu of independent departmental analysis and evaluation of the work of the faculty member. In discussing external referee letters, the Department Chair should take care to avoid including too much detail in describing the credentials of the external referees to ensure that the identity of the external referees remain confidential.
- It is helpful for the department to provide both an honest assessment and supporting evidence of the quality of the publishing or performance venues. Suggesting that a journal is top-tier, when it is not, will not be helpful to the candidate. When candidates participate in large collaborations, the department should include a discussion of the candidate's contributions to the collaborative project, and how these contributions justify the proposed action.

- The department is expected to describe the actual effort and effectiveness of teaching, and any new or modified teaching plans, as well as the actual quality and effort that go into university and professional service.
- The candidate and department should identify clearly what work has been accomplished within the review period for the specific action.
- The department should address shortcomings that are obvious in the file, clarify exceptional circumstances, and explicitly address potentially troubling aspects of the file, e.g., a split departmental vote or negative comments in the external letters. If the previous CAP recommendation pointed out any weaknesses, the department should describe what the candidate has done to remedy them.
- On tenure and promotion cases, the department should obtain sufficient analytical and independent external letters (3 for appointment at the Assistant rank above Step II or for promotion to Full Professor, and advancement to Professor, Step VI, or Above Scale; 5 for promotion to the Associate rank or for appointment at or above the Associate rank). Failure to include the required number of independent letters will delay the onset of review by CAP. The department should also carefully select outside referees, preferably picking largely from among well-established faculty members at peer universities.
- For the integrity of the review process, it is important to avoid either a conflict of interest or the appearance of such at all levels of review. The internal letters (i.e., from the department, the ad hoc committee, Chair, and Dean) should not be written by faculty members with whom the candidate has had a recent or substantial collaboration. In defining recency, CAP finds reasonable the guideline adopted by the National Science Foundation: individuals should not author a letter in the review if they have collaborated with the candidate on a project or on a book, article, report, or paper within the last 48 months. Likewise, external referees who are providing letters of evaluation should not be recent collaborators of the candidate, and any such connection should be explicitly noted and discussed. Letters from both external and internal collaborators are often very useful, but this information supplements that provided by independent sources.
- Rather than "bean counting," the department should focus on the significant matters, the original and important discoveries, the exceptional contribution to teaching, the influence of the work on others, and laborious and effective service.
- The bibliography portion of the biography-bibliography ("biobib") should be organized in a straightforward manner. All items in the A section should be appropriate to that section (e.g., peer-reviewed), and distinctions among meaningfully different forms of items in this section (e.g., research articles, review articles) should be clearly indicated (by separate sections or by a separate column). In some disciplines, contributions to edited volumes (i.e., "book chapters") are considered peer-reviewed contributions; if included, these also should be specifically labeled.

9. What are the personnel deadlines?

Deadlines for files: Deadlines are established by the EVCAA and Academic Personnel Services (APS). APS posts an updated schedule of campus file deadlines on the web each year.

Admissible materials and deadlines for submission:

- For non-career reviews, CAP considers only materials accepted or published by October 15th of the review year.
- For tenure cases (promotion to Associate Professor), CAP considers all materials and information available up until the time that CAP makes its final recommendation. For example, files may be amended to reflect articles or books accepted for publication after the standard submission deadline.

10. What is the normal timing of a personnel action?

Actions requiring external letters of evaluation should follow a departmental schedule that assures letters will be in hand in time for departmental review during the Fall Quarter. A file consists of the Academic Biography and Bibliography (biobib), teaching evaluations, publications and reviewable evidence of creative activity; the departmental evaluation and vote; external letters of evaluation if applicable; the Chair's evaluation or letter of transmittal; and, if the candidate chooses, a personal statement.

For delegated merit reviews, the Dean judges the file, determines the personnel action if there is no disagreement at or with a lower level of review (i.e., Chair, department), and informs the candidate of that action. All other files proceed to Academic Personnel Services, where they are reviewed for completeness and consistency, and then are transmitted to CAP. CAP meets weekly from late September through July and acts on nearly all complete files within nine days of receipt. For each case, CAP transmits a written recommendation to the EVCAA.

11. What can delay the normal personnel process?

- Failure of the department or school to submit files in a timely fashion.
- An incomplete file. Files will be sent back to the department if it is missing documentation such as teaching evaluations. The Academic Personnel Services facilitates the process of returning files to the department.
- A need for additional information. Requests for additional information are processed through Academic Personnel Services. CAP never contacts individuals or the departments directly.
- Need for additional independent referee letters. CAP may request that the department solicit additional referee letters when, for example, the group of letter writers largely consists of close collaborators and friends of the candidate; too many writers represent non-research or non-academic entities; a UC perspective on appropriate step is necessary; or few of the letters received are sufficiently analytical to assist CAP in its review. Solicitation letters sent to external referees (both to assess scholarly activity and teaching performance) should request objective evaluation, rather than, for example, asking for support for a proposed action.

- Formation of a campus *ad hoc* review committee. In most cases, CAP acts as its own *ad hoc* committee. However, for cases in which CAP has identified a need for more information on scholarly contributions in the file, a campus *ad hoc* committee may be formed to provide specific expertise. This adds considerable time to the review process.
- Responding to a preliminary decision. In some cases in which different levels of review (including CAP) disagree on the action proposed, the preliminary decision is transmitted from the EVCAA to the Dean to the Chair and finally to the candidate.

12. Does CAP consider aspects of a professor's career that fall outside the review period? (Same as #9 in Section B)

At the major actions – promotion to Associate or Full Professor, and advancement to Step VI and Above Scale – CAP evaluates the candidate's career since the last advancement, since the last major action, and across the entire academic career. For actions associated with merit increases CAP focuses on the work accomplished during the review period since the last advancement. For all actions, CAP has access to the file prepared for the prior review.

13. Can work in progress be considered in a personnel review? (Same as #10 in Section B)

Section C of the bibliography is for "Works in Progress." Because items listed in Section C have normally not been subject to peer review or had an impact on the field, they generally do not form the basis for major promotions or advancements. However, they can be useful in 4th year appraisals, and at regular merits when the preparation of a major work, such as a book, takes longer than a single review cycle. Items in Section C can also be useful in establishing that the candidate has a trajectory of continued productivity. The faculty member's department should present and analyze work in progress if it seems appropriate in a particular case.

If work in progress forms a significant part of the basis for the current action, that work cannot again be the sole basis for a future action. In short, work is credited only once. As in many ambiguous matters in personnel reviews, the key here is for the candidate and the department to explain fully and candidly what is taking place. In many departments it is not the custom to submit work in progress for review; it is certainly not required.

14. When is credit given for items that move from Section C to A? (Same as #11 in Section B)

Items are typically placed in section C to provide evidence of continuing productivity as well as a sense as to the direction of ongoing scholarship. Such work does not generally form the basis of the proposed action and will be credited in a future review if and when it appears in section A. One common exception is in the granting of a crossover step, when the material in section C is used and credited to justify the advancement.

15. In the external letters of evaluation, what distinguishes "department-nominated" from "candidate" letters? (Same as #14 in Section B and #4 in Section C)

Formally, the Department solicits all letters of evaluation. "Candidate" letters are those solicited from an official list of names that the candidate provides. These may include doctoral and postdoctoral advisors, collaborators, and colleagues with whom the candidate may have worked in professional contexts, as well as independent reviewers. "Department-nominated" letters are solicited from referees not on the candidate's list of suggestions. In promotion cases or appointments at the Associate Professor rank or higher, "department-nominated" letters should be solicited from a slate of expert reviewers who are tenured and at least at the candidate's rank. Letters from Full Professors are preferred.

Of the letters, normally no more than 1 out of 3 (when 3 independent extramural letters are required for the file) or 2 out of 5 (when 5 extramural letters are required for the file) should be from referees selected solely by the candidate [per PPM 230-29, III.D.2.a].

16. What constitutes an acceptable and helpful set of external referee letters?

For appointment at the Assistant Professor level, there should be at least three external letters. Independent external referees are not required for appointments at the level of Assistant Professor, Steps I and II (since it may be too soon for the candidate to have established an independent reputation in the field).

For appointments at the level of Assistant Professor, Step III and above, there must be at least three independent letters. Independent letters are those from individuals who have not had a collaboration, co-authored publication, or joint grant or grant application (criteria that match the current federal standard for defining potential conflict of interest) nor are former mentors. For appointment to Associate Professor and higher, there should be at least five external letters in the file that are analytical and from individuals who are independent of the candidate.

It is sometimes argued that it is difficult not to use collaborators in relatively small fields or subdisciplines. Nevertheless, there is likely to be a perception of bias if a letter writer contributed significantly to scholarship on which the departmental recommendation is based. When a department feels it is necessary to include a letter from the candidate's collaborator, coauthor or mentor, the department letter should be clear about the nature of the association. Similarly, when "department-nominated" letters are solicited from individuals at the rank of assistant or associate professor, this should be noted and explained in the "Qualifications" section of the form identifying external referees.

For advancement to Professor, Above Scale, three independent letters are required. For advancement to Above Scale, analytical letters from internationally recognized senior colleagues are particularly helpful for assessing international recognition and acclaim.

Advancement to Professor, Step VI, no longer requires external referee letters. Cases in which the candidate's national reputation and impact are clear have been approved without any external referee letters. If the advancement to Step VI is based on recently accepted publications that have not yet been widely reviewed in the professional

community, it is important for the department to include some form of external validation of the work in the file. This can include readers' reports for books, or one or more external referee letters. Letters from faculty at other UC campuses may be especially helpful for advancement to Step VI.

It is especially important to receive evaluations from experts with sufficient professorial experience within the University of California system to evaluate appropriate placement of the candidate on the UC step scale or when the action involves a subtle knowledge of the UC step system, e.g., acceleration, or advancement to Professor, Step VI or Professor, Above Scale.

CAP is aware that departments cannot control the quality of letters received. However, the quality of the letter of solicitation has considerable impact on the quality of letters received. It is advisable to provide information in the solicitation letter that would help external reviewers write letters that are strongly analytical. Solicitation letters should include the rank and step of the action proposed by the department as well as a clear statement if the proposed action includes an acceleration. It may be useful to begin the solicitation process early, so there is time to send a second solicitation if several "testimonial" letters are received, or if the writers are discovered to lack independence from the candidate. The Academic Personnel Services web site provides examples of appropriate solicitation letters.

17. What constitutes a good internal letter of evaluation and how can departments avoid potential "conflict of interest" in internal letters of evaluation?

The same attributes that make an external "department-nominated" letter useful also apply to the internal evaluation of the candidate's research. Specifically, Chairs of *ad hoc* committees and of departments should be analytical and evaluative in their letters. Letters that simply enumerate numerical contributions are less helpful, as are letters that quote extensively from those written by external referees. When published work in joint authorship (or other product of joint effort) is presented as evidence of academic achievement, it is the responsibility of the department Chair to establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in the joint effort (APM 210-1 d(2)).

It is essential for the departmental recommendation letter to comment on the candidate's formal teaching and service contributions and to explain apparent anomalies (e.g., a lack of formal undergraduate teaching during the review period) whenever possible.

Internal letters of evaluation, including letters from a departmental *ad hoc* committee, division chief, department Chair, or Dean, should be free from a conflict of interest or appearance thereof. The department should apply the same guidelines articulated above to determine whether internal colleagues are in potential conflict of interest situations and, if so, should exclude such colleagues from file preparation whenever possible. If this is unavoidable, this should be explicitly justified, and the potential conflict of interest should be clearly noted in the internal letter of evaluation that is provided.

CAP recognizes that departments might favor inclusion of collaborators as referees for reasons of expertise and expediency. However, although letters from collaborators can be useful for determining the nature of the candidate's individual efforts in the collaboration, they are much less useful for external validation of the quality of the work. For that, independent letters are essential. In some circumstances, CAP may return a file to the department for a new letter due to the appearance of possible conflict of interest.

18. Are separate Chair's letters in a file allowed?

Yes. The department Chair may use such a letter to provide a different perspective from that of the departmental recommendation letter. In addition, the department Chair's letter can broadly comment on the candidate's record in comparison with those of other faculty members, a comparison that is less likely to appear in the department letter.

19. How does CAP view publication by way of conference proceedings or electronic media as opposed to "archival" print journals and books? (Same as #15 in Section B)

CAP values all publications that involve rigorous peer review and that have demonstrated impact in the candidate's area of scholarship.

CAP is broadly aware of the different selectivity and impact of different media and venues of publication in different fields. In some areas, notably, but not exclusively, in Computer Science, certain highly selective refereed conference proceedings are regarded as having the same academic impact as first-rate journal publications. In such circumstances, the department should document the selectivity of the conference and the archival nature of the proceedings. Without such documentation, assertions that "these publications are in highly selective conferences" add little to CAP's deliberations.

Candidates and departments should note that it is not appropriate to count conferences as primary work in fields where such work later appears, in archival form, in journals. In such circumstances, conference presentations can nonetheless be cited as evidence of engagement and impact in the field.

In a related issue, as technology advances and fields expand, publication in less traditional venues is becoming more common. This includes online and open access venues, blogs, or other types of non-traditional publications. CAP recognizes that work in non-traditional venues may be meritorious and impactful; however, it is incumbent on the department Chair to explain the importance of any non-traditional publication venue, as well as the peer-review process involved in publication.

20. Does CAP distinguish and reward dedicated service as opposed to nominal membership on a committee? (Same as #20 in Section B)

Yes, especially with the department's help. CAP welcomes testimony from committee Chairs or other individuals who can comment on the real effectiveness of university

service as part of the file. This is especially the case when extensive service is judged to compensate for weakness in other parts of the profile. Mere membership on a committee is not itself a sign of service.

21. What types of course evaluation are required? (Same as #21 in Section B)

The PPM encourages more than one type of evidence about teaching. It is very helpful if departments summarize the crucial questions (teacher's overall effectiveness, overall quality of course) and provides summary comparisons with other courses. CAP members are conscious of the imperfections of course evaluations as indices of teaching quality. CAP hopes that departments provide other evidence (e.g., classroom visits and comments by other faculty) especially where teaching plays an exceptional role in the decision for or against a merit or promotion. Student comments, if solicited in an unbiased manner and provided *in toto*, are welcome.

22. What can a unit do when there is need for exceptional speed in a personnel case?

Let the Dean's office know about the situation. In appointment and retention cases of extraordinary urgency, CAP will normally accept files even if they are submitted after the deadline for a meeting.

23. Under what circumstances is a market off-scale salary component increased? (Same as #2 in Section E)

Based on the policies governing the establishment and resetting of market off-scale (MOS) salary components, an existing MOS is increased only as part of a retention based on a documented external offer or of a negotiated pre-emptive retention. In recent years, the EVCAA has also instituted a "Career Milestones" Initiative in which faculty who achieve promotion to Associate or Full Professor will receive an increase to their market off-scale salary component. Advancement to Professor, Step VI, is also included in the Initiative. To address salary compression, the EVCAA has also instituted a "Spot Compression" program that seeks to alleviate salary compression as much as possible.

24. Can CAP discuss personnel cases directly with Deans or Chairs? (Same as #7 in Section A)

No. At some UC campuses, Deans may address their CAPs about individual cases, but not at UCSD. The strongly held view of the UCSD CAP is that speaking to Deans or Chairs can lead to inequity: an especially skillful or relentless verbal advocate of one professor might sway opinion, where another professor may have no such advocacy. Deans and Chairs do provide their opinions on all files in letters that CAP takes very seriously.

25. What is the policy on the postponement of tenure reviews? (Same as #23 in Section B)

It is generally not in the interest of the candidate, the department, or the university to postpone either promotion or non-reappointment unless there is a compelling reason to do so. Postponement can be justified if the candidate has significant work in progress or under review, the evaluation of which will occur within a year but not in time to be included in the sixth year review.

If a candidate's tenure review is carried out during the 6th year but is not successful, he or she can receive a reappointment with a one-year delay in promotion review or a 1- or 2-year terminal reappointment. If the tenure review in the 7th year is unsuccessful, the candidate receives a one-year terminal reappointment and year 8 is the terminal year. Reconsideration of the terminal reappointment may be granted by the EVCAA (after consultation with the CAP Chair) during the 8th year if there is substantial evidence of significant improvement in the record of scholarly achievement, particularly with respect to previously identified as areas of weakness.

CAP FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

E. Special and Irregular Actions

1. What is an acceleration and what criteria are applied? (Same as #3 in Section D)

Acceleration takes place when a candidate skips a step in an advancement or promotion. (They can also occur with less than the normal period of service at the preceding rank or step, and these are discussed under “off cycle reviews”)

The standards for acceleration are high and require an exceptional level of academic productivity since the last advancement, coupled with excellence in teaching and service. For acceleration, there is a requirement for research or creative activity beyond the specific disciplinary norm in the period of review. Further, as stated in the PPM, “acceleration cases should not be proposed if there is a weakness in the appointee’s performance in any area of responsibility specified in the review criteria.” In other words, a weakness in teaching or service will prevent acceleration, even though the teaching and service might be sufficient for normal merit advancement.

One-step accelerations are typically granted for research productivity that is on the order of twice that normally expected in a discipline at that rank, together with good or excellent teaching and service. Thus, doubled productivity with little or poor teaching would not constitute a strong case for acceleration. Accelerations at a more senior level will usually require more evidence of exceptional performance than accelerations at a more junior level. Accelerations are possible, but rare, when the exceptional performance is in the domain of teaching or of professional, university, or community service.

Extramural letters are not required for acceleration. However, as stated in the PPM, “For advancement to any level for which external letters are required, the department Chair should explain in the solicitation letter the significance of the advancement and note the degree of acceleration, if applicable, so that the referees may evaluate the appointee’s achievements in relation to the University’s criteria for advancement.” (PPM 230-28 IV.B) In such cases letters from faculty at other UC campuses may be especially useful because “acceleration” may not be well understood outside of the UC system.

Accelerations of more than one step are warranted only in rare circumstances. There should be extraordinary productivity and external validation of professional distinction and achievement, as well as outstanding teaching and service. In such cases, external letters, especially from UC faculty who can speak to the step, are advisable.

Accelerations may sometimes involve career review actions, such as a promotion or advancement to Step VI. When the candidate would normally undergo a career review in the current review, and an acceleration is requested in addition to the career review, then the entire career is examined prior to considering the current review period for the acceleration. In these cases, either the candidate’s performance in the current review

period or a recalibration to a higher step may justify the acceleration. When a proposed acceleration results in a career review (e.g. when an accelerated promotion from Associate Professor, Step II, to Professor, Step I, is proposed), the committee first considers whether the current review period justifies acceleration. If it does not, the career review does not apply. If the current review period justifies acceleration, then the committee considers the career review action.

2. Under what circumstances is a market off-scale salary component increased? (Same as #23 in Section D)

Based on the policies governing the establishment and resetting of market off-scale (MOS) salary components, an existing MOS is increased only as part of a retention based on a documented external offer or of a negotiated pre-emptive retention. In recent years, the EVCAA has also instituted a "Career Milestones" Initiative in which faculty who achieve promotion to Associate or Full Professor will receive an increase to their market off-scale salary component. Advancement to Professor, Step VI, is also included in the Initiative. To address salary compression, the EVCAA has also instituted a "Spot Compression" program that seeks to alleviate salary compression as much as possible.

3. What is the difference between a recalibration, an acceleration, and a Career Equity Review (CER)?

Though all three actions (recalibration, acceleration, and Career Equity Review), if successful, will result in the skipping of one or more steps, the justifications for the three actions differ. The traditional acceleration is discussed in the first question of this section, and the criteria used to review such proposals will not be repeated here. The Career Equity Review is a special action that candidates can request when they believe that previous review actions may have resulted in an inaccurate rank and/or step designation. Possible justifications may include, but are not limited to, the assertion that the cumulative record warrants an acceleration, even though no one review period was sufficient to trigger acceleration, or that the rank and/or step was too low at the time of initial appointment. Whereas the CER can be proposed at the Associate level, at the Full level prior to advancement to Step VI, or at the Full level between Steps VI and IX, the recalibration is usually proposed by the department or the candidate at the time of a career review. Recalibration arguments are oftentimes phrased in terms of the productivity of the candidate as compared to colleagues, ideally in the same subfield; however different measures are used for different candidates (publications, publications/year, patents, conference proceedings, books), with the department chair emphasizing the category of comparison that is most favorable to the candidate. This argument leaves out the rest of the candidate's activities: the comparison faculty may have a distinguished history of teaching and service that has been critical in their progression up the academic ladder, and these activities are sometimes not mentioned in much depth, if at all, for the candidate under review. If a recalibration argument is used, the departmental recommendation letter should discuss the comparison

population, as well as the metrics used to determine the proper rank and step for the faculty member. Weaknesses in teaching and/or service may preclude the recalibration.

CAP FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

F. Criteria for Series Other than Professor (Ladder-Rank) That Are Reviewed By CAPⁱ

1. What are the criteria for appointment and advancement in the Professional Research (Research Scientist) series?

The titles in this series are: Assistant Research Scientist, Associate Research Scientist, and Research Scientist. Appointees do not have teaching responsibilities, but the research expectations and the criteria for performance in research are equivalent to those in the Professor (Ladder-Rank) series. The appointee must be continuously and effectively engaged in independent, high quality research and creative activity. Research Scientists who do engage in educational activities may count them toward their service contributions. Service is required at the rank of Associate and above. Unlike candidates in the Professor (Ladder-Rank) series, service contributions in this series can be University and/or professional service. Advancement to the Associate level is mandatory within eight years at the Assistant level. According to the APM 310-4, this series is not appropriate for those "whose duties are limited to making significant and creative contributions to a research project or to providing technical assistance to a research activity." Such individuals belong in the Specialist or Project Scientist series, where they will be able to advance in their careers.

Appointees in the Research Scientist series are not members of the Academic Senate. An individual appointed in this series may serve as an advisor for a Ph.D. student, provided that he or she also has a non-salaried lecturer appointment. If the individual engages in a significant amount of classroom teaching, an appointment to the Adjunct Professor series may be more appropriate.

2. What are the criteria for the Adjunct Professor series?

Appointees in the Adjunct Professor series may engage predominantly in research with limited teaching or engage predominantly in teaching with limited research. The departmental recommendation letter at the time of appointment should clearly delineate the amount of effort that will be allotted to each category of evaluation, as well as the expectations for advancement and promotion. Each subsequent review should also clearly document the expectations for the candidate. In either case, service activities are required. Adjunct Professors may not be reappointed if they cease doing research or creative activity. This series is undoubtedly the source of the most contentious appointments/advancements, partially because previous practice has not been in accord with the PPM, but more fundamentally because it is used in different ways in different parts of the University.

There is an eight-year limitation of service at the Assistant Adjunct Professor rank.

Appointees in the Adjunct Professor series are not members of the Academic Senate.

3. What are the criteria for the Professor in Residence series?

The individuals in this series are judged by the same standards as for the Professor (Ladder-Rank) series. They are members of the Academic Senate, but their salaries are

contingent on available funds. As with the Professor (Ladder-Rank) series, appointments at the Assistant rank are for at most two years at a time and for a cumulative total of at most eight years. Appointments at higher levels do not carry tenure or security of employment and generally should have a specified ending date.

4. What are the criteria for the Professor of Clinical “X” series?

This series, in the Health Sciences, is designed for clinical scholars in full-time university service. Advancement in the Professor of Clinical “X” series requires excellence in research or creative work, teaching, and service, as well as in clinical practice. Though the major part of their time may be devoted to teaching and clinical service, they are expected to engage in creative scholarly activities aimed at improving clinical practice or medical education. For appointment or promotion to the Associate Professor of Clinical “X” level, a regional reputation within a clinical specialty is expected, and for the Professor of Clinical “X” level, a national reputation is expected. Appointees in this series are members of the Academic Senate.

Departments are sometimes reluctant to make appointments at the Assistant Professor of Clinical “X” because of the difficulty of documenting clinical excellence. CAP believes that such documentation is possible and encourages departments to propose such appointments because appointment of junior faculty to the wrong series can create difficulties for all concerned. One example of such documentation is letters from clinical experts who may not be independent from the candidate, but who can evaluate the candidate’s clinical contributions.

There is an eight-year limitation of service at the Assistant Professor of Clinical “X” rank.

5. What are criteria for the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series?

The titles in this series are: Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment (LPSOE), Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE), Senior Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment (Sr. LPSOE) and Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment (Sr. LSOE). Appointees in this series are not required to demonstrate excellence in research or creative activity, but must demonstrate excellence in four areas related to education: (1) Teaching of truly exceptional quality; (2) Professional achievement and activity; (3) University and public service; and (4) Educational leadership beyond the campus. Departments must be careful to document all four areas explicitly. The last area has proven to be the most problematic. Educational leadership can be documented in a variety of ways, including publication in journals dealing with pedagogy and involvement with national or statewide reports concerning teaching in the field. Appointees in this series must advance to LSOE within eight years. Appointees in this series are members of the Academic Senate.

6. What are the criteria for the Unit 18 (NSF) Lecturer series? What is an "Excellence Review" in the Lecturer series?

The primary criterion of review is documented evidence of truly exceptional teaching. In its review of Unit 18 (NSF) Initial Continuing Appointments, CAP gives due consideration to all materials contained in a review file. In considering a proposed continuing appointment, these materials may include student evaluations, assessments by former students, assessments by other members of the department, program or unit, and other

appropriate faculty members, development of new and effective techniques of instruction and instructional materials, and assessments resulting from classroom visitations by colleagues and evaluators.

7. What are the criteria for the Professor of Practice series?

The “Professor of Practice” series was created at UCSD after faculty recognized the difficulty in appointing individuals without a traditional academic background to the Adjunct Professor series. These individuals are usually professionals from industry or elsewhere with valuable professional expertise that can be shared with UCSD graduate students. They do not normally have the publication record that is required for appointment in the Adjunct Professor series. Professional competence and activity, teaching, contributions to the research and/or creative mission of the University with an emphasis on professional practice, and service are the four criteria by which Professors of Practice are judged. The evaluation of the candidate with respect to these criteria should take into account the nature of the University assignment of duties and responsibilities.

ⁱ Please note that the following FAQs present an overview of each series. For a full description of criteria for advancement in all series, please see PPM 230-28.