



To: All UC San Diego School of Medicine Faculty  
From: School of Medicine Committee on Academic Personnel (KP Edmonds, Chair)  
Date: May 23, 2025  
Subject: 2024-2025 Where SOMCAP Stood

---

### Topline Recommendations:

SOMCAP is a committee made up of faculty members who volunteer their time and expertise and work to level-set academic actions for the Health Science (HS) Clinical and Clinical X series, across all Departments in the School of Medicine. From our work this year, we wish to highlight the following high-yield recommendations for faculty and Department leadership:

- ✓ We encourage all Health Sciences Clinical faculty to familiarize themselves with the Health Sciences Clinical Minimum Advancement Guidelines and use them to structure mentorship and career planning activities.  
<https://pulse.ucsd.edu/departments/VCHS/administration/academic-administration/academic-affairs/Pages/Unit-Academic-Standards-and-Criteria.aspx>
- ✓ **Management positions compensated by UCSD** (e.g., Medical/Clinic Director, program director) should be listed under Clinical activities, not as University service.
- ✓ **Creative** efforts include peer-reviewed manuscripts, but for HS Clinical faculty, can also be patient educational material shared outside your clinical practice, QI projects, new teaching curricula, clinical guidelines and pathways, Epic order sets, national and international guidelines/position statements, and podium presentations & posters at conferences; All items should be peer reviewed, as noted below. **Evidence** of creative output should be included in a Dropbox for reviewers.
- ✓ Teaching **evaluations** with constructive comments and/or mention of areas for improvement should be addressed in both the Candidate's Self-Assessment and the Division/Department letter.
- ✓ University **service, beyond your own division and department**, is expected as faculty advance through Associate and Full Professor rank. A comprehensive list of Health Sciences committees can be found here:  
<https://vchs.ucsd.edu/administration/aa/files/HS%20Committee%20List%2002102025.pdf>

### **Committee Charge:**

For the 2024-25 year, the School of Medicine Committee on Academic Personnel (SOMCAP) was composed of seven appointed School of Medicine faculty from different departments who volunteered their time to review a variety of academic actions in the Health Sciences (HS) Clinical and Clinical X series in the School of Medicine (SOM). Committee members typically meet twice monthly and typically serve 3-year terms and report to the HS Faculty Council annually.

Since the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences has delegated authority over the HS Clinical Professor series, these faculty dossiers are not reviewed by the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) for appointments<sup>1</sup>, accelerations, appraisals, consecutive no changes, career reviews, promotions, or terminations. Therefore, for these academic review actions, SOMCAP makes their recommendations to the Senior Assistant and Assistant Vice Chancellors (AVC) for HS Academic Affairs, based on the departmental criteria and consideration of the overall School of Medicine's files for the faculty in its purview, to ensure parity. SOMCAP also reviews and recommends actions for Clinical X faculty to the HS AVCs to include in their letter to CAP, but final authority over the Clinical X series resides with the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) or Chancellor.

Because SOMCAP serves as an administrative recommending body, its members abstain from formally voting on academic actions for votes that occur in their own home department. In addition, to preserve objectivity, SOMCAP members should not be asked to provide letters of recommendation for faculty under review. If a SOMCAP member has provided a letter of recommendation or if they have collaborated with a faculty member being reviewed, they are required to recuse themselves from the committee discussion and abstain from the SOMCAP vote. Lastly, SOMCAP members should not be asked to provide guidance or review files that will be submitted for review. Assistance in preparing the file should be provided by the department leadership, academic personnel analyst or previous SOMCAP members who may be able to provide their input. Guidance is also offered annually via a series of presentations from the Academic Resource Center and HS Academic Affairs office as part of the Faculty Workshop Series.

### **SOMCAP Activities in AY 2024-25**

SOMCAP convenes during the Fall and serves through early Summer. All files are assigned to a primary and secondary reviewer on SOMCAP. So far this year, SOMCAP held 14 regular meetings and 1 ad hoc committee, lasting up to 3 hours. SOMCAP reviewed a total of 203 files, 168 of which were review files and 35 of which were appointment or change in series files, which are also considered as "new appointments." Of the 203 files, 81 (40%) were reviewed as consent agenda (abbreviated review) files and 122 (60%) required discussion by the entire committee. SOMCAP

---

<sup>1</sup> Per the authority and review Chart, the Senior Assistant and Assistant Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs has final authority for all actions within the HS Clinical series, however appointment files align with the campus practice of requiring committee review for appointments made at the Associate and Full ranks and appointments.

had a 71% rate of agreement with the review actions proposed by the faculty member's department, and 71% agreement for the appointments/change in series actions.

### **KEY FEEDBACK**

**Funded Roles:** SOMCAP reminds faculty and their departments that compensated positions (e.g., medical director, service line chiefs, etc.) do not qualify as service. Those clinically related activities should be included under "Clinical" activities and not service. We encourage faculty to use the Candidate Self-Assessment to contextualize any mismatch between funding (AKA "protected time") and the amount of work required for the role. We further encourage faculty to be explicit about roles that are voluntary, but may sound like they are funded, e.g., "my Division has recognized my efforts with an unfunded 'Director of QI' title, that I am hopeful will be funded in coming years."

**Scholarly/Research/Creative Efforts:** the HS Clinical Series Minimum Guidelines for advancement encourages that all of the following are appropriate means to meet this requirement: typical manuscripts in "main stream" journals, but also patient educational material, QI projects, new teaching curricula, clinical guidelines and pathways, Epic order sets, participation in team-based collaborative research, participation in national and international organizational document/guideline development/position statements, and podium presentations & posters at conferences. Each item should be peer reviewed by senior faculty members and paired with supporting material transmitted in the shared OneDrive/Dropbox folder. These may include article reprints, files containing patient handouts, A3 forms or other work products for QI projects, etc. SOMCAP members review these documents to ensure that they meet the standard for disseminatable scholarly/creative works. SOMCAP continues to encourage Departments to develop creative work advancement and promotion criteria in the HS Clinical series that also consider quality improvement projects, development of course content, curricula, and teaching content so as to recognize creative faculty who are excelling in teaching innovations and are meeting review guidelines in the clinical, and service categories, but who are not actively publishing their work in peer reviewed journals.

In the 2024-2025 review year there was a significant number of dossiers which lacked sufficient documentation of scholarly by inclusion of the documents in a Dropbox folder. With insufficient information the Committee must either issue a Request for Additional Information or issue a Preliminary Assessment, both result in delaying a final recommendation to the AVC.

When faculty are involved in grant funded research, grants should be listed in Section (d) Contracts and Grants of the BioBib, not in Section (c) Honors and Awards. Further, grants that are unfunded or closed should not be listed at all or separated from active, current, and funded grants. When completing the Contracts and Grants table in the BioBib, the Role column refers to the percentage of the grant for which the appointee has oversight, not the funding percentage provided to the appointee.

Publications listed in Section A of the BioBib must be peer-reviewed with A.I. being reserved for original research publications where authors meet ICJME criteria. Other peer-reviewed products, such as Reviews, Commentaries, or works including those in which the appointees are acknowledged or members of a consortium may be listed in A.II., A.III., and so on. It is not a requirement to list products in Section C- Work in Progress, however, any items listed in Section C must have a corresponding entry uploaded to the Dropbox folder for review.

**Constructive Feedback in Teaching Evaluations:** Areas for improvement identified in teaching evaluations should be frankly discussed in both the Division/Department letter and the Candidate Self-Assessment including general context around the comments and plans for improvement. SOMCAP takes these seriously and wants to know that the faculty and department do as well. SOMCAP understands that this information may sometimes be sensitive and does not expect full details, rather the acknowledgment that the faculty and department are aware and that they are mutually addressing these issues.

**Service:** SOMCAP recognizes that most faculty are very active professional citizens. As faculty reach higher ranks, leadership roles within the Department and service outside of the home Department and the faculty member's clinical and scholarly sphere-of-interests should be actively pursued and clearly documented. We encourage faculty to seek out diverse venues in which to share their unique perspectives both within the School of Medicine, Health Sciences, the Health System or major affiliates such as the VA or Rady Children's Hospital:

<https://vchs.ucsd.edu/administration/aa/files/HS%20Committee%20List%2002102025.pdf>.

Service beyond UCSD, such as community engagement, charitable work, societal committees, and peer review or editorial work, is also required and cannot substitute for University work.

When completing Section (a) University Service of the BioBib, separating out service activities by area (Division, Department, Health System, School, Campus, etc.) assists reviewers in evaluating the areas of impact and involvement. As appointees advance in their career it's important for service activities to be outside their areas of self-interest.

**Percent Effort:** Reviewers greatly appreciate the effort candidates, divisions, and departments take in preparing documents for their appointment or academic review. In line with campus practice, SOMCAP continues to request that faculty include their subjective percent effort devoted to each academic review category discussed in the self-assessment (i.e., Clinical, Scholarly / Research, Teaching, and Service) to allow reviewers to provide the most equitable reviews. Having these data allows reviewers to distinguish faculty with varied efforts, for example those that have 90% clinical activity with minimal time for scholarship might be considered differently than faculty in the same series who have 50% clinical activity with more time allocated to scholarship.

	Effort (100%)	Details
Clinical	90%	8 clinics/week, 250 patients/year
Teaching	5%	Rounding with residents and fellows
Service	3%	Department Clinical Competency Committee
Scholarly	2%	1 new presentation

**Candidate Self-Assessment:** The self-assessment is the faculty's opportunity to describe how they meet the series criteria and highlight impact of their accomplishments during the relevant period (i.e., the previous 2–3-year cycle for normal merit actions). This document should be a **concise** narrative and should serve to contextualize the faculty's relevant accomplishments. Candidate self-assessments may be used to explain variances in performance or contributions and can include personal impact statements, as appropriate. However, candidates are not required to disclose confidential or sensitive personal information. This will provide an opportunity for reviewers to consider extenuating circumstances. Regarding clinical effort, this is the only area where discussion of clinical work is evident in the file; we encourage including quantification when possible (e.g. shifts/month, patients/session, surgeries/week, reads/hr., etc.) as well as any patient satisfaction data that is available. Please ensure that all patient-identifying information is fully redacted to maintain confidentiality and comply with privacy regulations.

**Mentees:** SOMCAP has noticed some candidates and departments including a large volume of mentees in candidates' files, which seem likely to entail all learners the faculty clinically supervised during the review period. We would note that mentorship entails more than routine supervision of a learner in the clinical setting and listed mentees should be limited to those to whom the faculty provided personalized and longitudinal support toward career development. Generally, evaluations from these mentees are expected to be included in the file. Faculty should work with their academic personnel analyst in ARC to solicit evaluations.

Mentorship and teaching of junior faculty or students outside UCSD should be listed under service activities.

## COMMENTS BY ACTION

**Preliminary Actions or Requests for Additional Information:** SOMCAP attempts to be judicious in using these actions as they introduce frustration and delay for all parties. We note that, when additional information is obtained from Departments, we are often able to align with the Department's proposed action. SOMCAP therefore recommends avoiding delayed actions by ensuring that faculty have adequate resources and guidance in constructing their packet, that the Department letter clearly states why the candidate meets criteria for the proposed actions, and that sufficient justification for the proposed action be provided at the outset. In the 2024-2025 academic review year, proposed appointments requiring committee review resulted in 1 RFI and

6 prelims being issued. Proposed academic review actions requiring committee review resulted in 7 RFIs and 34 preliminary assessments being issued.

**Initial Appointments:** SOMCAP reviewed 35 initial appointment files this year and agreed with the Department's proposal 71% of the time. Assessing the ideal appointment rank and step for candidates can be challenging, particularly when candidates are proposed for appointment from non-Academic settings. SOMCAP must ensure parity with existing faculty who have advanced for multiple years within the UCSD system. In borderline cases, SOMCAP may recommend an appointment at a "cross-over" step (HS Assistant Steps V or VI or Associate Steps IV or V) to balance concerns and recognize the candidate's potential. These steps are equivalent in terms of service but allow the new faculty time to establish their presence and build their UCSD portfolio. Departments are encouraged to provide evidence and justification for proposed steps such as comparable faculty scholarly productivity and teaching experience, among other quantifiable and relevant criteria.

**Fourth Year Appraisals:** This year, Departments proposed a Favorable appraisal rating for 75% of submitted cases; SOMCAP recommended a Favorable appraisal rating for 43% of submitted cases. Overall, the rate of agreement between Departments and SOMCAP was only 61%. SOMCAP reminds faculty and Departments that an appraisal of Favorable with Recommendations should not be perceived as a negative assessment, but rather as constructive feedback used to guide faculty, mentors, and Department Leadership on how to best prepare the candidate for promotion at the next review. The most common reasons for disagreement between SOMCAP and the Department recommendations include: lack of documented scholarly contributions and insufficient teaching evaluations provided in the dossier.

**Promotions:** SOMCAP reviewed 85 promotion files with a 79% recommendation as proposed. For promotions from the assistant rank, while the normative time spent at the Assistant rank is 6 years before promotion to the Associate rank, faculty can be proposed for promotion at any time while at the Assistant rank. As in previous years, SOMCAP encourages Departments considering promotion of faculty who served less than 6 years at the Assistant rank, to compare them with other faculty members in the Department/Division who are at the proposed rank and step and provide this comparison in the Department Letter to ease review and to better ensure that equity is met within the Department. It is noted that of the very few faculty in recent years who have been denied promotion to the Associate rank, it is notable that these denials are frequently of faculty proposed for promotion at <6 years after appointment.

**Accelerations:** SOMCAP reviewed 34 acceleration files this year and agreed with the Department's proposal 74% of the time. We look forward to the opportunity to recognize faculty for one or more areas of remarkable productivity within a given cycle. At the same time, faculty and Departments must ensure that any file proposed for acceleration be consistently excellent across all four categories, i.e. there are no areas of "weakness" in the file and that a clear case is

made (including supporting data/documentation) for the remarkableness and uniqueness of the effort supporting the proposed acceleration. In general, given its heavily clinical focus, accelerations in the HS series should not be solely based on creative/scholarly efforts, but rather on outstanding contributions in the clinical excellence, teaching, or service categories. High clinical volume is not considered justification for acceleration. Additionally, simple numeric doubling of scholarly output is not sufficient to justify acceleration and consideration for quality and venues of dissemination are important factors when evaluating appropriateness for acceleration. Accelerated actions involving a barrier step (early promotions, promotions with accelerated merit, merits to/through step VI at the full rank) are frequently difficult to justify.

### **Final Thoughts**

We encourage faculty to take advantage of the Academic Resource Center and the Division/Departmental liaisons who can provide valuable assistance with document preparation. SOMCAP encourages faculty to attend annual workshops on how to get promoted hosted by the Vice Chancellor Health Sciences Academic Affairs office, and to actively participate in the departmental review of academic files. This training and service will provide faculty with extensive knowledge of the best practices for file preparation and the review process and will ensure constructive feedback and improvement of the academic review process. The Faculty Training Workshop schedule can be found on the VCHS website:

<https://vchs.ucsd.edu/administration/aa/for-faculty-and-academics/faculty/faculty-trainings.html>

We understand that there are efforts to engage **augmented intelligence (AI) tools** to assist with faculty file development. We encourage faculty to be maximally transparent in the use of these tools and ensure that any AI-informed work product accurately represents and adequately contextualizes your efforts. Faculty might consider including an acknowledgement statement, similar to what is being asked by many peer-reviewed journals, such as, "I have used augmented intelligence generated content tools in the drafting of my self-assessment. I take full responsibility for the accuracy of the final document and of any information provided by the tool and for the accuracy of any supporting work on which that information depends." This could be included in the candidate's self-assessment following the signature. SOMCAP understands that further work and guidance in this area may be forthcoming and encourage faculty and Department leadership to be on the lookout.

Ultimately, we thank all our faculty for their efforts, especially in these times, to advance the tripartite mission of Health Sciences.

Appointments 2024-2025				REVIEWS 24-25								
Appointments	46	Total: 58		Accelerated Reappt/Merit/Appraisal	1	0%		Consent Agendas	85	38%		
Change in Series	12			Accelerated Merit	35	16%		Full Discussion	140	62%	Total: 225	
Consent Agendas	20	Total: 58		Accelerated Promotion	8	4%		SOMCAP Recommendation	As Proposed	157	70%	
Full Discussion	38			Appraisal (4th Year)	17	8%			Down Mod	50	22%	
RFI		Total: 58		Career Review	12	5%			Up Mod	7	3%	
Clin X	15	Total: 16/58		Consecutive No Change	3	1%			Lateral Mod	10	4%	
Adjunct	1			Merit (Above Scale)	1	0%		Split Vote	1	0.44%	Total: 225	
SOMCAP Recommendation	As Proposed	39	67.24%	Merit (Committee)	4	2%		AVC Outcome	As Proposed	143	64%	
	Down Mod	15	26%	Merit (Further Above Scale)	1	0%			Down Mod	57	25%	
	Up Mod	2	3%	Merit/Reappointment	16	7%			Lateral Mod	13	6%	
	Lateral Mod	2	3%	No Change	1	0%			Up Mod	6	3%	
AVC Outcome	As Proposed	37	63.79%	Promotion	107	48%		EVC Outcome	Pending/Prelims	6	3%	
	Down Mod	16	27.59%	Promotion w/ Acceleration	6	3%			As Proposed	18	62%	
	Up Mod	3	5.17%	Readiness Assessment (6th Year)	2	1%			Down Mod	2	7%	
	Lateral Mod	1	1.72%	Reappt/Merit/Appraisal	11	5%			Lateral Mod	1	3%	
EVC Outcome	Pending	1	1.72%	Total: 225				Up Mod	3	10%		
	AVC Overrides	As Proposed	11	68.75%	Clin X	29	13%		Pending	5	17%	
		Down Mod	0	0.00%	RFI				Appraisals			
		Up Mod	3	18.75%	Rate of Agreements - Reviews				DEPT	SOMCAP	AVC	
Lateral Mod		0	0.00%	SOMCAP-AVC	89.78%			FAV	22	12	9	
AVC Overrides	Pending	2	12.50%	DEPT-SOMCAP	70%			FWR	6	16	18	
	As Proposed	8	13.79%	DEPT-AVC	64%			PROB	1	1	2	
	Down Mod			AVC Overrides (23)	10.22%			Total: 29 Appraisals				
	Up Mod											
Rate of Agreements - Appts				Accelerations								
SOMCAP-AVC	86.21%			SOMCAP Recommendation	As Proposed	33	66%	28	56%	AVC Outcome	Total: 50 Accelerations	
DEPT-SOMCAP	67.24%				Down Mod	16	32%	17	34%			
DEPT-AVC	63.79%				Up Mod	1	2%	1	2%			
AVC Overrides (8)	13.79%				Pending	0	0%	4	8%			