

To: All UC San Diego Faculty

From: Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), Frank Biess (Chair, 2022-23)

Date: September 1, 2023

Subject: Where CAP Stood (2023)

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is an essential component of the University of California's cherished tradition of faculty self-governance. As part of a multi-step review process, UC faculty's accomplishments in research, teaching and service are evaluated by a committee of their peers -- CAP. CAP is comprised of faculty from all parts of campus. This year's committee had 13 members – 4 from the Health Sciences, 2 from the Social Sciences, 2 from the Arts and Humanities, 1 from the Biological Sciences, 1 from the Physical Sciences, 2 from Engineering, 1 from the Scripps Institution of Oceanography. It is essential to underscore that CAP does not wield decision-making authority. The final authority on all personnel actions rests with the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) and Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Sr. AVC-AA) or, in some cases, the Deans (Unit-18 Lecturers) or the Chancellor (promotion to tenure and advancement to Above Scale, security of employment for Teaching Professors). While CAP's role is limited to making recommendations, the rate of concurrence has historically been very high. This year was no exception. The final authority's decision followed CAP's recommendation in about 98% of the cases. This high rate of agreement indicates that, in the area of academic personnel review, shared governance is working very well.

This year's CAP was still affected by the lingering COVID-19 pandemic. Nevertheless, CAP held most of its 37 meetings in hybrid mode. Most committee members were present in person while up to three committee members participated remotely via Zoom. This meeting modality imposed significant burdens on our staff, and the Committee is deeply grateful to the CAP analyst for facilitating remote attendance for some members. CAP meetings generally last 4-5 hours. All members evaluate all files. Each file is presented by a lead reviewer or, in the case of appointment and promotion files, by an internal CAP *ad hoc* committee of three members. What follows is a robust discussion of each file, in which the committee strives to articulate and present each possible view on the file. After the discussion, the committee votes and CAP provides a recommendation to the EVC or equivalent final authority. CAP also "post-audits" files from the previous year that had been conducted under Dean's authority. These include appointment files (up to Assistant Professor, Step III) as well as regular merit files.

CAP evaluated 734 files and post-audited 115 files during the 2022/23 academic year. Compared to the previous years, this year's CAP issued a relatively high number of "upmods", that is the Committee recommended an additional bonus off-scale salary component or a higher step than the one proposed by the department in 86 cases or 11% of the files. In 99 of the cases, CAP did not agree with the departmental recommendation and "downmoded" a file. In 53 cases, the department requested a re-consideration, and in 18 cases, CAP reversed its preliminary decision.

CAP also commented on a series of other personnel issues, such as Endowed Chair appointments and re-appointments, on the conferral of emeriti titles, on administrative reviews of Department Chairs, Deans and Provosts. CAP provided extensive feedback on the new APS Process Manual (see [here](#)), which now provides the most up-to date guidelines for the Academic Review Process at UC San Diego. CAP also commented on policy and personnel issues such as the Academic Council Recommendation for allowing Teaching Professors to serve on Divisional CAP Committees, on the Holistic Teaching Implementation Report, on revisions to Procedures for Academic Senate Faculty Discipline, on revisions to the APM to specifically recognize mentoring activities, on proposals to establish new departments of Astronomy and Otolaryngology, and on other revisions to the UCSD-specific PPM and to the systemwide APM.

CAP's deliberations are confidential. This is why it is not appropriate to contact CAP members or the CAP chair with questions regarding specific files or personnel actions. CAP members will not be able to respond to such queries; they cannot even confirm whether a particular file has or has not been reviewed by CAP. We ask all faculty members to respect the integrity and confidentiality of the academic review process. There are multiple opportunities throughout the year for the campus community to communicate with CAP. Department Chairs and Deans are invited to visit CAP in the Fall quarter. The CAP chair delivers several presentations to the campus community. The annual "Where CAP Stood" (WCS) documents as well as former CAP members can provide additional guidance for the review process.

CAP's most important goal is to advance equity and fairness in the review process. CAP is uniquely positioned to do so since it is the only reviewing body (except for the final authority) that sees personnel files from all parts of the University. This enables CAP to have a broader and sometimes comparative perspective on the review process, and it makes it possible to recognize campus-wide inequities or imbalances.

As in past years, CAP also underwent implicit bias and diversity training, this year in a session with UCSD's Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Becky Pettit and Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, Victor Ferreira. These presentations have sharpened CAP's sensitivity to the particular challenges that female scholars and scholars from underrepresented minorities face at UC San Diego and within academia at large. Whenever possible and warranted, CAP has considered such challenges in its deliberations and, at times, also in its recommendations. CAP has been deeply committed to furthering equity, diversity and inclusion at UC San Diego. It has done so by frequently recognizing the particular achievements of female colleagues and of colleagues from underrepresented minorities.

## **FILE PREPARATION**

The best way to support colleagues in the academic review process is to submit a well-prepared file.

## **Departmental Recommendation Letter**

The departmental recommendation letter is the centerpiece of the academic review file. CAP cannot emphasize strongly enough that a succinct and comprehensive analysis of a candidate's activities in research, teaching, and service (and, in certain fields, professional accomplishments) in the departmental letter forms the basis of CAP's judgment. The departmental letter should present an independent evaluation of the candidate's record. It should not simply reproduce the candidate's statement or the analysis provided in an *ad hoc* report, let alone repeat verbatim sections from these documents. The proposed action should align with the department's stated expectations for advancement. CAP encountered several files in which the published departmental expectations diverged from the expectations applied in the departmental letters. Such divergences can be a reason for CAP to return the file to the department. Departments should also not try to anticipate CAP's judgment in formulating the departmental proposal. Instead, they should present the strongest possible arguments for the action that they deem most appropriate and in accordance with departmental standards.

The departmental letter should explain the quality and impact of a candidate's research in a way that is accessible to non-specialists. CAP does not appreciate the view that a colleague's research is so specialized or unique that it cannot be adequately evaluated by reviewers outside of the candidate's field. The departmental letter should also explain the significance of any awards received for research, teaching, service or professional accomplishments. The departmental letter should offer an analysis of the candidate's specific contributions and address potential problems in the file. For example, a candidate's problematic teaching evaluations might be the result of having been assigned a particularly challenging course. It is also helpful if the departmental letter explains the nature and extent of a candidate's service contributions. Finally, the departmental letter should also explain the reasons for dissenting votes. Such explanations are important in order to convey to CAP the full range of the departmental discussion of a particular file.

For appointment files, the departmental letter must describe, in accordance with policy, the search process. This includes information on how the position was advertised, how many applicants applied for the position, how many finalists were interviewed, and how the final candidate was selected. Also per policy, market off-scale salary components (MOS) need to be justified for newly appointed faculty members. The departmental letter should justify the MOS component with reference to the candidate's current position, a competing offer at a peer institution or with market conditions. The latter can be justified with comparable data from academic institutions or discipline-based salary studies. If the market off-scale salary component is due to the departmental entry-level salary agreement (ELSA), the departmental letter should indicate so.

## **BioBib**

It is important that candidates update their BioBib each review period. New activities should be clearly marked as "new". CAP has often seen service activities that are described as lasting up to the present but that are simply not updated. For career reviews, it is important to have the most important service activities for the entire period of service at a particular

rank included. It is helpful to delineate service at the departmental, school and University-wide level. Instructional activities such as advising students or serving on dissertation committees should not be listed under “Section II.a. University Service” except for Research Scientists and other series not requiring teaching. Nor should certain activities that are part of the normal duties of a faculty member be listed on the BioBib. These include attending department meetings or job interviews, writing letters of recommendation or meeting with students outside of class. Such information can be included within a candidate’s statement.

Active grants should be listed with the percentage dedicated to a faculty member’s research contribution (not percent salary effort). This is especially important for grants with multiple PIs, which should indicate the percentage of the grant that was allocated to an individual faculty member’s research. It is useful for CAP to have a faculty member’s grants listed from the previous review period. Pending grants should not be listed on the BioBib since their precise status can be confusing to campus reviewers. CAP recommends that candidates describe their pending grant applications in their candidate statements.

Articles in predatory journals that do not require peer-review or manuscripts that appear in self-publication venues should not be included in Section A of the BioBib. Publications in Open Access and other journals that require fees can be included in Section A as long as they are peer-reviewed. Conference Proceedings constitute another ambiguous category. In some fields such as Computer Science, they are the main publication venue and are clearly peer-reviewed. In other fields, their status is not as clear. If conference proceedings are included in Section A, they must be peer-reviewed. CAP also appreciates additional information on publication venues such as acceptance rates, especially for conference proceedings. The department letter should explain if and how conference proceedings were taken into consideration in arriving at the departmental recommendation, and these standards should be applied consistently within an academic unit.

Non-peer-reviewed publications should be listed in Section B. Items in this section are generally less important for the review process. These items can nevertheless contribute to bolstering a case if their significance is explained in the department letter. Manuscripts deposited to arXiv repositories are pre-publication and cannot be counted as published research in the review period.

Work in progress or publications that have not been finally accepted for publication, including manuscripts deposited to arXiv repositories, can be listed in Section C. In general, CAP does not assign much weight to items in Section C. Yet under certain circumstances, items in Section C can be important for the review process. In book fields, the inclusion of draft chapters can document research progress even in the absence of publications. In some departments, Section C items can become the basis for a merit advancement, with appropriate explanations in the departmental letter. Items in Section C can also signal the future trajectory of a candidate, which can be particularly important as part of the fourth-year appraisal and promotion review.

Multiple authorship is common in many research areas and is becoming more frequent in other fields (for example in the Arts and Humanities). In order to evaluate correctly the contributions of individual faculty members, it is critically important that the specific

contributions to each co-authored piece are clearly described by the candidate. CAP does not appreciate numerical coding systems that are in place in several units. The committee prefers short descriptions after each entry in section A of the BioBib outlining the specific author contributions, particularly with respect to leadership and mentorship roles.

CAP also recommends that the BioBib reference section list ALL authors and highlight/bold the candidate's position in the author order. Marking the corresponding author(s) and the candidate's mentees also helps CAP evaluate the candidate's contributions. For those publications with a large number of authors, it may be appropriate to truncate the author list; however, a description of the candidate's role in the manuscript remains critical.

### **External Referee Letters**

Appointments above Assistant rank, step III, promotions, and career reviews require a minimum number of independent external referee letters. While letters are no longer required for merit advancement to/through Step VI, they constitute a reliable method of establishing a candidate's national and/or international recognition. Letters for advancement to or through Step VI are particularly useful if the department also proposes an acceleration. They are required if advancement to Step VI is part of a Career-Equity Request (CER).

Not including a sufficient number of independent external referee letters is one of the main reasons for CAP to return a file to the department. Letters from former academic advisors or mentors are never independent. This also applies if the mentoring/advising occurs in clinical settings in the Health Sciences. CAP also views letters from active collaborators within the last five years as not independent (though CAP has accepted letters with no collaboration within a four-year period as borderline independent, in accordance with changed NSF guidelines). Letters from referees who are planning to collaborate with the candidate in the future are typically viewed by CAP as borderline independent and have been accepted on a case-by-case basis. If the minimum number of independent letters is being satisfied through several such "borderline" letters in a file, CAP is likely to send the file back for more letters. CAP is also aware that some colleagues, especially in the Physical Sciences, can be part of very large consortiums. Letters from members of such consortiums can be independent if they do not come from close collaborators within a subgroup of that consortium. If this is the case the department letter should explain that the relationship did not involve recent or direct collaboration. Letters must also come from external referees who are at an equal or higher academic rank than the one that the candidate is proposed for. CAP encourages departments to practice due diligence in the selection of external referees.

### **Reading the CAP Letter**

CAP pays close attention to recommendations for candidates in the CAP letter from the candidate's previous review period. It is important for candidates to be aware of these recommendations and to take them seriously. Department Chairs should also alert candidates to these recommendations and, if necessary, explain their meaning to candidates. For example, if a previous CAP letter "encourages" a candidate to expand their University service activities, CAP expects to see a discernible increase in service activities in the following review period. Not following CAP's suggestions for improvement regarding an

aspect of the candidate's portfolio can often lead to a similar weakness in the subsequent review period, constituting one of the main reasons for "downmods" of proposed actions. Conversely, CAP very much appreciates it if candidates demonstrate efforts to address the previous recommendations of the committee, and if these efforts are described in the candidate's statement or department recommendation letter.

## Research

One of the most rewarding aspects of serving on CAP is to learn about the wide range of excellent research and creative activities across the University. CAP members were frequently humbled by the creativity and productivity of our colleagues.

CAP realizes that departments are best suited to define expectations for professional advancement in their discipline. This is why, in the area of research, CAP does not set expectations but follows departmental standards. CAP appreciates the fact that almost all academic units now have formulated such departmental standard guidelines, which are publicly available via the Academic Affairs Personnel Services website.

The main basis for evaluating research/creative activities are the items listed in Section A of the BioBib. This section should be reserved for published or accepted peer-reviewed articles and creative activities. If unpublished material is included in the file, it should also include evidence that a particular item has been accepted for publication before the October 15 deadline. This is particularly important for book manuscripts or contributions to edited collections, and such evidence is often provided by a short letter from the editor.

Many departments define their standards in numerical terms, that is they list a certain number of publications as required for merit advancement, acceleration and/or promotion. CAP appreciates such quantitative standards since they facilitate the evaluation process. At the same time, CAP does not engage in simple "bean counting" when evaluating files. The committee is very much willing to consider the qualitative impact of research and/or creative activities. Sometimes such significance can be discerned on the basis of publications in high-impact journals such as *Nature* or *Science*. In general, CAP considers numerical indexes such as the H-index of only limited usefulness in ascertaining research impact. In many cases, the committee depends on the department letter to explain the specific impact of publications and/or creative activities. Such an explanation is particularly important if the number of publications is below the departmental expectations for acceleration and if the case for advancement or promotion is made on the basis of impact rather than the number of publications.

CAP does take notice if many faculty members within a department consistently surpass departmental expectations for research productivity by a significant margin, such as two-fold or greater. In instances where colleagues exceed departmental benchmarks by an even greater factor, such as eight-fold or more, CAP's level of concern increases. CAP recommends that any such deviations be adequately addressed and put into context within the departmental recommendation letter. CAP recognizes that there are varying publication norms across different subfields within the department; this should be adequately described within the review file.

Research independence constitutes the most important criterion for advancement to the Associate rank for candidates appointed in a series where research is the main criterion (i.e. Professors, Professor in Residence, etc.) In most fields, the best way to demonstrate research independence is the publication of first, corresponding, or senior-authored papers without previous mentors as co-authors. Insufficient independence is the most frequent cause for CAP's lack of support for promotion to Associate rank. It is also the primary reason for a less than "favorable" fourth-year appraisal rating. It should be noted, however, that "favorable with recommendations" is the most frequent fourth-year appraisal rating and is considered a positive appraisal by CAP.

CAP greatly appreciates it when the candidate's previous doctoral/post-doctoral mentors are easily identified within the file. This helps the committee to ascertain the candidate's independence. CAP understands that collaboration is an important aspect of many fields of scholarship and that junior scholars make independent contributions to research even if they collaborate with more senior scholars. Still, CAP implores senior scholars who served as doctoral/post-doctoral mentors to agree to be excluded as co-authors on these papers in order to avoid compromising junior scholars' quest to demonstrate independence. If there is a legitimate reason for senior scholars to remain on the paper as co-authors, the departmental letter should explain the ways in which the candidate drove the research agenda. A supplemental statement by the senior scholar testifying to the candidate's independence might be another option.

CAP has expressed concerns regarding author "groups," wherein faculty members with comparable expertise regularly feature one another as co-authors on each other's publications, potentially aimed at inflating their publication numbers. It is important that the department recommendation letter comment on whether this is the norm for the discipline and how the candidate is the true driver for the research and should receive equal credit as other faculty members who appear as co-authors on the same publications.

Some departments include grant funding as part of their expectations for promotion and advancement, and CAP adheres to these guidelines. In general, however, CAP has not rewarded success in securing grant support *per se* but rather the research products or creative activities that resulted from such grants.

Prestigious awards, invitations to conferences as a keynote speaker, or elections to professional societies or academies are some of the major ways to demonstrate a faculty member's research excellence and/or national and international recognition. CAP appreciates a thorough explanation of the selectivity and significance of these awards in the departmental letter.

## **Teaching**

Teaching constitutes a central aspect of a faculty member's duties at a large, public and student-centered University. CAP members were continuously impressed by the dedication, energy and innovation that colleagues brought to the teaching mission of the University. This

was true, especially under the conditions of a global pandemic. The continuity of the educational mission of the University largely depended on the commitment, time, and labor of the faculty.

CAP discussed extensively how to evaluate teaching, especially since the campus is undergoing a transition on how to document teaching effectiveness. Based on the recommendations of a new workgroup on holistic teaching evaluations, future academic reviews will require a teaching portfolio that includes several types of evidence, including a teaching statement, syllabi, and student evaluations. While colleagues have already included many of these items in past reviews, CAP welcomes the inclusion of additional evidence to document teaching effectiveness. CAP has already seen several files with teaching portfolios and finds them highly useful in the review process. A well-written teaching statement is especially important in communicating a faculty member's teaching strategies and efforts.

CAP does not assign central weight to the CAPE "Recommend Course" and "Recommend Instructor" percentages and has ceased to refer to them in the CAP letter. Studies have shown that these general questions are especially prone to implicit bias. Nevertheless, CAP still finds student comments to be of essential importance in the review process. The inclusion of student comments in review files is not optional but rather mandated by policy which requires "evaluations and comments solicited from students for most, if not all, courses taught since the candidate's last review." (APM 210-1). CAP understands that in some fields such as the Health Sciences, it can be more difficult to obtain student evaluations and comments. CAP nevertheless encourages colleagues to do what they can to solicit such comments. Having read hundreds (or thousands!) of teaching evaluations, committee members have developed a good sense as to which comments to take seriously and which ones to ignore. The committee tends to dismiss rude and offensive student comments, and it remains sensitive to the possibility of implicit (or sometimes explicit) bias toward female instructors and instructors from underrepresented minorities.

CAP does pay attention to comments that pertain to general class and lecture organization and pedagogical strategy. Consistently negative comments regarding these issues in several courses often lead CAP to recommend that a colleague seek the assistance of the Teaching and Learning Commons (TLC). CAP is particularly disturbed by student comments that characterize the instructor as creating a hostile learning environment, including belittling or humiliating students. CAP also does not appreciate extensive tardiness, running classes too long, lack of responsiveness and/or absences from teaching, or the outsourcing of instructional duties to Teaching Assistants or third-party videos. Student comments often constitute the only source of information for such problematic teaching practices. A consistent pattern of such comments over an extensive period of time can be one reason for CAP to conclude that teaching constitutes a weakness in the file and hence precludes promotion or acceleration.

CAP encourages candidates to address and, if possible, explain negative student comments in their candidate statements. CAP members read every student comment, and it is futile to hope that negative comments might go unnoticed. If candidates do not address such negative comments, committee members might conclude that an instructor does not take them seriously. CAP tends to be skeptical regarding faculty explanations that attribute all



negative comments to the students, for example by claiming that they fail to recognize the brilliant or challenging nature of one's courses. Instead, the committee looks for a genuine engagement with negative student comments combined with some strategies to mitigate these problems, possibly with the assistance of the TLC.

CAP does not penalize colleagues for experimenting with new teaching strategies and methods. In fact, the committee encourages such initiatives, especially if they occur in consultation with the TLC. CAP sees such activities as an indication of a faculty member's deep commitment to the instructional mission of the University. Moreover, the committee understands that not everything works well the first time in the classroom and that new teaching strategies might produce more negative student comments and evaluations at first. While CAP recognizes such efforts as part of a faculty member's overall teaching portfolio, the committee has been reluctant to recommend extra rewards (such as a half-step bonus off-scale salary component) for efforts with mixed results. Likewise, CAP expects faculty members to respond to constructive student feedback and criticism. Sticking to an instructional approach that does not seem to work according to common metrics is seen as problematic.

This year's committee also featured extensive discussions over the relationship between grades and student evaluations. Some CAP members opined that there is a strong correlation, others were more skeptical and pointed to different grading conventions on different parts of campus. High course expectations and relatively low grades can certainly constitute one possible explanation for critical student comments and low evaluations, and this information could be included in the departmental recommendation letter. CAP also recognizes the variety of grading practices across the University. CAP appreciates that teaching effectiveness can be measured by the extent to which course learning outcomes are defined and teaching strategies implemented to allow students to achieve these learning goals. CAP also realizes that advances in Artificial Intelligence have posed new and serious problems for teaching and academic integrity. The committee has been impressed by some colleagues who have confronted these challenges for example by developing new forms of assessment (such as oral exams).

Mentoring is another essential part of the teaching mission of the University, and proposed revisions to the APM seek to give special recognition to faculty's mentoring activities. CAP is aware of the fact that mentee evaluations can be problematic since their anonymity cannot always be guaranteed. CAP encourages colleagues to describe the nature and extent of their mentoring activities in their teaching or candidate statements. Mentoring of junior faculty, students and scholars outside of the University of California is currently recognized as a form of professional service.

## **Service**

Service is an essential part of faculty self-governance and a requirement for all academic appointees, except Unit 18 lecturers. Unlike in research and teaching, CAP measures candidates' service against University-wide standards; this is one of the many ways in which the committee seeks to ensure equity and fairness across the University in the review process. Service is an essential facet of the University of California's shared governance

model that extends beyond individual departments or schools. The cultivation of a truly exceptional University hinges on the active engagement of its most outstanding and brilliant faculty members in the pursuit of upholding the University's mission.

CAP has reflected on expectations regarding service for many years and the committee's descriptions of expectations regarding service have been remarkably consistent, as a quick perusal of past iterations of "Where CAP Stood" will document. As previous CAPs have stated, service expectations increase with rank. While Assistant Professors are expected to perform some service, expectations are limited and usually satisfied by some departmental service. Associate Professors are expected to perform more extensive service, often including some service outside of their department. Full Professors and especially faculty members approaching Step VI are expected to perform University service outside of their department and school and outside of their area of research. The latter aspect is particularly important. For the higher professorial ranks (Step VI and above, Above Scale), such University-wide service outside of the candidate's area of research becomes essential and should be part of every review period. Service is valued less if the faculty member's research or creative activities clearly benefit from it, including roles directing research centers or facilities, and securing funding for one's own research activities or programs. Insufficient University-wide service constitutes one of the main reasons for CAP to decline advancement or accelerations in the professorial ranks, particularly above Step VI. As one of the classic CAP letter guidance sentences says: "A University can only be great if its best and brightest faculty members lend their talent to self-governance."

CAP understands the structural impediments for University-wide service. As the University grows and the number of faculty members increases, University service opportunities might not have expanded at the same rate. Moreover, colleagues in the School of Medicine are part of a very large academic unit and might find it challenging to identify service opportunities outside of their school. Regarding these issues, CAP offers the following advice. Faculty members at the higher professorial rank should actively seek out service opportunities outside their department and school. Faculty members should be willing to serve on a wide variety of committees and not limit their preferences to their favorite committees. CAP also notes that Senate service is also only one way to perform University-wide service. There are many University-wide service opportunities in the Colleges, in University-wide review committees or in interdisciplinary search and recruitment committees spanning several schools. Faculty members are also encouraged to alert their Department Chairs and/or their representative on the Committee on Committees of their need for service opportunities, especially when approaching a barrier step such as Step VI or Above Scale. In the Health Sciences, faculty members should seek service opportunities that are unrelated to their research and that extend beyond their school (e.g. School of Medicine, Skaggs, School of Public Health) and to the Health Sciences more broadly.

That said, CAP has recognized certain kinds of service within one's own academic unit as the equivalent to University-wide service. This includes service as Department Chair or service as Associate Dean. In the Health Sciences, service in committees encompassing several schools or high-level administrative service in hospitals might count as equivalent to University-wide service as well. It is incumbent upon the Department Chair to clearly characterize the extent and nature of a colleague's service contributions, especially if these

activities are supposed to count as “University-wide service” but do not correspond to the definition of being “outside of one’s school” and “outside of one’s area of research.”

CAP appreciates that faculty members engage in professional service. Extensive professional service, such as serving as president of a professional organization or as editor of an important journal, can also indicate a faculty member’s professional recognition in the field. CAP recognizes high-level professional service with a broad impact on a local, national and international scale. At the same time, the committee generally does not accept professional service as a substitute for University service. The only exception here is the Research Scientist series in which professional service (as well as any instructional activities) are subsumed under the broader category of “service”.

CAP is strongly committed to promoting faculty members’ efforts on behalf of equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI). These activities do not represent a separate area of review, and they can be part of a faculty member's research and/or teaching and/or service record. CAP also understands that some efforts in this area are difficult to quantify, for example, the extensive mentoring of URM students. In these cases, CAP asks the Department Chair or the candidate in their statement to describe these activities. In several cases, CAP has rewarded a strong record in promoting diversity with an additional half-step bonus off-scale salary increase (BOS). Conversely, and in accordance with policy, CAP does not penalize faculty members for not engaging in EDI efforts.

### **Accelerations/Recalibrations/CERs**

Proposals for the advancement of more than one step occupy a large part of CAP’s deliberations. There are various mechanisms in place to justify the advancement of more than one step. Departments should be clear about which path for advancement they propose since the particular mechanism defines the specific argument that needs to be made in support of the proposed action.

### **Accelerations**

The most common form of advancing more than one step is via acceleration. Accelerations are solely concerned with the achievements within the singular review period. The most straightforward case for an acceleration is doubling the research productivity for a review period with no weakness in other areas of review. Per policy, in series where research is the main criteria (for example: Ladder-rank Professors, Adjuncts, and Professor In Residence), accelerations require that research productivity exceeds what would be expected for a normal merit advancement. If research productivity exceeds expectations for merit advancement but does not quite amount to doubling expectations, a combined argument in support of an acceleration is possible. In this case, excellence beyond normal expectations in teaching and/or service can augment the case for acceleration. CAP would like to reiterate that accelerations *do not* require excellence beyond normal expectations in *all* areas of review nor do they require doubling the research productivity in every case. CAP discourages departments from proposing accelerations if a candidate has a problematic teaching record or only limited service. In these cases, CAP will likely judge teaching and/or service as a weakness and decline to support the acceleration. It should also be noted that the numerical

expectations for a merit advancement and/or acceleration remain the same independently of an abbreviated or extended review period. For example, if a department expects three publications for a three-year review period at the full Professor rank, the expectation would still be three publications if the candidate decides to defer their review by one year and hence completes a four-year review period. CAP is also skeptical of acceleration proposals for Assistant Professors based alone on research performed with mentors as this does not contribute to the progression of the candidate toward research independence.

Accelerations of more than one step (“double-accelerations”) are possible but are exceedingly rare. In those cases, CAP generally expects a tripling of research productivity combined with external recognition and excellence (not just no weakness) in all areas of review.

Accelerations to and through the barrier step (for example Step VI) are possible and are, in principle, not treated differently than other acceleration proposals except that they are combined with a career review. That is, an acceleration proposal from Professor Step IV to Step VI needs to answer two questions (in this order). First, does the review period justify a three-year acceleration? Secondly, does the candidate’s career record justify advancement to Step VI? Consecutive accelerations are possible. CAP judges acceleration proposals based on the record in the review period, and a candidate’s review history has no influence on CAP’s judgment about the current review period. Accelerations to the Above-Scale rank are possible but rare. Such proposals have to meet the high bar of being “rare and compelling” and are reserved for candidates with exceptionally strong academic records in all areas of review. CAP has supported several such requests this year.

At the Above-Scale rank, advancements of 50% and 100% are considered regular merit advancement. A 50% advancement does not represent a punishment and simply falls short of the expectation of a 100% advancement, which requires exemplary performance in all areas of review. Accelerations of 150% and 200% not only require an outstanding record of research and creative activities combined with extensive external recognition but also excellent teaching and service. At the Above-Scale rank, extensive University-wide service outside of a faculty member’s department or school and unrelated to their specific research interests is expected. Insufficient University-wide service contributions constitute one of the most common reasons for CAP’s decision to decline to support acceleration requests at the Above-Scale rank. CAP is unlikely to support acceleration requests of more than 200% except in the most unusual and distinguished cases.

### **Recalibration and Career Equity Reviews**

Recalibration and CERs are two different mechanisms for advancing more than one step. Both are career reviews, and each one is conducted at the time of a regularly scheduled review. In CERs, the department recommendation letter needs to propose an action just for the review period and, *in addition*, another action pertaining to a faculty member’s career record. The outcome of such actions may result in the advancement of more than one step.

Recalibrations can be used at the time of a career review only (promotion to Associate Professor, to Professor, to Professor Step VI, or to Professor Above Scale), and it can be

proposed by the department but also by the Dean or by CAP. Recalibration requests need to be justified with reference to specific reasons. Recalibrations can be based on the argument that a faculty member was hired at too low a step or that certain accomplishments in the past have not been sufficiently rewarded. Recalibration requests can also be justified with comparisons to other colleagues in the same field or department at the same rank.

Unlike a recalibration, a CER is requested by the candidate and can occur at any rank or step, not just while undergoing a normal promotion or career review. CAP encourages Department Chairs to make colleagues aware of this mechanism. A CER can be justified in similar ways as a recalibration, such as the argument that a faculty member was hired at too low a step or that certain accomplishments in the past have not been sufficiently rewarded. Consecutive BOS awards can also be used to justify a CER. In this case, a faculty member exceeded expectations for a merit in several consecutive review periods while falling short of expectations for an acceleration. In those cases, the cumulative effect of consecutive BOS awards can translate into an additional step via CER (or, at the time of a career review, also via recalibration). A CER can also be justified with comparisons to other colleagues in the same field or department at the same rank, and this information should be included in the department letter for a CER. Like recalibration requests, CER requests need to be justified with reference to specific reasons. CAP has especially encouraged colleagues to make use of the CER mechanism in seeking to mitigate the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, if research productivity during one or several review periods declined due to the pandemic, a CER can be used to argue that the overall career record and research trajectory justify the advancement of more than one step.

### **Reconsiderations**

Despite its best efforts and extensive discussions, CAP realizes that the committee might not always arrive at the correct decision. Departments can request a reconsideration if the preliminary decision diverges from the initial departmental proposal. CAP takes these requests very seriously, and, in 18 of the 53 cases this year, reversed its initial decision. The most effective reconsideration requests either present new evidence or explain the significance of existing evidence that CAP might not have fully appreciated in its first review of a file. CAP tends to ignore scolding or belittling language by disappointed colleagues or Department Chairs in reconsideration requests. The committee would like to remind colleagues and Department Chairs that the rules for civility and professional conduct also apply to interactions with CAP.

### **Bonus Off-Scales (BOS)**

A half-step bonus-off scale salary component (BOS) is a good way to reward specific accomplishments in research, teaching and service. The specific reasons for a BOS request must be outlined in the departmental recommendation letter, and they must be based on activities and accomplishments that go beyond the regular duties of a faculty member or expectations for a normal merit advancement. Unspecific BOS requests are likely to be denied. Most successful proposals for a BOS are based on exceeding research expectations for a merit but falling short of expectations for an acceleration, distinguished awards or prizes, excellent teaching that is indicated by more than just excellent student evaluations

(such as teaching awards or pedagogical or curricular innovation) or distinguished service or EDI contributions. CAP has generally denied support for a BOS for performing departmental service roles below the Chair's level (for example Director of Graduate Studies or Vice Chair for Academic Personnel) as well as for compensated Director or Program Director positions.

### **Collegiality**

APM 210.1.a. states that it is appropriate "to consider professional integrity as evidenced by performance of duties." While collegiality is not explicitly listed as a performance criterion for academic appointees, it is inherently reflected in the specified criteria and plays a vital role in teaching, research, and service. A 2019 Senate-Administration taskforce thus concluded that the evaluation of collegiality could be included in academic review files. As a result, CAP has seen several files in which issues of collegiality were adjudicated.

In accordance with policy, CAP has considered issues of collegiality in determining its recommendation. In general, the academic review process might not be the best venue for dealing with issues of collegiality and professional behavior. CAP suggests that involved parties explore other venues to adjudicate such issues, for example, the Academic Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure or forms of mediation within a department. That said, if such issues are introduced into a file (for example through the supporting comments from "no"-votes of dissenting faculty), it is important to consider the following issues. First, it is important to provide specific examples of uncivil behavior or lack of collegiality in the departmental letter. Blanket and unspecific allegations are not helpful. Secondly, the candidate needs to be able to respond to these allegations by including a statement in the file. If a departmental recommendation is based on unspecific allegations of lack of collegiality, CAP is likely to return the file for more information.

### **COVID-19 Pandemic Impact**

This year's files were still impacted by the lingering COVID-19 pandemic. In fact, the COVID impact has become perhaps even more discernible. The inability to conduct research during the pandemic has had a delayed effect on faculty members' productivity. This is why COVID-impact statements have still been useful for CAP to understand better a colleague's research trajectory. COVID statements can explain or contextualize a dip in productivity or a shift to other creative activities (for example review rather than research articles). It can explain anomalies in teaching evaluation or in the nature and extent of service obligations. The committee would like to reiterate that it does not expect faculty members to reveal details of their private lives in such statements.

This year has also seen other ways in which faculty's research, teaching and service have been impacted by events beyond their control. Many faculty members still experience adverse consequences of the difficulties related to the shifting of campus software platforms via the campus Enterprise System Renewal (ESR) initiative. In addition, the UAW labor strike affected the ability to conduct research. If such factors have a discernible impact on a colleague's academic record, CAP appreciates an explanation of these issues in the file. Finally, external events such as the murder of George Floyd in the Spring of 2020 or the

increase in hate crimes against Asian Americans deeply impacted some of our colleagues and was still apparent in some review files.

CAP has also made repeated use of the recommendations of the joint senate-administration workforce to mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the academic review process. In several cases, the committee requested a one-time file update past the October 15 deadline for tenure files. The committee also has remained mindful of the possibility of a half-step offset for colleagues who might fall short of meeting research expectations for a merit advancement. In general, CAP has applied the principle of “achievement-relative to opportunity” (ARO) in its holistic evaluation of files. In several cases, CAP has rewarded individual faculty members’ extensive and unusual efforts to mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic with an additional half-step bonus off-scale salary component. At the same time, successfully making it through the pandemic, even if it involved additional time and effort, has not been judged as sufficient to merit a BOS or acceleration in most cases. In general, CAP has also shied away from using the notion of ARO as justification for accelerations. Speculative claims that one’s productivity might have been significantly higher in the absence of the pandemic are difficult to verify. In such cases, and if appropriate, CAP recommends the use of a CER as a better justification for an advancement of more than one step. The CER makes it possible to consider the entire career trajectory and not just productivity during the most recent review period.

### **Retentions/Pre-emptive Retentions**

CAP understands that it is vital for the University to retain colleagues who are being recruited by other universities. The committee generally supports retention requests if a colleague has a documented offer for appointment in a similar position at another University that is also a peer-institution. It is vital to include the outside offer in a retention request. Whenever possible, departments should discuss the ranking of the department of the competing institution relative to their own ranking. The committee understands that even institutions or departments that are ranked lower than UC San Diego can be considered peer-institutions in specific fields or subfields.

Pre-emptive retentions are sometimes more difficult to adjudicate. They offer a mechanism for retaining a colleague before they receive an actual offer from another institution. In the ideal case, a pre-emptive retention is supported if a faculty member is a finalist for an advertised job. The pre-emptive retention file then should include the job advertisement as well as the invitation to an on-campus interview. Ideally, the pre-emptive retention should be requested before a faculty colleague is interviewed for a job. Accepting the pre-emptive retention would then obligate the faculty member to cancel the planned job interview. CAP looks askance at pre-emptive retention requests that are submitted months after a candidate has already interviewed for the job.

CAP understands that sometimes recruitments happen in non-traditional ways, for example through target of opportunity recruitments. In such cases, it is vital that the candidate presents evidence of interest from a peer institution that documents the actual availability of a faculty position. In many cases, this can be done by providing evidence of having been contacted by a Department Chair, Dean or other high-level administrator. An e-mail

message from another faculty member at another institution expressing interest in recruiting a UC San Diego faculty member is usually not sufficient to demonstrate interest from another University.

In alignment with campus practice, policy, and procedures, CAP only supports retention and pre-emptive retention requests from other academic institutions, not from private industry. However, as in other personnel actions, the EVC is the final authority on retention requests.

## **SERIES SPECIFIC GUIDANCE**

### **Professor/Professor in Residence/Professor of Clinical X/Adjunct Professor in the Health Sciences**

CAP reviews files from a variety of different series within the Health Sciences. As in other files, the committee judges the portfolio against departmental expectations in research and teaching for these different series. CAP appreciates if requests for promotion and acceleration are calibrated to the specific series requirements. For example, in the Professor and Professor in-Residence series, independently produced research articles as first or senior author are particularly prized besides teaching and service. In the Professor of Clinical X series, clinical expertise, stature and recognition as well as teaching are the main series criteria. This series allows for a wider range of publications to be considered, including case reports and/or publications tied more closely to the candidate's clinical practice (see APM 210). However, acceleration based on these other types of publications alone are rarely considered in the absence of documented performance in the primary criteria of teaching and clinical excellence at or above departmental standards. The Professor of Clinical X series with its stronger emphasis on teaching and clinical performance should not be used as a "bridge" to the ladder rank series. Expectations for faculty members in the Adjunct Professor series are pro-rated based on the percentage of their appointment, which should be clearly identified and explained in the departmental letter or in an included MOU.

### **Teaching Professors**

Teaching Professors (or Lecturers with Security of Employment) comprise an increasing segment of faculty at UC San Diego. CAP is pleased that many departments now have developed and made public departmental expectations for Teaching Professors. According to APM 285-9, teaching professors are evaluated based on three criteria: (1) Teaching excellence, (2) professional and creative activity (3) University and public service. Unlike in the research faculty series, teaching excellence is the main criterion in this series. Moreover, professional and creative activity encompass a wider range of activities, including peer-reviewed articles (either in pedagogy or in the candidate's discipline) but also conference proceedings, invited talks, and textbooks.

Throughout the year, CAP reviewed many excellent Teaching Professor files. It should be noted that Teaching Professors were just as much affected by the COVID-19 pandemic as Ladder-rank Professors. Teaching Professors have a higher teaching load and often teach large classes. The transition of these classes to remote teaching was therefore very labor and time-intensive for these colleagues. Nevertheless, many Teaching Professors were very



successful in doing so and were also instrumental in assisting other colleagues with the transition to remote teaching. In several cases, CAP has rewarded such efforts with an additional BOS.

Accelerations for Teaching Professors can be difficult to adjudicate because the Teaching Professor series lacks clear guidelines of what would constitute, in analogy to Ladder-rank Professors, a “double productivity” as the basis for an acceleration. Accelerations in the Teaching Professor series thus are almost always based on a combined argument that a candidate exceeded expectations in several areas of review. For example, while teaching excellence is a standard expectation in the Teaching Professor series, candidates might exceed expectations by winning a teaching award or by implementing a new and innovative pedagogical method or by engaging in curriculum design and/or the development of new courses. Teaching Professors can exceed expectations in creative and professional activity by publishing a higher number of papers or by publishing in high-impact journals. External recognition can be demonstrated through professional awards but also through invited talks and/or the broader adoption of a specific teaching strategy. Finally, like research professors, teaching professors perform service at all levels. It is worth noting that the number of colleagues in this series continues to grow, and that campus reviewers are learning to calibrate files in this series more precisely.

### **Unit-18 Lecturers**

Similar issues apply to Unit-18 Lecturers. CAP sees files in this series when colleagues are first appointed as Initial Continuing Lecturers and when they are proposed for a salary point of more than two points as stipulated within the MOU. Based on the new MOU, CAP now also sees files for promotion to the newly established rank of Senior Continuing Lecturer. Teaching is the only criterion in this series. Neither research nor service is required. Departments are obligated to develop specific criteria for appointment as Initial Continuing Lecturer and for promotion to Senior Continuing Lecturer. It is imperative that the departmental recommendation letter describes how candidates specifically meet expectations for these actions. This also applies to merit increases beyond two or three salary points. Additional salary points must be justified with a colleague’s specific activities or accomplishments.