

To: All UC San Diego Faculty

From: Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), Wendy Campana (Chair, 2023-24)

Date: October 15, 2024

Subject: Where CAP Stood (2024)

Overview

The 2023-2024 Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) was chaired by a Health Sciences (HS) Faculty member. This is notable considering that a HS faculty member has not chaired CAP in more than 20 years. This year was also noteworthy considering that this is the first time in UC San Diego's history that both the Chair and Vice Chair were female—in addition to 7 of the 12 other members. This is also the first CAP to include a Teaching Professor (from Physical Sciences) in the membership. The insight gained into faculty teaching and the depth of understanding of the nuances of the Teaching Professor series were greatly enhanced with the addition of a Teaching Professor on CAP. This year, CAP comprised faculty from all parts of campus with 14 members: 4 from the Health Sciences, 2 from the Social Sciences, 2 from the Arts and Humanities, 1 from the Biological Sciences, 2 from the Physical Sciences, 2 from Engineering, and 1 from the Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

CAP is an advisory body to the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) and Chancellor; it is important to note that final authority on all personnel actions rests with the 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, promotion to Associate Teaching Professor). Historically, the rate of concurrence between CAP recommendations and the EVC/Chancellor is high. This year was no exception: there were only 18 overrides from the EVC out of 773¹ files reviewed; approximately 98% agreement. An override is defined as when an outcome decision made by the final authority differs from CAP's final recommendation in step or action (appointment, merit advancement, promotion, or career review). In 2023-2024, the overrides were on diverse files. The CAP annual report provides additional information on these cases. The high rate of agreement supports the concept that shared governance is operating well. CAP leadership was impressed by the open and frank conversation with the EVC and the Sr. AVC-AA on challenging academic files.

CAP held most of its 36 meetings in hybrid mode. However, most committee members participated in person. Three of the meetings were held fully remote via Zoom. Most CAP members appreciated in-person meetings, and given the nature of the committee charge, CAP was the Senate committee with the most robust in-person attendance. CAP meetings generally last 4-6 hours. CAP conducted 877 reviews (773 initial/additional information/reconsiderations, and 104 "Above the Line" items (endowed chairs, administrator reviews, policy amendments, etc.). The number of file reviews exceeds previous years (734 in 2022-2023), and the number of "Above the Line" items was nearly double last year's activity (57 in 2022-2023). Moreover, several files were submitted for review

¹ CAP and Academic Personnel Services (APS) calculate the rate of agreement differently. CAP counts each step in the process separately, meaning an initial review and the review of a departmental response to a preliminary assessment are considered two separate files. On the other hand, APS organizes data by candidate, so both an initial review and a response to a preliminary assessment would be reported as one file in their reports.

after the deadline this year which will result in 99 files being carried over to next year. For each weekly meeting, all CAP files are read and commented on by every CAP member. Files then are presented by a lead reviewer or, in the case of appointment, promotion, and career review files, by an internal CAP *ad hoc* committee of three members. A robust discussion of each file occurs at the meetings. All views and perspectives are revealed, and files are discussed at considerable length. After the discussion, the Vice Chair leads the committee vote that is recorded by the CAP analyst. Typically, the committee discusses between 20 and 30 files at each meeting (although some meetings included more than 40) and discusses 2-4 "Above the Line" Items.

At the beginning of the academic year, the CAP Chair delivered several presentations to the campus Schools in collaboration with the Sr. AVC-AA. In these forums, the basics of CAP review are provided with ample time for questions and discussion. These campus-wide presentations are important for equity and informational purposes. The CAP Chair also delivered a similar presentation to all new faculty at the University to ensure transparency in the academic review process. In addition to these forums, CAP also accepted requests for visits from 29 visitors from across the campus including Department Chairs, Deans, Administrators, and leadership from Academic Personnel Services (APS). In these meetings, the visitors had an opportunity to discuss specific questions related to their departmental needs, and for further clarification of CAP's operating procedures. Thus, there are multiple opportunities throughout the year for the campus community to communicate with CAP. CAP's deliberations are of course confidential. It is highly inappropriate for a faculty member to contact a CAP member to discuss a file. This is very awkward for CAP members when it happens, as they are not allowed to respond and moreover, discussion would risk losing the integrity of the academic review process. CAP members cannot confirm whether a particular file has or has not been reviewed by CAP.

In CAP 2023-24, a recurring theme that emerged was the goal of equity and fairness in the review process. The integrity of the review process is maintained by the independence of CAP review and recommendations. CAP takes departmental standards very seriously, though note that not all departments provide those standards as expected. In the absence of clear departmental standards, particularly for acceleration actions, CAP utilized an equity lens to evaluate files relative to other similar departments and schools. Because departmental standards are a crucial benchmark to assess files through an equity lens, CAP strongly encourages departments to clearly articulate standards for advancement and acceleration, and to regularly update them to reflect changes in the discipline and the department. Moreover, it is important to note that CAP has the benefit and purview of reviewing University-wide academic files. This enables CAP to have a broader perspective on the review process, which makes it possible to recognize campus-wide inequities or imbalances that departments may be unaware of and thus be unable to assess.

Above the Line Items

CAP 2023-2024 reviewed 104 "Above the Line" items, a record number of reviews. These personnel issues included endowed chair appointments and re-appointments, the conferral of emeritus/a titles, and administrative reviews of Department Chairs, Deans, and Provosts. CAP also provided extensive reviews of Department voting procedures in accordance with Bylaw 55. In some cases, CAP conferred with the UC San Diego Academic Senate Rules and Jurisdiction Committee and the University-wide Academic Senate Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction to seek guidance and assistance with the interpretation of specific UC policies. The committee discussed ownership of the campus *ad hoc* review process and whether that function best lies in CAP's purview or APS's

purview. In 2023-2024, CAP recommended that campus *ad hoc* committees review 2 files. This process is very rarely used on our campus, though at one point in campus history, it was required for nearly every file that came before CAP review. When CAP recommends the formation of a campus *ad hoc* committee, it usually results from a lack of suitable expertise on CAP to judge the candidate's research accomplishments, and in instances when CAP judges that assessment outside of CAP may be necessary before rendering its judgment.

CAP discussed numerous other academic personnel-related proposals, such as the proposed revisions to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan Implementation Procedures. Another example includes a proposal to form two distinct departments of basic and clinical sciences in the Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. CAP also discussed a proposal regarding the removal of the limit of the number of Professor of Clinical X series in UC San Diego policy and voiced concerns about the Health Sciences Senate faculty expansion that could change the nature of that group of faculty and how they might participate and contribute to university research, service, and teaching, as well as issues with gender equity. In addition, it voiced concern over the impact on the balance of representation in the Academic Senate.

CAP reviewed several files that included teaching portfolios that were prepared following guidance from the holistic teaching evaluation oversight committee. Following the review of these files, CAP provided feedback to the oversight committee on the importance of brevity and appropriateness for material included in the teaching portfolios (and concurred with the recommended page limit for teaching statements of less than 5 pages) and better context for smaller formal teaching loads (especially for Adjunct Professors). For candidates, a guideline of 10 pages total (including all candidate and teaching statements, excluding COVID and sabbatical statements of usually less than one page each) is likely sufficient for most merit advancements although slightly longer explanations for career reviews may be appropriate. Candidates are encouraged to prioritize their statements based on their efforts, responsibilities, and standards, summarizing how their accomplishments and loads compare to department expectations. Exhaustive submissions including detailed course materials and presentations did not materially affect the evaluation of the candidates, and such submissions are discouraged.

CAP also provided extensive feedback and recommendations for revision to the APS Process Manual and hopes to review any proposed revisions to the manual in the upcoming review cycle.

Efforts with Equity Diversity and Inclusion

As in past years, CAP underwent implicit bias and diversity training, this year in a session with UC San Diego's Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Becky Petitt, and Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, Victor Ferreira. One of the topics that emerged was considering how Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) efforts could help bolster cases for accelerated merit advancement. For example, if a faculty member has significant research, but does not quite double the department standards, yet has substantive EDI contributions, good teaching and service, this may collectively justify an acceleration or half-step bonus off-scale salary component. Implicit bias training refreshed CAP's sensitivity to the challenges that female scholars and scholars from underrepresented minorities face at UC San Diego and within academia at large. CAP 2023-24 benefited from members who have substantial backgrounds in EDI research and policy. Whenever possible and warranted, CAP considered EDI in its deliberations and, at times, its recommendations. Although one committee obviously cannot correct structural inequities resulting

from long histories of discrimination, this year's CAP was again deeply committed to furthering EDI at UC San Diego. It did so by frequently recognizing merit-based achievements of female colleagues and colleagues from underrepresented minorities that CAP judged to be undervalued by their departmental assessments.

Unit 18 Continuing Lecturers

This year CAP reviewed many proposals for promotions and accelerated merit advancements in the Unit 18 Continuing Lecturers series. After discussions, CAP opted to waive the review of the Unit 18 Lecture series starting with the 2024-25 academic year, and Academic Senate leadership agreed and supported CAP's request. Since the authority for these non-senate appointees rests with the cognizant Dean (and not the EVC), CAP members concluded that CAP review of such actions was not appropriate. Because CAP has seen an exponential increase in files over the last two years, not reviewing these files will expedite the processing of other academic personnel files by eliminating several additional steps in the review process for these actions.

File Preparation

A well-prepared file is the best way to facilitate equity in the review process and support our colleagues. During this review cycle, delays, and disruptions occurred repeatedly due to poor file preparation. In several instances, issues could have been resolved before reaching CAP if the advice provided by AP staff had been followed. Department Chairs and Deans are encouraged to heed the file preparation advice from their trusted academic personnel staff. Some examples of these file preparation errors that could have been resolved before reaching CAP include issues with the candidate's Biobib (typically unpublished work listed in Section A rather than Section C, service sections not updated from previous review periods, or forgoing the inclusion of dates for service activities and not including teaching evaluations), file documents out of the expected document order, and missing file components.

Departmental Recommendation Letter

The departmental recommendation letter sets the tone for the academic review and should present a brief and independent evaluation of the candidate's record. It should not simply reproduce the candidate's self-statements, 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, particularly when accelerations are proposed. CAP encountered several files in which the published departmental expectations diverged from the expectations applied in the departmental recommendation letters. Such divergences can be a reason for CAP to return the file to the department for clarification. Moreover, there still remain several departments that have unpublished or overly vague or brief departmental expectations, requiring CAP to divine the expectations from the department recommendation letter or other materials provided in the file, which is a potential source of broader inequity and is unfair to the candidate. CAP urges departments to publish substantive standards and justify how their proposed action is in line with those standards in the recommendation letter.

The departmental recommendation letter should explain 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 recommendation letter should not be written by the Department Chair where there is an identified, documented conflict of interest (COI). CAP noted

several files this year where the Department Chair wrote the departmental recommendation letter and solicited external letters for the file while having a COI with the candidate. When CAP received the returned file, the same letter was often simply replaced with another signature and/or the external referee letters were still solicited by the Department Chair in conflict. These types of COIs penalize the candidate by significantly delaying the review process, reflect poorly on the department, and add unnecessary work for others in the review process.

The departmental recommendation letter should also explain the impact of a candidate's research, and discuss the quantity, quality, and number of senior-authored works (in multi-author disciplines). This year, CAP saw several files where the faculty member had a very low rate of senior-authored papers throughout their careers, and the Department Chair proposed an early promotion or accelerated merit advancement through a barrier step. While CAP supports collaborative science that results in co-authorships versus senior authorships and understands the nuances of highly interdisciplinary faculty (i.e. biostatisticians, clinical consortium work, etc.), independent research portfolios at promotion and at career barrier steps are expected. Thus, these types of cases gave CAP pause. For promotion to the Associate rank cases, it is important for the Department Chair to identify previous mentors so that CAP can evaluate independence appropriately.

The departmental recommendation letter should outline the significance of any potential awards. For example, it could provide CAP with the number of people who receive or were considered for this award annually, or the significance of the award to a particular society. The same applies to teaching and service activities. The department recommendation letter and candidate statement should offer an analysis of the candidate's specific contributions and address potential problems in the file. For example, a candidate's low and/or problematic teaching evaluations might be the result of structural issues in the department or of the candidate having been assigned a particularly challenging course; these sorts of insights that cannot be gleaned from teaching evaluations are extremely helpful to CAP members, and they impact their recommendations.

It is also helpful if the department recommendation letter explains the nature and extent of a candidate's service contributions, which is often one of the least developed sections of the file. It is often difficult to untangle administrative service roles that are compensated (example: AVC, Deans, Chairs, Vice Chairs, Provosts) with general service. This is particularly important in Health Sciences where compensated service is more common than on the general campus. It is helpful when the departmental recommendation letter and the candidate statement clearly outline these service roles and responsibilities. Details regarding the frequency of meetings, hours spent, intensity, and importance of work should be included in the candidate statement, particularly when files are being proposed for career reviews and/or acceleration actions.

Finally, the department recommendation letter should also explain the reasons for any possible dissenting votes, or provide a statement noting that no comments or discussion arose from dissenting votes, if appropriate. CAP finds it difficult to evaluate a file with a substantial minority dissent without explanation. 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 department recommendation letter must describe, in accordance with policy, the search process. This includes information such as a brief description of the recruitment

process and how the candidate was selected. CAP prefers that the description of the recruitment efforts include details on the departmental selection process, including how many applicants applied and were interviewed for the position.

BioBib

This year CAP reviewed several BioBibs generated from the Faculty 180 system. CAP members found that BioBibs prepared by Faculty 180 exacerbate the cognitive load on reviewers for numerous reasons, primarily due to the small font size, issues with publication citation tags, and the reverse chronological ordering of activities. CAP provided feedback on their experiences with Faculty 180 BioBibs to Academic Personnel Services earlier this year and hopes that the changes suggested may be implemented before the broader use of Faculty 180.

It is important that the BioBib is updated for each review period. New activities should be clearly marked as “new”, and all items should be dated. The Biography may contain short (1-line) explanations of the items included, where appropriate, but should not repeat or expand on narratives presented in the candidate statement. Including a list of recent and current mentees in the Biography helps to support the assessment of the candidate’s role in publications led by mentees. Wherever possible, the Bibliography should be organized and formatted to reduce the cognitive burden for reviewers, clearly designating the roles of mentees, the quality of the publication, and the candidate’s contributions. All items listed in the Bibliography should list all authors so as to facilitate the identification of conflicts of interest whenever possible. It is recommended that the candidate’s name be bolded or highlighted in such a manner that the author’s order can easily be identified. It is not appropriate to end the author list with the candidate’s name followed by et al., in large multi-authored papers as this may imply to reviewers an inaccurate designation as last/senior author. All items in sections A & B of the biobib should be published or accepted and available for reviewers as part of submitted publications in the candidate’s publication hyperlink. Submitted publications not accepted should be listed in C. It is important to describe the candidate’s role when the candidate is not a first or senior author and in disciplines where the order of authorship does not clearly denote their role in the publication. Importantly, documenting intellectual independence and the significance of the work is key, this can be augmented in the candidate statement.

Active grants with multiple PI designations should be listed with the percentage of dollars dedicated to a faculty member’s lab/role in the grant (not their percent effort on the grant). The dollar value of the award (directs and indirect costs) should be listed for the entire grant. Only funded grants should be listed, not protocols or IRB submitted/approved projects. It is useful to have grants listed from the previous review period. Pending grants should not be listed on the BioBib since their precise status can be confusing. Candidates can describe their unfunded projects and pending grant applications in their self-statements. It is also important to clarify the distinction between being a PI versus a Co-PI/MPI. This is particularly important for candidates being considered for promotion to the Associate rank. CAP takes the view that grants reflect a candidate’s stature in the field and a means to support research productivity for merit promotion or advancement. As such, they are a means to an end. CAP looks forward to rewarding tangible outcomes like peer-reviewed publications that typically follow the receipt of extramural funding but does not find arguments for accelerations or BOS based on grantsmanship to be persuasive—

except in rare cases where the level of commitment is combined with a high level of service and/or teaching.

External Referee Letters

Appointments and promotions require a minimum number of independent external referee letters. It is greatly appreciated when Departments identify non-independent letters as part of the “Ref ID List”. This year, CAP saw a concerning number of appointment files with insufficient independent letters. Per policy, CAP is forced to return these files without review until additional letters are collected, which can add significant delay to the review process. CAP is acutely aware of the delicate nature of faculty recruitment and the frequent exigency with which such files must be processed, yet ill-prepared files only serve to delay approval. CAP encourages departments to reconfirm the independence of all letters in the file before submission to avoid jeopardizing time-sensitive recruitments.

External referee letters from former academic advisors, mentors, or faculty from departments where the candidate was a postgraduate student postdoc, or had a prior faculty appointment are never judged to be independent by CAP. This also applies if the mentoring/advising occurs in clinical settings in the Health Sciences. Letters from active collaborators within the last five years are also not independent. Letters from external referees who proposed to collaborate or who are planning to collaborate with the candidate in the future are borderline independent and can be accepted on a case-by-case basis. If there are more than one such “borderline” letters in a file, CAP is likely to send the file back for more letters. CAP is also aware that some colleagues are part of very large consortiums. Letters from other members of such consortiums can be considered independent if they do not come from close collaborators within a subgroup of that consortium. Letters must also come from external referees who are at an equal or higher academic rank than the one for which the candidate is proposed. CAP encourages Departments to practice due diligence in the selection of external referees and the identification of any conflicts on the referee form rather than wait for CAP to identify problems and return the file.

CAP noted that most external referees do not see teaching evaluations or other evaluations of teaching effectiveness in many departments. CAP notes this makes it problematic for most external referees to comment on teaching effectiveness. CAP hopes that this shortcoming can be remedied in order for external reviewers to comment on teaching in the future.

While letters are no longer required for merit advancement to/through Step VI, they constitute a prime method of establishing a candidate’s national recognition, especially in the absence of other awards. 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 Review (CER).

Reading the Previous CAP Letter

CAP pays close attention to recommendations for the candidate in the CAP letter from the candidate’s previous review, if available. It is important for candidates to be aware of these recommendations and address them prior to the next review cycle. 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 raises questions in CAP's evaluation as to whether the candidate understands expectations for the faculty of their contributions to the university, and often leads to disagreement with the proposed actions in the current review cycle. Conversely, CAP welcomes a candidate's demonstrated and documented efforts to address the previous recommendations from campus reviewers. CAP notes that the candidate's prior review documents are available to the candidate for reference if the department has routed the file and shared the relevant documents with the candidate within the Interfolio system.

Research

UC San Diego has some of the most innovative research worldwide. CAP members are 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 CAP does not set expectations for research productivity but follows departmental standards. CAP appreciates the fact that almost all academic units now have formulated such departmental standards, which are publicly available via the Academic 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 peer-reviewed publications 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 campus-established deadline of October 15. This is particularly important for book manuscripts or contributions to edited collections.

In 2023-2024, CAP noted that some departments do not define their standards in terms of the expected number of publications or research products. While the committee is very much willing to consider the qualitative impact of research and/or creative activities, it is imperative that the file documents such impact. Sometimes, the significance of the work can be easily discerned based on the high-impact venues in which the work appears, but this is not always the case. In the cases where this is not clear, CAP relies on an in-depth explanation of the research impact/productivity related to the department standards by the Department Chair and the departmental ad hoc committee, if applicable. Impact is not considered consistently across all departmental standards. Some departments have different types of publication profiles among their faculty, and in these cases, it is important that standards differentiate expectations, for example between single-author and multi-author sub-fields. It is important that each department has a clear roadmap for promotion for their faculty to ensure equitable treatment among faculty members. In general, CAP considers numerical indexes such as the H-index of only limited usefulness in ascertaining research impact.

White papers, committee opinions, 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. Publications in Open Access journals that require fees for open access 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. The Department recommendation letter should explain if and

how conference proceedings were taken into consideration in arriving at the departmental recommendation. Non-peer-reviewed publications should be listed in Section B. Items in this section are generally less important for the review process and not considered as important, particularly in a proposed acceleration action. But they can nevertheless contribute to bolstering a case if their significance is explained in the Department recommendation letter.

Pre-prints (for example, BioRxiv) that are available online before being published should be placed in Section C, not A or B. Work in progress or publications that have not been finally accepted for publication can also 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 some Departments, Section C items can become the basis for a merit advancement, particularly in book fields. In book fields, the inclusion of draft chapters can document research progress even in the absence of publications, but CAP cautions departments to ensure that progress to a book is not counted twice. Research articles that have not been accepted for publication can also signal the future trajectory of a candidate. They can be important in fourth-year appraisal and promotion files.

Multi-authored work is common in many research areas. 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. In particular, candidates should highlight whether they served as corresponding or senior author, as appropriate for their field. CAP does not appreciate numerical systems that are in place in several units. The committee prefers short descriptions after each entry in the BioBib outlining the specific author contributions, and in particular what part of a large project was led by the faculty member. CAP prefers that the candidate's name be highlighted or bolded for easy recognition in author order, including all authors except with very large author lists. The last author should be clear and the candidate's name should not be the last author followed by et al. when subsequent authors are listed beyond the candidate's name.

Research independence constitutes the most important criterion for promotion to the Associate rank. In most fields, the best way to demonstrate research independence is the publication of first or senior-authored papers **without** previous mentors as co-authors and PI roles in non-mentored research grants. Insufficient independence is the most frequent cause for CAP's lack of support for promotion to the Associate rank. It is also the main reason for a less than "favorable" fourth-year appraisal. It should be noted, however, that "favorable with recommendations" is the most frequent fourth-year appraisal and is considered a positive appraisal by CAP.

CAP understands that junior scholars can be the main drivers of research even if they collaborate with more senior scholars. Still, CAP implores senior scholars, to not appear 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 recommendation letter and candidate statement should explain the ways in which the candidate drove the research agenda. A supplemental letter by the senior scholar testifying to the candidate's independence can be another way to document the candidate's independence.

It is prudent to document when publications are first authored by graduate students or post-doctoral trainees. This may support why a file may have a smaller number of publications (time training a student) and provides evidence of successful mentoring.

Prestigious awards, invitations to conferences to present 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 department recommendation letter.

Teaching

CAP discussed extensively how to evaluate teaching, especially since the campus is undergoing a transition in how to document teaching effectiveness. This year, with a Teaching Professor serving on CAP for the first time, these discussions benefited from valuable and robust insights. CAP reviewed several teaching portfolios modeled based on the guidance for holistic teaching evaluation that included several types of evidence, such as a teaching statement, syllabi, and new student evaluations of teaching forms (SETs) that will replace CAPEs. CAP appreciated the holistic approach of addressing quantity (teaching load) and quality and noted the value of statements that specifically evaluated the candidate's course design and pedagogy, mentoring and advising, and reflection and growth. However, CAP noted that the length of teaching portfolios prepared for a holistic teaching evaluation were very long, sometimes including excessive amounts of course materials, which tended to distract from evaluating teaching effectiveness. CAP does not appreciate the inclusion of large syllabi or other teaching materials that are included without direct interpretation to the candidate's teaching effectiveness. This year, CAP utilized a hybrid approach to teaching evaluations that included CAPE scores, student evaluations, and teaching statements. Based on this year's experience, CAP has made recommendations to the holistic teaching evaluation committee for improved guidance to faculty members. CAP also noted that the holistic teaching evaluation may not adequately address teaching effectiveness in Health Sciences, particularly as many faculty's teaching activities are clinical and not classroom-based. Additionally, the issue of anonymity of residents in small or 1:1 interaction likely limits the value of evaluations as many residents may be hesitant to provide candid and constructive feedback for fear of retaliation. CAP encourages the holistic teaching evaluation process to account for this variation in the teaching and evaluation process for clinically oriented HS faculty.

CAP realizes that the CAPE questions "Recommend Course" and "Recommend Instructor" percentages are prone to implicit bias and thus are no longer commented upon in the CAP letter or included in SET evaluations. Nevertheless, CAP still finds unfiltered student comments to be of essential importance in the review process. The inclusion of student comments in review files is not optional but 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). 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 encourage departments to solicit such comments, without having the faculty candidate be involved. Having read hundreds (or thousands!) of teaching evaluations, committee members have developed a good sense of how to interpret student comments. A well-written teaching statement is especially important in communicating a faculty member's teaching strategies and growth. It is important that the teaching statement address any weaknesses in the file, such as lower than

expected teaching evaluations and problematic student comments, especially if teaching issues were flagged in the previous CAP letter.

CAP encourages candidates to respond to student comments, especially for how candidates plan to address critical comments that may be viewed as concerning, toxic, and/or hostile. Reflective candidate statements help provide the necessary context for CAP to make equitable recommendations. CAP also encourages departments to provide context for student evaluation scores, noting courses that are perceived as challenging or otherwise problematic for students and explaining the need for such courses. This year, CAP identified that the Department of Philosophy has an excellent classroom evaluation form; CAP suggests that it be used as a model for classroom evaluation.

CAP is most concerned about student comments that describe poor pedagogy or organizational issues. CAP is also disturbed by student comments that characterize the instructor as creating a hostile learning environment, including belittling or humiliating students. A particular concern is the potential effects of such environments on underrepresented students. CAP looks for long-term patterns in teaching comments prior to making any judgment on the teaching aspect of the file. Often, CAP requests that the colleague seek the assistance of the Teaching and Learning Commons when consistently poor teaching evaluations are in the file. It is important that the candidate follow up and discuss this process prior to the next review, as CAP members have access to the previous CAP recommendation letter, when available, and look for explanations and progress forward. A consistent pattern of comments over an extensive period of time can be one reason for CAP to conclude that teaching constitutes a weakness in the candidate's record and hence precludes promotion or accelerated merit advancement. Notably, CAP tends to dismiss rude and offensive student comments, and it remains sensitive to the possibility of implicit (or sometimes explicit) bias toward female instructors, instructors from underrepresented minorities, and instructors for whom English is not a first language.

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 documented consultation with the Teaching and Learning Commons. 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. Documenting the process of attempting these new strategies will help CAP form a fair evaluation of the candidate's efforts. However, sticking to an instructional approach that does not seem to work according to common metrics is seen as problematic if there is not a pedagogical or structural reason to justify it.

Mentoring is another essential part of the teaching mission of the university, and the recently revised policy (APM 210) gives special recognition to faculty mentoring activities. CAP is aware of the fact that mentee evaluations can be problematic since their anonymity cannot always be guaranteed and that they are not uniformly collected across all departments and Schools. CAP encourages all departments to collect and include mentee evaluations as evidence of effective mentoring and advising but does not appreciate non-anonymous mentee evaluations. CAP encourages colleagues to describe the nature and extent of their mentoring activities in their self-

statements. Mentoring students and scholars, including faculty members, outside of the University of California is currently recognized as a form of university and public service.

Service

Service is an essential part of the academic mission, and CAP takes service to the University very seriously. 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 within the academic review process. Service is an essential facet of the University of California's shared governance model that extends beyond individual departments or schools for more senior faculty. 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.

In the Biobib, CAP has often seen service activities that are described as lasting up to the present but that are simply not updated. Older service activities can be deleted, though CAP advises that it can be helpful to have the service activities of the previous review period included in the BioBib. For career reviews, it is important to have the most important service activities for the entire period of service at a particular rank included. Instructional activities such as advising students on a thesis committee should not be listed under "Service." 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, attending commencement, or training courses. It is helpful for the candidate to describe in the self-statement which activities are departmental, school, and University-wide activities. Time, effort and intensity of service activities at each level should be addressed.

The service expectations for CAP have remained fairly consistent over the years. In particular, as previous CAPs have stated, service expectations increase with rank and step. 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, including some service outside of their department and often in their School. 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, with increased leadership in their service activities as they approach Above Scale. Performing more Departmental service does not necessarily make up for a lack of wider University service at the higher ranks. University-wide service outside of the candidate's area of research becomes essential and should be part of every review period at Step VI and above. Service is valued less if the faculty member's research or creative activities benefit from it or if it is compensated. Insufficient University-wide service constitutes one of the main reasons for CAP to decline merit advancement or accelerated merit advancement in the higher professorial ranks. 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 is very aware that Academic Senate service is not the only way to perform University-wide service. Faculty members at the higher professorial rank should actively seek out service opportunities that involve leadership, such as chairing a committee, founding a new service group relevant to University-wide issues, etc. CAP has recognized certain kinds of service within one's own academic unit as the equivalent of university-wide service. This includes service as Department

Chair or service as Associate Dean. More highly compensated administrative positions such as Dean or Assistant Vice Chancellor do not count as service in the academic review process; these service activities are evaluated separately. There are many University-wide service opportunities in the Colleges, in university-review committees, or interdisciplinary search and recruitment committees spanning several schools. Faculty members are also encouraged to alert their department chairs and/or their representative on the Academic Senate Committee on Committees of their need for service opportunities, especially when approaching a barrier step such as Step VI or Above Scale. Broad service is expected for Advancement Above scale.

Service in Health Sciences has elicited great debate. Faculty members in HS are part of a very large and diverse academic unit and thus, often participate in service inside this unit. HS faculty have found it challenging to identify service opportunities outside of HS. However, service on hospital committees, service at the VA, and service in HS Schools that are not associated with the faculty candidate's primary appointment are highly valued by CAP.

CAP acknowledges the importance of faculty members engaging 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 and reputation 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." Public service may also be counted as service. Public service is important and, when significant, is considered by CAP. Faculty service activities related to the improvement of elementary and secondary education represent one example of this kind of service. Similarly, contributions to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees and as advisers to student organizations should be recognized as evidence, as should contributions furthering diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging within the University through participation in such activities as recruitment, retention, and mentoring of scholars, students, and faculty. Further detail is provided in APM 210.

CAP is strongly committed to promoting faculty member's 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. However, in combination with the academic mission, EDI efforts might help support an accelerated merit advancement or a bonus off-scale salary component. CAP also understands that some efforts in this area are difficult to quantify, for example, the extensive mentoring of underrepresented minority students. In these cases, CAP asks the Department Chair or the candidate in their self-statement to describe and/or elaborate on these activities. In accordance with policy, CAP does not penalize faculty members for not engaging in EDI efforts.

Accelerations/Recalibrations/Career Equity Reviews

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 accelerated advancement they propose since the particular mechanism defines the specific argument that needs to be made in support of the proposed action.

Accelerations

Accelerated merit advancements, commonly referred to simply as accelerations, are solely concerned with 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 teaching and service during the review period. Per policy, in a series where research is the main criterion, accelerations require that research productivity exceeds what would be expected for a normal merit advancement. If research productivity exceeds expectations for a merit advancement but does not quite amount to doubling expectations, a combined argument in support of acceleration is possible. EDI contributions may also be considered. In this case, research impact and excellence beyond normal expectations in teaching and/or service can augment the case for acceleration. For series where clinical excellence in teaching is the main criterion for advancement (example: Professor of Clinical X,) simply doubling scholarly output is not considered sufficient for acceleration in the absence of clear excellence in clinical and teaching activities. A doubling numerically of low-impact scholarly works (e.g. case reports and non-peer-reviewed publications) is also generally not considered sufficient 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.

The Department Chair should avoid asking for accelerations in an abbreviated review period. CAP also discourages Departments from proposing accelerations if a candidate has a problematic teaching record or only limited service. In these cases, CAP may 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 2-3 publications for a three-year review period at the Full Professor rank, the expectation would be the same if the candidate decides to defer their review by one year and hence completes a four-year review period. For accelerations, the expectation also remains the same if the candidate opts for an abbreviated review period (for example, coming up for review ahead of their normally scheduled review). This means that for acceleration, candidates would need meet the criteria expectation for the review period, despite only completing a portion of the expected review cycle.

Accelerations of more than one step (“double accelerations”) are possible but tend to be exceedingly rare. In those cases, CAP generally expects at least a tripling of research productivity combined with external recognition and excellence (not just the absence of any weakness) in all areas of review. CAP would also expect significant service contributions and sustained teaching excellence for this type of request.

Accelerations to and through the barrier step (Step VI) are possible. However, these are combined with a career review. 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; however, the candidate’s review history is noted. Previous accelerations might mean that the candidate has not had enough time to build a sufficient level of service to meet the expectations for Step VI or AS or whatever rank/step they are proposed for.

Accelerations to the Above Scale rank are possible but exceedingly rare, as an exception to the policy requirement that candidates need to serve at least four years at Step IX before advancing to the Above Scale rank. 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. This year, CAP reviewed nine files that were proposed for accelerated merit advancement to Above Scale. CAP did not support any of these cases, and the EVC concurred with CAP in all cases. Departments should clearly articulate how a case is “rare and compelling” if they are proposing a candidate for advancement to Above Scale before they have served four years at Step IX.

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. Expectations for service are high for Above Scale faculty, with evidence of recent University-wide contributions and leadership roles expected in each review period. Accelerations of 150% and 200% require not only an outstanding and often world-class record of research and creative activities, but also extensive external recognition combined with sustained excellence in 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 main reasons for CAP’s decision to decline to support acceleration requests at the Above Scale rank. CAP is unlikely to approve acceleration requests of more than 150% except in the most unusual and distinguished cases, such as receiving a prestigious prize (e.g., National Academy, Nobel Prize, Fields Medal).

Recalibration

Recalibration and CERs are two different mechanisms for advancing more than one step. Both proposals are career reviews that should be conducted together with a regularly scheduled review. In both cases, 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 combined effect then usually translates into an advancement of more than one step.

Recalibrations can be used at the time of a career review (promotion to Associate Professor, to Professor, merit advancement to Professor Step VI, or to Distinguished Professor), and it can be proposed by the Department but also by the Dean and 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. Consecutive bonus off-scale salary components can also be used to justify a recalibration. The department is encouraged to support recalibration requests with data comparisons to other colleagues in the same field or Department at the same rank.

Career-Equity Review (CERs)

A CER can be requested by the candidate during a regularly scheduled review. CAP encourages Department Chairs to make colleagues aware of this mechanism. Unlike recalibration, a CER does not have to occur at a barrier step. 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 bonus off-scale salary components can also be used to partly justify a CER. In this case, a faculty member exceeded expectations for a merit advancement in several consecutive review periods while falling short of expectations for an

acceleration. In those cases, the cumulative effect of consecutive bonus off-scale salary components may translate into an additional step via CER. A CER can also be justified by a specific review period that was not sufficiently rewarded. A CER with comparisons to other colleagues in the same field or Department at the same rank is encouraged. Like recalibration requests, CER requests need to be justified with reference to specific reasons. CAP especially encourages 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 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 16 of the 52 reconsideration cases this year, reversed its initial decision. Per policy, requests for reconsideration must either present new evidence or provide additional context for existing evidence that CAP might not have fully appreciated in its first review of a file. While CAP attempts to ignore scolding or belittling language by disappointed colleagues or Department Chairs in reconsideration requests, CAP is discouraged by such poor professional civility.

Bonus Off-Scales

A 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 department recommendation letter, and must be based on activities and accomplishments that go beyond the regular duties of a faculty member or expectations for a normal merit increase. Unspecific BOS requests are likely to be denied. The most successful proposals for a BOS are based on exceeding research expectations for a merit advancement 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 not supported 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. BOS is also often recommended when a candidate's acceleration proposal fails to meet expectations, particularly when weaknesses in the file are identified.

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 workforce 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 over the last few review cycles.

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 adjudicating issues of collegiality and professional behavior. Any claims of professional misconduct (sexual harassment, bullying etc.) need to be confirmed by the appropriate process and should not

be litigated within the candidate's file. 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 "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. Blanket and unspecific allegations are not helpful and cannot be considered. Secondly, CAP gives full consideration to candidates' responses in the statement they must be afforded the opportunity to include in the file. If a file includes unspecific allegations of uncivil behavior that have an impact on the departmental (or the Dean's) recommendation, CAP is likely to return the file for more information and request formal documentation.

COVID Impact Continues

This year's files were still impacted by the lingering COVID-19 pandemic. This is why COVID-impact statements remain useful for CAP to understand 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 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.

In general, CAP has applied the principle of "achievement-relative to opportunity" (ARO) in its holistic evaluation of files. 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. CAP does not use ARO as justification for accelerations or promotions. 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 and 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 from another university that is also a peer institution. It is vital to include the outside offer in a retention request. CAP supports cases if a candidate can provide evidence of a competing offer from a peer academic institution for an appointment in a similar position. 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 offer a mechanism for retaining a colleague before they receive a formal offer from another institution. In the ideal case, pre-emptive retention is granted if a faculty member is a finalist for an advertised job. In this year's CAP, several pre-emptive retention files were not supported due to the delay in timing between the request and/or lack of sufficient and credible evidence to support the pre-emptive retention request. Accepting the pre-emptive retention would obligate the faculty member to cancel the planned job interview. Conversations between the EVC and CAP leadership this year resulted in the consideration of more structured

ways to facilitate pre-emptive retentions or retentions. In this year's CAP, several consecutive pre-emptive retentions were noted, some which came forward while the candidate was in an embargo period for a previous pre-emptive retention or retention. CAP interpreted the existing guidelines to mean that a faculty member may not request a pre-emptive retention or retention within the embargo. However, it is clear that there are distinct interpretations of the existing guidelines, and CAP looks forward to forthcoming clarifications and revisions.

CAP understands that sometimes recruitment happens in non-traditional ways, for example, through target-of-opportunity recruitment. 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 a faculty member who is not identified as a search committee chair, department chair, etc. at another institution expressing interest in recruiting a UC San Diego faculty member is usually not sufficient to demonstrate interest from another university. Per policy, CAP only supports retention and pre-emptive retention requests from other academic institutions, not from private industry.

Series Specific Guidance

0% and Non-Salaried Appointments

CAP notes the increasing number of non-salaried Adjunct Professor and secondary 0% appointments. CAP expects that departments provide clear expectations for teaching and service for all 0% and non-salaried appointments, preferably in an MOU, to be included in each review file; at minimum, these expectations should be articulated in the appointment file in accordance with policy. When the faculty member is due for review, the review file must explain how the candidate meets the expectations for each appointment in each department in each review period. More than one 0% appointment and/or non-salaried appointment carry high expectations for contributions to multiple departments, which are likely to be viewed with concern since appointments come with expectations of workloads that may be difficult to manage. The department letter should clearly identify the benefit to the University having these faculty appointed.

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 when 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 in addition to teaching and service. In the Professor of Clinical X series, clinical expertise, teaching, and stature and recognition are the main series criteria. This series allows for a wider range of scholarly activities to be considered, including case reports and/or publications tied more closely to the candidate's clinical practice (see APM 210). Expectations for faculty members in the Adjunct Professor series (salaried or non-salaried) should be based on a departmental MOU stated in the Department Letter regarding the relative distribution of responsibilities among the four criteria but must be clearly defined for an individual at appointment. Candidates who are proposed for a series change should clearly justify the rationale for the change and how their record meets the requirements for the proposed level of the new series.

Teaching Professors

Teaching Professors 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. CAP encourages all Departments with Teaching Professors to develop specific expectations, particularly regarding professional and creative activity, which vary across departments. Based on 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 non-peer-reviewed conference proceedings, invited talks, and textbooks.

Teaching Professors have a higher teaching load, and many of them teach large classes. The transition of such classes to remote teaching was very labor and time-intensive for these colleagues. Nevertheless, many Teaching Professors were 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 a ladder-rank professor, "double productivity" as the basis for an acceleration. While most Teaching Professor acceleration cases are based at least in part on surpassing normative sustained teaching excellence, it is not certain whether CAP should allow departments to define what teaching excellence is or should instead incorporate a more University-wide approach to teaching excellence. Accelerations in the Teaching Professor series are thus almost always based on a combined argument that a candidate exceeded expectations in several areas of review. For example, whereas teaching excellence is a standard expectation in the Teaching Professor series, candidates might exceed expectations by winning a major teaching award, implementing a new and innovative pedagogical method, or by engaging in curriculum design and/or the development of several 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, Teaching Professors perform service at all levels and exceptional service duties are rewarded similarly to the ladder rank Professor series. It is worth noting that the number of colleagues in this series continues to grow and that campus reviewers are striving to calibrate files in this series more precisely.

Conclusion

In Summary, CAP was a highly productive committee during the 2023-2024 academic year. As Chair, I greatly appreciate the extraordinary faculty who served on the committee this year. The CAP analyst fully supported the committee and was invaluable. All members manifested an unyielding commitment to file review, and promoting merit-based faculty advancement, while maintaining a pulse on equity and fairness in the process. It was an honor to serve as Chair, and to serve the University at large.

Sincerely,

Wendy M. Campana. PhD
Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)
2023-2024