SUSAN CARLSON, VICE PROVOST
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Re: UCAP Letter on CAP Evaluations of Health Sciences Faculty

Dear Susan,

The Academic Council has endorsed the attached letter from the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) summarizing the committee’s discussions about campus CAP evaluations of Senate health sciences faculty. The letter notes that while health sciences departments provide criteria to CAPs to aid them in reviews of health sciences faculty, CAPs can still struggle with criteria and expectations for research, teaching, and service. The letter offers advice to health science faculty about preparing files for CAPs, and provides examples of where more communication and clarity would be helpful regarding advancement criteria, service expectations, and review guidelines.

We ask your assistance in forwarding the letter to the campus Vice Chancellors of Academic Personnel. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

Mary Gauvain, Chair
Academic Council

cc: UCAP
Academic Council
Senate Division Chairs

Encl.
October 2, 2020

MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: Summary of discussions with Health Science faculty, 2019-2020

Dear Mary,

Six University of California campuses have schools of medicine (UCD, UCI, UCLA, UCR, UCSD, and UCSF), and UC Health includes health professional schools spanning seven campuses (Dentistry at UCLA and UCSF; Nursing at UCD, UCI, UCLA, and UCSF; Optometry at UCB; Pharmacy at UCI, UCSD, and UCSF; Public Health at UCB, UCSD, and UCLA; and Veterinary Medicine at UCD). UCAP was asked by 2018-2019 Senate Chair Robert May to explore the issues and challenges that campuses have experienced in CAP evaluations of the academic advancement of Health Sciences (HS) faculty. In 2019-2020, UCAP dedicated time during each meeting to discuss CAP evaluations of these faculty members. UCAP asked CAP analysts to identify HS faculty who had served on their CAP to join discussions of effective processes and gaps in academic review of HS faculty, including the criteria by which personnel cases in these series are assessed. Here we report on our discussions and offer observations and suggestions.

Our discussions were wide-ranging and centered on transparency about criteria used for evaluation, expectations for service and scholarly activity, evaluating teaching in this setting, and understanding expectations for faculty who balance heavy patient care and clinical teaching loads. The process revealed that each campus uses different approaches for HS faculty evaluations. For example, UCLA uses a dedicated Clinical CAP subcommittee, but most campuses rely on the their campuswide CAP to review the files of non-Senate HS faculty. Across campuses, CAPs struggle with expectations related to the assessment of scholarly/creative activity as well as service and teaching activities for faculty in health sciences. And, by comparing practices across campuses, it became clear that there is not a uniform approach.

UCAP concluded that it is not the role of UCAP or a campus level CAP to mandate expectations, yet they can—and should--provide recommendations for departments (via vice chancellors of personnel) for improving the academic review of HS faculty members. Related:

- Specific criteria for advancement should be specified at the medical center, medical school, or department level, if not already in place. Each HS faculty member should be evaluated in relation to these criteria. The criteria should be specific to the title series. Criteria examples are included in Appendices. Appendix A shows the UCD School of Veterinary Medicine’s review criteria for the
Professor of Clinical X series; Appendix B shows the UCD School of Veterinary Medicine’s review criteria for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series; and Appendix C shows UCI Health Science’s review criteria for all their academic series. Department-specific criteria help ensure fairness and applicability for their array of responsibilities. It was noted that criteria are most helpful when balanced between specificity and being open-ended, and shared transparently with faculty candidates and faculty voters. Junior faculty should not be expected to provide as much service/committee work as that of more senior faculty. It was also noted that women are disproportionately asked to serve on committees. Therefore, when appropriate,
  o service expectations should be specified by the department or division, and criteria should be specific to the academic rank and step if it differs significantly from UC expectations;
  o service provided should be quantified by the candidate (e.g., in % effort or hours).

• Faculty members should be encouraged to prepare their dossier in relation to the specific criteria.
  o Candidates should be encouraged to write personal statements based on these criteria.
  o The dossier should include evidence of teaching and teaching evaluations, with the understanding that the number of students/trainees may be limited. Clinical teaching of students, resident and fellows is an important component of the teaching record and evaluations and reporting of current job positions of former trainees should be included in the dossier.
  o It was suggested that candidates be encouraged to describe service in terms of the frequency of meetings and the amount of work involved.
  o Junior faculty may benefit from mentorship to ensure understanding of the criteria to be applied to them for advancement and promotion.
  o The percent of the clinical appointment is helpful for reviewers of these files, and should be provided in the dossier. This helps set appropriate expectations for creative/scholarly activity.

• The review of these faculty should include faculty members from the health sciences or schools of medicine and veterinary medicine, either by representation on CAP or a separate committee to review these files, as their responsibilities may vary from those of other faculty.

• UCAP suggests improved and proactive communication between each campus-level CAP and campus medical centers. One way to facilitate this communication is for leaders and representatives from Health Sciences departments to meet with CAPs annually to review and describe their departmental criteria for advancement, and receive feedback from CAP on how faculty can prepare personnel files in a way that clarifies their activities. Educating HS faculty on file preparation and CAPs on the expectations for HS Clinical faculty will improve this file review process.

We would like to thank the participants in these discussion for their valuable observations, insights, and input, in addition to the 2019-2020 UCAP members:
• Christine Cocanour, Professor of Surgery, Surgical Critical Care Fellowship Program; Director, Surgery - Trauma, Acute Care Surgery and Surgical Critical Care, Surgery - Surgical Critical Care, UCD
• Donald Forthal, Division Chief – Infectious Diseases; Professor of Medicine – Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, UCI
• Stephen Hayden, Professor of Clinical, Emergency Medical Services, UCSD
• Sanford J. Shattil, Distinguished Professor, Department of Medicine; Interim Chief, Hematology Oncology Division, UCSD
• Ping H. Wang, Professor of Medicine, Physiology and Biophysics, and Experimental Pathology, Director, UC Irvine Diabetes Center Chief, Division of Endocrinology, Diabetes and Metabolism, UCI
• Lonnie K. Zeltzer, Distinguished Research Professor of Pediatrics, Anesthesiology, Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Science Director, UCLA Pediatric Pain Research Program, David Geffen School of Medicine, UCLA

Sincerely,

Susan F. Tapert, Ph.D., Chair, UCAP
Professor of Psychiatry, UC San Diego

Lisa A. Tell, D.V.M
Professor of Veterinary Medicine, UC Davis

Valerie Jenness, Ph.D.
Distinguished Professor of Criminology, Law & Society, UC Irvine