

Faculty Advancement Workshop

CAP Recommendations

Marisa Abrajano, Professor

Department of Political Science

Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)

<http://senate.ucsd.edu/committees/standing/academic-personnel/home>



What is CAP?

- ▶ The purpose of CAP is to ensure fairness in academic advancement
 - ▶ Advises the Chancellor/EVC or Dean on the merits of faculty personnel proposals
 - ▶ 13 senior faculty members chosen by the Academic Senate
 - ▶ All members vote on every file unless there is a conflict of interest
 - ▶ Term of service is 2-3 years; Chair is 1 year
 - ▶ Members provide informed perspectives on achievements of faculty members in their Divisions and Schools - **but they are not advocates.**
Current members are from:
 - ▶ Division of Social Sciences (2)
 - ▶ Health Sciences (2)
 - ▶ Division of Arts and Humanities (2)
 - ▶ Jacobs School of Engineering (3)
 - ▶ Scripps Institution of Oceanography (1)
 - ▶ Division of Physical Sciences (1)
 - ▶ Division of Biological Sciences (2)
 - ▶ Rady School of Management (0)
 - ▶ School of Global Policy and Strategy (0)
-



Biography/Bibliography

- ▶ Employment history
- ▶ Education
- ▶ University service
- ▶ Honors/awards
- ▶ Grants
- ▶ External professional activities (service to the field including seminars, reviewer, organizer, consulting)
- ▶ Contributions to diversity
- ▶ Mentoring
- ▶ Peer-reviewed, original research or creative work
 - ▶ This must be clearly distinguished from other peer-reviewed work (e.g., reviews of the literature) and all other non-peer-reviewed work

You



Are Responsible

Academic Performance Criteria

▶ Research/Creative Activity

- ▶ Enables progress up the academic ladder
- ▶ Exceeding standard productivity by 2x can be rewarded by an acceleration up the ladder, provided research impact is strong and both teaching and service are good
- ▶ Productive, impactful research that doesn't quite merit acceleration standards may be rewarded with a bonus (one half-step)

▶ Teaching/Mentoring

- ▶ Evaluation is difficult but the extremes of teaching quality are generally easy to recognize
- ▶ Bad teaching will prevent progress up the ladder
- ▶ Great teaching may be rewarded with a bonus (one half-step)

▶ Service

- ▶ Expectations increase with seniority
- ▶ Service is required to the University and to the field
- ▶ Great service may be rewarded with a bonus (one half-step)

▶ Professor, Professor-in-Residence, Professor of Clinical X, Adjunct Professor, Research Scientist with Lecturer Appointment

The CAP Letter

- ▶ There are generally two parts to a CAP letter:
 - ▶ Congratulations
 - ▶ Guidance
- ▶ **Congratulations**
 - ▶ This section describes CAP's recommendations, which generally support the proposed actions
 - ▶ In about 20% of cases CAP modifies the proposal up or down (so 'Congratulations' may not always feel positive in the latter case...)
- ▶ **Guidance**
 - ▶ This section provides guidance on how to improve your performance during the next review period
 - ▶ Guidance can sound critical after the great news in the "Congratulations" paragraph, but be strong and take it to heart



Independence is Essential

- ▶ For promotion to Associate Professor (with tenure) the academic review file must provide evidence of an **independent** research/creative program and leadership (8-year clock)
- ▶ Typical documentation includes
 - ▶ Serving as first, sole, and/or corresponding author on publications or creative endeavors
 - ▶ Publishing/performing without mentors
 - ▶ Giving invited presentations at prominent venues
 - ▶ Earning major grant support as Principal Investigator
 - ▶ Letters from five independent referees that attest to the candidate's scholarly independence and leadership
- ▶ Terminal reappointments are often caused by failure to demonstrate independence
- ▶ Pay attention to CAP's fourth-year appraisal
 - ▶ Departments, Chairs, and Deans will sometimes cheer for the candidate rather than provide critical feedback



Fourth-Year Appraisal

- ▶ The most common appraisal from CAP is *Favorable with Reservations* (FWR), which often indicates that the quality and quantity of research/creativity is on track toward promotion but more independence must be established. Sometimes FWR is given because more publications are needed to reach the tenure threshold. FWR can also be given if there are deficiencies in teaching. CAP views *Favorable with Reservations* as provisionally positive.
- ▶ *Problematic* appraisal indicates that future promotion is possible if substantial deficiencies in the present record are remedied. Candidates would do well to heed CAP guidance.
- ▶ Other CAP appraisal outcomes include *Favorable* (all signs are looking great) and *Unfavorable* (tenure/promotion unlikely to the point that remedying won't fix it)



Teaching & Mentoring

- ▶ Poor teaching is the most common reason that career advancement is slowed or denied for good scholars
- ▶ By policy, it is the Department's responsibility to evaluate teaching but few departments take this seriously
 - ▶ UC San Diego is the only UC campus without a system for teaching evaluation
 - ▶ CAPEs are used as a substitute
- ▶ CAPE scores are proportional to response rates
 - ▶ Incentivize students to participate (but you cannot withhold grades)
- ▶ CAP will judge performance based on the teaching evaluations presented in the file
 - ▶ Consistent praise or criticism by students is weighted proportionately
 - ▶ Make certain that ALL of your teaching is evaluated
 - ▶ Include the course syllabus in your file
 - ▶ Enlist the UC San Diego Teaching + Learning Commons for evaluations or help
- ▶ Describe your mentoring
 - ▶ Effort and impact



Service

- ▶ **To the University**
 - ▶ Department
 - ▶ Division, College
 - ▶ Campus-wide
 - ▶ Academic Senate: 24 standing committees in addition to 5 special committees
- ▶ **To the field**
 - ▶ Editor, editorial boards, manuscript and grant proposal reviewer, conference organizer, society president, outreach
- ▶ **Self-service vs. “self-less” service**
 - ▶ Advances the candidate's research (e.g., Director of a Center)
 - ▶ Helps the campus more broadly (e.g., AS committee)
- ▶ **Obligations increase with seniority and become more “self-less”**
 - ▶ Inadequate service prevents advancement of some senior faculty members each year



Joint Appointments

- ▶ **Joint appointments are treated like any new appointment**
 - ▶ Full application process including independent letters, department vote, Dean's letter, CAP evaluation, Chancellor approval
- ▶ **A joint appointment is a single job with obligations that are the sum of the duties in each department**
 - ▶ An MOU should define the candidate's obligations at the time of appointment and is highly recommended
- ▶ **Academic advancement requires satisfying the requirements for advancement in both departments**
 - ▶ Cannot advance in just one department
- ▶ **Even a 0% appointment in a second department obligates the candidate to new duties in teaching and service**
 - ▶ Those duties should be defined at the time of appointment



Summary

- ▶ **Research and/or Creative Activity**
 - ▶ Independence from former mentors
 - ▶ Research support, if applicable
 - ▶ Middle authorship requires explanation of contributions
- ▶ **Teaching**
 - ▶ Excellent teaching performance; evaluations
 - ▶ Plans for improving teaching performance, if needed
- ▶ **Service**
 - ▶ Service contributions appropriate to your level:
 - ▶ Junior Level – service to the field and department
 - ▶ Senior Level – professional leadership in your field, Academic Senate committees, other University-wide service
- ▶ **General**
 - ▶ Know the standard for a normal merit advancement in your department
 - ▶ Know the standard for promotion in your department
- ▶ **Where CAP Stood**
 - ▶ <http://senate.ucsd.edu/committees/standing/academic-personnel/home>



The Academic Review File

- ▶ Summary page (proposed actions; ladder/rank history)
- ▶ *Ad hoc* committee's letter
- ▶ Referee letters
- ▶ Candidate self-statement
- ▶ Syllabus and teaching evaluations
- ▶ Biography/Bibliography
- ▶ File from preceding review
 - ▶ Any warnings/advice from previous CAP?
 - ▶ If yes, make sure you explicitly describe how you corrected these deficiencies and provide documentation of the improvements in your performance



Decision process

- ▶ Department makes the Academic Review File available to members who are eligible to vote
- ▶ At a Department meeting of voting members a colleague presents the file for discussion and evaluation
 - ▶ Informal show of hands; discussion of opposing votes, abstentions, recusals
 - ▶ Formal, confidential, electronic vote
- ▶ The Chair adds a Departmental Recommendation letter to the file explaining the Department votes and stating the case for the proposed actions, articulating performance relative to standards for research, teaching, and service and taking into account the *ad hoc* committee recommendations



Decision process (continued)

- ▶ The Dean adds a letter to the file agreeing with the Department letter (or disagreeing and proposing modified actions)
- ▶ CAP adds a letter to the file agreeing with the Department (or disagreeing and proposing modified actions)
- ▶ The EVC/Final Authority issues a final decision supporting the proposed actions if CAP agreed with the Department; otherwise a preliminary decision is made and the Department is invited to submit new information in a reclama that addresses concerns raised by CAP
- ▶ CAP evaluates the reclama and writes a recommendation
- ▶ The EVC/Final Authority issues a final decision
 - ▶ The EVC overrides CAP in less than 1% of cases

