**Report of the Task Force on Personnel Processes**
**for Non-Senate Academic Appointees**
**February 15, 2006**

**Introduction**

On March 7, 2005, Acting Senior Vice Chancellor Miller and Academic Senate Chair Tuzin established a joint Senate/Administration Task Force on Personnel Processes for Non-Senate Academic Appointees. (The charge letter is provided in Appendix 1.)  The task force was asked to consider the procedures for appointments and reviews in the non-Senate series, namely Adjunct Professor, Visiting Professor, Research Scientist, Project Scientist, Specialist, Academic Coordinator, and Academic Administrator.  The panel was asked to identify practices that will enable the campus to improve the quality and timeliness of reviews, while maintaining the integrity of the system.  The panel was also asked to anticipate, to the extent possible, campus expansion and increased numbers of academic employees.  The goal was to further refine the present system to benefit individual non-Senate members, academic departments, and ORUs, as well as to aid campus reviewers in the processing of review files, streamlining the process where possible while maintaining high standards for personnel evaluations. The task force was asked to consider the following specific questions:

1.  Are the required content of personnel files and standards for actions appropriate?  Should the content or standards be modified for different series or certain actions?
2.  Who should have input into and final authority for personnel actions?  Are the roles of academic deans and central campus committees such as the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), the Project Scientist and Specialist Review Panel (PSSRP), and the Academic Administrator/Coordinator Review Panel (AARP) appropriate?  Should authority for certain series or actions within a series be delegated?
3.  Is it appropriate that there be differences in how academic files are processed among the campus units, i.e., the General Campus, Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO), and School of Medicine (SOM)?
4.  Should a new series, tentatively entitled "Professor of X Practice," be established? (The last question was added to the charge in Summer 2005 by Acting SVC Miller.)

**Summary of Recommendations**

The task force makes the following recommendations on these and related matters.[1]

***A. General recommendations***
1.  Develop an electronic file review system.
2.  Consider adding an Adjunct Professor and a Research Scientist as members of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP).

---

[1] Note: Because the Dean of Graduate Studies functions as the equivalent of the divisional dean for the Rady School of Management and the School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, references to divisional or General Campus deans do not include the deans of these schools.

3. Support campus ad hoc service by non-Senate academic personnel.
4. Encourage the use of departmental ad hoc committees in the development of academic personnel files.
5. Set uniform General Campus file submission deadlines.
6. Encourage departments to obtain input into academic files from ORUs and interdisciplinary teaching programs.
7. Provide assistance or training to small or inexperienced academic units (e.g., some ORUs) in the preparation of academic personnel files.
8. Collect and publish annually statistics on the timeliness of the review processes.

## B. Recommendations for the Research Scientist, Project Scientist, and Specialist series

9. Delegate authority to General Campus deans for all personnel actions except appointments and career reviews for Research Scientists, Project Scientists, and Specialists in units that report to the deans.
10. Uphold the standard for Research Scientists that their research qualifications and accomplishments be equivalent to those of Professors.
11. Develop and honor clear, explicit space commitments for Research Scientists.
12. Consider allowing Research Scientists in the School of Medicine to be eligible for participation in the Health Sciences Compensation Plan.
13. Combine the PSSRP and the AARP into one committee.
14. Provide a means (possibly electronic) for PSSRP/AARP to reach decisions between monthly meetings when necessary.
15. Require supervisors of Project Scientists and Specialists to provide letters of recommendation for academic review files.
16. Require fewer independent letters for Project Scientist and Specialist appointment and promotion files.

## C. Recommendations for the Academic Administrator and Academic Coordinator series

17. Delegate authority for Academic Administrator and Academic Coordinator personnel actions to divisional deans[2] (for individuals in their units) and the Vice Chancellor for Research (for individuals in General Campus ORUs).
18. Provide bibliography guidance and require a self-evaluation statement for Academic Administrators and Academic Coordinators.
19. Eliminate the requirement for independent letters for Academic Administrators and Academic Coordinators.

## D. Recommendations for the Adjunct Professor series

20. Allow the omission of title modifiers for Adjunct Professors on contract and grant proposals. (The task force suggests that this be permitted for the In Residence series, as well.)
21. Create the "Professor of X Practice" title within the Adjunct Professor series.
22. Review how the Adjunct Professor series is used in the School of Medicine in order to ensure consistency and equity.

---

[2] For the purposes of this report, "divisional deans" refers to deans in the School of Medicine, the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, and the General Campus.

23. Streamline appointments and reviews for nonsalaried Adjunct Professors without concurrent salaried UCSD faculty appointments.
24. In cases of great distinction, allow a waiver of the requirement for independent letters for nonsalaried Adjunct Professors without concurrent salaried UCSD faculty appointments.
25. Streamline the review process for nonsalaried Adjunct Professors by involving CAP only in appointments and promotions.
26. Eliminate the requirement for external letters for secondary appointments of nonsalaried Adjunct Professors who have concurrent salaried faculty appointments.

### E. Recommendations for the Visiting Professor series
27. Discontinue the requirement for provost reviews for initial appointments of Visiting Professors, but continue to require them for reappointments.

## Process

The task force met 20 times during the spring, summer, and fall quarters. A listserv was established and all academic employees were invited to post suggestions to the task force. The task force heard from many, and it met with individuals from the non-Senate academic series and with members of various review panels (CAP, AARP, and PSSRP), as well as with deans, provosts, department chairs, ORU directors, and members of the Health Sciences Faculty Council.

The Academic Personnel Office provided extensive statistical data on the processing of appointment and advancement files. The task force reviewed the distribution of appointments in the various series (see Appendix II) and the rate of agreement and/or the origin of disagreements among reviewers, as well as the extent and origin of delays in file processing.

In order to gain a first-hand perspective on key steps in the current system of file processing, the task force audited selected files from the relevant series handled by CAP, PSSRP, and AARP. This audit focused on the period 2003–2004, which was the most recent academic year for which complete data were available. The emphasis of the audit was on longer-delayed files in each series, because it was anticipated that they would be most indicative of disagreements and other problems. As described below, appointment files from that comparison year were also examined, since the ability to respond rapidly in such situations is a particularly important facet of our recruiting process.

The task force also reviewed an important historical document from the system-wide Assembly of the Academic Senate (a special report, "Non-Senate Academic Personnel," in the Record of the Assembly of the Academic Senate, Vol. IV, No. 4, May 22, 1967, presented by F.N. Spiess, chair). This document revealed that even in 1967, the University was noting the importance of these various series and observing that their growth was more rapid than that of the ladder-rank (FTE) series and that morale problems associated with the review and welfare of personnel in these series needed to be addressed.

## Organizing Principles

The task force began its proceedings by focusing on the principles that it believed should guide file review processes. In the view of the task force, reviews should be conducted in the context of UCSD's tradition of shared governance in order to promote excellence in research, scholarship, teaching, and/or administration, in accordance with the duties of the series; to provide fairness to the candidate and opportunities for professional growth; and to maintain equity in rank and salary structure, while acknowledging market forces as necessary and appropriate.

UCSD has a long and valued tradition of shared governance, whereby academics and staff members share with the administration the task of running the University. Effective involvement of the faculty and other academic appointees is a critical part of the appointment and review processes, providing, among other things, opportunity for meaningful peer review.

Fair and equitable personnel decisions that foster excellence are central to the University's education and research missions. A properly designed and maintained appointment and review process is, in turn, central to achieving fairness and equity. Appointment and review procedures must be fair to the candidate and insulated from inevitable pressures and conflicts of interest. The process must also be fair to all, maintaining equity while acknowledging market forces as they may arise. Files should be prepared in accordance with personnel policies specific to each series, but when unique circumstances arise, departmental and campus reviewers are encouraged to be flexible in applying these policies.

## Findings

*Performance of the review panels.* Questions were raised as to the merit of the relevant review panels (CAP, PSSRP, and AARP) and the delays they introduce in the review process. The task force found that the review panels are functioning well in terms of both the timeliness and the substance of their reviews. The panels handled files expeditiously; once a file was ready for panel consideration, the time required for panel action was generally short compared to the time required for the other steps in the process. When delays were the result of panel action, the reasons were usually substantive and appropriate. These panels continue to play key roles in the review and appointment processes. As discussed below, there are some modifications that might further enhance the panels' effectiveness, most notably combining PSSRP and AARP.

*Time required to process new appointments.* Concern was expressed that the current appointment process is so long as to jeopardize our recruiting efforts. To address this issue, the task force audited appointments for the 2003–2004 academic year. Excluding cases in which there were requests for additional information or in which preliminary assessments were issued, the average time from the receipt of files in the Academic Personnel Office (or in the Office of Graduate Studies and Research, as relevant) to the final decision was 25 working days (WD) for Research Scientists; 30

WD for Project Scientists[3]; and 16 WD for Adjunct Professors.  Based on these data and on indications that the review panels place a high priority on handling such appointment files, the task force concluded that this aspect of the appointment process was functioning satisfactorily.

*Appropriateness of differences in review procedures among the campus units*. There are a number of differences in review procedures among the campus units (General Campus, SOM, and SIO).  For example, SOM and SIO have their own CAPs, which review some files for these units before they are routed for further review.  The task force judged such differences to be appropriately within the purview of the individual units.  It was also felt that the campus-wide review committees (CAP, PSSRP, and AARP) serve an important role in ensuring equity across the campus.  With regard to uniform campus standards, the task force recommends (below) a more consistent campus-wide use of departmental ad hoc committees and self-evaluation statements from individuals being reviewed.

*Anticipating the effects of campus expansion on the review process*.  At present, there are few specific bottlenecks that consistently slow down the campus personnel review process.  Nonetheless, the task force identified a number of changes in practices that should expedite the review process as the campus grows.

*Reporting relationship for personnel actions in General Campus ORUs.* There was considerable discussion regarding the reporting relationship for personnel actions in General Campus ORUs. It was suggested that that because some General Campus ORUs are closely connected to specific schools or divisions, such ORUs should have the option of reporting to the dean of the appropriate division or school, rather than to the Vice Chancellor for Research.  Some members felt that the current reporting relationships, with ORUs independent of campus departments and divisions, are important in fostering interdisciplinary activities.  Others preferred allowing an ORU to choose, as a unit, to have the divisional dean as final authority for academic personnel actions within that unit.  The task force did not reach a consensus as to whether it would be better to maintain the status quo (i.e., having ORUs report to the Vice Chancellor for Research for academic personnel matters) or to allow ORUs to report to a divisional dean for academic personnel matters.

## Task Force Recommendations

### A.  General recommendations

**1.  Develop an electronic file review system**
　　　　Academic reviews are enhanced when they are handled efficiently. The current paper-based system introduces inefficiencies in file handling. The task force supports the rapid development of a campus-wide electronic file management system for all academic review and appointment files, recognizing that with appropriate security and back-up, advantages will include a database of bibliographic information that will allow production of bibliographies in a variety of formats (NIH, NSF, Academic Personnel,

---

[3]  Eight of ten files; the remaining two presented substantive issues and took 98 and 126 WD to process.

etc.); electronic file routing that will make the status of files visible at all times; data capture at each step, providing a data repository and reducing the need for data entry; document storage; and improved timeliness. Statistics on the timeliness of file processing should be provided each year to the campus.

**2. Consider adding an Adjunct Professor and a Research Scientist as members of CAP**

Adjunct Professors and Research Scientists are evaluated by CAP but have no representation on CAP. This practice is at odds with the concept of peer review. The task force recommends that consideration be given to CAP membership for academics in these two series, perhaps by increasing the number of members. A change in the bylaws may be necessary to allow such individuals to vote on files.

**3. Support campus ad hoc service by non-Senate academic personnel**

It is important that candidates perceive the academic review process as fair. That sense of fairness is enhanced when the merits of individual cases are assessed by peers. The task force supports the current practice of permitting non-Senate academics to be members of departmental and campus ad hoc committees and encourages their inclusion in review of non-Senate personnel files.

**4. Encourage the use of departmental ad hoc committees in the development of academic personnel files**

Thoughtful departmental ad hoc reports can be particularly helpful in assessing candidates' activities. Departments/ORUs should provide such careful analyses assembled by departmental/ORU colleagues in the field who are knowledgeable about candidates' research and/or teaching and service contributions.

**5. Set uniform General Campus file submission deadlines**

The various General Campus deans' offices and the Vice Chancellor for Research have different deadlines for the same personnel review actions, leading to confusion among academic departments. Uniform deadlines should be employed for all General Campus review file actions.

**6. Encourage departments to obtain input into academic files from ORUs and interdisciplinary teaching programs**

Academics who are appointed to departments or ORUs frequently make significant contributions to research or teaching in other academic units. Often the appointing unit neglects to solicit input from other units to which the candidate has contributed. A process should be put in place that encourages both the candidate and the appointing department to include such information in review files.

**7. Provide assistance or training to small or inexperienced academic units (e.g., some ORUs) in the preparation of academic personnel files**

Some ORUs lack the accumulated experience to correctly assemble non-Senate series files. This leads to inadequate file preparation and inevitable delays in file processing. A yearly training workshop for ORU directors and their staff who handle academic files should be offered. Consideration should also be given to centralizing administrative support for some ORUs to assist in preparation of academic files. That

central office would have the continuing experience with the process to ensure accurate and complete file preparation.

**8. Collect and publish annually statistics on the timeliness of review processes**
Academic employees are naturally concerned about the timeliness of the processing of their files. Furthermore, there are significant variations in file processing time among departments, ORUs and divisions. <u>The task force recommends that statistics on the handling of academic review files be collected and published annually</u>. All major steps in the processes should be monitored, from the date of the candidate's initial submission of review materials through the departmental ad hoc committee meeting (as appropriate) and the steps involving the department chair, dean, provost (as appropriate), APO/OGSR, campus ad hoc committee, and CAP/PSSRP/AARP. <u>For this purpose, guidelines should be developed to ensure that files contain all relevant dates, starting with the date a candidate initially submits materials at the beginning of a review.</u>

## *B. Recommendations for the Research Scientist, Project Scientist, and Specialist series*

**9. Delegate authority to General Campus deans for all personnel actions except appointments and career reviews for Research Scientists, Project Scientists, and Specialists in units that report to the deans.**
In order to increase efficiency, some personnel actions could be handled directly by General Campus deans without referring them to the Vice Chancellor for Research. <u>The General Campus deans should have authority for some review actions (e.g., regular and accelerated merits, uncontested no-change actions, and first deferrals of reviews) and such routine personnel matters as leaves and family accommodations for Research Scientists, Project Scientists, and Specialists within their divisions. For appointments and career reviews, the General Campus deans should provide assessments of the files, but final decisions should remain the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor for Research.</u>

**10. Uphold the standard for Research Scientists that their research qualifications and accomplishments be equivalent to those of Professors**
The Academic Personnel Manual indicates that the primary appointment criterion for Research Scientists is "research qualifications and accomplishments equivalent to those of appointees in the professor ranks." <u>The task force recommends that departments adhere to this standard for appointments and advancements, including career reviews, in this series, and that department chairs/ORU directors familiarize themselves with the equivalence between Research Scientists and ladder-rank faculty.</u> Departments should consider a different series, such as the Project Scientist series, for individuals whose research qualifications are not comparable to those for appointees in the professorial series.

**11. Develop and honor clear, explicit space commitments for Research Scientists**
The task force heard testimony that space commitments for Research Scientists have not been consistently honored. <u>When Research Scientists are appointed, the University's space commitments to them must be clear and explicit.</u> If the University has signed a contract or grant application from a Research Scientist and has promised

space for a project, that space commitment must be honored for the duration of the contract or grant.

## 12. Consider allowing Research Scientists in the School of Medicine to be eligible for participation in the Health Sciences Compensation Plan

SOM Research Scientists' salaries are lower than equivalently ranked SOM professors because they are excluded from the Health Sciences Compensation Plan. Research Scientists at SOM should be eligible for an expanded salary compensation plan similar to that used by Health Sciences (an "XYZ" compensation plan). Given that most (if not all) Research Scientists are paid through their own extramural funds, there would be little cost, if any, to the University in implementing this plan. The University should explore whether an XYZ system might be advantageous for non-SOM Research Scientists. (The University may wish to consider such a system for non-SOM faculty as well.)

## 13. Combine PSSRP and AARP into one committee

Project Scientists, Specialists, Academic Coordinators, and Academic Administrators play important roles in the research and/or teaching functions of the University. Currently, their files are handled by two separate committees, but the number of files handled each year by these committees is actually quite small. The task force recommends merging the two committees and adjusting membership accordingly. It was suggested that the new committee might be composed of ladder-rank faculty, Specialists, Project Scientists, Research Scientists, Academic Administrators, and Academic Coordinators. In defining the committee's charge, attention should be given to voting rights—i.e., whether all members vote on all series, or whether certain members vote only for certain series. In addition, the panel should adopt procedures to ensure that assessment letters are written and relayed expeditiously. Additional recommendations (below) regarding PSSRP and AARP functions would also be relevant for the new combined PSSRP/AARP.

## 14. Provide a means (possibly electronic) for PSSRP/AARP to reach decisions between monthly meetings when necessary

PSSRP currently meets monthly and has ad hoc provisions for extra meetings as necessary. In general, files are handled expeditiously; however certain steps could be taken to improve efficiency even further. The panel is encouraged to consider cases via electronic means as necessary.

## 15. Require supervisors of Specialists and Project Scientists to provide letters of recommendation for academic review files

The task force found that there is considerable variability across campus in the content of Project Scientist and Specialist files. Some files are too sketchy, hindering assessment during the review process. The task force wishes to strengthen current policy by requiring that files for employees in these non-Senate series contain supervisors' letters of recommendation. Further, candidates should be encouraged to include statements in their files summarizing professional activities relevant to the review.

**16.  Require fewer external letters for Project Scientist and Specialist appointment and promotion files**

Independent external letters serve the important function of ensuring fairness to the candidate and providing external validation of the quality of the candidate's scholarship.  For these series, however, independent letters are more difficult to obtain. The task force believes that three independent letters will suffice for evaluating most career-review files. Thus, the requirement of five letters for appointment or promotion to the Associate and Full levels should be reduced to three letters.  PSSRP may request additional letters as it deems necessary. For Specialists, not all letters should be required to be independent (i.e., from noncollaborators outside the University).  Rather, letters should be from individuals knowledgeable about the candidate's performance.


*C.  Recommendations for the*
*Academic Administrator and Academic Coordinator series*

**17.  Delegate authority for Academic Administrator and Academic Coordinator personnel actions to divisional deans (for individuals in their units) and the Vice Chancellor for Research (for individuals in General Campus ORUs).**

The Senior Vice Chancellor currently has authority for appointments and career reviews for the Academic Administrator and Academic Coordinator series.  The panel recommends that final authority be delegated to divisional deans and the Vice Chancellor for Research for file actions and other personnel matters (e.g., leaves, deferrals, family accommodations, etc.) related to these series.

**18. Provide bibliography guidance and require a self-evaluation statement for Academic Administrators and Academic Coordinators**

The standard biobibliography form may not elicit all information required for assessment of academics in the Academic Administrator and Academic Coordinator series.  Guidelines should be developed to assist academics in these series in completing the biobibliography form so that all pertinent information is provided.  In addition, a self-evaluation statement summarizing activities and accomplishments should be required for review files for all academics in these series.

**19.  Eliminate the requirement for independent letters for Academic Administrators and Academic Coordinators**

It is difficult for external referees to evaluate the accomplishments of individuals in the Academic Administrator and Academic Coordinator series.  Thus, the requirement for independent letters for individuals in these series should be eliminated, and letters should instead be sought from people with direct knowledge of the candidate's performance in program management and/or administration.


*D.  Recommendations for the Adjunct Professor series*

**20.  Allow omission of title modifiers for Adjunct Professors on contract and grant applications**

The salaried Adjunct Professor title is used extensively in the School of Medicine. A problem arises when these faculty submit applications for extramural funds, since

they are required to include the modifier "Adjunct" with their titles (i.e., Adjunct Professor). There is anecdotal evidence that this can negatively influence grant reviewers and agency personnel who might have the impression that the connection of these faculty to the institution is tenuous and/or that institutional support for them may be lacking. In practice, salaried Adjuncts at UCSD fulfill the full range of professorial responsibilities, including research, teaching, clinical service, and University service (albeit not necessarily in equal amounts). The task force recommends that Adjunct Professors be allowed to omit the title "Adjunct" on contract and grant applications, similar to current practice on other UC campuses. (By extension, this would also logically apply to "In Residence" and "Clinical X" professors.)

**21. Create the "Professor of X Practice" title within the Adjunct Profesor series**

Many divisions see the need for a title that would allow them to appoint personnel who do not fit the traditional academic profile, but who would greatly benefit the University by bringing real-world experience and expertise to its educational and research missions. These include the Rady School of Management, the Jacobs School of Engineering, IR/PS, and some Social Science departments. Such a title needs to have a clear set of standards for review, *different* from the traditional research model, which recognizes that nonacademic experience and expertise are valuable additions to the University. Appointments in such a title should be flexible (salaried or nonsalaried, part or full time) but time-limited. The title "Professor of X Practice" within the Adjunct Professor series, with the same salary scale but different appointment and review criteria, could be used for this purpose. An appropriate addition to the Policy and Procedure Manual should be developed.

**22. Review how the Adjunct Professor series is used in the School of Medicine in order to ensure consistency and equity**

The task force heard consistent and extensive testimony that the use of the Adjunct Professor series in the SOM needs to be examined in terms of appointments, mentoring, and advancement. Salaried Adjuncts are appointed almost exclusively in SOM (135 out of 142 total at UCSD), and reviews of these candidates present significant problems. For example, in the comparison year (2003–2004), 34% (14/41) of the proposed SOM actions for these candidates were either rejected or modified in a manner disadvantageous to the candidate. Reasons included less research productivity than expected and disagreement with the departments' assessments of favorable prospects for promotion. There is confusion about the requirements for appointment and advancement of salaried members of the Adjunct Professor series, particularly at SOM, where many full-time salaried adjuncts function identically to In Residence faculty. If departments wish to appoint individuals prominent in research and also expect excellence in teaching and service, those prospective appointees should be considered for a different series (e.g., Professor In Residence). PPM guidelines should be reviewed to ensure that individuals with full-time, salaried appointments in the Adjunct Professor series are assessed fairly. The School of Medicine should convene a special task force to examine these matters.

**23. Streamline appointments and reviews for nonsalaried Adjunct Professors without concurrent salaried UCSD faculty appointments**

Nonsalaried appointments in the Adjunct Professor series seem fully appropriate for faculty members whose primary appointments are at other institutions with standards

comparable to those at UCSD, such as the Salk Institute or The Scripps Research Institute.  In order to streamline the appointment and review processes and reduce the procedural burden on departments, CAP, and the candidates, the task force recommends establishing procedural agreements similar to that between The Salk Institute and the Division of Biological Sciences with equivalently excellent neighboring institutions.

**24.  In cases of great distinction, allow a waiver of the requirement for independent letters for nonsalaried Adjunct Professors without concurrent salaried UCSD faculty appointments**

Independent letters are currently required for nonsalaried Adjunct appointments. The task force thought that in some instances such independent letters were an unnecessary requirement and posed an extra burden on departments and CAP. Independent letters should continue to be sought for initial appointments and for career reviews in this series, but in cases of great distinction, the task force recommends that departments be allowed to petition the SVC to authorize waiving or modifying requirements for external letters.

**25.  Streamline the review process for nonsalaried Adjunct Professors by involving CAP only in appointments and promotions**

Currently, nonsalaried Adjunct files are reviewed by CAP every six years, and the SVC has final authority for these reviews, regardless of the proposed action..  However, ladder-rank, Clinical X, and In Residence files are not reviewed by CAP unless an acceleration or some other unusual action is being considered. The task force recommends that a procedure be adopted for nonsalaried Adjunct Professors similar to that currently in place for normal merit advancements of ladder-rank, Clinical X, and In Residence appointments; i.e., eliminate CAP review of such cases and delegate authority to the appropriate dean for the review and reappointment of nonsalaried Adjuncts.

**26.  Eliminate the requirement for external letters for secondary appointments of nonsalaried Adjunct Professors who hold salaried faculty appointments**

In the interests of diminishing burdens on departments and CAP, the task force thought that the requirement for external letters could be relaxed in certain circumstances. When a faculty member already holds a salaried faculty appointment in one department, and another department wishes to appoint him or her as a nonsalaried Adjunct Professor, independent external letters should not be required.

### E.  Recommendations for the Visiting Professor series

**27.  Discontinue the requirement for provost reviews for initial appointments of Visiting Professors, but continue to require them for reappointments**

The Visiting Professor series provides for temporary appointments, normally for one year, with maximum service limited to two years.  Due to the temporary, short-term nature of these appointments, no college assignment should be required for appointment in this series, and the provost should not be required to provide an assessment of the file.  However, for reappointments to this series, the provost's assessment should be obtained.

We wish to thank the many members of the UCSD staff, administration, and faculty who met with the task force and/or provided written information on the appointment and review processes. We would also like to thank the staff of UCSD Academic Personnel Office for the extensive help they provided regarding details of the appointment and review processes and statistics on the handling of personnel files.

Stephen Adams, Project Scientist, Pharmacology
Richard Attiyeh, Vice Chancellor for Research & Dean of Graduate Studies, Co-Chair
Jennefer Collins, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel, Consultant
Joel Dimsdale, Professor, Psychiatry, Co-Chair
Patricia East, Research Scientist, Pediatrics
Sadik Esener, Professor, Electrical & Computer Engineering
Jeanne Ferrante, Associate Dean, Jacobs School of Engineering
Gilles Fauconnier, Professor, Cognitive Science
Robert Parker, Professor, SIO/IGPP
Richard Salmon, Professor/Research Scientist, SIO/CMBB/MBRD
Randall Souviney, Academic Administrator/SLSOE, Education Studies
Clifford Surko, Professor, Physics
Nissi Varki, Adjunct Professor, Pathology

**Charge to the Task Force on Personnel Processes for Non-Senate Academic Employees**

REVISED
May 20, 2005

STEVE ADAMS, Project Scientist, Pharmacology
RICHARD ATTIYEH, Vice Chancellor for Research & Dean of Graduate Studies, Co-Chair
JOEL DIMSDALE, Professor, Psychiatry, Co-Chair
PATRICIA EAST, Research Scientist, Pediatrics
SADIK ESENER, Professor, Electrical & Computer Engineering
JEANNE FERRANTE, Associate Dean, Jacobs School of Engineering
GILLES FAUCONNIER, Professor, Cognitive Science
ROBERT PARKER, Professor, SIO/IGPP
RICHARD SALMON, Professor/Research Scientist, SIO/CMBB/MBRD
RANDY SOUVINEY, Academic Administrator/SLSOE, TEP
CLIFFORD SURKO, Professor, Physics
NISSI VARKI, Adjunct Professor, Pathology

SUBJECT:     Task Force on Personnel Processes for Non-Senate Academic Employees

To ensure that UCSD's academic review process remains fair, objective, effective, and timely, it should undergo periodic evaluation.  For this reason, we are asking you to serve on a task force to evaluate the review processes for non-Senate academic employees and to recommend ways to improve these processes.  The goal is to identify practices that will enable the campus to improve the quality and timeliness of reviews, while maintaining the integrity of the system.  This effort should anticipate campus expansion and increased numbers of academic employees and should serve to benefit individual non-Senate members and academic departments/ORUs, as well as aid campus reviewers in the processing of review files.  The task force is asked to consider the following non-Senate series:  Adjunct Professor, Visiting Professor, Research Scientist, Project Scientist, Specialist, Academic Coordinator, and Academic Administrator.

While the task force is free to consider any aspect of the review processes for these series, we ask that you examine the specific issues identified below and provide recommendations on how to streamline the review processes while maintaining high standards for personnel evaluations.

- Are the required content of personnel files and standards for actions appropriate? Should the content or standards be modified for different titles or certain actions?
- Who should have input into and final authority for personnel actions?  Are the roles of academic deans and central campus committees such as the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), Project Scientist and Specialist Review Panel (PSSRP), and Academic Administrator/Coordinator Review Panel (AARP) appropriate?   Should authority for certain series or actions within a series be delegated?

- Is it appropriate that there be differences between the campus units, i.e. the General Campus, SIO, and SOM?

Vice Chancellor Richard Attiyeh and Professor Joel Dimsdale have agreed to serve as co-chairs of the task force.  Assistant Vice Chancellor Jennefer Collins will serve as staff consultant.

We ask that the task force submit its report in fall quarter 2005.  We thank you in advance for agreeing to serve on this important Senate/Administrative campus committee.  The first meeting will be convened soon, and we look forward to discussing this charge with you at that time.


Donald Tuzin                                              David R. Miller
Chair, Academic Senate                                   Acting Senior Vice Chancellor


c:      Chancellor Fox
        AVC J. Collins

# Distribution of Non-Senate Academic Personnel in the Campus Units

**Headcount as of October 31, 2004**

| Professional Research Series | Rank | General Campus | Scripps Inst. Of Oceanography | School of Medicine | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Research Scientist | Full | 44 | 44 | 7 | 95 |
| | Associate | 24 | 9 | 12 | 45 |
| | Assistant | 24 | 10 | 30 | 64 |
| Total Research Scientists | | 92 | 63 | 49 | 204 |

| Project Scientist Series | Rank | General Campus | Scripps Inst. of Oceanography | School of Medicine | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project Scientist | Full | 9 | 2 | 19 | 30 |
| | Associate | 24 | 6 | 31 | 61 |
| | Assistant | 79 | 16 | 131 | 226 |
| Total Project Scientists | | 112 | 24 | 181 | 317 |

| Specialist Series | Rank | General Campus | Scripps Inst. of Oceanography | School of Medicine | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| Specialist | Full | 8 | 9 | 15 | 32 |
| | Associate | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| | Assistant | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Total Specialists | | 10 | 12 | 18 | 40 |

| Adjunct Professor Series | Rank | General Campus | Scripps Inst. of Oceanography | School of Medicine | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Full | 4 | 1 | 28 | 33 |
| Salaried Adjuncts | Associate | | | 33 | 33 |
| | Assistant | | | 73 | 73 |
| Total Salaried Adjuncts | | **4** | **1** | **134** | **139** |
| | | | | | |
| | Full | 57 | 5 | 49 | 111 |
| Non-Salaried Adjuncts | Associate | 10 | 1 | 17 | 28 |
| | Assistant | 6 | | 20 | 26 |
| Total Non-Salaried Adjuncts | | **73** | **6** | **86** | **165** |
| | | | | | |
| Total Adjunct Professors | | **77** | **7** | **220** | **304** |

| Academic Administrator and Academic Coordinator Series | General Campus | Scripps Inst. of Oceanography | School of Medicine | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Academic Administrators | 4 | 3 | 2 | 9 |
| Academic Coordinators | 32 | 2 | 2 | 36 |
| Total Academic Administrators/Coordinators | 36 | 5 | 4 | 45 |

| Visiting Professors (files processed in 2003-2004) | Rank | General Campus | Scripps Inst. of Oceanography | School of Medicine | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| | Full | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| | Associate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| | Assistant | 5 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Total Visiting Professors | | 37 | 0 | 0 | 37 |