REPORT OF THE SENATE-ADMINISTRATION WORK GROUP
on the

ACADEMIC PEER REVIEW PROCESS

University of California San Diego

Work Group Members

Marianne Beckett, Co-Chair
Philip Roeder, Co-Chair
Patrick Anderson
Frank Biess
Stacey Brydges
Gert Cauwenberghs
Suzi Hong
Jennifer Johnson
Lane Kenworthy
Emily Lukacz
Jens Lykke-Andersen
John Moore
Veronica Shubayev
William Tronzo

Professional Staff

Brandy Cheshire
Gabriel Lopez
Malaika Tiofil

The Work Group also benefited from the contributions of Wendy Campana and David Danks, who were members for part of the Work Group's term, but were unable to participate in adoption of the final report.

Approved by unanimous (14-0) vote of the Work Group on
February 16, 2026

CONTENTS

The Charge of the Work Group 1

The SAWG-APRP Activities 1

Recommendations:

- Reducing CAP's Workload 2
- Elaborating Departmental Standards 5
- Standards for Accelerations and FAS Advancements 7
- Standards for Teaching Professor and ClinX Series 10
- Managing Holistic Teaching Assessments 10
- Defining Service Expectations 11
- Streamlining File Preparation 14
- Informing the Faculty 16

Appendices

1. The Work Group Charge 18
2. Files Coming to CAP (as of Fall 2025) 20
3. CAP's Workload, 2009-25 21
4. Accelerations, by School, 2021-24 22
5. Accelerations Among Teaching Professors, by School, 2021-24 23
6. Exemplary Letters Recognizing Faculty Service 24
7. List of SAWG-APRP Recommendations 26

THE CHARGE OF THE WORK GROUP

(Paraphrased. See the full Charge in Appendix 1.)

1. ***Aggregate Review***: Which files that currently require individual review by the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (EVCAA), or Chancellor should be re-delegated to Deans' authority and audited annually in the aggregate by CAP?

2. ***CAP Subcommittees***: Which actions currently reviewed by CAP should be delegated to subcommittees of CAP or even advisory committees to CAP?

3. ***Holistic Teaching***: How should CAP efficiently and fully incorporate the information of the Holistic Teaching Reviews in its assessments? How can CAP assist in advising departments to incorporate this information in their assessments of individual files?

4. ***Service Expectations***: How can the campus clarify expectations for faculty service contributions at each rank and step?

5. ***Accelerations***: How can the campus help ensure that standards for accelerations are consistent across departments?

6. ***Above-Scale***: For the Above-Scale steps, how can CAP assist with establishing standards for 50% and 100% Further Above Scale (FAS) advancements that are consistent across departments?

A list of the SAWG-APRP recommendations contained in this Final Report appears at the end of the Report in Appendix 7.

THE SAWG-APRP ACTIVITIES

The Senate-Administrative Work Group on the Academic Peer Review Process (SAWG-APRP) met fifteen times from April 25, 2025, to January 20, 2026. Each meeting averaged one and a half hours during which its fourteen voting members plus two professional support staff engaged in spirited discussions of approximately forty formal proposals. Professional support staff advised the Work Group and gathered data describing academic-review practices on the UC San Diego and other UC campuses. The entire Work Group or its Co-Chairs met with leaders of CAP, the Holistic Teaching Oversight Committee, and the Academic Senate Committee on Committees, and with Academic Personnel coordinators in various UCSD schools. The Work Group also conducted a broad survey of all academic senate faculty to identify aspects of the

academic review process with which members are satisfied and dissatisfied to help guide the Work Group's efforts.

Members of the SAWG-APRP shared a commitment to the academic review process as central to the university's commitment to faculty self-governance, particularly in the area of academic personnel hiring and advancement. At a time when political pressures to ensure that faculty do not coast after tenure and to increase non-academic scrutiny of faculty are increasing around the country, the University of California system can confidently claim that for decades it has maintained a system of frequent review of all Senate faculty at all ranks, a review by peers rather than non-faculty appointees. The charge of the SAWG-APRP is to suggest ways to improve and strengthen this review process in light of the increasing number of files and the complexity of the decisions that arise in this process.

RECOMMENDATIONS: REDUCING CAP'S WORKLOAD

In the three academic years from 2022 to 2025 CAP considered an average of 839 academic files each year, representing a 24% increase over a decade earlier (2012-15) and 42% over a decade and a half earlier (2009-2012). (See Appendices 2 and 3.) Over the past two years CAP also reviewed 104 "Above the Line" items in 2023-24 and 84 in 2024-25; these included such issues as endowed chair appointments, conferral of emeritus/a titles on non-Senate appointees, and comment on pending changes to university policies and procedures. Due to a considerable number of late and carry-over files, CAP temporarily waived Post-Audit reviews of normal merit actions and Assistant Professor (Step I-III) appointments in both years.

The challenge: With the expected increase in the number of faculty as the student population grows over the next decade and a half, the campus needs to identify additional ways to manage the workload of CAP and the academic personnel staff at all levels.

Recommendation #1. Enhanced Shadow CAP. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: The San Diego Divisional Representative Assembly create a standing Senate Committee to subsume the duties of the pre-existing special standing Senate committee, Shadow CAP, with expanded responsibilities to include review of appointments of non-salaried adjunct professors who do not hold other UCSD faculty appointments and select "Above-the-Line Items" such as endowed chair appointments, conferral of emeritus/a titles on non-Senate appointees, and administrative reviews of Department Chairs, Deans, and Provosts. The Enhanced Shadow CAP agenda could also include urgent summer appointments (such as academic appointments for new faculty expected to start administrative roles over the summer); the committee would need to define clearly what conditions qualify as urgent. Items would remain on CAP's agenda if required by system-wide or campus policy and procedures. The SAWG-APRP further recommends that the new committee have as many CAP alumni as possible so that members will have expertise in CAP standards for the evaluation of files.

Discussion: This recommendation received unanimous support among members of the SAWG-APRP. Since Recommendation #1 may require changes to a number of UCSD policies, it may be appropriate to appoint a Work Group to address these in a comprehensive reform plan. Some of these transfers of files, such as the approval of endowed chair appointments, will require revision of the UCSD's PPM (Policy and Procedure Manual). Others, such as reviews of department chairs and conferral of emeritus titles on non-Senate appointees, do not require such changes. This may also require revising Senate rules to make the enhanced Shadow CAP Committee chair a member of the Senate Council. The Senate may want to increase the membership of the enhanced Shadow CAP from the current 5 members and establish regulations for more frequent meetings to address its expanded responsibilities. The Senate may want to arrange the schedules of CAP and Enhanced Shadow CAP so that their summer breaks do not coincide and one committee is always available for urgent summer appointments of Health Sciences faculty.

Similar proposals that were rejected: The SAWG-APRP considered various proposals for creating sub-committees, advisory committees, and even multiple CAPs, but did not find any of these to be an improvement over the current arrangement of a single CAP. In particular, the SAWG-APRP members felt that preserving the unity of the review process of members of the Academic Senate is an essential part of academic self-governance.

Recommendation #2a. Elimination of CAP Review of Specific Series. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: CAP no longer review files in the Research Scientist, 0% Professor, non-salaried adjunct professor (for faculty with a current primary appointment at UCSD), and Professor of Practice series.

Recommendation #2b. Delegation of Review of Specific Series. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: Campus delegate decisions concerning files in the Research Scientist, 0% Professor, non-salaried adjunct professor (for faculty with a current primary appointment at UCSD), and Professor of Practice series to Dean's authority.

Discussion: These recommendations also received unanimous support among members of the SAWG-APRP. In 2024-25, CAP reviewed the following number of reviews (faculty members with appointments in multiple series count as multiple files in these numbers):

Professor	498
Professor in Residence	34
Professor of Clinical X	61
Teaching Professor	55
Salaried Adjunct Professor	49
Non-salaried Adjunct Professor	75
Research Scientist	27
Professor of Practice	3

Delegation of files in the Research Scientist, 0% Professor, non-salaried adjunct professor, and Professor of Practice series to Dean's authority would remove 105 files (out of 803) from CAPs agenda. An appointment as Research Scientist, Adjunct Professor, and Professor of Practice does not bring membership in the Academic Senate.

There are two "phenotypes" of non-salaried adjunct appointments on campus:

- (1) "Internal" adjuncts are ladder-rank professors with a full FTE appointment in one UCSD department and a secondary non-salaried adjunct professor appointment in another UCSD department.

- (2) "External" adjuncts are employed at another university or institution and only have a non-salaried adjunct professor appointment at UCSD.

Under Recommendation #2, for "Internal" adjuncts, an academic appointee's primary-department (professor) file would continue to be reviewed by CAP, as per established academic review procedures, while the secondary-department, non-salaried (adjunct professor) file would only require CAP review whenever the primary appointment does. This relaxes the current campus requirement that CAP must review non-salaried adjunct professor appointments every six years. "Internal" secondary adjunct professor files would be delegated to Deans whenever an academic appointee's primary appointment does not require CAP review. CAP would continue to review *salaried* adjunct professor files—that is, adjunct professor appointments that bring a UCSD salary.

Under Recommendations #1 and #2, "External" non-salaried adjunct professor files would be sent to the Enhanced Shadow CAP.

Data from other UC campuses show that none (except Santa Cruz) assigns Research Scientist files to CAP for review.

Similar proposals that were rejected: The SAWG-APRP considered and rejected proposals to create two separate CAP-like committees—one to review files in the Teaching Professor series and another committee to review ClinX files. Although this would further reduce CAP's workload, these are series that confer membership in the Academic Senate. Separate CAPS would increase the risk of inequities in the treatment of files among academic senate members.

And more fundamentally, it would erode the principles that all Senate faculty submit to a common review process and govern themselves in the most important area of academic review through a common agency of the Senate.

Recommendation #3. Waiver of Post-Audit Reviews. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: CAP permanently waive (or rescind its previous request to conduct) Post-Audit Reviews of dean's authority actions and Assistant I-III appointments.

Discussion: This recommendation received strong support (93.3%) among members of the SAWG-APRP. The need for Post-Audit Reviews of Deans-authority actions arose at a time when CAP had difficulty calibrating accelerations in different departments because normal merit advancements (the standard against which accelerations are calibrated) were Dean's authority. Since most departments now post their standards for normal merit advancements, CAP uses these standards to calibrate what constitutes an acceleration in each department. The reason for Post-Audit Reviews has been removed.

RECOMMENDATIONS: ELABORATING DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS

SAWG-APRP discussions were guided by the premise that departments bear major responsibility for articulating standards for the evaluation of files in their respective disciplines, but those standards must conform to the broad guidelines articulated in the system-level Academic Personnel Manual (APM), in the campus-level Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM), and by CAP in Where CAP Stood (WCS). Departments are knowledgeable about the research and creative-works expectations within their respective disciplines. CAP serves in an advisory capacity by offering guidance and a campuswide lens on expectations for teaching and service, consistent with established policy. Collaboration between departments and CAP supports faculty self-governance in academic personnel decisions.

At the core of this CAP-Department collaboration are the published departmental standards actually used in the preparation and assessment of files. This makes a major contribution to the equitable treatment of all files. The campus has made major progress in drafting and publishing departmental standards. See the Academic Affairs website:

https://aps.ucsd.edu/academic-resources/academic-review/depart_standards.html

Nonetheless, as late as 2024, CAP was observing that "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 files, which is a potential source of broader inequity and is unfair to the candidate." "It is important that each department has a clear roadmap for promotion for its faculty to ensure equitable treatment among faculty members." (WCS 2024)

Recommendation #4. Departmental Standards. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: Departments at least once every five years establish and review concrete standards (a baseline) for a normal merit increase in each series. These standards define the average research, teaching, and service needed for a normal merit. These standards should also define expectations for each rank and for advancement to the next rank in the department. These standards become the baseline for assessment of each individual file up for review, determining normal merits, BOS, and accelerations, and calibrating Above-Scale merit advancements.

Discussion: Implementation of this proposal would address several of the problems noted in the Charge such as standards for accelerations, Further Above Scale advancements, and equity among series (such as between Ladder Rank and Teaching Professor series). This could be reinforced by asking departments to include within their departmental letter for each file the relevant text of the standard and reminding departments that recommendations are most compelling when an individual file is compared against this standard. CAP could give weight to this recommendation by announcing that it will be disinclined to support accelerations in departments with vague standards because, in the absence of a well-documented standard, the best guess in evaluating each file is that it is near the average for the discipline.

This recommendation received strong support (86.7%) of the members of the SAWG-APRP with much of the opposition focused on the following words in the original proposal. “SAWG further encourages departments: To base these standards on the averages in three to five identified peer departments at other universities. (The department identifies its peer departments.)” These words were subsequently removed. The rationale for including these words stressed that pegging standards to peer departments might reduce what one academic personnel official described as the “race to the bottom” in which departments lower their standards over time and more files become candidates for acceleration. Pegging this to peer departments could also document the claim of the truly exceptional department in which all its files have earned accelerations. The voices within the SAWG opposing inclusion of these words in Recommendation #4 thought that it would be very difficult for some departments to identify peers and their standards for promotion. The words were removed in the final report to strengthen support for the recommendation in this Final Report.

Recommendation #5. Departmental Standards for Research. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: In the evaluation of research, departmental standards emphasize the contribution to knowledge, including scholarly quality and impact, rather than simply the number of publications. This is particularly so in files being considered for accelerations. Department standards should make clear how contribution to knowledge, scholarly quality, and scholarly impact are assessed in the department’s discipline.

Recommendation #6. Individual Research Contributions. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: Department standards articulate the expectations for lead/senior authorship of research in all

files and particularly their role in determining accelerations.

Discussion: Recommendations #5 and #6 received unanimous support among members of the SAWG-APRP. These recommendations are far from novel and, in fact, restate principles already found in the PPM 230-220-88-1(b). These stipulate that a central consideration in the evaluation of each file should be the faculty member's contribution to knowledge. Departments should be wary of the shortcut in which the number of publications substitutes for a deeper engagement with the content of those publications.

RECOMMENDATIONS: STANDARDS FOR ACCELERATIONS AND FAS ADVANCEMENTS

The EVCAA's Charge to the SAWG-APRP included investigation of any "significant uptick in the number of accelerated merit requests" and whether there are significant differences among departments in standards for and rates of proposals for accelerations. Data collected by the Work Group's professional staff (shown in Appendix 4) for the years since the pandemic (2021-22 and following) reveal no significant increase in the proportion of files recommended for acceleration or in the proportion of these proposals that were not supported by CAP. These data do reveal variation among schools in these percentages. But, with few exceptions, the percentage of proposed accelerations and denials varied across schools within a narrow range. Of the two schools with proposal rates more than one standard deviation above the mean, neither had above-average rates of denial; CAP apparently found the "extra" proposed accelerations in these schools to be supported by evidence. With the evidence available to it, the SAWG-APRP was unable to discern whether the anomalies in a few schools reflected true differences in the quality of files, different department standards for awarding accelerations, or varying quality in the preparation of cases for acceleration.

The SAWG-APRP also reviewed whether there are inequities in the rates at which departments recommend accelerations for files in the Teaching Professor series compared to files in other series. Looking more closely at the data, the Work Group discovered that the figures show no evidence of inequities that disadvantage files in the Teaching Professor series. As shown in Appendix 5, in the three years 2021-24, when compared to the proportion of files in other series, higher proportions of Teaching Professor files were recommended for accelerations in all schools except Physical Sciences.

Recommendation #7. Departmental Standards for Accelerations. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: Revisions be made to PPM 230-220-88-1 and 2 to distinguish the criteria for acceleration in the Teaching Professor and Professor of Clinical X series from the criteria for acceleration in the ladder-rank Professor series. Specifically, these revisions would make clear that above-average research is not a pre-requisite for acceleration in these series.

Discussion: Recommendation #7 received unanimous support among members of the SAWG-APRP. The Work Group notes that PPM 230-220-88-1(a) states, "For series in which research and/or creative activity is among the performance criteria, above-average research and/or creative activity is a prerequisite to accelerated advancement." On its face this says that as long as research and/or creative activity are among the criteria for assessment of performance in the Teaching Professor and Professor of Clinical X series, proposals for accelerations must show evidence of above-average research or other creative activity. Yet, these are not the primary criteria on which faculty are hired in these series, nor are they the primary criteria for assessments. This should be clarified. PPM 230-220-88-2 goes on to state, "An acceleration proposal based primarily on the quality and quantity of contributions other than research and/or creative activity must contain documentation and evidence of these extraordinary achievements and of their impact characterizing their exceptional nature of effort and outcomes." This would seem to contradict what is said in the previous sub-section, opening the possibility of accelerations without above-average research or creative activity. The PPM should clarify this.

Proposals that were rejected: The SAWG-APRP reviewed proposals to limit the percentage of files that a department could recommend for acceleration. This was rejected as potentially punishing departments with an unusually strong cohort of files up for review.

Recommendation #8. Departmental Standards for Further-Above-Scale Advancements. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: PPM 230-220 be amended to remove the 50% Further Above-Scale (FAS) merit advancement. Advancements Further Above Scale should be no less than 100%, rewarding a faculty member for continuing the exemplary performance in all areas of research, teaching, and service that earned advancement to the Above-Scale rank. The SAWG-APRP further recommends that, when there are weaknesses in one or the other of these areas, departments delay submission of files for advancement until these deficiencies are resolved and a 100% Further Above Scale advancement is appropriate. This may require submitting a recommendation for no change once every four years.

Discussion: Recommendation #8 received strong support (80.0%) within the SAWG-APRP. Implementation of this recommendation would mean that FAS advancements would be treated similarly to advancements within other ranks, but with the expectations appropriate to more senior ranks; that is, 100% FAS advancement recognizes continuing exemplary research, teaching, and service rather than some new distinctions above and beyond what earned the candidate advancement to the Above Scale ranks. The 50% FAS salary increase is an anomaly: At other ranks, there is no half-step FAS advancement; bonus off-scales (unlike the 50% FAS) are not permanent increases in rank or salary. Eliminating the 50% FAS would bring UCSD into conformity with the practice on other UC campuses. UCSD is the only campus with a 50% FAS advancement.

Recommendation #9. 150% FAS or Higher Advancements. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: Departments make clear in their standards what criteria are used to identify files that have earned a Further Above Scale advancement of 150% or higher.

Recommendation #10. PPM Guidance on FAS Advancements. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: Revisions be made to the wording in PPM 230-220-88 to offer clearer guidance for applying standards that distinguish the criteria for 100%, 150%, and 200% Above-Scale Advancements.

Discussion: Recommendations #9 and 10 received strong support (93.3%) among members of the SAWG-APRP. According to Recommendation #10, the PPM should articulate broad guidelines (such as relative levels of productivity for different FAS), but departments are best positioned to articulate discipline-specific standards within those guidelines. Implementation of the recommendations would reduce the confusion that leads to rejected proposals for FAS advancements above 100% that result from the unclear language in the APM and PPM. This poorly charted area also increases the risk of inequity among departments. Collaboration among CAP, Departments, and any Work Group rewriting the PPM guidance would increase the likelihood of consistent standards in awarding Further Above Scale advancements of 150% or more.

The Question of Bonus Off-Scales: The SAWG-APRP also considered a proposal to eliminate Bonus Off Scale salary components. There is no system-wide policy requiring BOS. Only two other campuses (Davis and Riverside) have similar salary components. Berkeley uses a half-step advancement scale. Current CAP leadership and former CAP members serving on the SAWG-APRP opined that BOS discussions have been time consuming in CAP meetings even though the amount of money is small and the duration is only one review period. Moreover, over 60% of departmental recommendations for Bonus Off Scales are not supported by CAP. The existing campus policy for BOS is poorly articulated; departments and schools have widely varying requirements for BOS recommendations; and these can lead to considerable inequity among files. Despite these reservations, the SAWG-APRP concluded that BOS should be retained to reward files that may not have earned a full step merit advancement or acceleration. To limit the number of recommendations for BOS that CAP subsequently declines to support, CAP might issue clearer guidelines to help departments revise their standards for BOS.

Alternatively, the SAWG-APRP suggests that the campus consider eliminating BOS for files in the Health Sciences. The different procedures for negotiating salaries make BOS irrelevant and unnecessarily complicated when proposed for files from the Health Sciences.

RECOMMENDATIONS: STANDARDS FOR TEACHING PROFESSOR AND CLINX SERIES

Recommendation #11. Departmental Standards for Professor of Clinical X series. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: If PPM 230-220-88-1 and 2 are revised (Recommendation # 7), Departments distinguish standards for accelerations in the Professor of Clinical X series, giving priority to clinical excellence (documented by recognitions) or exceptional teaching (documented by awards or creation of a major education program).

Recommendation #12. Updating the PPM Teaching Professor Standards. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: PPM 230-285 (LPSOE/Teaching Professors) be updated to reflect the changes to APM 230-285, which allows for additional types of scholarly work to be considered in this series.

Recommendation #13. Departmental Standards for Professor of Teaching series. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: If PPM 230-220-88-1 and 2 are revised (Recommendation # 7), Departments distinguish standards for acceleration in the Teaching Professor series. These will vary among departments because Teaching Professors have been hired under different expectations.

Discussion: Recommendations #11 and 12 received unanimous support and #13 strong (93.3%) support among members of the SAWG-APRP. Recommendation #11 may require that Health Sciences files that recommend accelerations in the ClinX series document clinical excellence with reports from HS committees with clinical expertise. In addition to these recommendations, members commented that in a few years the campus will need clear standards for Further Above Scale advancements in the Teaching Professor series.

RECOMMENDATIONS: MANAGING HOLISTIC TEACHING ASSESSMENTS

The SAWG-APRP discussed at considerable length the management of the Holistic Teaching Assessments within the academic personnel review process. The Holistic Teaching Assessments (HTA) represent an important step towards equitable and full assessment of each instructor's contribution to the educational mission of the University. At the same time, the Teaching Portfolios that will be added to each file could become a substantial burden on CAP. Anticipating the risk that they could balloon to the thousand or more pages that had been rumored, CAP has already recommended that departments limit the portfolios sent to CAP to 100 pages. Even 100 additional pages in each file will represent a substantial increase in the workload of CAP and the academic personnel staff at every level *particularly if CAP or these staff were given the primary responsibility for analyzing the raw materials*. CAP and the academic personnel staff do not have the capacity or discipline-specific expertise to do this;

CAP does not have the authority to advise an instructor on responses to strengths or weaknesses in the teaching portfolio. Yet, the primary value of Holistic Teaching Assessments is the advice they provide individual faculty members concerning what each does well and what could be improved.

A proposal that was rejected. By a vote of 53.3% of members declining to support inclusion and 46.7% supporting inclusion, the following proposal is not a recommendation of the SAWG-APRP: Each department (or group of departments or school, depending on the number of faculty) establish a standing committee (DepTAC) to evaluate all Holistic Teaching Assessments (HTA). Each DepTAC would consult with its department members to establish and update standards for assessment of the HTAs. Each DepTAC could then review the teaching materials in each file up for review and write a summary for each file assessing how the file compares to the teaching standard in the department for the particular series and rank. This DepTAC summary (along with the complete HTA) could become a part of the file sent from the Department. The Department could share with the candidate the DepTAC summary and supporting materials on which it is based and schedule a meeting with the faculty member under review to discuss the DepTAC's findings.

Discussion: The Work Group majority thought that this proposal would impose a heavy bureaucratic burden on departments and is not flexible enough to address the varied circumstances across many departments and schools. SAWG members also noted that the implementation of Holistic Teaching Assessment will need considerable work to adapt to the Health Sciences and particularly to series such as ClinX. Departments are best positioned to take the lead in this adaptation.

The SAWG-APRP majority thought that the current short narrative in each Teaching Portfolio, the self-assessment of the faculty member, and the departmental letter are better summaries of the teaching contributions of each faculty member and make separate DepTAC reports unnecessary. Since the teaching statements of each faculty member are so critical, Departments should guide their faculty concerning the topics that should be addressed in such statements.

RECOMMENDATIONS: DEFINING SERVICE EXPECTATIONS

Service expectations have recently become one of the more contentious issues on campus, reflected in the results of the SAWG-APRP survey of faculty and in individual communications to the SAWG-APRP. The Work Group concludes that clearer departmental standards outlining service expectations, incorporating the campus' broad expectations, can reduce the uncertainty that leads to files receiving less than requested.

Recommendation #14. Listing Service Opportunities. The SAWG-APRP recommends that:

Schools and Colleges, in consultation with CAP or the Senate, develop comprehensive lists of service opportunities for faculty. This list should be limited to service that is self-less and not fully compensated. This list would categorize these opportunities as serving departmental, school-level, college-level, campus-level, and UC system-wide communities.

Discussion: This recommendation received strong (86.7%) support among members of the SAWG-APRP. Those voting against inclusion of this recommendation in this Final Report stressed the administrative burden on departments and the variety of circumstances in different schools.

Those supporting this recommendation stressed that the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has maintained a consistent standard of three broad principles concerning service expectations at each rank and step:

- Service expectations increase with rank and step. Assistant Professors are expected to perform only some service, usually at the department level. Associate Professors are expected to perform more extensive service at the department level and begin serving at the school and/or college level. Full Professors and particularly those approaching Step VI or above 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." (WCS 2024)
- Service fulfilling the service expectation should not be fully compensated by either financial reward or release from other duties (such as teaching).
- Service fulfilling the service expectation should not be simply self-serving (this is often labelled "altruistic" or "selfless" service). That is to say, service should be service to parts or all of the university community beyond one's own research or clinical group.

The premise of these service expectations is that faculty self-governance requires that all faculty members bear some part of the shared responsibility of decision making. Those who seek membership in the community of a self-governing professoriate must pay these dues.

The responsibility for applying these broad guidelines to the review of individual files rests with departments. For this reason, the SAWG-APRP recommends that departments include clear expectations for service in their standards. This calls for coordination between departments and CAP, with departments giving close attention to the guidelines summarized above, so as to reduce the risk of any disagreement when CAP applies campus' guidelines to the assessment of individual files.

Data collected by the SAWG-APRP professional staff on service expectations at other UC campuses found these expectations to be, for the most part, consistent throughout the system. Irvine and Los Angeles reported that their standards for senior full professors (Step VI and above), although similar to San Diego's, do not stress service on Senate committees or are "less rigid" than San Diego's standard. On the other five campuses that responded, these standards for senior full professors include "very extensive and significant service," "leadership," "high,

recognized service," and "significant leadership and systemwide service."

An Expanded List of Campus Service Opportunities. A campus brain-storming campaign might identify new opportunities for Academic Senate service. For example, an advisory panel of former CAP members might be created to meet one-on-one with junior faculty and advise them on the preparation of their academic review files. (This mirrors the panel of advisors drawn from former members of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.)

The definition of service at the campus level may need to be expanded. For example, an informal campus-wide network of faculty implementing a campus-wide initiative in different departments, such as assessment of learning outcomes for campus accreditation, might be treated as University service. Departmental officers, such as directors of undergraduate studies, who constitute a more formal network across campus might be treated as performing University service. Informal networks might be made more formal by periodic meetings among these departmental officers—such as the campus-level Council for Undergraduate Education for departmental directors of undergraduate education.

The definition of campus-level service cannot be limited to membership or leadership in Academic Senate committees. And CAP has consistently emphasized that such service is not the standard it applies in assessing files. According to data provided by the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee on Committees, there are approximately 910 positions each year in standing committees of the Academic Senate, elected Senate positions, administrative and senate working groups, system-wide positions, and Representative Assembly seats. (Many of these are multi-year appointments and so the number of new openings each year may be around 400.) For a faculty that includes approximately 2850 members, a narrow definition of campus-level may not accommodate all the senior faculty seeking to serve.

Recommendation #15. Service Portfolios. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: A working group be convened to design a template for Service Portfolios (paralleling the Teaching Portfolios) to be included in files. The working group could explore technologies, such as AI, for efficient collection of this information.

Discussion: Opinions within the SAWG-APRP on Recommendation #15 were divided with only 53% of its members supporting inclusion in this Final Report. Reservations focused on the increased administrative burden of assembling and assessing Service Portfolios. Further, a template might not be flexible enough to address the varied service opportunities and responsibilities in the different schools and departments. Those with reservations suggested that a more efficient approach would be for Departments to publish guidelines for faculty in reporting their service contributions.

Recommendation #16. Committee Letters for Portfolios. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: Every chair of a departmental, college, school, or campus committee write letters describing the service contributions of committee members. These letters could be submitted as parts of a faculty member's service portfolio.

Discussion: Such letters would document the information requested by CAP for more specific evidence of service: "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." (WCS 2024)

Opinions within the SAWG-APRP on Recommendation #16 were divided with only 60% supporting inclusion in this Final Report. Reservations focused on the increased burden of writing individual letters that would be imposed on Committee chairs. Supporters of this recommendation suggested that, like the examples in Appendix 6, each of these letters could be a common letter for all members of a committee describing the activities of the committee and that any additions that highlight unique contributions of individual members would be at the discretion of each chair.

Similar proposals that were rejected: SAWG-APRP considered and rejected proposals to set specific standards for service—such as at least one year of service on a college, school, or campus-wide committee every review period. The Work Group concluded that these proposals would create inflexible standards that would not reflect the varied situations in different series and schools and were unlikely to adjust to rapid changes over time.

RECOMMENDATIONS: STREAMLINING FILE PREPARATION

Recommendation #17. Reduce the Number of Independent External Letters. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: PPM 230-220-80 be revised to reduce the number of required independent external letters as follows:

PPM 230-220-80.c(2): "For Assistant-level appointments proposed at Step IV or higher, and for all appointments at the Associate or Full level, letters should be from external referees who are senior scholars (Associate level or higher) and <u>the majority of</u> who<u>m</u> are independent of the candidate." [Proposed revisions underlined]

PPM 230-220-80.c(3): "For advancement in the Teaching Professor series, <u>the majority of</u> external evaluation letters must be solicited from individuals who are professionally independent from the appointee. . . ." [Proposed revisions underlined]

Discussion: Recommendation #17 received unanimous support among members of the SAWG-

APRP. These amendments address only the proportion of external letters that must be independent and not the absolute number of external letters required. This recommendation would not change the requirement that a majority of letters in a file should be from referees suggested by the department rather than the candidate. It only stipulates that a majority of external letters submitted with a file must be independent from the candidate.

An internal audit in Health Sciences found that reducing the number of fully independent letters from five to three reduced the number of solicitations required to obtain the required number of letters from ten to seven solicitations and the time to complete the collection of letters from ninety-nine to sixty-four days. This represents a one-third reduction in the amount of time to compile the letters.

In a comparison with five other UC schools of medicine, UCSD Health Sciences found that UCSD is the only campus to require that all of the minimum number of referee letters be fully independent. Data from the UC campuses without medical schools showed that none required that all of the required minimum number of letters be both external and fully independent; and only Berkeley, which requires a minimum of seven letters, requires as many as five external and independent letters.

Recommendation #18. Limit the Length of Self-Assessments. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: Departments set limits (word limits) on the length of candidates' self-assessments in the files.

Discussion: Members of the Work Group with prior service on CAP noted that some candidate self-assessments have been excessively long so that the extra words have not strengthened the case for the proposed action. Departments are the appropriate place to define the optimal length and to establish limits, and Department Chairs can play an active role in advising faculty on well-crafted self-assessments.

Recommendation #19. Limit Redundant Internal Letters. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: Department Chairs and Deans work to limit the repetition of information in files. For example, when a department Chair fully agrees with the departmental vote and with any ad hoc committee recommendation, the department Chair might submit only one departmental letter that reports the consensus and incorporates the information in the ad hoc report. (A statement from the candidate is always an appropriate element of the file.) When the Dean agrees with the Departmental recommendation, the Dean might include only a brief statement to this effect or register concurrence on a short form. Multiple lengthier letters might be limited to files in which there are disagreements, such as between the Chair and department faculty or between the department and the Dean. The SAWG-APRP further recommends that: Academic Personnel develop a short form to register a Dean's concurrence with a Departmental recommendation that would replace the current Dean's letter.

Discussion: Recommendation #19 received unanimous support among members of the SAWG-APRP. This recommendation should in no way impinge on the need for departmental letters to include all the information specified in PPM 230-228-80(e).

Recommendation #20. Sharing of Best AP Practices. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: Academic Personnel convene regular meetings (annually or more frequently) at the campus or school level for Academic Personnel Coordinators in the different departments to share the practices (such as lists of service opportunities or guidelines for self-statements) that their departments have developed.

Discussion: Recommendation #20 received strong (93.3%) support among members of the SAWG-APRP. Supporters stressed that in conversations within the Work Group and with academic coordinators in some departments it had become apparent that departmental academic personnel coordinators are often unaware of the innovative aids their peers have developed. A community of practice might share these best practices.

Similar proposals that were not accepted: Although the SAWG-APRP could not recommend a solution, the SAWG-APRP did note that the twin problems of growing number of faculty and steady numbers (or even reductions) in AP staff could make the file preparation process more difficult to manage in the very near future. Departments may have half the staff per faculty to prepare files in the future. Departments and the Administration may find it prudent to begin planning for adjustments in the file preparation process to facilitate greater efficiency.

RECOMMENDATIONS: INFORMING THE FACULTY

Recommendation #21. A Manual: An Introduction to the Academic Review Process. The SAWG-APRP recommends that: The Academic Senate prepare a description/overview of the academic review process suitable for new members of the faculty. This could include a description of the process, such as that given to incoming CAP members, and distillation of the wisdom of "Where CAP Stood." This would be most helpful for new members of the faculty if it were concise and presented as a clear, accessible narrative (with definitions of jargon).

Discussion: Recommendation #21 received strong (93.3%) support among members of the SAWG-APRP. Supporters stressed that in the responses to the survey of faculty it is clear that many faculty members do not understand the reasons for the current academic review process and need guidance on how to prepare their files. Junior faculty need a clear introduction to the process. And even among more senior faculty, there are a surprising number of misconceptions

about how CAP evaluates files. An introductory manual should be prepared and issued by the Academic Senate, because, as our survey of faculty reveals, many faculty apparently distrust CAP, the EVCAA, or both when they explain the process.

The document might combine a brief description of the process (from the CAP orientation manual) and practice (from Where CAP Stood). The document should make clear how to find Department Standards and Where CAP Stood.

The document should make clear that the underlying rationale of our Academic Personnel Review process is that the faculty are members of a self-governing professoriate and that we have primary responsibility as such to evaluate one another's contributions to knowledge, education, and the university.

In discussions, members of the SAWG-APRP identified the following additional ways to expand faculty understanding of the Academic Review Process: School Workshops on file preparation might include former members of CAP to explain to junior faculty how CAP makes decisions. Academic Personnel staff, Associate Deans, and Vice Chairs might provide all faculty with information and reminders on the review process in general, sample materials or guidelines for writing succinct and informative self-statements, and information clarifying what materials are released to external reviewers. Departments might develop guidelines for Ad Hoc committees to support uniformity and equity in the review of files.

Appendix 1. The Work Group Charge

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO

BERKELEY · DAVIS · IRVINE · LOS ANGELES · MERCED · RIVERSIDE · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA · SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
TEL: (858) 534-3130

9500 GILMAN DRIVE
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0001
URL: WWW.EVC.UCSD.EDU

March 19, 2025

Subject: Charge for Senate-Administration Workgroup on Academic Peer Review Process

Purpose

UC San Diego's policies and processes for academic peer review, including the Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), should be periodically revisited and reconsidered to reflect the growth of the faculty and the implementation of revised campus academic personnel policies and procedures. The last comprehensive review was in 2011 when then-Executive Vice Chancellor Suresh Subramani and San Diego Divisional Senate Chair Frank L. Powell convened the Senate Task Force on Faculty Reward System II. Considering the significant transformation that the University and our faculty have undergone since that time, a Senate-Administration Workgroup is being convened both to evaluate our system's efficacy in rewarding activities that contribute to the educational and scholarly mission of the University and also to recommend any appropriate updates.

Charge

In the course of evaluating the academic peer review process, we ask that this workgroup pay particular attention to the following issues:

- Identify which actions, per systemwide AP policies, require CAP review of individual files as opposed to CAP review of aggregated file information by department or school (and gender or minority status, if possible). Compare and contrast what UC San Diego requires versus other UC campuses. The workgroup should make recommendations on actions that UC San Diego's CAP could potentially review annually for aggregated assessment of equity or waive, consistent with policy and in alignment with what other campuses do.

- Assess best practices for utilizing CAP in the academic peer review process, in a way that prioritizes equitable review and maximizes efficiency for individual file review as the University expands. Do all actions require review by all CAP members? Are there actions that could be delegated to a subset of CAP members? What practices are used by other UCs?

- Consult with the Holistic Teaching Oversight Committee (HTOC) to identify existing departmental standards that align with or incorporate our new holistic teaching criteria. Consider how these exemplars can help us inform departments about implementing the new holistic teaching criteria and potentially serve as the basis for updating departmental standards to incorporate HTOC recommendations for teaching.

- Evaluate UC San Diego's expectations for service at various ranks and steps compared to those expectations at other UC campuses to determine if UC San Diego's CAP expectations are properly calibrated. The workgroup should also make recommendations on how these service expectations can be incorporated into departmental standards, including explicitly identifying the increased expectations with rank and step.

- CAP has observed a significant uptick in the number of accelerated merit requests and this workgroup is asked to help identify what may be contributing to the increase. We request this workgroup first examine aggregate data on accelerated merit requests over the last ~5 years to see whether these requests are concentrated in particular units and/or whether there are significant differences by unit in the rate at which such requests are successful. If such patterns do exist, the workgroup should examine whether the quantitative department standards for research productivity appear to be consistently calibrated across departments with differing rates of requests and/or request success. If significant differences in the rate of requests, the rate of request success, and/or the calibration of department standards are observed, this workgroup is asked to recommend possible ways the Senate and Administration might follow up on this information.

- Recommend possible revisions to the PPM to clarify the distinctions between 50% and 100% merit advancement further Above Scale, as well as expectations for acceleration further Above Scale. Merit advancement and accelerations at the Above Scale rank continue to be a difficult target to calibrate in light of vague policy language, and the perceived discontinuity between requirements for lower rank and step merit advancements/accelerations and those Above Scale.

Timeline

The workgroup will meet from March through December 2025, with a report submitted to 2025-26 Senate Chair Rebecca Jo Plant and EVC Simmons by December 12, 2025. Support for the workgroup will be provided jointly by Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate.

APPENDIX 2. FILES COMING TO CAP (AS OF FALL 2025)

I. CAP reviews files in the following series:

[1] Professor
[2] Teaching Professor
[3] Professor of Clin X
[4] Professor in Residence
[5] Adjunct Professor
[6] Research Scientist
[7] Endowed Chair initial appointment
[8] Professor of Practice

II. CAP does *not* review files in the following series:

[9] Unit-18 (Dean's authority)
[10] Project Scientists (Dean's authority)
[11] Endowed Chair reappointments
[12] Preemptive Retentions or Retentions

III. In the series under I (above), CAP reviews career-review files at the following milestones:

[a] Fourth-Year Appraisal
[b] Promotion to Associate
[c] Promotion to Full
[d] Merit Advancement to (or through) Step VI
[e] Merit Advancement to Above Scale

IV. CAP does *not* review appointment or normal-merit files, *except* for the following:

[f] Appointment to Assistant Professor IV or above (V or above beginning in 2026-2027)*
[g] Acceleration
[h] Bonus Off-Scale
[i] Recalibration (normally part of a promotion file)
[j] Career Equity Review
[k] Second consecutive no-change
[l] Merits at the Above Scale rank
[m] Series Change appointments to a senate title, Research Scientist, or Adjunct Professor at step IV or above
[n] Reappointments for Professor of Practice, 0% Professors, non-salaried Adjunct Professors
[o] Terminations
[p] Files where the Dean proposes a modification of the departmental recommendation
[q] Files where the Administration finds CAP's review would be useful
[r] Files where the candidate, the department, or the Dean contests a 'no-change' recommendation
[s] Files where the department or candidate appeals a decision
[t] CAP also reviews all files involving administrators (e.g. Department Chairs, Deans, and Provosts).

*Tentative for Step V in 2026-2027.

Career review and appointment files are assigned to internal CAP *ad hoc* committees of three members who present the file to the entire CAP membership. All other files are assigned a single file lead, who presents the file to the entire CAP membership. All CAP members are expected to review and have an informed opinion about all the files on each weekly agenda.

APPENDIX 3. CAP'S WORKLOAD, 2009-25

Column B shows the total number of items coming to CAP each academic year. (Column B does not include faculty files decided by Dean's authority.) Column C shows faculty files under review that came to CAP as initial reviews, as responses to requests from CAP for additional information, or as requests for reconsideration of CAP's initial decision. Column D shows the number of Above-the-Line items, which include endowed chair appointments, conferral of emeritus/a titles to non-faculty series, comment upon pending changes to university rules, and audits of delegated decisions.

Academic Year	(B) **Total Items Reviewed**	(C) **Faculty Files**	(D) **Above-the-Line Items**
2024-25	848	764	84
2023-24	877	773	104
2022-23	791	734	57
2021-22	714	652	62
2020-21	815	750	65
2019-20	714	662	52
2018-19	741	683	58
2017-18	748	672	76
2016-17	677	636	41
2015-16	868	709	40
2014-15	708	654	54
2013-14	647	597	50
2012-13	668	616	52
2011-12	701	657	44
2010-11	615	576	39
2009-10	599	562	37

APPENDIX 4. ACCELERATIONS, BY SCHOOL, 2021-24

Column B shows the total number of faculty files up for review in the three academic years 2021-22, 2022-23, and 2023-24. These include both files assigned to Dean's authority and those coming to CAP. (Note that faculty members with split or joint appointments are counted as multiple files when each appointment is up for review.) Column C shows the percentage of the files in Column B with a recommendation for acceleration. (All files with a proposal for acceleration go to CAP.) Column D shows the percentage of files recommended for acceleration that CAP declined to support.

School	(B) **Total Faculty Files Up for Review**	(C) **Proposed for Acceleration**	(D) **Declined/Proposed**
Colleges	14	50.0%	0.0%
Data Science	64	14.1%	11.1%
Engineering	346	39.9%	11.6%
Management	63	4.8%	33.3%
Research Affairs	48	6.3%	66.7%
Arts & Humanities	202	27.7%	12.5%
Biological Sciences	222	23.4%	32.7%
GPS	56	8.9%	20.0%
Medicine	1080	15.5%	28.7%
Physical Sciences	247	21.9%	24.1%
Social Sciences	380	23.9%	18.7%
SIO	202	23.8%	6.3%
Pharmacy	45	15.6%	14.3%

Academic Year			
2021-22	938	21.1%	20.2%
2022-23	952	22.2%	19.4%
2023-24	1079	21.4%	19.9%

APPENDIX 5. ACCELERATIONS AMONG TEACHING PROFESSORS, BY SCHOOL, 2021-24

Column B shows the total number of Teaching Professor/LSOE files reviewed in the three academic years 2021-22, 2022-23, and 2023-24. (Column B includes both files decided by Deans' authority and those reviewed by CAP.) Column C shows the percentage of files in Column B proposed for acceleration. (All files proposed for acceleration go on to CAP.) Column D shows this percentage for files in all other series.

School	(B) **Teaching Professor Total Number of Files**	(C) **Teaching Professor Percentage Proposed for Acceleration**	(D) **All Other Series Percentage Proposed for Acceleration**
Colleges	10	70.0%	0%
Data Sciences	2	100.0%	11.3%
Public Health	0	—	—
Engineering	24	58.3%	38.5%
Management	0	—	4.8%
Research Affairs	0	—	6.3%
Arts & Humanities	12	58.3%	25.8%
Biological Sciences	20	40.0%	21.8%
Global Policy & Strategy	2	100.0%	5.6%
Medicine	0	—	15.5%
Physical Sciences	21	14.3%	22.6%
Social Sciences	40	45.0%	21.5%
SIO	0	—	23.8%
Pharmacy	0	—	15.6%

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO UCSD

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

January 13, 2026

TO: [redacted]

RE: Committee on Committees 2024-2025 Service

Dear [redacted]:

I am writing to thank you for your service as [redacted] of the Committee on Committees (ConC) of the UC San Diego Academic Senate during the 2024-25 academic year. Your investment of time and effort in the activities of the committee demonstrates your commitment to the Academic Senate and the model of shared governance that is a crucial pillar supporting UCSD's success.

The ConC met 30 times during the year. We filled 31 standing committees of the Divisional Senate with 281 Senate faculty members. We also nominated 2 candidates to run for Divisional Senate Vice Chair and 5 candidates to run for Divisional Representative to the systemwide Assembly of the Academic Senate in the Spring 2025 Senate elections.

The ConC also received and responded to 55 Administrative committee requests, recommending 716 Senate faculty to the Administration for potential membership on the various committees. We received 13 requests from the University Committee on Committees (UCOC) for nominations to serve on systemwide Senate committees, subcommittees, task forces, and special committees. In response, we forwarded 19 nominees to the UCOC for consideration for appointment. The ConC also nominated 16 Division members to serve on the 16 Assembly of the Academic Senate committees.

Service on the ConC is more demanding than most Senate committee service. It requires consistent and active participation in 2-hour weekly meetings, as well as diligence and timeliness in reaching out to fellow Senate faculty to ensure that all standing committees and administrative committees achieve full and balanced rosters of appointees and nominees. ConC members must also engage with department chairs and consult with Senate committee leadership and staff. Your efforts in fulfilling all of these duties and, as [redacted] enabled the ConC to achieve all of its goals for the year.

It was a pleasure working with you and I deeply thank you for your contributions.

Good luck as [redacted] in 2025-2026!

Sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY OFFICE
DIVISION OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

9500 GILMAN DRIVE # 0360
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0360
EMAIL: AIO@UCSD.EDU
URL: INTEGRITY.UCSD.EDU

First Name Last Name
Email Address

Dear First Name,

As you have now experienced, service on the Academic Integrity Review Board (AIRB) is unlike any other committee service in which you might engage at UC San Diego. While often personally rewarding, because you know you are helping to uphold degree integrity, it also presents emotional and intellectual challenges every time you participate. Specifically, I would like to highlight that you have:

- worked long hours when cases were complicated and emotions ran high;
- were patient and respectful under difficult circumstances;
- held students responsible even when you empathized with them; and,
- considered conflicting documentation and opposing arguments, all in search of the truth.

Your willingness to engage in this challenging work is much appreciated. The AIRB plays a critical role in reinforcing our efforts to promote honesty and integrity among our students, thus sustaining our University's academic reputation and the integrity of the UC San Diego degree. In addition, the accuracy of your work contributes to an environment in which faculty are willing to pursue integrity violations and students are assured that contested allegations will be resolved fairly.

For your records, **you signed up for # Review(s) and contributed more than # hours in service.**

On behalf of the AIO team, I wish to sincerely thank you for your commitment and service to academic integrity. And, if we are so fortunate to have you back again, the entire AIO team looks forward to working with you again.

Sincerely,

Tricia Bertram Gallant, Ph.D., Director, Academic Integrity Office

APPENDIX 7. LIST OF SAWG-APRP RECOMMENDATIONS

The SAWG-APRP recommends that:

Reducing CAP's Workload

1. Enhanced Shadow CAP. The San Diego Divisional Representative Assembly create a standing Senate Committee to subsume the duties of the pre-existing special standing Senate committee, Shadow CAP, with expanded responsibilities to include review of appointments of non-salaried adjunct professors who do not hold other UCSD faculty appointments and select "Above-the-Line Items" such as endowed chair appointments, conferral of emeritus/a titles on non-Senate appointees, and administrative reviews of Department Chairs, Deans, and Provosts. The Enhanced Shadow CAP agenda could also include urgent summer appointments (such as academic appointments for new faculty expected to start administrative roles over the summer); the committee would need to define clearly what conditions qualify as urgent. Items would remain on CAP's agenda if required by system-wide or campus policy and procedures. The SAWG-APRP further recommends that the new committee have as many CAP alumni as possible so that members will have expertise in CAP standards for the evaluation of files.

2a. Elimination of CAP Review of Specific Series. CAP no longer review files in the Research Scientist, 0% Professor, non-salaried adjunct professor (for faculty with a current primary appointment at UCSD), and Professor of Practice series.

2b. Delegation of Review of Specific Series. The campus delegate decisions concerning files in the Research Scientist, 0% Professor, non-salaried adjunct professor (for faculty with a current primary appointment at UCSD), and Professor of Practice series to Dean's authority.

3. Waiver of Post-Audit Reviews. CAP permanently waive (or rescind its previous request to conduct) Post-Audit Reviews of dean's authority actions and Assistant I-III appointments.

Elaborating Departmental Standards

4. Departmental Standards. Departments at least once every five years establish and review concrete standards (a baseline) for a normal merit increase in each series. These standards define the average research, teaching, and service needed for a normal merit. These standards should also define expectations for each rank and for advancement to the next rank in the department. These standards become the baseline for assessment of each individual file up for review, determining normal merits, BOS, and accelerations, and calibrating Above-Scale merit advancements.

5. Departmental Standards for Research. In the evaluation of research, departmental standards emphasize the contribution to knowledge, including scholarly quality and impact, rather than simply the number of publications. This is particularly so in files being considered

for accelerations. Department standards should make clear how contribution to knowledge, scholarly quality, and scholarly impact are assessed in the department's discipline.

6. Individual Research Contributions. Department standards articulate the expectations for lead/senior authorship of research in all files and particularly their role in determining accelerations.

Standards for Accelerations and FAS Advancements

7. Departmental Standards for Accelerations. Revisions be made to PPM 230-220-88-1 and 2 to distinguish the criteria for acceleration in the Teaching Professor and Professor of Clinical X series from the criteria for acceleration in the ladder-rank Professor series. Specifically, these revisions would make clear that above-average research is not a pre-requisite for acceleration in these series.

8. Departmental Standards for Further-Above-Scale Advancements. PPM 230-220 be amended to remove the 50% Further Above-Scale (FAS) merit advancement. Advancements Further Above Scale should be no less than 100%, rewarding a faculty member for continuing the exemplary performance in all areas of research, teaching, and service that earned advancement to the Above-Scale rank. The SAWG-APRP further recommends that, when there are weaknesses in one or the other of these areas, departments delay submission of files for advancement until these deficiencies are resolved and a 100% Further Above Scale advancement is appropriate. This may require submitting a recommendation for no change once every four years.

9. 150% FAS or Higher Advancements. Departments make clear in their standards what criteria are used to identify files that have earned a Further Above Scale advancement of 150% or higher.

10. PPM Guidance on FAS Advancements. Revisions be made to the wording in PPM 230-220-88 to offer clearer guidance for applying standards that distinguish the criteria for 100%, 150%, and 200% Above-Scale Advancements.

Standards for Teaching Professor and ClinX Series

11. Departmental Standards for Professor of Clinical X series. If PPM 230-220-88-1 and 2 are revised (Recommendation # 7), Departments distinguish standards for accelerations in the Professor of Clinical X series, giving priority to clinical excellence (documented by recognitions) or exceptional teaching (documented by awards or creation of a major education program).

12. Updating the PPM Teaching Professor Standards. PPM 230-285 (LPSOE/Teaching Professors) be updated to reflect the changes to APM 230-285, which allows for additional types of scholarly work to be considered in this series.

13. Departmental Standards for Professor of Teaching series. If PPM 230-220-88-1 and 2 are revised (Recommendation # 7), Departments distinguish standards for acceleration in the Teaching Professor series. These will vary among departments because Teaching Professors have been hired under different expectations.

Defining Service Expectations

14. Listing Service Opportunities. Schools and Colleges, in consultation with CAP or the Senate, develop comprehensive lists of service opportunities for faculty. This list should be limited to service that is self-less and not fully compensated. This list would categorize these opportunities as serving departmental, school-level, college-level, campus-level, and UC system-wide communities.

15. Service Portfolios. A working group be convened to design a template for Service Portfolios (paralleling the Teaching Portfolios) to be included in files. The working group could explore technologies, such as AI, for efficient collection of this information.

16. Committee Letters for Portfolios. Every chair of a departmental, college, school, or campus committee write letters describing the service contributions of committee members. These letters could be submitted as parts of a faculty member's service portfolio.

Streamlining File Preparation

17. Reduce the Number of Independent External Letters. PPM 230-220-80 be revised to reduce the number of required independent external letters as follows:
•PPM 230-220-80.c(2): "For Assistant-level appointments proposed at Step IV or higher, and for all appointments at the Associate or Full level, letters should be from external referees who are senior scholars (Associate level or higher) and <u>the majority of</u> who<u>m</u> are independent of the candidate." [Proposed revisions underlined]
•PPM 230-220-80.c(3): "For advancement in the Teaching Professor series, <u>the majority of</u> external evaluation letters must be solicited from individuals who are professionally independent from the appointee. . . ." [Proposed revisions underlined]

18. Limit the Length of Self-Assessments. Departments set limits (word limits) on the length of candidates' self-assessments in the files.

19. Limit Redundant Internal Letters. Department Chairs and Deans work to limit the repetition of information in files. For example, when a department Chair fully agrees with the departmental vote and with any ad hoc committee recommendation, the department Chair might submit only one departmental letter that reports the consensus and incorporates the information in the ad hoc report. (A statement from the candidate is always an appropriate element of the file.) When the Dean agrees with the Departmental recommendation, the Dean might include only a brief statement to this effect or register concurrence on a short form. Multiple lengthier letters might be limited to files in which there are disagreements, such as

between the Chair and department faculty or between the department and the Dean. The SAWG-APRP further recommends that: Academic Personnel develop a short form to register a Dean's concurrence with a Departmental recommendation that would replace the current Dean's letter.

20. Sharing of Best AP Practices. Academic Personnel convene regular meetings (annually or more frequently) at the campus or school level for Academic Personnel Coordinators in the different departments to share the practices (such as lists of service opportunities or guidelines for self-statements) that their departments have developed.

Informing the Faculty

21. A Manual: An Introduction to the Academic Review Process. The Academic Senate prepare a description/overview of the academic review process suitable for new members of the faculty. This could include a description of the process, such as that given to incoming CAP members, and distillation of the wisdom of "Where CAP Stood." This would be most helpful for new members of the faculty if it were concise and presented as a clear, accessible narrative (with definitions of jargon).