

NEWS from ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Fall 2008

Volume 3, Issue 1

Articles, Resources, and Tips ... For Your Career

Jointly Published by CAP and APO

Did You Know...You May Add New Materials to Your Dossier?

Inside This Issue

Did You Know...You May Add New Material to Your Dossier?	1
Proposal to Use Additional Academic "Steps" at UCLA	1
Resubmission of Denied Academic Cases	2
Establishing Evidence of Independence	2
Upcoming Events	5
Key Links	5
Diversity Resource Links	6

Both the U.C. Office of the President and the Chancellor's Office have made it clear that, going forward, academic advancement cases must be submitted on time, as established by the Academic Personnel Office deadlines. This requirement applies to cases in which an effective date of July 1 is sought. Delay in submitting a dossier may result in a later effective date for advancement.

While there are many reasons that a case can be late, only some of which are within your control, there are some things that you can

do to help ensure that your case is considered on time. For example, do not wait until a scholarly work is accepted for publication before turning in your dossier. *Faculty may add materials to their dossier at any time after it leaves their department.* Normally, the new material should be given to your department's Chair or Administrator, who will then forward it to the Dean's office, who in turn will forward it to the Academic Personnel Office. The added material will be considered by the pertinent review agencies. ■

Proposal to Use Additional Academic "Steps" at UCLA

UCLA is considering implementing a significant change in its personnel system, using four academic "steps" that most of the other U.C. campuses use, but we do not: Assistant Professor Steps 5 and 6, and Associate Professor Steps 4 and 5. Vice Chancellor Rice has presented the proposal to the Deans, CAP, the Senate Executive Board, and the Senate Legislative Assembly – generally with very favorable reactions. Via this Newsletter, we are presenting it to the UCLA faculty at large. We will provide more information at a Town Hall meeting that will be held on January 28 at 9:00 a.m. in the Faculty Center, California Room, with a panel that includes the Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, the Vice Chair of CAP, and the Senior Associate Dean of the School of Medicine. Now, or at the

meeting, we are soliciting your reaction. Feel free to send comments to Vice Chancellor Rice at trice@conet.ucla.edu.

It is important to understand that faculty members typically will not use more steps than is currently the case. Rather, they will use additional steps. Moreover, these steps are widely used at the other campuses. In fact at Berkeley 62% of all Associate Professors are at Steps 4 and 5 and 39% of all Assistant Professors are at Steps 5 and 6. As is currently the case, faculty would typically be considered for promotion to Associate Professor during their seventh year (or earlier in a few units on campus), and would be considered for promotion to full Professor in their sixth year at the Associate rank.

(Continued on page 3)

Did You Miss Our Spring 2008 Newsletter?

Go Check It Out ... http://www.apo.ucla.edu/docs/Newsletter_Spring08.pdf

Establishing Evidence of Independence

Achievement in research, scholarship, or creative activities is essential for faculty advancement within the U.C. system, but faculty sometimes are less familiar with the importance of establishing *independence* with regard to these accomplishments. Independence means that the faculty member's achievements within his or her field are largely the result of his or her own effort. A lack of independence arises when the faculty member disproportionately relies on others to conceptualize, initiate, or produce work.

CAP expects to see meaningful progress toward establishing independence at the time of the fourth year appraisal and convincing evidence of it at the time of advancement to Associate Professor. Independence is an essential part of The UCLA CALL's standard (Appendix 5, Section V): "Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion..." and this standard must be maintained and documented in career progression at UCLA.

Indicators of independence vary across fields, meaning that no one standard suffices to identify it. In some disciplines, the standards are relatively clear – for example, where accomplishment is evidenced by publications and sole authorship of these publications is the norm.

Multiple authorship, however, frequently characterizes publications in many fields, making it more challenging to establish evidence of independence. A source of difficulty is that the order of authorship conveys different contributions in different fields. For example, being first author often means that the faculty member has had the lead role. In other

fields, being last author equates with being the lead author. In some fields being second author connotes substantial contributions to the work. In contrast, the convention in some fields is to list authors alphabetically. It may also be the case that faculty publishing with doctoral students prefer that students be first authors.

Finally, in fields such as the performing arts, accomplishment typically occurs outside of journal or book publication. Indeed, independence in some fields may take unique forms for each individual.

Given this variability, it is incumbent upon the faculty member seeking advancement to clarify his or her contributions to the work being considered for advancement; this is typically done in the self-statement (see the Spring 2007 Newsletter, http://www.apo.ucla.edu/docs/Newsletter_Spring07.pdf). Department chairs and senior faculty can be useful in clarifying the standards for a given field. Letters from co-authors are very helpful in identifying the faculty member's contribution to the work, and in some cases may be required. This is particularly so in situations where two individuals frequently have written collaboratively, and especially when the other author has served as a mentor. Finally, in fields where extramural funding is required to sustain research, obtaining funding as Principal Investigator is strong evidence of peer-recognition of an independent contribution to the research -- although such funding is not listed as an explicit requirement for advancement in The CALL. The critical point, however, is that the faculty member and department need to document, as clearly as possible, the nature of the faculty member's individual contribution to the creative work that is being evaluated. ■

Resubmission of Denied Academic Advancement Cases

Except in the case of promotion to Associate Professor, UCLA does not have a formal appeals mechanism for academic advancement cases that have been denied. Rather, we rely on a process called "Resubmission." According to The UCLA CALL (<http://www.apo.ucla.edu/call/>),

"Resubmission of a departmental recommendation in a case in which there was a final negative decision for advancement or promotion of an Associate or Full

Professor may be made, after appropriate departmental review of the resubmitted file, in any year succeeding the year in which the original submission was made. Except in unusual cases, a final academic personnel decision will not be reconsidered in the same [academic] year the case was originally submitted, and a resubmitted proposal will not be approved unless sufficient new evidence has been added to the file."

(Continued on page 3)

Resubmission of Denied Academic Advancement Cases

(Continued from page 2)

In determining whether to request that his or her case be resubmitted, a faculty member may wish to request copies of the materials that were added to the file after the dossier left the department--in the typical case, copies of the Dean's commentary, the CAP ad hoc Review Committee (RC) analysis in cases where CAP used an RC, and the CAP report. These, together with the Vice Chancellor's letter, constitute a statement of the "reasons" for disapproval of the academic advancement. It is extremely important for the faculty member to understand the basis for denied action.

If the faculty member strongly disagrees with the decision or with significant elements in the review documents, there is, as noted, no formal appeals process. Instead, resubmission is generally the appropriate recourse. The requirement that there be "sufficient new evidence" (in the judgment of the department and the campus reviewing agencies) means that the original

dossier cannot simply be returned for another review. Rather, there must be a fresh departmental review in light of the new evidence, taking into account the basis for the original disapproval in the prior review.

The resubmitted dossier would normally have an effective date one or more years after the date in the original dossier. As a result, it is important that all material in the Data Summary be updated as part of the resubmission process. Once the faculty member assembles all of the materials for the resubmitted dossier, the department would discuss and vote on the case, as consistent with its bylaws. The resubmission process allows for a more prompt re-review of the faculty member's file than would ordinarily be feasible, with specific attention being devoted to earlier perceived weaknesses that led to denial of advancement or promotion. ■

Proposal to Use Additional Academic "Steps" at UCLA

(Continued from page 1)

What needs explanation is how progression will occur. Here is the normal progression, assuming criteria are met for academic advancement:

Assistant Professor:

- Step 4 to Associate Professor Step 1 (our current practice at UCLA)
- Step 5 to Associate Professor Step 2
- Step 6 to Associate Professor Step 3

Associate Professor :

- Step 3 to full Professor Step 1 (our current practice at UCLA)
- Step 4 to full Professor Step 2
- Step 5 to full Professor Step 3

The reason for his system of progression is to reduce or minimize the overlapping salaries between the ranks. For example, the salary for Assistant Professor, Step 5 is approximately that of Associate Professor Step 1; the salary for Assistant Professor, Step 6 is about equivalent to Associate Professor, Step 2; see <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/tab0809/tabcont.html>

Here are some examples of how the new system would work:

◆ A faculty member hired at Assistant Professor Step 2 would most likely progress through normal merit advancements every two years and would be at Step 4 after four years. Under the current system, he/she would stay at Step 4 until promoted to Associate Professor, Step 1. Under the new proposal, he/she would go to Step 5 during her 6th year, and normally be promoted to Associate Professor, Step 2. He/she could then progress through to Associate Professor, Step 4 – usually over a six-year period – and be promoted to full Professor, Step 2 if the academic record merited it.

◆ Similarly, a faculty member hired at Assistant Professor, Step 3 would most likely progress through, normal merit advancements, every two years to Step 6 after his/her 6th year, and ultimately be promoted to Associate Professor, Step 3. He/she would progress through Associate Professor, Step 5 and, if the academic record merited it, normally be promoted to full Professor, Step 3.

(Continued on page 4)

Proposal to Use Additional Academic “Steps” at UCLA

(Continued from page 3)

The previous examples apply to faculty who come to UCLA under the new system. But the proposal also can benefit current faculty. A faculty member who has deferred promotion from Associate Professor, Step 3 would have the ability to progress to Associate Professor Step 4 and 5. This would also allow for salary adjustment for a faculty member who is performing well, say, in teaching and service, but whose research or creative contribution is not yet sufficient for promotion to full Professor.

Possible Advantages

- It will provide some logic for salary adjustments for faculty who, under the current system, are at Assistant Professor, Step 4 for three or more years. Currently, their salaries are often arbitrarily adjusted at “reappointment” every two years.
- It will provide faculty the opportunity for continuous progression through the ranks for those who are currently “stuck” at Associate Professor, Step 3, as well as the opportunity for salary adjustment prior to a five-year review.

Possible Disadvantages (& Replies)

- We already have too many steps! *Reply:* A faculty member not will have to go through more steps than he or she does now, just additional steps. The normal period for Assistant Professor will continue to be 7 years, and Associate Professor, 6 years.
- Faculty who came in under the current system (e.g., those reading this article) would be disadvantaged compared to new faculty. To illustrate, the same accomplishments that merit full Professor, Step 1 for a current faculty member could, it might be argued, be equivalent to Step 3 for a future faculty member. *Reply:* This is a problem of

“transition,” when some faculty came to UCLA under one system, and others, under a different system. It can be ameliorated if the various reviewing agencies understand under *which* system the faculty member was. A current faculty member hired at Associate Professor, Step 1, for example, would have met or exceeded specific academic standards, and is anticipated to remain an Associate Professor for six years. A future faculty member who comes in to the Associate ranks at Step 2 or 3 would have had the same accomplishments, and like his or her counterparts, will be expected to remain for six years before promotion. There is no reason that any reviewing agency has to compare the accomplishments of one to the other. Rather, it need only think about the criteria for a new Associate Professor. The same is true at the lower ranks of full Professor. When a faculty member reaches full Professor, Step 6, there are objective criteria that all faculty – both new and existing – have to meet. As a result, faculty under the new system may decide to remain more than three years at Professor, Step 5. The proposal does allow for potential salary increases if a faculty member remains there for a longer period because he or she entered the full Professor ranks at Step 2 or 3 and might therefore not be ready for Step 6 after three years at Step 5.

In summary, we believe that the use of these “new steps” can improve the welfare of Assistant and Associate Professors in various ways. It will provide faculty the opportunity for continuous progression through the ranks for those who are currently “stuck” at Associate Professor, Step 3, as well as the opportunity for a salary adjustment prior to the five-year review. It also will provide some logic for salary adjustments for faculty who, under the current system, are at Assistant Professor, Step 4 for four years or more. ■

Upcoming Events

January 14, 2009

12:00 p.m.—2:00 p.m.

Faculty Center, Sequoia Room

Maximizing your Intellectual Capital, co-sponsored by office of Intellectual Property and Office for Faculty Diversity and Development.

This faculty program will cover understanding how to maximize use of research discoveries, developing production collaborations with industry, and appropriate management of copyright and inventions.

February 17, 2009

12:00 p.m.—2:00 p.m.

Faculty Center, Hacienda Room

Chair Forum with EVC and Provost Scott Waugh. During this luncheon meeting, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Scott Waugh will provide an overview of current issues at UCLA that are of interest to department chairs, followed by an informal discussion.

January 28, 2009

9:00 a.m.—10:30 a.m.

Faculty Center, California Room

Proposal to Use Additional Academic “Steps” Not Currently Used at UCLA.

This is a special Town Hall Meeting for all interested faculty members. UCLA is considering using some academic “steps” that the other campuses use, but we do not: Assistant Professor Steps 5 & 6, and Associate Professor Steps 4 & 5. An extensive discussion appears in this newsletter. At this meeting, representatives from CAP, the medical school, and the Academic Personnel Office will describe the proposal, answer your questions, and get your feedback.

March 11, 2009

12:00 p.m.—2:00 p.m.

Faculty Center, Sequoia Room

Chair Forum—Topic TBD. Chair forums hosted by the Office of Faculty Diversity and Development are open to all department chairs and vice chairs and cover various topics of interest. Past topics include accountability principles and actions for promoting faculty equity and diversity, the chair’s role in fundraising, and helping colleagues advance through mentoring.

February 12, 2009, March 2, 2009 and April 6, 2009

8:30 a.m.—10:30 a.m. and 12:00 p.m.—2:00 p.m.

Faculty Center, Hacienda Room

Faculty Search Committee Briefings. This briefing covers the faculty search process, research findings on candidate evaluation and search practices to enable equity. It is recommended that every faculty member attend a Faculty Search Briefing, since each faculty member participates in the search and selection process for faculty positions. Each department conducting a faculty search should have members of the search committee certified in the search process.

April 2, 2009

12:00 p.m.—2:00 p.m.

Faculty Center, Sequoia Room

Preparing for Academic Personnel Review. This semi-annual luncheon for Assistant Professors provides the opportunity to ask questions about the advancement process in small groups with former members of the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) and the Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel.

Key Links

Academic Personnel Forms -- <http://www.apo.ucla.edu/forms.asp>

Academic Personnel Manual: <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/welcome.html>

Academic Personnel Office (APO): <http://www.apo.ucla.edu>

Council on Academic Personnel (CAP): <http://www.senate.ucla.edu/committee/cap/cap.htm>

Deadlines: <http://www.apo.ucla.edu/deadlines.asp>

Emeriti Information: <http://www.errc.ucla.edu>

Faculty Diversity: <http://faculty.diversity.ucla.edu>

Faculty Handbook: <http://www.apo.ucla.edu/facultyhandbook>

Faculty Searches: <http://faculty.diversity.ucla.edu/search/searchtoolkit/index.htm>

The UCLA CALL: <http://www.apo.ucla.edu/call>

UCLA Salary Scales: <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/tab0809/tabcont.html>

Diversity Resource Links

Study Group on University Diversity

Overview Report to the Regents

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/documents/diversityreport0907.pdf>

Undergraduate Diversity

Undergraduate Work Team Report

http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/documents/07-diversity_report.pdf

BOARDS Inclusiveness Indicators

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/boars/boars.indicators.pdf>

Graduate and Professional School Diversity

Graduate and Professional School Work Team Report

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/documents/Grad-ProfWorkTeam.pdf>

Faculty Diversity

Faculty Work Team Report

http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/documents/0711-fac_tm_report.pdf

Report of the UC President's Task Force on Faculty Diversity

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/facultydiversity/report.pdf>

Report on Faculty Diversity in the Health Sciences

<http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/hsfaculty-equity-project/report.html>

UC Affirmative Action Guidelines for Recruitment and Retention of Faculty

<http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/fgsaa/documents/affirmative.pdf>

Staff Diversity

Staff Diversity Council Report

http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/documents/ucsdc_report.pdf

Fall 2006 University of California Statistical Summary of Students and Staff

<http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/uwnews/stat/statsum/fall2006/statsumm2006.pdf>

2004 Workforce Profile

http://atyourservice.ucop.edu/forms_pubs/misc/workforce_profile_2004.pdf

Campus Climate

Campus Climate Work Team Report

http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/documents/07-campus_report.pdf

UC Undergraduate Experience Survey

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/studentsurvey/>

Accountability Framework

Accountability Framework Draft

http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/documents/accountabilityframework_draft.pdf