

The following is sent on behalf of Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, Andrew L. Ries, M.D., M.P.H. and Assistant Vice Chancellor, Robert S. Ross, M.D.

We recently received the following communication from Campus Academic Personnel Services (APS) regarding a new requirement from CAP that academic personnel review files proposing promotion (in addition to acceleration) need to include “department standards for advancement” for each area of performance, as specified by the series criteria. After further discussion with APS, it has been agreed that this requirement will NOT be applied to 2016 files currently in review, but will impact files with an effective date of July 1, 2017. We are currently in the process of surveying departments for existing standards and hope to have suggestions for “best practice” for your use. As file preparation is already underway for the 2016-17 review year, we strongly encourage departments to begin articulating such standards. Please contact Rebecca Woolston in the VCHS Academic Affairs Office if you have any questions (rwoolston@ucsd.edu) or would like additional guidance.

“Department Standards for Faculty Advancement and Promotion

Recently revised PPM 230-28.IV.A.5 d. provides language clarifying that an academic appointee’s performance in all areas should be evaluated in terms of the department’s established performance norms and expectations:

5. Departmental Recommendation Letter

The department chair is responsible for drafting the departmental recommendation letter, which is a presentation of the department’s advancement and/or reappointment recommendation based upon an evaluation of the appointee by all eligible members of the department.

The letter should include:

d. An evaluation of the appointee’s performance and achievements in each area of responsibility to the University, as specified by the series criteria. The appointee’s performance in each area should be evaluated in terms of the department’s established performance norms and expectations, using established departmental evaluation methods.

As the review season has progressed, both AP and CAP have found that many files proposing acceleration, promotion, and promotion with acceleration are missing such department standards for advancement. Written standards for advancement should delineate expectations for quality and impact of research and other creative activity, instructional activities, service, and clinical performance, if applicable, Please be aware that files missing departmental standards may be returned.”