

# **Ad hoc Committee Responsibilities, and Writing an ad hoc Report**

SIO Department, adapted from guidelines from SIO CAP, 2017

## **PREAMBLE**

The University of California has a formal academic review process that is aimed to ensure fair and equitable review of all candidates. Much of the responsibility for this review begins with the ad hoc review committee.

The formal academic review process is a hallmark of the UC system. At SIO in particular, the multiple internal reviewing bodies are designed to try to ensure fairness and equity across our very diverse institution. Your participation in this process is central to its success. This is also a wonderful opportunity for senior colleagues to mentor our newer colleagues in conducting reviews, and in preparing themselves for success at their own reviews. Please review your colleague with the same diligence that you would like your own review to receive.

At SIO, the ad hoc committee is appointed by the Department Chair (Professorial appointments), the Section Head (Research appointments), or the Division Director (Project Scientist appointments). These appointers will be referred to as the “Department Chair,” for simplicity, for the remainder of this document.

One member of the ad hoc committee is designated the chair. It is the chair’s responsibility to call meetings, and to communicate with the Department Chair and appropriate staff person. Deadlines for file-review materials are set by the UC San Diego campus. SIO sets internal deadlines to try to ensure that materials reach the campus well in advance of their deadlines. It is the ad hoc’s responsibility to ensure that their report is delivered to the Department Chair well in advance of the stated deadline.

Files for promotion involve career reviews and outside letters. Obtaining such letters takes time - often several months. Because of this, service on an ad hoc committee may begin prior to the fall quarter. Please be prepared to participate in your ad hoc committee’s meetings during the summer, when necessary.

It is the ad hoc committee’s responsibility to make a recommendation to the Department Chair for a particular action for a candidate. This recommendation must be supported by careful analysis of the candidate’s materials and external referee letters (if applicable), focusing on the particular areas of review for that candidate. The ad hoc’s recommended action is advisory -- the Department Chair does not have to accept or follow the recommendation (though they typically do).

All deliberations of the ad hoc committee are confidential. The ad hoc committee should never communicate with the candidate, or make themselves known to the candidate. Rather, all communication should be with the Department Chair and appropriate academic personnel staff members, who will provide guidance and advice when needed.

When reviewing a candidate's materials, it is imperative to recognize your potential for implicit bias. Implicit Bias training is available through the Associate Dean for Faculty Equity and from UC Learning ([UC Managing Implicit Bias Series](#)). Please participate in such trainings when they are offered. It is the Department's expectation that reviews will use the candidate's (and others mentioned in the report) title and last name, rather than their first name. Avoid using gendered pronouns whenever possible.

Guidance for appointment and promotion in various academic titles can be found under Policy PPM 230-200 to 230-375.

<https://adminrecords.ucsd.edu/PPM/docs/toc230.HTML>

## **GETTING STARTED**

Please look over all the review materials carefully, including in particular the candidate's submitted statements.

Before anything else:

Assess whether the file will involve an action that requires letters to be solicited. If so, communicate this to the Department Chair and appropriate staff member. They will ask you to identify a list of appropriate, unconflicted, external referees. They will ask for quite a few more referee suggestions than are required: often, when asked to write a letter, half or more of the referees decline. If you have any questions, confer with the Department Chair and the appropriate academic personnel staff member.

[Senate CAP Guidelines for Selecting External Referees](#)

## **WRITING THE AD HOC REPORT**

1. Address letter to the specific person who has requested the ad hoc report (e.g., the Department Chair or Vice Chair, the Section Head, or the Division Director).
2. State candidate's name and current position, whether this is a merit advancement, reappointment, or career review.
3. State ad hoc recommendation in the first paragraph of the letter. In your letter you must justify your recommendation. Possible recommendations are:
  - a. no change
  - b. no change with a half-step bonus off-scale component (BOS)
  - c. normal merit advancement (single merit step)
  - d. normal merit with a half-step bonus off-scale (single merit step in addition to rewarding a particular activity or area of excellence)
  - e. an accelerated merit (two steps)
  - f. a career review: promotion, advancement to/through Step VI, advancement to above scale
  - g. career recalibration: UCSD policy allows faculty to have a "career recalibration," either at the time of a promotion or as a one-time per



Candidates should have identified their contributions to multi-authored papers, including indicating papers first-authored by their own students or postdocs. This information should be reflected in the ad hoc report. In the case of multi-authored papers, when the candidate is not first author, to the extent possible, discuss (the candidate's) scientific role. In most cases papers that are first-authored by the candidate's students or postdocs are likely to reflect significant guidance on the part of the candidate, and this effort can be indicated in the ad hoc letter.

Keep in mind that subsequent reviewers will seek information on the impact and significance of the publications, and whether the candidate demonstrates a clearly identifiable research program that is independent of previous mentors and current collaborators.

The department generally advises against detailed analysis of Section C papers. The ad hoc report can mention the existence of Section C papers, but should not review them unless necessary to justify a proposed action. Section C papers can be commented on as an indication of a candidate's research trajectory; however, detailed discussion of Section C papers may jeopardize their inclusion in subsequent reviews. A lack of Section C papers should not be mentioned or interpreted in the ad hoc report.

**Teaching:** Discuss the quantity, effort, and effectiveness of formal classroom teaching (graduate and undergraduate) as well as student mentoring (postdocs, grad students, undergraduates). Indicate development of new classes or other teaching innovations. Try to discuss in more detail courses that reach a broad range of student majors or are particularly large. The ad hoc report should make a distinction between formal teaching and mentoring (evident on official records), and informal advising, guest lectures, etc. If a significant amount of informal teaching occurs, ask the Department Chair to have the candidate obtain a letter that documents this. If the candidate has received a teaching or mentoring award, discuss its significance.

The ad hoc should keep in mind that the campus is shifting to holistic assessment of teaching, though this will not be implemented until subsequent academic years. Evaluation of teaching should not rely solely on course and student evaluations. Some candidates will be including a detailed holistic teaching statement in addition to student evaluations and syllabi. All of the materials provided should be reviewed in assessing the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

**Service:** Discuss SIO service (curricular group, standing committees, ad hocs, etc.), campus and Senate (UCSD) service, system-wide (UC-wide), professional service, and public service, as applicable. Highlight those activities that represent a significant effort or that benefit those outside the candidate's discipline. Campus reviewers pay particular attention to Senate and campus-wide service.

To the extent possible, detail all the service so that subsequent reviewers gain a good understanding of the candidate's contributions. A careful analysis of service activities -- rather than simply listing highlights -- is encouraged, particularly if you are recommending

action above a normal merit advancement.

It is important for the ad hoc to articulate the service activities that are distinct from the candidate's research effort. Analysis of the effort, activity and impact of the candidate's service will benefit subsequent reviewers.

**Contributions to Diversity:** If the candidate does not provide information on their contributions to diversity, state explicitly that the candidate did not address contributions to diversity in their file. Otherwise, discuss the candidate's contributions to diversity in the context of any of the applicable areas of review: research, teaching, and service. Reviewers will generally be looking for evidence of *active, purposeful* contributions to diversity.

Particularly notable contributions to diversity should be discussed, and can be used to justify particular actions on the file. For guidance on activities that could be considered contributions to diversity, refer to [Guidance on Documenting Contributions to Diversity in Merit and Promotion Files, Scripps Institution of Oceanography](#) and the Center for Faculty Diversity and Inclusion's [Contributions to Diversity Statements](#).

**COVID-19:** Candidates have been asked to write a COVID-19 impact statement. If the candidate provides a statement, address COVID-19 impacts during the review period with respect to the candidate's statement. The ad hoc committee should specifically consider the candidate's *achievement relative to opportunity*.

Impact statements allow candidates to describe ways that they adapted to the pandemic, for example, through innovative teaching and mentoring, or extra service. Candidates are not required to disclose personal information, but could choose to identify impacts that they experienced or to specify the degree to which they were personally impacted. Final guidance on COVID-19 impacts can be found in the [Senate and APS's guidance for Covid-19 Impact Statements](#).

**External Referee Letters** (if applicable)

Provide a summary of the external referee letters. If you choose to quote from parts of the referee letters, please keep those quotes brief (subsequent reviewers will have access to the same materials). Do not state information that can potentially identify the external referee. External referees should be referred to as Referee A, B, C and so forth. If there are negative letters from referees, these should be explicitly discussed and put in context.

**Justification for Recommendations:** Close the letter with a restatement of the recommendation and summarize the justification for this recommendation. This is particularly important in the case of accelerations, and must touch on all criteria for advancement:

- For Professors: Research, Teaching and Service
- For Researchers, Project Scientists: Research and Service

**GUIDELINES FOR SALARIES**

It is generally not in the ad hoc's purview to address the market off-scale (MOS) salary component. Market off-scale salary components are static. Increasing a market off-scale component normally requires additional evidence such as written documentation of a competing outside offer, and is generally dealt with separately by the Department Chair.

If the ad hoc determines that the candidate's salary is inappropriate, that information and its justification should be communicated to the Department Chair, who will consider it and determine the appropriate path forward.

### **GUIDELINES FOR ACCELERATION**

Accelerations recognize extraordinary achievement and must only be proposed if there are no weaknesses in the appointee's performance in any area of responsibility specified in the review criteria: Research, Teaching (Professors) and Service.

Per PPM 230-220-88, the criteria for series that require research and/or creative activity are:

*Evidence that a candidate's productivity is double that which is expected for normal advancement in the review period is typically sufficient to demonstrate a candidate's performance is exceptional for purposes of a one-step acceleration. In cases in which research productivity is greater than that required for normal advancement, but falls short of twice the expected rate, extraordinary achievements in additional performance criteria are necessary to justify accelerated advancement.*

*An acceleration case based on exceptional productivity in research must be documented with evidence of the appointee's contributions and their impact using norms appropriate to the research field. The department recommendation should articulate the grounds for acceleration beyond simple numerical tabulation of papers and citations; for example, demonstration of the special impact of research, the quality of publications, the awarding of prizes or election to national or international learned academies.*

*The criteria for other series:*

*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. Documentation substantiating the significant and extraordinary nature of the achievements and their impact is needed; for example, the awarding of prizes, exceptional service of significant duration and/or importance (not otherwise rewarded or compensated), or professional recognition of contributions.*

If a file documents outstanding Research, Teaching, or Service that exceeds normal merit expectations – but is less than would be expected for an acceleration – the ad hoc may consider recommending a merit with an additional half-step bonus off-scale salary

increment (BOS). This BOS is calculated as the salary difference between the proposed step, and the subsequent step. The BOS applies only for the next review period, and is removed at the following review.