

Document Title

1. Clarify document title and change to Academic Personnel Review Procedures for Senate Faculty.

Table of Contents

1. Add section on Academic Personnel Office Roles, Routing and Delegation Chart (web link), under II-A, General Review Procedures for Academic Files.
2. Change #2, to By-Law 55 and Department Voting Rights.
3. Add section on Appointments under II-B, Instructions for Specific Actions

Schedule for Academic Personnel Reviews/Due Dates

1. Update all dates to reflect 2008-2009 due dates.

By-Law 55 and Department Voting Rights

1. The senate office will send out the CALL for updated by-law 55 voting rights.
Revised language: “Department voting policies and procedures must be submitted annually to the Academic Personnel Office Academic Senate for use by the Committee on Academic Personnel. Use Attachment I. Voting policies must be submitted to the Academic Personnel Office by October 15 or prior to the first department meeting. Departments are not required to re-vote each year but Department Chairs should review the current voting procedures with his/her faculty.”

Acceleration

1. Page 5-b, Acceleration: removed “strongly”

Revised Language: “The campus ~~strongly~~ encourages departments to put forward deserving candidates for acceleration.”

Pages 5-6, Acceleration: language clarification

Revised Language: “A recommendation for acceleration must be considered by the voting members of the department if a request is made by the candidate, by the Chair, or by any other ladder rank faculty member of the department eligible to vote on the recommendation. **The candidate should be consulted on this before the vote. If the request is made by the candidate, a vote must be taken. If a department vote is taken, the candidate must be informed of the vote.**”

“The question of acceleration should not be an issue in promotion to Associate Professor and Professor cases or advancement to Professor VI and Professor Above-Scale cases: the issue is whether the candidate has met the criteria **for the rank and step proposed,** not whether the criteria have been met in a particular time frame. **In the case for acceleration within above scale, “A further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an above-scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Continued good service is not an adequate justification. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinite, and only in the most superior cases where there is strong and compelling evidence will increases at intervals shorter than four years be approved.” (APM 220-18-b4)**

Procedures Before the Personnel Review File is Assembled

1. Page 7, 5-2

Revised Language: “~~The Tenured faculty member~~ may wish to defer review.”

Procedures During Departmental Review

1. Page 8, 7-d, delete "For security reasons, email review is strongly discouraged."
2. Page 8, 7-d, change from "five working days" to "seven calendar days:
3. Page 8, 7-d, moved language from page 21.K.

"Identifiers of extramural and student letters are to be limited to numerical or alphabetical designations. The same protection of confidentiality should also be extended to statements made by individual faculty members.

In units where there is no Chair, the "departmental letter" summarizing the case should be prepared by a senior faculty member designated by the Dean. The same member should be responsible for preparing the letters for all candidates in the unit. This faculty member may also prepare a "Chair's letter." (See section [III.I](#))

An oral summary of the departmental letter shall be provided to the candidate once the period for the submission of minority reports is expired. The candidate will be able to review the unredacted **finalized** letter and any minority reports after the period for submission of minority reports is expired."

4. Page 8, 7-d, added section e for procedures for minority reports

"e. Minority reports are intended to permit interpretations of fact and academic judgment which differs materially from those expressed in the departmental letter. The intent is not to extend to unreasonable degrees, differences of academic judgment already clearly delineated in the departmental letter and reflective of both majority and minority views. Minority reports should be embarked upon only when consultation with the departmental letter writer reaches an impasse with regard to the departmental letter's being an accurate and objective rendering of diverse academic and professional judgments as discussed during departmental deliberations. Such minority reports are not to be treated as alternatives to departmental letters in scope or detail but should focus on critical matters of fact and academic judgment about the specific case not discussed in the departmental letter.

Names of extramural referees, eligible voters, and students must not be disclosed in minority reports. The minority opinion must be signed and forwarded as an addendum to the departmental letter. The addendum is considered part of the department letter, not a separate document on which the candidate may comment. All documents not submitted through the Department Chair and the Dean's office will be returned to the sender. Minority reports for merit files (other than advancements to Professor VI, Professor Above-Scale, and within Professor Above-Scale) are limited to a maximum of two pages.

For all such documents sent to the department, the Chair must make the document known and available to departmental members eligible to vote on the case. To avoid undue delay in processing and forwarding files, any minority reports must be submitted to the Chair not more than five working days after the finalized letter of recommendation is available for review by eligible faculty. When the Chair has announced the deadline by which the file and final letter of recommendation is to be forwarded, all accompanying documents must be submitted. The Chair may comment on the minority report or other document in a Chair's Letter.

Minority reports and other such documents submitted in accord with the above specified procedures will be a part of the file as it is considered by all of the subsequent reviewing agencies (see section II.A.8.b for exception, relating to the candidate's option of sending his/her comment to the Dean's office).

The candidate will be able to review the unredacted finalized letter and any minority reports after the period for submission of minority reports is expired.”

Procedures During Review Beyond the Department

1. Page 9, 9-a

Revised Language: “OTHER PROMOTION TO TENURE FILES AND APPRAISALS MAY BE UPDATED UNTIL MARCH 1st **THE LAST CALENDAR DAY IN FEBRUARY.**”

Non-reappointment for Assistant Professors or Other Appointees of Equivalent Rank

1. Page 11, c-iii

Revised Language: “~~If extenuating circumstances so warrant,~~ **The candidate is also permitted to send a separate memo directly to the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel which will become a part of the file at the time the file is forwarded to the Committee on Academic Personnel.**”

Instructions for Specific Actions

1. Page 12, 1-3, added APM language to explain expectations for advancements to VI, advancements to A/S and advancements within A/S.
2. Appraisals, Page 12-4, added all possible outcomes.

Revised Language: “**The possible outcomes for an appraisal are positive** ~~(with or without qualification),~~ **qualified positive or negative.**”

3. Career Reviews, Page 12-5

Revised Language: “Any **tenured senate** faculty member who thinks that he/she may not be at the appropriate level on the rank/step scale has the right to be evaluated by the process of Career Review.”

4. Promotions, Page 14, 10-3rd paragraph

Revised Language: “**The Chancellor** ~~or his/her designee~~ **has final authority on promotions.**”

5. Page 17, A-2nd paragraph, fixed typo: “In certain circumstances, CAP may act as ~~it’s~~ **its** own ad hoc or may waive ~~it’s~~ **its** own review (APM 220-80.K).”

Patents

1. Page 19, fixed numbering for this section.

Biography

1. Page 19, modified language to account for eFile. Paper copy must be signed. This is not applicable to eFile.

Revised Language: “The Biography form **must be updated during each review period and if in paper form** must be signed by the candidate. **This is not applicable to eFile.**”

Candidate’s Response to the Departmental Letter

1. Page 19, F, removed redundant instructions. Add “See section II.8.b.”

Departmental Letter

1. Page 21, K, removed redundant instructions. Add “See section II.7.d.”

Minority Reports

1. Page 26, P, removed redundant instructions. Add “See section II.7.e.”

Difference List

1. Page 24, added expectations for jointly authored work.

New Language: “For each co-authored item on the Difference List. Candidates should explain their role and provide information about the collaborators (e.g., graduate student, post doc or technician; rank and institution of collaborator)”

Extramural Letters

1. Page 24, deleted footnote in chart.

Grant Activity

1. Page 25, deleted the following language: “In addition, the list should include a brief contribution statement for grants with a CoPI (maximum 2-3 sentences).”
2. Modified Attachment F to include date submitted, status (pending, awarded, denied), funding period (beginning and ending dates), PI status, names of other PIs. This is currently required for eFile.

Self Statement

1. Page 28-U, added “strongly” “(optional but **strongly** encouraged)

Student Evaluations of Teaching

1. Page 28, removed language on departmental summaries (outdated)

Teaching Load Data

1. Page 29, language clarification

New Language: “For merits, teaching load and evaluations should be documented for the review period. For promotion, appraisal, advancement to Professor VI and Professor Above-Scale, the teaching load and evaluations should be documented for the last 3 years. “

Attachment B-1 – SIGNED STATEMENT ATTESTING TO PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS (Part 1)

1. Page 33, B-3, clarified language

Revised Language: “3. I request redacted copies of confidential documents in this file, 4. I certify that I received the following before the department meeting...”, 5. I had the opportunity to provide a written statement for inclusion in this file in response to or commenting upon material in the file.”

Attachment B-2 – SIGNED STATEMENT ATTESTING TO PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS (Part 2)

1. Page 34, modified language

Revised Language: “I was informed of the addition, **deletion, correction of the following material and informed by the Chair of the content.”**

Attachment C-2 – Checklist for Career Review

1. Page 36, fixed reference to page numbers of the CALL

Attachment D – Departmental Recommendation

1. Page 41, rephrased the statement on the department letter regarding sabbatical report to read: **“During the review period, sabbatical leave reports are: (1) Not Due (2) On file and available upon request or (3) Not on File (include explanation)”**

Attachment F – Extramural Grant Activity Format

1. Page 52, modified attachment F to include date submitted, status (pending, awarded, denied), date awarded, funding period (beginning and ending dates), PI status, names of other PIs.

By-Law 55 Information Sheet

1. Page 57, removed from The Call as it is a senate document.

Checklists

1. Pages 35-40, modified checklists to remove inconsistencies and clarify requirements.