ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
REVIEW PROCEDURES
FOR SENATE FACULTY

"THE CALL"
2011-2012

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR & PROVOST
VICE PROVOST FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
JULY 1, 2011

APM 220-80C: "Each campus shall develop guidelines and checklists to instruct Chairs about their duties and responsibilities in connection with personnel reviews."

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCEDURES
2011-2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Academic Personnel Review Procedures

SCHEDULE FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEWS

2011-2012

Personnel Review Action	Date Due in Deans' Offices	Date Due in Academic Personnel Office	File Entry Cut-Off Date
Promotion to Associate Professor Advancement to Above Scale (A/S)	The Monday following the end of instruction in December	The third Tuesday in January	**September 30** **Exceptions** 7th year promotion to tenure files may be updated until April 30 of the seventh year. Extramural and Student letters may be received to November 1.
Promotion to Full Professor Advancement to Professor VI Career Review	The Monday following the end of instruction in December	The first Monday in February	
Reappointment of Assistant Professor	The Tuesday following MLK day in January	The first Monday in March	
Appraisal	One-third due the Tuesday following MLK day in January	The first Monday in March	
Merit	Two-thirds due the Tuesday following President's Day in February	The first Monday in April	
Quinquennial Review	100% due the third Monday in March	The first Monday in May	

NOTE: For 7th year promotion to tenure cases, extramural letters should not be solicited until after June 30 (or any earlier than the end of the 6th year). For all cases, letters should be solicited before September 1 to allow reviewers ample time to respond. For off-cycle 7th year promotions, the dates will be adjusted accordingly.

Announcements of final Academic Personnel Review decisions will be made once a week on Friday if they are available. Final decisions after the last calendar day in June will be announced as soon as they become available. In the interest of equity and efficiency for candidates and reviewers alike, it is important that the schedule and its deadlines be adhered to carefully. The Deans, CAP, and the VPAP feel no obligation to consider cases in which a faculty member does not supply documents and information by the deadlines that Chairs may set. Tenured faculty files not received in the Academic Personnel Office by the final due date (first Monday in May) normally will be returned for consideration during the next academic year. Such files will be classified as deferrals and will not be considered for retroactive action. Tenured faculty members below Professor Step V who are at normal time at step will receive an automatic deferral if they do not submit materials by the departmental due date, unless the department Chair has granted an extension. Mandatory action files received after the extension deadline or beyond the final due date listed on the Schedule may be automatically denied or deemed unsatisfactory.

II. PROCEDURES

A. General Review Procedures for Senate Faculty Academic Personnel Files

"Each campus shall develop guidelines and checklists to instruct Chairs about their duties and responsibilities in connection with personnel reviews." Procedures for academic personnel review of senate faculty at the UCR campus are outlined in the "CALL". No other procedures or guidelines for faculty review will be used.

1. Role of Academic Personnel Office (APO), Routing, Delegation Chart and eFile

The Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP) is designated by the Chancellor and the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost to develop and implement academic review procedures for the Riverside campus (APM 220-80c). The VPAP facilitates all Academic Personnel actions on behalf of the Chancellor and the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (Chancellor's designee) via APO. All items should be addressed to the Chancellor and submitted to APO via the appropriate Dean's Office.

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) provides advice to the Chancellor (or designee) on academic personnel matters. The VPAP is the Chancellor's and Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost's designee for facilitating administrative input and advice from CAP. All items should be addressed to the Chancellor and submitted to APO via the appropriate Dean's Office. The full committee charge for CAP can be found on the Charge for Committee on Academic Personnel (http://senate.ucr.edu/committee/4/charge.html).

The Delegation of Authority Chart provides information on the final authority on review actions. It can be found on APO website at http://academicpersonnel.ucr.edu/resources/DOAChart11-20-09.pdf.

The eFile System captures granular data in a relational database in the support of merit/promotion actions and immediate generation of faculty bio-sketches and other reports supporting various faculty needs (e.g. extramural funds requests). It is used for a routed, paperless review of merit and promotion files. Supporting processes outside of eFile include: Chair's meeting with candidate, signing of Procedural Safeguard Statement (Part 1 and Part 2), Department meeting, Department voting, preparation of department recommendation (draft and final), CAP meeting, CAP voting and preparation of CAP recommendation. General information regarding the eFile system can be found on the eFile website at http://efileinfo.ucr.edu/.

2. Bylaw 55 & Department Voting Rights

Academic Senate Bylaw 55 contains material governing voting rights and other issues related to considerations of academic personnel procedures. See the Academic Senate Manual for Bylaw 55 text. Please refer all questions related to interpretation and implementation of Bylaw 55 to the Rules and Jurisdiction Committee of the Academic Senate**.** Voting Rights Template is available on the Academic Senate website: http://senate.ucr.edu/committee/?do=info&id=4.

The method of taking votes will continue to be left to the discretion of the department. It is important that this be done in some way that will result in a clear picture of faculty opinion about the proposed action. Review of departmental delegations and procedures are solicited annually by CAP. Bylaw 55 forms should be completed and submitted to the Academic Senate by the end of October. CAP will provide copies to APO and the Dean's offices by the first week of November.

3. Procedures for Extension Requests

A request for a late submission of the file must be for extraordinary reasons and be approved by the VPAP prior to the final due date for submission to the Dean's office published in Section I. Such a

request must be forwarded through the Dean's office and will specify the reason for the delay and include the estimated date when the file will be received in the Dean's Office. If the extension request is for an action which requires extramural letters, then the extension request must additionally request an exception to include letters dated past the cut-off date. If the estimated submittal date for any action is beyond the final date for files to be received by the Academic Personnel Office (first Monday in May), the extension request must also be approved by CAP. The Deans, CAP and the VPAP feel no obligation to consider cases in which a faculty member does not supply documents and information by the deadlines that Chairs or Deans may set. Files received after the extension deadline or beyond the final due date listed on page 4 of the CALL may be returned for re-submission during the next academic year. Mandatory action files received after the extension deadline or beyond the final due date listed on the Schedule may be automatically denied or deemed unsatisfactory.

4. Procedures regarding Eligibility

The department Chair is responsible for making certain that within the department there is an annual review of the status and performance of each faculty member in the department. Cases of possible eligibility for merit increase or promotion shall be examined (APM 220-80.b.) and a preliminary list must be provided to APO, via the College Dean's Office, by the first Monday in August. Faculty are eligible for advancement or promotion each year, however, advancement usually occurs in conjunction with completion of normal time in step. Throughout this document, the term 'eligible' references the completion of normal time in step with the broader understanding that nothing precludes submission of a file during any review cycle. See section II.A.4.b below for the concept of acceleration.

a. Normal Time in Step

CHART I – NORMAL TIME IN STEP					
Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor		Distinguished Professor Above Scale	Normal Period of Service at Step
Step	Step	Step	Step	no steps	
I					2 years
II					2 years
III					2 years
IV*					2 years
V	I				2 years
VI	II				2 years
	III				2 years
	IV	I			3 years
	V	II			3 years
		III			3 years
		IV			3 years
		V			3 or more years
			VI		3 or more years
			VII		3 or more years
			VIII		3 or more years
			IX		4 or more years
				no steps/ just merits	4 or more years between merit advancements

* Review for tenure must occur no later than the seventh year of service in order to adhere to the eight-year rule and the terminal-year requirement. Visiting assistant professor and acting assistant professor appointments count toward the eight-year rule.

Departments are required to review each faculty member at the Associate or Full ranks who is at normal time in step and to make a recommendation for or against advancement. (See section II.B.6 for deferral.) Departments are required to review each faculty member at the Assistant rank who is at or above normal time in step and to make a recommendation for or against advancement. Assistant Professors may not defer. (See section II.B.6 for deferral.)

Because there is no specified normal time at Professor Step V and above, service at these steps may be of indefinite duration. (However, see section II.B.11-Quinquennial Review.) Advancement to Steps VI, VII, VIII, and IX usually will not occur until at least three years of service at the lower step. Advancement to Above-Scale usually will not occur until at least four years of service at Step IX.

b. Acceleration

Advancement to a higher step before normal eligibility constitutes acceleration. The campus encourages departments to put forward deserving candidates for acceleration. Advancement to a higher rank must meet the appropriate criteria for promotion (APM 210-1-d and APM 220-18-b(4)). The minimum criterion for acceleration within rank is excellence in all areas of review during the abbreviated review period. In addition:

(i) For one-year accelerations within rank, the record for the abbreviated review period must reflect a level of accomplishments commensurate with the normal on-time merit.

(ii) For multiple year accelerations within rank, the records for the abbreviated review period must reflect excellence in all areas of review commensurate with the proposed step, in addition to performance in at least one area deemed to be outstanding and a driving force for the acceleration.

(iii) Advancement to Step VI usually will not occur after less than three years of service at Step V, and will be granted on evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in each of the following three categories: (1) scholarship or creative achievement, (2) University teaching, and (3) service. Above and beyond that, great academic distinction, recognized nationally, will be required in scholarly or creative achievement or teaching. A recommendation for acceleration to this step requires highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellent University teaching at the standards noted in APM 220-18-b(4).

(iv) The bar is set higher for both advancement and acceleration to steps at the senior professor and distinguished professor levels, as required in APM 220-18-b(4), revised in 2008. Advancement to Professor VII, VIII or IX requires evidence of "continuing achievement" at the level of "great academic distinction" that was required for the advancement to Professor VI. Such advancements usually will not occur after less than three years at the lower step. A recommendation for acceleration to these steps requires exceptional performance at the standards noted in APM 220-18-b(4).

(v) Advancement to Professor Above-Scale usually requires four years of service at Professor IX; advancement within Professor Above-Scale usually requires four years of service at the current scale. Only in the most superior cases where there is strong and compelling evidence will increases at intervals shorter than four years be approved. A recommendation for acceleration must demonstrate a signal achievement or honor in one of the three areas of assessment in addition to exceptional performance at the standards noted in APM 220-18-b(4).

(vi) Normally a promotion to Associate Professor or Professor is not accompanied by a recommendation for a step acceleration. In exceptional cases, a promotion or advancement is recommended simultaneously with a post-promotion acceleration in step. In such cases, the department and Dean should vote separately on the promotion and the post-promotion acceleration in step unless the

recommendation to the accelerated step is unanimous. The recommendation for acceleration in step should be explicitly and separately justified. (See Acceleration Charts II and III on page 8.)

(vii) The department and Dean are expected to explicitly address the acceleration recommendation in their letters. Multiple-year accelerations and those at the senior professor and distinguished professor steps should be particularly well justified.

The Department Chair has the responsibility to review the record of each member of the department to determine whether a recommendation for acceleration should be considered by the voting members of the department. Chairs and colleagues should always be alert to exceptionally strong performances and should be prepared to make appropriate recommendations which are carefully and thoroughly documented by evidence appropriate to the case.

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. 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.

After the departmental vote is taken and the candidate is informed of the vote, the department and candidate may agree not to have the recommendation for acceleration forwarded for further review. Ultimately, however, this is the candidate's choice.

A promotion is not considered an acceleration, regardless of years at rank or step when a candidate is advancing to the "normal" (see Charts II and III below) step in the next rank. In cases where movement to a lateral step is possible, the first step above the lateral step is considered the "normal" step. Regardless, departments may always elect to vote on the lateral step when advancement to the lateral step is deemed most appropriate. A vote on the lateral step would particularly be important if the vote on the "normal" step were less than unanimous.

Chart II - Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor (Tenure)

	To Associate Professor			
From Assistant Professor	**Steps**	**I**	**II**	**III**	**IV**
	I, II, III, IV	Normal	2-yr acceleration	4-yr acceleration	6-yr acceleration
	V	Lateral	Normal	2-yr acceleration	4-yr acceleration
	VI	-	Lateral	Normal	2-yr acceleration

Chart III - Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

	To Full Professor			
From Associate Professor	**Steps**	**I**	**II**	**III**	**IV**
	I, II, III	Normal	3-yr acceleration	6-yr acceleration	9-yr acceleration
	IV	Lateral	Normal	3-yr acceleration	6-yr acceleration
	V	-	Lateral	Normal	3-yr acceleration

c. Overlapping Steps

The normal periods of service are described in APM 220-18-b. The use of Assistant Professor, Steps V and VI is encouraged as an alternative to premature consideration of promotion to tenure. Overlapping steps are those in which the published salaries vary by $100. The following are overlapping steps in the professorial series. See also Lateral Promotion.

Assistant Professor V	Associate Professor I
Assistant Professor VI	Associate Professor II
Associate Professor IV	Professor I
Associate Professor V	Professor II

5. Review Criteria

Reviewing bodies which advise on actions concerning appointees in the Professor and corresponding series, are instructed to use these criteria for appointment, promotion and appraisal. (APM 210-1-d):

In teaching, "clearly demonstrated evidence of high quality in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion." In addition, participation in graduate programs is expected, as is specified in every faculty job description. This applies to departments with a graduate program. Attention may be given to the role of the candidate and the candidate's field in attracting high caliber graduate students to the campus.

In the area of research, "There should be evidence that the candidate is continuously and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance." "Publications in research and other creative accomplishment should be evaluated, not merely enumerated." (APM 210-1-d(2)), both the quality of publication outlets and impact of the research in the field are important factors.

Research and scholarship must be performed at the highest level. In many areas, extramural support is essential for a high quality research program and while it is understood that grant activity should not be the sole criterion for advancement, it may be used as a gauge of sound and productive research activity. In particular, successful competition for extramural grants, especially at the national level and through a peer reviewed process, may be taken as an indication of peer evaluation of the quality of the research program. The absence of extramural funding, however, shall not be taken as a negative indicator of the quality of research. When appropriate, the candidate and department are advised to address the issue of funding in the self-statement and department letter.

For Professional Activity, see APM 210-1-d(3). For University and Public Service see APM 210-1-d(4).

The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Teaching, research, professional and public service contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of the candidate's qualifications. See APM 210-1-d

6. Procedures Before the Personnel Review File is Assembled

It is the candidate's and the Department Chair's responsibility to document the file in an adequate manner. Chairs may not independently add materials to the file that cannot be documented. Chairs may utilize statistical information (e.g. journal rankings, impact factors, citation reports, etc.) that might aid in the evaluation of the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarly activity. The file should present the scholarly and intellectual contributions of the candidate in each area of review. Review will be based only on what is contained in the file. It is in the candidate's interest to provide all pertinent material and information to the department and to be certain the file is complete (as verified by the Procedural Safeguard Statement).

It is the expectation of the Deans, CAP and the VPAP that all faculty having advancement cases will provide their updated material to the Department/School/Division Chair as early as possible. Cooperation in providing information for one's personnel file is a professional obligation without which the review process cannot be initiated.

The Chair shall discuss with the faculty member the following possible options:

1. The faculty member may wish to be considered for promotion. If so, a full promotion file, including extramural letters, shall be prepared.
2. Tenured faculty members may wish to defer review. (For limitations, see section II.B.6-Deferral.)
3. The faculty member may wish to be considered for a merit if he/she is not at the highest step and is not in the 7th year in the Assistant rank.
    a. The Chair notifies the candidate of the impending review.
    b. The Chair makes certain the candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process and is made aware of APM 210-1, 220-80 and APM 160.
    c. The Chair makes certain the candidate is given an opportunity to:
        i. Ask questions.
        ii. Supply pertinent information and evidence, including a self-statement if desired.
        iii. Suggest, where relevant, names of persons to be solicited for letters of evaluation.
        iv. Provide in writing to the Chair names of possible extramural reviewers who, for reasons set forth by the candidate, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications and performance. Any such statements shall be included in the personnel review file.
        v. Provide in writing to the VPAP and CAP, names of possible campus ad hoc reviewers who, for reasons set forth by the candidate, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications and performance.

7. Procedures Before the Departmental Recommendation is Determined

a. The Chair shall provide the candidate the opportunity to inspect all documents to be included in the personnel review file other than confidential documents. It is advisable to allow, at a minimum, a period of five business days.

b. The Chair shall provide to the candidate, upon request in writing or checking the appropriate line on the Procedural Safeguards Statement, a redacted copy of the confidential documents in the file (including declinations from extramural evaluators). If redacted confidential documents are not obtained by the candidate at this time, the candidate may not have access to this material until after the decision. (An exception to this applies when the Chancellor's preliminary assessment is to make a terminal year appointment or a non-reappointment of an assistant professor, or when the Chancellor's preliminary assessment is provided in a promotion or appraisal case. See sections II.A.12.a(iv) and II.A.12.b(ii).

Note: The identities of persons who were the sources of these documents shall not be disclosed. Redaction of a letter of evaluation (including declinations) is defined as removal of the name, title,organizational/institutional affiliation, and relational information contained below the signature block. (APM 160-20-c(4) Any identifying information on the letterhead and emails (including email address or signature) must also be removed.

c. The candidate will be given 5 business days to submit a written statement in response to or commenting upon material in the file. The response will be included in the review file. The members of the department who are eligible to vote will be given 5 business days to access and

review the response before voting. Extensions of these deadlines will be considered by APO in extenuating circumstances.

d. The candidate shall sign Section I of the Procedural Safeguards Statement (Attachment B-1)

8. Procedures During Departmental Review

a. The Chair is obliged to ensure that the departmental review is fair to the candidate and rigorous in maintaining University standards. The Academic Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T) should be contacted directly for allegations of procedures which violate the Faculty Code of Conduct.

b. The Chair has the responsibility of making the complete file available for inspection by the members of the department who are eligible to vote (see 7-c above). In the case of absentee ballots, all votes should be received prior to the department meeting.

c. All ranks/steps requested by the candidate must be considered and voted upon by the voting members of the department. Record all votes taken unless the vote for higher rank and step is unanimous.

d. The department shall adopt procedures under which the departmental letter setting forth the departmental recommendations shall be available for inspection by all voting members, including faculty who have been given advisory voting privileges.

When the **draft** of the departmental recommendation letter is ready for review, the Chair is responsible for communicating to the faculty where the **draft** is available for review. The Chair must also provide the faculty with a due date for receipt of any comments to the draft. It is advisable to allow, at a minimum, a period of 48 hours. Once the due date has passed, the Chair must review any comments received from the faculty, and to the extent possible, incorporate those comments into the **finalized** departmental recommendation letter.

The Chair must then notify the faculty that the **finalized** departmental letter is available for review (but no further comments from the faculty will be allowed except for corrections of errors of fact).

The date on which the Chair notifies the faculty of the **finalized** departmental letter is also the date that starts the clock for the 5 business days for the submission of any minority reports.

Identifiers of extramural and student letters are to be limited to numerical or alphabetical designations in the department letter. The same protection of confidentiality should also be extended to statements made by candidate 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.H)

A 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.

e. Minority reports are intended to permit interpretations of fact and academic judgment which differ materially from those expressed in the departmental letter. Minority reports must address the evaluation of teaching, research, and service as discussed at the department meeting but not viewed as being represented in the department letter. The report may not contain comments on procedures/processes used to assemble the file or conduct the meeting. 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 (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 business 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.9.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.

9. Procedures After the Departmental Recommendation is Determined

Before the file is forwarded:

a. The candidate shall be provided a copy of the departmental letter and all minority reports if requested on Section II of the procedural safeguard form and shall be informed verbally of the following:
(i) The departmental recommendation including the nature of the departmental vote.
(ii) The substance of the departmental evaluations under each of the criteria.

b. The candidate has the right to make a written comment on the departmental recommendation (and minority reports, if any). The candidate's written comment, to be transmitted within five business days of receipt of the departmental letter, may be addressed to the Chair, the Dean, or the VPAP. (It is the joint responsibility of the candidate and the department to verify the date the candidate received a copy of the departmental letter as noted on Section II E.3 of the procedural safeguard form.) The candidate must use Attachment H for his or her response, and specify to whom the response is addressed:

- **If addressed to the Chair**, it will be added to the department's copy of the file and will proceed with the forwarded file through the review process. The Chair must make the document known and available to departmental faculty members eligible to vote on the case. Department faculty may not comment on a response to the department letter.

- **If addressed to the Dean**, it will not be sent to the department, but the Dean will inform the Department Chair that a written statement has been received from the candidate without revealing the contents. A written statement that is addressed directly to the Dean will be forwarded to the Vice Provost's Office and to CAP but will not be sent to an ad hoc review committee, unless the candidate specifically requests that the statement be included in the file that goes to the ad hoc committee.

- **If addressed to the VPAP**, the response will be reviewed only by CAP and the Chancellor or his/her designee. The VPAP will inform the Department Chair and Dean that a written statement has been received from the candidate without revealing its contents.

  The candidate's written comments in quinquennial reviews and merit files (including Professor within above Scale) are limited to two pages. The candidate's written comments in advancements to Professor VI, Professor Above-Scale, promotions, career reviews, reappointments, and appraisals are not limited in length.

c. The candidate and Department Chair must sign Section II of the Procedural Safeguards Statement (Attachment B-1)

In eFile, the same processes and documentation requirements apply with the entry, review, approval and routing done electronically via the eFile system.

10. Procedures During Review Beyond the Department

a. Corrections to the File

After review by the department faculty and the Dean, no additions to the file are permitted apart from recommendations of subsequent reviewing bodies, and as permitted under section II.A.9.b or section II.A.12.a. No changes in the status of publications may be made. Only corrections of fact are permitted. The candidate must be informed of any correction. If requested by reviewing bodies beyond the Dean, corrections must have documented departmental review before being forwarded. The exceptional requests apply only to cases outside of the 220 process and will use a file cut-off date of the last calendar day in February.

If the correction is on the list of publications, the department should submit a new page or pages reflecting the change. The candidate shall certify on Part 2 of the Procedural Safeguards Statement that he/she has been informed of the corrections in the file.(Attachment B-2). The new corrected page should be dated and should be submitted with a note indicating what the changes are and which existing page in the list of publications is being replaced with the substituted page. (The old page will be discarded by the departmental office, Dean's office and the APO.) The new corrected page will then become part of the original file and will be considered as such.

If a correction is made to the departmental letter, the corrected departmental letter should show the original date AND all subsequent revised dates. The candidate must certify on Part 2 of the Procedural Safeguards Statement that he/she has been informed of the changes in the file. (see

Attachment B-2). Any revision in the departmental letter affords the candidate a five business-day period to respond to the departmental letter (see section II.A.9.b).
In eFile, the same processes and documentation requirements apply with the update, review, approval and routing done electronically via the eFile system.

b. Additional Information Solicited During Review

i. If additional clarifying information or an update is requested by an ad hoc committee (in cases involving ad hoc committees), or by CAP, such information shall be solicited through the VPAP. If additional information is requested by the VPAP, EVCP or the Chancellor after CAP's recommendation has been forwarded, CAP shall be informed of the request and the response. Deans may also independently solicit information already present in the file but may not solicit updates to the file, i.e. the Dean may write directly to the department (or the candidate via the department) asking for clarifications if there is not enough information about the candidate's role in a joint publication (or on a committee, or in a grant, etc). For update requests involving cases other than a 220 response or 7th year tenure review, the last calendar day in February will be used as the cut-off date.

ii. All responses shall be limited to the specific information requested in the memo from the VPAP (or Dean if applicable) and will be added to the file at the department level and routed to all subsequent reviewing bodies. The department may comment on the new material and may submit a new vote or may reiterate its original recommendation. If the department opts out of commenting, or re-voting, the file must contain a statement from the Department Chair indicating that the department was made aware of the clarification or correction but has decided not to comment or re-vote. The requesting body must specify whether or not a department vote is required with the new material.

iii. A new department vote will require an addendum to the department letter and subsequent waiting periods.

iv. The candidate shall be informed by the Chair of the substance of the changes in the file, without disclosure of the identities of sources of confidential documents, and may be provided access to the new material in accord with APM-220-80-d.

v. The candidate shall be provided the opportunity to make a timely written statement on the amended file for inclusion in the file.

vi. The candidate shall certify on Part 2 of the Procedural Safeguards Statement that he/she has been informed of the changes in the file. (Attachment B-2)

vii. In the case of updates to the list of publications, it is understood that these may not appear on subsequent Difference Lists if the advancement is awarded except as described in II.B.7.

11. Procedures for Announcement of Administrative Decision

a. Merits cases (including advancements to Professor VI and Professor Above-Scale [A/S]):

i. The decision on the candidate's file will be communicated to the Chair through the Dean, with a copy of the decision announcement to CAP. The Chair shall promptly communicate the decision to the candidate.

ii. Appeals to merit decisions are not permitted except for procedural violations.

iii. The candidate may request access to records (including the CAP report, the Dean's letter and the Chair's letter, if any) as outlined in section I.D.1, after the Chancellor's or his/her designee's final decision has been communicated. If the candidate has requested access to designated records on the Procedural Safeguards Statement, these will be automatically furnished by the APO.

b. Appointment, reappointment, formal appraisal, or promotion to Associate Professor and Professor:

i. In the following situations the Chancellor's first assessment is considered preliminary and it triggers the 220 process (see II.A.12):

- If the Chancellor's preliminary assessment is negative in cases for 7th year promotions to tenure, or
- If the Chancellor's preliminary assessment is negative in cases for reappointments of Assistant Professors, or
- If the Chancellor's preliminary assessment is contrary to the recommendation of the department, Dean or CAP.

In these cases the Chancellor makes the final decision after the completion of the 220 process.

ii. In cases where all reviewing bodies are negative for a non-seventh-year promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, promotion to Professor, appointment, or fifth-year appraisals, the Chancellor's (or designee's) first assessment constitutes the final decision and a 220 process will not be initiated.

iii. The final decision of the Chancellor will be communicated in writing by the EVCP to the Chair of the department through the Dean. The Chair shall promptly communicate the decision to the candidate. The announcement for 7th year cases will occur soon after the Chancellor's final decision. The decision announcement will be communicated in writing by the EVCP to the Chair of the department through the Dean, with a copy to CAP. The Chair shall promptly communicate the decision to the candidate.

c. **Candidate's access to records:** The candidate may request access to records (including the CAP report, the Dean's letter and the Chair's letter, if any) as outlined in section I.D.1, after the Chancellor's or his/her designee's final decision has been communicated. If the candidate has requested access to designated records on the Procedural Safeguards Statement, these will be automatically furnished by the APO.

12. Appeals of Promotion, Appraisals and Appointment Cases – 220 Response

a. Updates:

i. The 7th year promotion to tenure candidate may continuously update the file until the earlier of two events: the announcement of a positive promotion decision by the Chancellor or April 30 of the seventh year. New or updated information should be provided as it becomes available, through the appropriate channels. For non-7th year promotions, promotions to full professor, appraisals and appointments, if applicable a one-time 220 update through April 30 may be solicited. Acceptable updates for these cases include significant service commitments, additional teaching evaluations, grant awards, publications, and previously solicited extramural letters (including student letters) which arrived late. Letters resulting from a solicitation by the candidate are not allowed. Departmental responses are limited to comments on the new material. See II.A.12.b for details. For off-cycle 7th year promotions, the date will be adjusted accordingly.

ii. Promotion to tenure cases that are brought before the seventh year, promotions to Professor, appointments, reappointments or fifth-year appraisals are not allowed the

continuous update to file. In these instances, the one-time 220 update through April 30, is allowed if the preliminary assessment is contrary to the recommendation of the department, Dean or CAP as described in section II.A.12.b.

b. Preliminary Contrary or Negative Decisions (220 process; APM 220-8-j and APM 220-84-b):
If a 220 process is mandatory the VPAP shall initiate the 220 process as follows:

i. The EVCP shall communicate the preliminary assessment in writing to the Chair of the department through the Dean, with a copy to CAP. The letter must indicate the reasons for the preliminary decision and ask for any further information that might support a different decision. The Chair shall provide the candidate with a copy of the EVCP's statement.

ii. If the 220 process is completed prior to April 30, the file will be held at APO until April 30 to await further updates. During that period, the candidate has the right to submit further updates. Updated information may include additions to the originally submitted file, such as grants, publications, and/or teaching evaluations. Extramural letters shall not be solicited. If the 220 process is completed after April 30, only material dated April 30 or before will be accepted.

iii. The candidate may waive the right to hold the file open until April 30 in the interest of an earlier decision. In this case, the file is closed to further updates when the candidate waives updating rights.

iv. The candidate may request (in writing) access to records from APO. The request form is given as Attachment A-1. If the candidate has requested access to designated records on the Procedural Safeguards Statement, these will automatically be furnished by the APO. The department Chair and the Dean will also be provided with copies of records supplied to the candidate at this time. These materials should also be made available to the members of the department who are eligible to vote.

v. The department review shall include a new departmental vote. Procedures after the department recommendation is determined, as set forth under II-A-9, shall be followed.

vi. The updated file is forwarded by the Chair to the Dean for review. The Dean shall include his/her recommendation based on the updated file. The updated file is then reviewed by CAP, and a final decision is made by the Chancellor. No appeal of the final decision is permitted since the addition of information to the file has provided the opportunity for appeal of the Chancellor's preliminary assessment.

vii. If the promotion is approved as a result of the response to the preliminary assessment, the decision is based on the resubmitted file.

viii. The final decision of the Chancellor will be communicated in writing by the EVCP to the Chair of the department though the Dean. Once the final decision has been communicated to the candidate, the candidate may request access to records. The request form is given as Attachment A-1. If the candidate has requested access to designated records on the Procedural Safeguards Statement, these will automatically be furnished by the APO. The department Chair and the Dean will also be provided with copies of records supplied to the candidate at this time. At this time, the candidate may also request a statement of reasons for the final negative decision.

c. Non-reappointment for Assistant Professors or Other Appointees of Equivalent Rank:
According to academic personnel regulations, each appointment and reappointment of an Assistant Professor is for a maximum term of two years. Thus, it is possible that non-reappointment of an Assistant Professor may occur at the end of any such term of contract or during an appraisal review. [See also Appraisal, Merit and Reappointment of Assistant Professors.]

If a recommendation for the terminal appointment of an Assistant Professor is made by a Dean, campus ad hoc review committee, and/or CAP, or if the Chancellor's preliminary assessment is to make a terminal appointment or not to reappoint, then, before there is a final decision by the Chancellor to make a terminal appointment or not to reappoint, the procedures set forth in the preceding section (II.A.12.b) must be followed.

B. Instructions for Specific Actions

1. Advancement to Above-Scale

Use the checklist found in Attachment C-5
Period of Review: Include activity since Advancement to Professor VI
Approval Authority: Chancellor

Advancements to Professor Above-Scale examine the candidate's file with respect to the criteria as set forth in APM 220-18-b(4).

- Files sent forward for consideration of this advancement should include the following:
- Extramural evaluation by very senior faculty familiar with the UC rank and step system
- Extramural evaluation by national and international experts
- Evidence of international research leadership and visibility
- Compelling evidence that the candidate is considered by his or her peers to be among those at the top of the field of research
- Evidence of teaching excellence for those with teaching experience. In unusual cases, truly outstanding researchers may be hired at the above-scale level without formal university teaching experience, provided that a strong case can be made for their communication skills and mentorship.
- National service leadership
- Prestigious award(s) for research

Advancements to Above Scale must show significant evidence of new achievement, and except in the most rare and compelling cases will not occur at intervals of less than four years at Step IX.

2. Advancement within Above-Scale

Use the checklist found in Attachment C-5.
Period of Review: Include activity since last merit within Above-Scale
Approval Authority: EVCP

A further merit within Above-Scale must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Intervals between advancements within above scale 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-b(4)).

3. Advancement to Professor VI

Use the checklist found in Attachment C-5.
Period of Review: Include activity since Promotion to Professor
Approval Authority: EVCP

Advancement to Step VI usually will not occur after less than three years of service at Step V, and will be granted on evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in each of the following

three categories: (1) scholarship or creative achievement, (2) University teaching, and (3) service. Above and beyond that, great academic distinction, recognized nationally, will be required in scholarly or creative achievement or teaching. A recommendation for acceleration to this step requires highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellent University teaching at the standards noted in APM 220-18-b(4).

4. **Appointment**

Use the Appointment Checklists found in Attachments C-7 & C-8.
Approval Authority:
Assistant Professor I, II & III – Dean
Assistant Professor IV and above – Chancellor

An academic appointee is defined as one who is engaged primarily in one or more of the following: teaching, research, and public service, and whose duties are closely related to the University's instructional and research functions. Academic Personnel Definitions are located in APM 110-4.

Appointments must be offered in writing and signed by the candidate to whom approval authority has been delegated (see Delegation of Authority Chart). APM 133 provides a list of titles which count toward the eight-year limitation rule. Any break in service for an academic will be treated as a new hire and requires full review. Titles for academics employed on a year-to-year basis and subject to appointment renewal must be informed that the appointment is for a specified term, i.e. an ipso facto statement.

Use the Faculty Hiring Toolkit for a detailed description of the faculty appointment process.

5. **Appraisal**

Use the checklist found in Attachment C-1.
Period of Review: Include activity since Appointment
Approval Authority: VPAP

Each Assistant Professor shall be appraised during his/her fifth year of service as an Assistant Professor (or fifth year of service in combination with other applicable titles which lead to tenure) unless s/he is proposed for advancement to tenure rank during that year. This appraisal is mandatory and is intended to comply with the intent of APM 220-83-a.

Procedures and criteria for the appraisal of Assistant Professors, to determine whether they are making satisfactory progress toward tenure rank, are located in APM 220-82 and 220-83.

The possible outcomes for an appraisal are positive, qualified positive or negative. It is also possible that an appraisal review may lead to a recommendation for a non-reappointment. If so, procedures as outlined in APM 220-84 will be followed.

In cases that originated from an appraisal (i.e. file was prepared as an appraisal file but the department or other reviewing bodies opted to additionally vote on a reappointment), the file should be augmented at the department level and would come forward as two independent files, one for an appraisal and a second for reappointment.

If an Assistant Professor does not provide the required material to prepare an appraisal file by the departmental due date, the Department Chair will inform the Dean and the VPAP in writing and detail the circumstances. The Department Chair will provide a copy of the document to the

candidate. In the absence of unusual mitigating circumstances, the VPAP will determine whether a recommendation for a non-reappointment should be considered.

6. Career Review

Use the checklist found in Attachment C-2.
Period of Review:
If promotion was greater or equal to 5 years, include activity since last promotion.
If less than 5 years, include activity since the previous promotion or appointment.
Approval Authority: EVCP/Chancellor

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. Departments and Deans should also be alert to this possibility that on rare occasions a faculty member may be seriously out of place on the rank/step scale. The purpose of a Career Review is to assess the candidate's overall record in order to determine the appropriate rank/step placement. Candidates for a Career Review are encouraged to submit an optional professional C.V. with his/her file in the "Other" section.

Ordinarily the Career Review is initiated, by the candidate's written request, in the department and follows the procedures for promotion, complete with extramural letters. The Career Review solicitation letter (Attachment E-7) must be used for all extramural evaluators. The candidate needs to specify a rank and step for which he/she wishes to be considered. All ranks/steps requested by the candidate must be considered by the voting members of the department and subsequent votes submitted. Record all votes taken unless the vote for higher rank and step is unanimous.

Alternatively, the candidate may (upon written request to the Dean) elect to have his/her Career Review file initiated and prepared at the appropriate Dean's office. The Dean's office assembles the file, including letters requested from extramural evaluators. The Dean consults with the department and the candidate for the names of potential reviewers and may also solicit additional reviewers. Upon completion of the file (after the Dean has met with the candidate to review the contents of the file), the Dean forwards the file to the department for departmental review and vote. Thereafter, the file is handled by the normal procedures for promotion.

There is no option for appeal of the outcome of the Career Review process.

Once a Career Review occurs, two positive advancement reviews must be completed before another Career Review may be requested. Exceptions to this policy will be considered on a case by case basis by the VPAP before the review is initiated.

If the time period since last promotion or advancement (i.e. Step VI) is less than or equal to 5 years, a Career Review file will include materials since the previous promotion or appointment, whichever occurred first. In all cases, a complete bibliography will be included in the file.

7. Deferral

Use the form found in Attachment C-2.

A tenured candidate with an appointment below Professor V may submit the "Deferral Request Form" (Attachment C-3) on or before the published dates for merits or promotions and advancements. The form must be routed to the Chair, the Dean, and then to APO, who shall in turn notify CAP of the deferral. No file or department vote is required for a deferral.

For a Professor above Step V service at step may be of indefinite duration. Therefore, it is not necessary to request a deferral when a candidate is not being proposed for an advancement.

Deferral requests will not be considered as fulfilling the mandatory quinquennial review.

Assistant Professors may not request a deferral. However, Assistant Professors may elect to have their file considered for a reappointment (no change in step/salary) rather than a merit advancement, provided they are not due for a mandatory (7th year) promotion to tenure review. For Assistant Professors who receive a denied merit, a file is required to be submitted the following year. The candidate may elect to have their file considered for either a merit advancement or a reappointment, provided they are not due for a mandatory (7th year) promotion to tenure review.

8. Lateral Promotion

Movement between overlapping steps from one rank to another represents a lateral promotion. Only one Difference List is required for merits following a lateral promotion. The documents in the file shall address the time since last merit advancement. For example, in merit consideration to Associate Professor II following a lateral promotion to Associate Professor I after one year at Assistant Professor V, the Difference List will address the time served at Assistant Professor V and Associate Professor I (two years).

9. Merit Advancement

Use the checklist found in Attachment C-4.
Period of Review: Include activity since last advance
Approval Authority: EVCP

Merit candidates should not add copies of publications or creative work to the file unless requested during the review process. eFile users have the benefit of readily including a PDF of publications.

A possible outcome of a merit review for Assistant Professors is consideration of non-reappointment. If the preliminary decision is not to reappoint, the procedures as outlined in APM 220-84 will be followed. In cases that originated from a merit (i.e. file was prepared as a merit file but the department or other reviewing bodies opted to additionally vote on a reappointment), the file should be augmented at the department level to include material since appointment and would come forward as two independent files, one for a merit and a second for reappointment.

If an Assistant Professor does not provide the required material to prepare a merit file by the departmental due date, the Department Chair will inform the Dean and the VPAP in writing and detail the circumstances. The Department Chair will provide a copy of the document to the candidate. In the absence of unusual mitigating circumstances, the VPAP will determine whether a recommendation for a non-reappointment should be considered.

Appeals to merit decisions are not permitted except for procedural violations.

10. Off-Scale (O/S) Salary (APM 620)

Off Scale is typically awarded only at appointment or retention. Departments or Deans should not propose O/S for existing faculty unless this action is supported by extraordinary circumstances or extraordinary accomplishment of the candidate.

All O/S salary proposals for new faculty appointments require documented approval from the EVCP except in the following cases:

(a) For Assistant I, II and III, when the O/S is no more than $100 less than the next step at the Assistant Professor rank.

(b) For LSOE/PSOE, when the O/S is no more than $100 less than Assistant Professor IV.

The EVCP may consult CAP, on an ad hoc basis, for review of O/S proposals for retention of faculty. All O/S proposals for preemptive retention requests from Deans will be reviewed by CAP.

All O/S granted will be maintained subject to market adjustments to the UC salary scale. All O/S salary granted will be qualified by the statement "this O/S will be maintained as long as satisfactory academic progress is made". This is in effect for 2010 actions onwards. The policy is available on the APO website at:
http://academicpersonnel.ucr.edu/salary/OffScalePolicyJuly12010.pdf

11. Promotion

Use the checklist found in Attachment C-5.
Period of Review:
Promotion to Associate Professor – include activity since Appointment
Promotion to Full Professor – include activity since Promotion to Associate Professor
Approval Authority: Chancellor

A promotion review examines the candidate's record with respect to the criteria as set forth in section II.A.5. The question of acceleration should not be an issue in promotion to Associate Professor and Professor cases: the issue is whether the candidate has met the criteria, not whether the criteria have been met in a particular time frame.

In cases where the departmental recommendation for promotion is negative and instead a merit is recommended, all subsequent reviewing bodies must address the merit as well as the promotion.

After the departmental vote on promotion is communicated to the candidate, the candidate may decide not to have the promotion file forwarded for further review. In this case, a memo requesting deferral of consideration for promotion should be forwarded to the candidate's Department Chair and a merit file may be pursued. (See section II.B.6-Deferral.) However, it should be noted that all solicited letters will be used in the subsequent promotion file.

Non-7th year Promotion and Promotion to Full Professor actions may be recommended for a merit, in lieu of a promotion.

In cases where all reviewing bodies are negative for a non-seventh-year promotion, the Chancellor's first assessment constitutes the final decision and a 220 process will not be initiated. If the department did not vote on the lesser merit action, the file will be returned for a departmental consideration per Bylaw 55. In this case, a Bylaw55 memo from the EVCP will be sent requesting for a vote on an action that was not originally considered by the Department and/or Dean. The Chancellor makes the final decision after the completion of the Bylaw 55 process. The merit decision will be based on the file as originally submitted for the promotion consideration.

In cases where the Chancellor's preliminary assessment is contrary to the recommendation of the department, Dean or CAP, the 220 process will be initiated (see 220 Process). If the department and/or Dean did not vote on the lesser merit action, the 220 memo will include a request to vote on an action that was not originally considered by the Department and/or Dean (Bylaw55).

Assistant Professors may not defer but may instead opt to submit a merit or reappointment file provided the candidate is not in his/her 7th year.

12. Quinquennial Review

Use the checklist found in Attachment C-6.
Period of Review: include activity for the past 5 years
Approval Authority: VPAP

All tenured faculty members, including those at open steps (Professor V and above) and those who hold administrative appointments, are required to be reviewed every five years (APM 200-0 and 220-80-b). For a 100% time administrator who has held the administrative position for five years, an administrative review may be used in lieu of a personnel review. For personnel reviews, the Chair is to prepare a file with the candidate after the fourth year with no review. The candidate may choose whether to submit a merit, promotion (if appropriate) or quinquennial review file. Merit and promotion files would follow their normal procedures. Non-submission of materials by a faculty member will not constitute automatic deferral.

A quinquennial review file results in a satisfactory, satisfactory with qualifications or unsatisfactory outcome. Candidates need not meet the criteria for merit advancement to receive a satisfactory recommendation in a quinquennial review, but they should show an acceptable level of performance in each of the areas of evaluation. A satisfactory quinquennial review requires suitable evidence of the following aspects of the candidate's performance during the last five years:

- Documented record of quality teaching, commensurable with the candidate's rank and stature as a faculty member in the University of California system;
- Documented record of substantial and valuable service to the University and to the public, commensurable with the candidate's rank and step;
- Documented record of a serious effort to engage in meaningful research and/or creative activity and professional service.

The focus of this review should be to provide constructive feedback aimed at maximizing the candidate's effectiveness in the above-mentioned areas.

If a candidate does not provide the required material to prepare a quinquennial file by the departmental due date, the Department Chair will inform the Dean and the VPAP in writing and detail the circumstances. In the absence of unusual mitigating circumstances, the candidate's performance will be deemed unsatisfactory.

Should an evaluation result in a review decision of "unsatisfactory", the candidate can expect guidance from the Department Chair, Dean, and/or the Chancellor's office.

13. **Reappointment of Assistant Professors**

Use the checklist found in Attachment C-10.
Period of Review: include activity since Appointment
Approval Authority: EVCP/Chancellor

Appointment of an Assistant Professor is typically made for a maximum term of two years with renewal occurring biennially at the conclusion of a positive merit evaluation. Alternatively, an Assistant Professor may *choose* to submit a reappointment file in lieu of a merit file during any period of merit eligibility. Assistant Professors who receive a denied merit are reappointed for only one year and are required to submit a review file the following year. The candidate may elect to submit a merit consideration or a reappointment, provided a mandatory (7th year) promotion to tenure is not due. Appraisal eligibility is independent of assistant professor merit or reappointment eligibility.

Candidates need not meet the criteria for merit advancement to receive a recommendation for a reappointment, but they should show an acceptable level of performance in each of the areas of evaluation. A reappointment requires suitable evidence of the following aspects of the candidate's performance since appointment:

• Documented record of quality teaching, commensurable with the candidate's rank and step as a faculty member in the University of California system;
• Documented record of service to the University and to the public, commensurable with the candidate's rank and step;
• Documented record of an effort to engage in meaningful research and/or creative activity and professional service.

For cases of reappointment of Assistant Professors, submitted items may be counted in the review and mentioned in the department letter. In these cases the discussion of the submitted work is expected and the evaluation should be based on careful reviews of the appointee's progress, promise, and achievement.

The purpose of this review is to offer an alternative to a mandatory two-year review of Assistant Professors. The reappointment option may be especially of use for an Assistant Professor who is returning from an extended period of leave and may not have a documented record of sufficient research, teaching or service to justify a merit, but clearly is on track to warrant reappointment.

In cases that originated from a merit (i.e. file was prepared as a merit file but the department or other reviewing bodies opted to additionally vote on a reappointment), the file should be augmented at the department level to include material since appointment and would come forward as two independent files, one for a merit and a second for reappointment.

Possible outcomes of a reappointment review are 1) a positive review resulting in a two-year appointment extension; or 2) non-reappointment with a terminal year. In the latter case, the procedures as outlined in APM 220-84 will be followed. (See page 15.)

If an Assistant Professor does not provide the required material to prepare a merit or reappointment file by the departmental due date, the Department Chair will inform the Dean and the VPAP in writing and detail the circumstances. In the absence of unusual mitigating circumstances, the preliminary consideration will be for non-reappointment with a terminal year and the procedures as outlined in APM 220-84 will be followed. (See page 15.)

C. Other Reviews and Recommendations

1. Department Chair

It is the responsibility of the Dean to initiate review of Departmental Chairs who have completed normal time in rank and step. In those cases in which a Chair will be put up for advancement, the procedures are identical to those for any candidate except that the Dean

designates a senior member of the department to fulfill the Chair's duties in the case, including preparation of the departmental letter. This faculty member may also submit a letter equivalent to the Chair's letter, which shall be added to the file at the Dean's office (the office of record) and forwarded with the file. The candidate may be provided access to this "Chair's letter" as outlined in section III.H.

The Dean shall also review the record of each Chair to determine whether a recommendation for acceleration should be considered by the voting members of the department. A recommendation for acceleration will be considered by the voting members of the department if a request is made by the Dean, the candidate (i.e., the Chair), or any other ladder rank faculty member of the department.

While it is expected that Department Chairs shall remain active in both teaching and research, it is understood that a Chairperson will have less time to devote to these areas. The Dean should address any shifts in academic activity for the Chair in the decanal review letter. See APM 245.

2. Joint Appointments in two or more units*

For purposes of the personnel review of joint appointees, one of the departments will be considered as the principal department. Ordinarily this will be the department with the larger percentage of FTE. For joint appointments in which the FTE split is 50-50, the candidate will write a brief memo to the Chancellor's Office requesting that one of the two departments be designated as the principal department. This declaration, once made, applies indefinitely and need not be restated. The request should be forwarded via the Chairs of both departments to the Dean(s) for their reviews.

The Chair of the principal department has the responsibility of holding a joint meeting with the candidate and other Chair before either department considers the file. The purpose of this meeting is to review personnel procedures, to assemble information for the file and, where appropriate, to allow the candidate to suggest names of persons to be solicited for extramural letters. Names for extramural referees may be suggested to either or both Chairs who then will solicit additional names of referees from their departments so as to ensure the balanced assessment specified in section III. M. Both Chairs should be aware of all letters being sought.

The personnel files to be reviewed by each department shall contain identical information. Thus, it is the responsibility of the Chair of the principal department to arrange to have all information, including external letters obtained by the other department, collected in a single file which can then be duplicated for review by both departments.

Under APM 220-80-d, "Before the departmental recommendation is determined, the Chair shall provide the candidate the opportunity to inspect all documents in the personnel review file other than confidential academic review records (as defined in APM-160-20-b (1)), and shall provide to the candidate upon request a redacted copy (as defined in APM 160-20-c (4)) of the confidential academic review records in the file."

The provisions of the above APM 220-80-d will be carried out by the Chair of the principal department only.

Each department will independently evaluate the candidate and make a recommendation, emphasizing where appropriate those portions of the candidate's responsibilities which are specific to that department. The Chair of each department will prepare a departmental letter to be sent to the Dean (and, if another college or school is involved, to the other Dean as well). When

both departments are ready to forward their respective recommendations, there shall be a meeting of both Chairs and the candidate, during which each Chair will give the candidate an oral summary of his/her departmental recommendation. The candidate will not be given such an oral summary except at that meeting with both Chairs present. Any written form of the departmental recommendation will also be given to the other Department Chair and to the candidate, on request.
*The unit must be a department, a school, or a division (APM 220 – Appendix A).

3. **Full-Time Lecturers and Full-Time Sr. Lecturers with Security of Employment (SOE) and with Potential Security of Employment (PSOE) (APM 285)**
   Use the Checklists found in Attachments C-4A, C-5A, C-6A and C-7A

   Lecturers with Potential Security of Employment and Lecturers or Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment are members of the Academic Senate when appointed at 100%. Refer to UCR Guidelines for Appointment, Compensation, Advancement, and Promotion criteria: http://academicpersonnel.ucr.edu/policies/LecturersSOEandPSOEGuidelinesFINAL.pdf

D. Access to Academic Personnel Records (APM 158 & 160)

Regulations regarding access by a candidate to his/her academic personnel records appear in APM 158 and 160.

1. **The basic regulations pertaining to access include:**
   a. All documents pertaining to a candidate, except confidential documents, shall be accessible for inspection by the candidate (APM160-20-b-2).
   b. Candidates can obtain a redaction of confidential documents in such records (APM 160-20-b-1).
   c. If a candidate has requested access to academic personnel records pertaining to that candidate, material other than that called for under the conditions of redaction shall not be deleted from such records.

2. **Requests for corrections, deletions, additions to personnel records**
   APM 160-30 contains provisions whereby a candidate has the opportunity to request corrections or deletions in academic personnel records and to make additions to such records. Such requests shall be addressed to the VPAP who shall, within 30 calendar days, determine whether the request shall be granted. In any event, the candidate shall have the right to have inserted in the appropriate record any statement the candidate wishes in response to or commenting upon the challenged material.

3. **Procedures to be followed by faculty members when requesting access to records**
   The specific procedures are divided into two categories: procedures in relation to an ongoing personnel review (APM 220) and procedures for access to all other records (APM 160).

4. **Access by Third Parties**
   Per APM 160-20-d-1: Access by University officers and employees to academic review records shall be strictly limited to those officers and employees who need such access in the performance of their officially assigned duties, provided that such access is related to the purpose for which the information was acquired. To request access to records, Department Chairs and Deans must submit attachment A-2.

III. DOCUMENTS

It is the candidate's and the Department Chair's responsibility to document the file in an adequate manner. Review will be based only on what is contained in the file. It is in the candidate's interest to provide all pertinent material and information to the department and to be certain the file is complete (as verified by the Procedural Safeguard Statement).

A. Ad Hoc Review Committee Report (Senate)

(APM 210-1a) describes the appointment of ad hoc committees.
An ad hoc review committee may be appointed for any action when it is determined by CAP, VPAP, EVCP or Chancellor that additional expert analysis is required in order to make a more informed recommendation. In cases when an ad hoc committee is utilized, the Dean's letter will be removed from the file being forwarded to the ad hoc committee. The redacted ad hoc report will be forwarded to the Dean and the Dean will be given the opportunity to respond. Both of the Dean's letters will then be added to the file and will remain as part of the file. Ad hoc committees will be comprised of a committee Chair, typically one or two committee members and one non-voting department representative. The department representative will act as a consultant during discussion, will not be present during the ad hoc vote and will not be given access to the ad hoc report.
Note: Redaction of ad hoc committee reports will consist of the removal of the names of individual members of the committee. (APM 160-20-c(4))

B. Ad Hoc Committee Report (Departmental)

The reports of ad hoc committees, internal to the department, are regarded as working documents within the department and are not part of the file, nor may they be forwarded with the file. Departments should develop their own procedures on how or if they will utilize internal ad hoc committees and reports. Departmental ad hoc committee reports and membership are confidential (See APM 160-20-b-1-c).

C. Bibliography of Publications and/or Creative Activity (UC format) – At Last Advance

The bibliography at last advance should be included in the file forwarded to the APO.

D. Bibliography of Publications and/or Creative Activity (UC format) – Current

Except as noted in Sections II.A.10.a and II.A.10.b, this document may not be updated beyond the File Entry dates specified in Section I. Schedule. The current Bibliography will be forwarded with the file. Items that are "in preparation" or "in progress" should not be included in the bibliography or difference list except in cases of reappointment of Assistant Professor. For cases other than reappointment of Assistant Professor, these items may be described in the candidate's self statement. Items omitted from previous reviews may be added to the current Bibliography but not on the current Difference List.

Only work produced by the candidate is allowable on the bibliography. Candidate items should be listed in chronological order (oldest to newest) and grouped into similar categories, followed by the status of the item (published, in press, or submitted [optional]), such as the following example:

I. Technical Journal Articles
   - A. Technical Journal Articles Published
   - B. Technical Journal Articles In Press
   - C. Technical Journal Articles submitted (optional)

II. Semi-technical Journal Articles
   - A. Semi-technical Journal Articles Published
   - B. Semi-technical Journal Articles In Press
   - C. Semi-technical Journal Articles submitted (optional)

1. Categories

   a. Separate categories may include: technical journal articles, semi-technical journal articles, review articles, book reviews, conference proceedings, book chapters and contributions to edited volumes, books, monographs, edited volumes, textbooks, etc. Departments may be flexible in employing the categories as relevant for their discipline. Items are considered technical when they are directed to other scholars in the field. Items that have a scholarly basis but are directed to non-experts are considered semi-technical and should be listed in a separate category.

   b. Citation of reprinted and/or translated items shall be included immediately after the original item and shall not be accorded a separate number in the enumerated list of items.

   c. List edited volumes and special issues of a journal only once, noting the editorial contribution (e.g., editor's introduction) by the author. If the edited volume also contains an original contribution as an author (not as the editor), this item should be listed separately in the category of contributions to edited volumes, as if it were contributed to a volume edited by another candidate. If the edited work does not contain original editorial material or is not the product of scholarly research of the candidate, then the work should be listed in the professional service activity portion of the file. This would apply for editorial work as a journal or series editor.

   d. Conference proceedings that subsequently appear as journal articles should be so noted. Abstracts and reports may be included at the author's discretion.

2. Status

   a. Published. Complete citation information should be provided about each published item, including page numbers and full journal title. The citation listing should indicate whether the item will appear exclusively as an electronic publication, or whether it will also appear in print. In the case of multiple-authored work, the sequence of authors shall be listed in the order they appear on the publication. For each item, indicate which are refereed, non-refereed, and/or invited. Articles are considered refereed when they have been evaluated by other scholars prior to acceptance for publication. Articles are considered non-refereed when the judgment of the editor is the sole determinant of acceptance for publication.

   b. In Press. Items that have been unconditionally accepted for publication are included as In Press. Letters of acceptance must be included for any item listed as In Press. List the date accepted (or the date the galley was received), publisher, and number of manuscript pages (or published pages, if known). For books to be considered accepted for publication, the book must be completely written and unconditionally accepted by a publisher. Chapters are considered In Press when all of the following are true: i) the chapter is fully completed, ii) the chapter has been unconditionally accepted by an editor, and iii) the chapter is contained in a book that has a signed contract with a publishing company.

   c. Submitted. Items under submission, may be included on the Bibliography, at the author's discretion. If an item is included on the publication list, it should also be included on the Difference List. Submitted items should include the submission date, publisher, number of manuscript pages, and order of authorship as it appears on the manuscript. For an article, chapter, book, or edited book to be listed as submitted the entire manuscript must have been submitted to the publisher, not a partial or incomplete manuscript. Submitted items should not be counted in the review nor mentioned in the department letter except briefly. For cases of reappointment of Assistant Professors, submitted items may be counted in the review and mentioned in the department letter. In these cases the discussion of the submitted work is expected and the evaluation should be based on careful reviews of the appointee's progress, promise, and achievement.

3. Patents

There are three primary stages in the pursuit of a patent: a) UC Disclosure of Invention; b) Patent Application Filing with US Patent and Trademark Office; and c) Issuance of a US Patent by US Patent and Trademark Office.

a. UC Disclosure of Invention.

Under University policy, all potentially patentable inventions must be disclosed to the University. This is accomplished by submitting a Record of Invention Form. Upon receipt, the record of invention is assigned a UC Case Number. Technically, this constitutes a filing within the UC system, but is often referred to as "Patent Disclosure". This should be listed on the bibliography as shown in the following example.

SMITH, MARY (List all names on disclosure)
UC Case No.: 1999-008-4
Title: "A NOVEL FORMULATION OF PHOSPHORUS FERTILIZERS FOR PLANTS"
Status: Disclosure **Date Disclosed:** June 03, 1999

b. Patent Application Filing with US Patent & Trademark Office

If it is decided to proceed with filing a patent application, the completed patent application is submitted in the inventor's name to the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The official status at this stage is "Patent Pending". Patent activity at this stage should be listed as follows:

SMITH, MARY (List all names on disclosure)
UC Case No.: 1999-008-4
Title: "A NOVEL FORMULATION OF PHOSPHORUS FERTILIZERS FOR PLANTS"
Status: Patent Pending **Date Filed:** February 23, 2000

c. Issuance of Patent by US Patent and Trademark Office

Once a patent is issued, it is given a public patent number. Patented properties should be listed as follows:

SMITH, MARY (List all names on disclosure)
UC Case No.: 1999-008-4
Title: "A NOVEL FORMULATION OF PHOSPHORUS FERTILIZERS FOR PLANTS"
Status: U.S. Patent No. 5,514,200 **Date Issued:** August 2, 2001

E. Biography Form - Current

The Biography form must be updated during each review period and, if in paper form, must be signed.

F. Candidate's response to Departmental Recommendation (Attachment H)

The candidate has five business days from receipt of the departmental letter to provide a written response to the departmental recommendation (and minority reports, if any). This response may be addressed to the Chair, the Dean, or the VPAP. **See section II.A.9.b for procedures.** The candidate's statement in quinquennial reviews and merit files (including Professor within above Scale) is limited to two pages. The candidate's statement in advancements to Professor VI, Professor Above-Scale, promotions, career reviews, reappointments, and appraisals are not limited in length.

G. Candidate's Response to Extramural Letters and/or Other Contents of the File

The candidate may submit a statement in response to the redacted copies of confidential documents or as a commentary on the file. This written response will become a part of the file, but it must be submitted to the Chair at least five business days prior to the departmental meeting at which review of the file will occur.

H. Chair's Letter (Optional)

In addition to the departmental letter, the Chair, at his/her discretion may elect to write a separate letter, known as the Chair's letter. Such a letter can be an important part of the file, especially when significant differences of opinion and voting are expressed in the departmental letter. Chairs may not independently add materials to the file that cannot be documented. Chairs may utilize statistical information (e.g. journal rankings, impact factors, citation reports, etc.) that might aid in the evaluation of the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarly activity. The Chair's Letter may not contain comments on procedures/processes used to assemble the file or conduct the meeting. It must adhere to an evaluation of teaching, research, and service. The Chair's letter is a confidential document (See APM 160-20-b-1-b) and should be forwarded to the Dean's office and not retained in the department. The Chair's letter is prepared AFTER the Chair has informed the candidate about the departmental recommendation. Upon request by the candidate, access to the Chair's letter will be provided in redacted form after the final administrative decision has been communicated to the candidate, or at the Chancellor's preliminary assessment stage in promotion and appraisal.

I. Checklist of Documents

The Checklist of Documents appropriate to the type of review should be utilized. These checklists can be found as follows:

CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS	
Type of Action	Attachment #
Advancement to Above-Scale	Attachment C-5
Advancement to Professor VI	Attachment C-5
Advancement within Above-Scale	Attachment C-5
Appointment for Assistant Professor I, II, III	Attachment C-7
Appointment for Assistant Professor IV and above	Attachment C-8
Appointment for Lecturers/Senior Lecturers with SOE or PSOE	Attachment C-7A
Appraisal	Attachment C-1
Career Review	Attachment C-2
Deferral	Attachment C-3
Merit and Assistant Professor Reappointment	Attachment C-4
Merit and Reappointment for Lecturers/Senior Lecturers with SOE or PSOE	Attachment C-4A
Promotion to Associate Professor	Attachment C-5
Promotion to Lecturer or Senior Lecturer with SOE or Senior Lecturer with PSOE	Attachment C-5A
Promotion to Professor	Attachment C-5
Quinquennial Review	Attachment C-6
Quinquennial Review for Lectuers/Senior Lecturers with SOE	Attachment C-6A
Reappointment of Assistant Professors	Attachment C-10

J. Dean's Recommendation Letter

The Dean's letter is not a confidential document. The letter is forwarded to Academic Personnel with the file for merit cases. In cases when an ad hoc is utilized, the Dean's letter will be removed from the file being forwarded to the ad hoc committee. The redacted ad hoc report will be forwarded to the Dean and the Dean will be given the opportunity to respond. Both Deans' letters will then be added to the file and will remain as part of the file.

The Dean's letter should briefly evaluate the file in light of the review criteria (see section II.A.5) and document the Dean's recommendation. All ranks/steps proposed by the department should be evaluated and commented on by the Dean in the Dean's letter. Identifiers of extramural and student letters are to be limited to numerical or alphabetical designations. Deans may not independently add materials to the file that cannot be documented. Deans may utilize statistical information (e.g. journal rankings, impact factors, citation reports, etc.) that might aid in the evaluation of the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarly activity. The Dean's Letter may not contain comments on procedures/processes used to assemble the file or conduct the meeting. It must adhere to an evaluation of teaching, research, and service.

In normal, on-time merit cases with a clear department recommendation, the Dean may simply concur with the department and opt to forego a Dean's letter if s/he has nothing evaluative or informative to add. The Dean will signify his/her concurrence by signature on the department letter. Deans may not simply concur in accelerated merit cases or in merit recommendations where there is a split departmental vote, or where there is not a clear majority (i.e. a +2-3 vote). A Dean's Letter is required for all other actions.

K. Departmental Recommendation Letter

The Chair has the responsibility of writing the departmental letter which provides, from the perspective of the voting faculty of the department, an evaluation of the file and a departmental recommendation. For promotions to Associate Professor and Professor, advancements to Professor VI, Professor Above-Scale, advancement within Professor Above-Scale, Career Reviews, Appraisals and Quinquennials this evaluation should be comprehensive, critical and detailed. For merit files (other than advancements to Professor VI, Professor Above-Scale, and within Professor Above-Scale) this evaluation shall be limited to a maximum of two pages. **See section II.A.8 for procedures.**

1. Contents of the Departmental Letter

The departmental letter must not simply enumerate that which the file contains, but must analyze the materials included in the file and describe the **significance and impact** of the teaching, research, and service contributions. The department letter should not contain information that cannot be documented and should not contain comments on procedures/ processes used to assemble the file or conduct the meeting. The department letter should also not contain detailed discussion of the reasons for a leave of absence, as this may constitute a potential breach of confidentiality. The department may utilize statistical information (e.g. journal rankings, impact factors, citation reports, etc.) that might aid in the evaluation of the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarly activityThe letter shall include the departmental vote(s) in the cover page and shall report any difference of opinion which would explain a minority vote or abstention. Faculty are obligated to give specific reasons for a minority opinion and every effort should be made to assure the department letter reports all views. It should be reported and explained if options have been exercised without comment. Reasons for abstentions also should be explained.

Record all votes taken unless the vote for the higher rank and step is unanimous. If multiple votes are taken, the candidate may ask to exclude votes for steps higher than the one s/he wishes to forward.

a. Introductory Information

The format for the department letter found in Attachment D should be followed. It should include:

(i) present title, rank and step of the candidate and the number of years at the present rank and step. (Previous advancement information should not be included.)
(ii) rank and step recommended.
(iii) the exact vote specifying the number in favor, opposed, abstained and unavailable. (See section II.A.2); include an explanation for negative and/or minority votes in narrative.
(iv) sabbatical leave report status.

b. Evaluation of Teaching
In the evaluation of teaching APM 210-1-d must be considered.
Where possible and applicable, the departmental letter should comment on items such as the following:
(i) The role of the candidate in the graduate and undergraduate instructional program including such items as the amount, variety and difficulty of the teaching assignments and the preparation and attention given by the candidate to his/her teaching responsibilities. Make reference to teaching load data form.
(ii) Out-of-class teaching and advising at both the graduate and undergraduate levels (careful thought should be given to the advising role of each candidate): directed research, special studies, help given to students, office hours with students, contributions to the teaching of other faculty, etc.
(iii) Graduate student supervision and advising: PhDs, Masters, committees, post-doctoral, and Graduate Research Assistant supervision. Attention may be given to the role of the candidate and the candidate's field in attracting high caliber graduate students to the campus.
(iv) Development of new and effective techniques of instruction; writing of teaching materials, manuals, textbooks.
(v) Evaluation of teaching as judged by departmental colleagues. Guidelines dealing with the evaluation of teaching are contained in APM 210-1 and should be consulted by Chairs on behalf of their departments. Among other elements of teaching, faculty colleagues are particularly well qualified to make thoughtful and substantial assessments of the candidate's command of subject matter and continuous growth in his/her field. Faculty perceptions and information should be shared with colleagues at the departmental personnel meeting concerning the candidate and incorporated into the file in an appropriate manner. Departments should be mindful that candidate faculty who write letters of evaluation will be disqualified from service on the candidate's ad hoc committee in cases of appraisal and promotion. In anticipation of such situations, the information may better be incorporated in the departmental letter.
(vi) Evaluation of teaching by students. Materials submitted by students (see III.V) should be discussed by the department in its meeting and summarized and evaluated in the departmental letter. All levels of instruction (lower-division, upper-division, and graduate) performed during the review period should be assessed and commented on. Hearsay is not acceptable for use in teaching evaluations.

c. Evaluation of Research and Creative Activity
Department letters must explain the quality of the candidate's publication venues. References to "top tier" should include information to support such claim in order to inform and assist the review process. Supporting detail is needed since colleagues in a wide variety of fields are involved in the review process.

The departmental letter should evaluate specifically the following:

(i) Contribution to the Scholarly Field
Research and other creative activity should be subjected to critical analysis, not merely enumerated, and should be considered in terms of the significance and quality of contribution that the work makes to the scholarly field. For promotion reviews, the candidate's entire record will be reviewed, including contributions since the last promotion or appointment. For merit reviews, primary emphasis will be placed on the evaluation of contributions since the last advancement. For merits following a lateral promotion, see section II.B.7

(ii) Identification and Classification of Research Items
The Chair should comment in detail on the nature of the publications or creative activity. For example, if the candidate has edited a book or anthology, the candidate's specific contribution should be described and evaluated. The Chair should comment on the quality and nature of the journals and publishers as well as the quality and significance of the work itself.

(iii) Extramural Letters
The Chair may quote from the extramural letters, but quotations cannot substitute for an informed and critical evaluation of the letters and of the academic expertise of persons writing them. 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 candidate faculty members.

d. Evaluation of Professional Activity and University and Public Service
It is the Chair's responsibility to include departmental comments and evaluations, where possible, of the professional activities and service of the candidate. Simple enumeration does not materially assist the review process.

e. Departmental Letter Format
The format of the Departmental Letter should be as shown in Attachment D.

L. Difference List

On a separate "Difference List", enumerate the candidate's recent publications and/or creative activity to be credited since the time of appointment or last positive review. The numbering and format of publications should be consistent in the Difference List and the current Bibliography. The header of the Difference List should include the applicable review period.

In assessing work completed since appointment or last advance, a general guideline followed by all reviewing agencies is not to "credit" an item until it is accepted for publication (or in press). That is, items are credited only once. Items omitted from previous reviews cannot be included on the current Difference List. Submitted items should not be counted nor mentioned in the department letter except briefly. For cases of reappointment of Assistant Professors, submitted items may be counted in the review and mentioned on the department letter. In these cases, the discussion of the submitted work is expected and the evaluation should be based on careful reviews of the appointee's progress, promise, and achievement. Conditionally or provisionally accepted and in-prep items should not be listed except in cases of reappointment of Assistant Professors.

Only work produced by the candidate is allowable on the Difference List; for example reviews written by the candidate are allowable whereas reviews of the candidate's work are not.

For each co-authored item on the Difference List (excluding abstracts or reports), candidates should explain their role (a maximum of 3-4 sentences) and provide information about the collaborators (e.g., graduate student, post doc or technician; rank and institution of collaborator).

For merits following a lateral promotion, see section II.B.8

An optional one page cover sheet (on blue paper) may be included with the Difference List. The cover sheet should briefly provide a clear description of the quality and characteristics of the venues in which the candidate publishes.

M. Extramural Letters

Extramural letters solicited by the candidate's Department Chair are required as specified below. Candidates may not solicit their own extramural letters. Candidates may not contact potential reviewers prior to suggesting a list of names to the Chair.

Extramural Letters	
Advancements to Professor VI	Required
Advancements to Above-Scale	Required
Advancements within Above-Scale	Not required
Appraisals	Not required
Career Reviews	Required
Deferrals	Not allowed
Merits and Accelerated Merits	Not allowed
Promotions	Required
Quinquennial Reviews	Not required
Reappointments of Assistant Professors	Not Required

The letter of solicitation should include a current curriculum vita and should clearly specify the action for which the reviewer is being asked to evaluate the candidate. All letters must be signed. Letters that do not have signatures must be accompanied with written documentation (i.e. email from letter writer that they sent the letter). Electronic signatures are acceptable.

For 7th year promotion to tenure candidates, without complication of eligible service at other UC campuses, extramural letters should not be solicited BEFORE the sixth anniversary of the UCR appointment date. For persons with prior service at other campuses, extramural letters for 7th year promotion to tenure files may be solicited after the completion of the 72nd month of appointment (inclusive of prior service). (See APM 133-17).

The candidate's (optional) Self-Statement(s) may be sent to the extramural referees upon written request of the candidate. This Self-Statement will be provided by the candidate in a timely manner and becomes a part of the file forwarded for review. If the self-statement sent to extramural referees differs from the self-statement in III.U, both self-statements should be included in the file. (See III.M.2)

All extramural letters should be from qualified persons of a rank equal to or above the rank sought by the candidate. The reviewers' qualifications should include an established reputation and a disciplinary expertise enabling them to comment and assess in an informed manner. Preferably, such persons should be affiliated with institutions comparable in quality to the

University of California. Letters should be requested from 3-6 referees suggested by the candidate, and from 3-6 referees suggested by the department and/or Chair; the list of referees should be adequately balanced between the candidate's suggestions and those of his/her colleagues. In suggesting referees, it is desirable to include not only the best qualified persons in the field or subdiscipline but also some not closely affiliated with the candidate or his/her work.

It is preferable that the file includes some extramural referees familiar with the UC rank and step system. No more than two letters should be from the same campus.

Sample solicitation letters are provided as follows:

Appointment or promotion to Associate Professor	Model Letter A (Attachment E-1)
Appointment or promotion to Full Professor	Model Letter B (Attachment E-2)
Advancement to Professor VI	Model Letter C (Attachment E-3)
Advancement to Professor Above-Scale	Model Letter D (Attachment E-4)
Career Review	Model Letter G (Attachment E-7)

The University of California policy on confidentiality (Attachment E-8) is to be enclosed with solicitation letters for extramural review.

All solicited letters, whether from a previous year or the current year, obtained in connection with a given action shall be included in the file. In the case of letters received in a previous year, the Chair may write to all or a subset of those who wrote letters and offer them the opportunity to write a new letter or update the previous letter. The Chair will provide a brief explanation (in the departmental letter) of the department's reasons for not re-contacting previous years' reviewers. The Chair may also solicit letters from additional referees.

The extramural letters should be numbered or referenced by alphabet characters, and included should be:

1. The letter soliciting the extramural letters.
2. The file should include items sent to extramural referees (including such items as a self-statement, bibliography, and optional curriculum vita) ***only if*** the item differs from the current file. A list of documents provided to extramural referees however should be included.
3. The list of persons from whom extramural letters were sought. This list should be annotated as to whether they were nominated by the candidate or the department (including the Chair) or both. Declinations or other reasons for non-response should be included. If letter is withdrawn prior to file being opened for review, indicate as such and include a copy of the email.
4. The Chair should provide, on the list in #3 above, a brief (one or two sentences) comment on the academic standing and reputation of each letter writer. This does not need to be provided for those who declined or did not respond to the solicitation letter. This information is confidential and is not to be released to the candidate. (See APM 160-20-b-1(d)).
5. English translations must be provided for extramural letters written in another language.

N. Grant Activity (The header should include the applicable review period)
All grant and funding activity should be listed on a separate page in the format shown in Attachment F. Under Award Status, use the following criteria: Current, Expired, Denied and Pending.

Identify acronyms that refer to granting agencies (NICHD, DOD, NIA, etc) by a footnote.

Grant Activity	
Type of Action	*Include Activity Since*
Advancement to Professor VI*	Promotion to Professor
Advancement to Above Scale*	Advancement to Professor VI
Advancement within Above Scale	Last advance
Appraisal	Appointment
Career Review	Last promotion if promotion was greater than 5 years past
	If ≤5 years, then include activity since the previous promotion or appointment
Merit following lateral promotion	Last merit
Promotion to Associate Professor*	Appointment
Promotion to Professor*	Promotion to Associate Professor
Quinquennial Review	For past 5 years
Reappointment of Assistant Professor	Appointment

***Grants from prior institutions that were received within the period of review may be included for candidates whose term of appointment at UCR is insufficient to provide an informed evaluation of the file.**

O. Letters from Other Departments/Programs/Institutes/Centers

At the request of the candidate, the department will solicit letter(s) from the Chair(s) or Director(s) of programs with which the candidate has a significant relationship. All letters received will be included in the file at the departmental level. Such letters are non-confidential and shall be limited to two pages.

P. Minority Reports

In the departmental review of an appointment, appraisal, career review, merit, promotion, quinquennial or reappointment of Assistant Professors:

Any minority opinion on a faculty member (or any other solicited or unsolicited document) which is intended for consideration by CAP or the Chancellor's Office is viewed as non-confidential.

Minority reports are intended to permit interpretations of fact and academic judgment which differ materially from those expressed in the departmental letter. Minority reports must address the evaluation of teaching, research and service as discussed at the department meeting but not viewed as being represented in the department letter. The report may not contain comments on procedures/processes used to assemble the file or conduct the meeting.
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.
See section II.A. 8.e for procedures.

Q. Procedural Safeguards Statement

Every personnel review file submitted is required to have a Procedural Safeguards Statement signed by the candidate. If the candidate should refuse to sign, the file will not be accepted for review. If the candidate refuses to sign for a mandatory review, such as a 7th year promotion to tenure or quinquennial review, refer to the instructions provided (Attachment B-1).
Part 2 of the Procedural Safeguards Statement (Attachment B-2) should accompany any addition or change to the file.

R. Professional Activity and Service (The header should include the applicable review period)

The candidate shall provide a list of significant activities under the categories of Professional Activity and Service. Information should be listed only once and as much as possible, organized by activity in chronological order (oldest to newest), including beginning and ending year(s) of participation, rather than repeating an activity.

Entries that are duplicative of an item on the bibliography and/or Difference List (such as conference proceedings) should be noted. Abstracts however, do not need to be cross referenced.

Invited papers and presentations should be clearly identified. It is permissible to include invited activities which the candidate declined or was unable to attend.

Future invited activity can be included if the invitation was received before the file closing date.

Professional Activity and Service	
Type of Action	*Include Activity Since*
Advancement to Professor VI*	Promotion to Professor
Advancement to Above Scale*	Advancement to Professor VI
Advancement within Above Scale	Last advance
Appraisal	Appointment
Career Review	Last promotion if promotion was greater than 5 years past
	If ≤5 years, then include activity since the previous promotion or appointment
Merit following lateral promotion	Last merit
Promotion to Associate Professor*	Appointment
Promotion to Professor*	Promotion to Associate Professor
Quinquennial Review	For past 5 years
Reappointment of Assistant Professor	Appointment

***Service from prior institutions that was performed within the period of review may be included for candidates whose term of appointment at UCR is insufficient to provide an informed evaluation of the file.**

Professional Activity includes such things as:

1. editing books or journals, refereeing articles or other publications, serving on review panels
2. holding an office in a professional or learned society
3. awards, prizes, honors received from professional organizations, foundations, etc.

4. presenting papers or Chairing sessions at professional meetings, presenting invited seminars, colloquia, workshops, report writings, etc. including location and date of meeting or presentation
5. consulting activity

S. Publications

For paper files, the department should keep one copy of the actual publications, creative work and in press material available in the department. Hard-copy publications should not be forwarded with the file unless requested during the review process. eFile users have the benefit of readily including a PDF of publications and are encouraged to do so. Additionally, if applicable, a link to view creative activity such as images or video is also encouraged.

T. Sabbatical Leave Reports and Conflict of Commitment Filing (APM 025)

Sabbatical Leave reports (APM 740-97) do not need to be forwarded but must be available upon request. If the Sabbatical report has not been filed, the review process will not move forward until the documentation has been received.

Conflict of Commitment Reports (APM 025-20-b) do not need to be forwarded but may be included at the discretion of the candidate. If Conflict of Commitment reporting has not been filed for the minimum time period (see Form C-9), the review process will not move forward until such reporting has been filed. Candidate must sign C-9, Candidate Statement for Conflict of Commitment Report.

U. Self-Statement (optional but strongly encouraged)

The candidate is strongly encouraged to submit a brief statement describing and evaluating, in language understandable to a general audience, his/her achievements and recognition. These self-statements are not required but are helpful to the reviewing agencies if they direct the reviewers' attention to the candidate's most significant work and the current direction of scholarly activities; simple enumeration of material evident in the file does not materially assist the review process and should be avoided. Accuracy of the self-statement is the responsibility of the candidate. Self-statements in quinquennial reviews and merit files are limited to a two-page maximum. Advancements to Professor VI, Professor Above-Scale, within Professor Above Scale, promotions, career reviews, reappointments, and appraisals are not limited in length.

V. Student Evaluations of Teaching

The APM requires student evaluation of teaching. It should normally cover the teaching done in the review period (See Section X for details). All available evaluations should be included in the file. Evaluations of University Extension courses for the period under review are not to be included. Summer Session teaching will be recorded on the Supplemental Teaching Load Data Form.

W. Student Letters Evaluating Teaching

For areas of teaching not covered by standardized evaluations, student letters of evaluation should be solicited. In this case, include a statement showing how student letters were obtained (i.e. random sample of all students, solicitation of all graduate students, etc.). The letter of solicitation of such evaluations should be included and should include a statement of legal safeguard of the sort indicated in Attachment E-8. Oral or other informal request mechanisms are not sufficient. Student letters evaluating teaching are confidential documents.
Student letters from previous unsuccessful files should be included if they serve to complete teaching documentation for the same two or three year period shown on the Teaching Load

Data Form. If sufficient standardized evaluations are provided to assess teaching skill and effectiveness, these letters are not required to be included.

X. Teaching Load Data (TLD) Form

Department Chairs are required to provide a brief departmental teaching statement. The statement should be used to explain departmental teaching norms, any course releases, the unusual circumstance which lead to some courses not being evaluated, and other elements of teaching that may be unique to the department.

For merits, teaching load and evaluations should be documented for only those courses taught since last advance or for the three years listed on the Teaching Load Data Form, whichever is shorter. For promotion, appraisal, career review, advancement to Professor VI, Professor Above Scale and Professor within Above Scale, the teaching load and evaluations should be documented for the last 3 years. Additional earlier years may be included at the candidate's discretion and such additions are encouraged when the candidate has been at his or her current rank and step for more than three years. The additional years may be included on the TLD form (or with the teaching records in e-file). The additional information and evaluations should be identified as being optional and included at the candidate's request. For Quinquennial review files, list all courses for the past five years.

If a course is shared, explicitly state what percentage of the course was conducted or how many lectures or labs were done by the candidate. When this period includes a sabbatical leave, the form should identify the leave period in relation to the lack of available evaluations for that period. The role of the candidate on graduate committees should be explained.

Graduate Student Instruction	
Type of Action	*Include Students Since*
Advancement to Professor VI*	Promotion to Professor
Advancement to Above Scale*	Advancement to Professor VI
Advancement within Above Scale	Last advance
Appraisal	Appointment
Career Review	Last promotion if promotion was greater than 5 years past
	If ≤5 years, then include activity since the previous promotion or appointment
Merit following lateral promotion	Last merit
Promotion to Associate Professor*	Appointment
Promotion to Professor*	Promotion to Associate Professor
Quinquennial Review	For past 5 years
Reappointment of Assistant Professor	Appointment

***Graduate Student Instruction from prior institutions that was performed within the period of review may be included for candidates whose term of appointment at UCR is insufficient to provide an informed evaluation of the file.**

Y. University and Public Service (the header should include the applicable review period)

The candidate shall provide a list of significant activities under the categories of University and Public Service. Information should be listed only once and as much as possible, organized by activity in chronological order, including beginning and ending year(s) of participation and the

candidate's role (e.g. Chair, member, co-Chair and other), rather than repeating an activity. List department, college, Senate, administrative and systemwide service under separate categories. Ad hoc committee service (without revealing the name of the candidate) should be listed under Senate service.

University and Public Service	
Type of Action	*Include Activity Since*
Advancement to Professor VI*	Promotion to Professor
Advancement to Above-Scale*	Advancement to Professor VI
Advancement w/in Above-Scale	Last advance
Appraisal	Appointment
Career Review	Last promotion if promotion was greater than 5 years past
	If ≤5 years, then include activity since the previous promotion or appointment
Merit following lateral promotion	Last merit
Promotion to Associate Professor*	Appointment
Promotion to Professor*	Promotion to Associate Professor
Quinquennial Review	For past 5 years
Reappointment of Assistant Professor	Appointment

***Service from prior institutions that was performed within the period of review may be included for candidates whose term of appointment at UCR is insufficient to provide an informed evaluation of the file.**

Z. Unsolicited Letters

Letters that were not solicited by the Department Chair may be included in the file. These should be prepared as a separate packet. Unsolicited letters are confidential documents.

Model Letter E (Attachment E-5) must be used to inform the writer of any such letter of the candidate's potential access to the file.

Attachment A-1

REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO RECORDS
BY A CANDIDATE

Name _____ Department _____

I request a copy of the following material in my academic personnel file for the _____ review year.

Confidential (redacted form)	Non-confidential
___Extramural letters	___Dean's letter
___Student letters	___CAP report
___Chair's letter	___Department letter (if not received earlier)
___Ad Hoc committee report	___Other
___Other confidential	

Signature _____ Date _____

Note: Unless otherwise specified, all requests will be assumed to be for the official personnel review file of record which is maintained in the Academic Personnel Office (APO).

APO USE ONLY

_____ 1. Request received

_____ 2. Documents with cover letter sent to candidate.

Attachment A-2

REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO RECORDS
BY A THIRD PARTY

Name _____ Department _____

Title: _____

I request a copy of the following material in the academic personnel file of _____ for the _____ review year.

The reason(s) for this request are: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Confidential (redacted form)

___Extramural letters
___Student letters
___Chair's letter
___Ad Hoc committee report
___Other confidential

Non-confidential

___Dean's letter
___CAP report
___Department letter (if not received earlier)
___Other

Signature _____ Date _____

Note: Unless otherwise specified, all requests will be assumed to be for the official personnel review file of record which is maintained in the Academic Personnel Office (APO).

APO USE ONLY

_____ 1. Request received _____ Approved _____ Denied

_____ 2. Documents with cover letter sent to _____

_____ 3. Copy of documents sent to candidate

Attachment B-1

_____
PRINT CANDIDATE'S NAME

SIGNED STATEMENT ATTESTING TO PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS (Part 1)

Every personnel review file submitted, including deferral and mandatory quinquennial review files, is required to have a Procedural Safeguards Statement signed by the candidate. Files received without a signed Procedural Safeguards Statement by the Candidate will not be accepted for review, the only exception being in cases of a mandatory review. In those extremely rare instances of a mandatory review in which a faculty member has refused to sign the Statement, a written statement from him/her should be sought by the Department Chair in which the reasons for the refusal are presented. If the faculty member refuses to provide written reasons, the Chair should make an effort to ascertain the reasons for the refusal and supply a statement on the basis of the oral response received. The Department Chair will initial & date those areas on the Procedural Safeguards Statement where he/she advised the candidate of the process.

The purpose of this Statement is for you to certify that you have been informed of your rights under Section 200 of the Academic Personnel Manual and that you have been provided the opportunity to exercise those rights at the appropriate times during the review process. If you believe you have not been given your rights at any time during this review, you should bring this to the attention of your Department Chair (and/or indicate it on this form). Your signature on this Statement does not necessarily imply that you agree with the department's recommendation. If you have any questions about the review process, please contact Academic Personnel.

Section I. Initial stages of review process prior to Department review:

I CERTIFY THAT:

A. Under APM 220-80-c
1. I was informed of the impending review for this personnel action and of the review process (through access to APM 210-1, 220-80 and 160).
2. I was provided the opportunity to ask questions, supply information and evidence, make any desired additions, suggest names for extramural letters (where relevant), and to provide, in writing, names of extramural reviewers, who for reasons set forth by me, may not provide objective evaluations.

B. Under APM 220-80-d ***(not applicable to Deferrals)***
1. All documents and information I have provided are accurate to the best of my knowledge.
2. I had the opportunity to inspect all documents to be included in the file other than confidential documents.
3. *I request redacted copies* of confidential documents in this file. ___**YES** ___**NO**
4. I certify that I received the following before the department meeting:
___Extramural letters ___Student letters ___Other confidential on _____(date).
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. _____(initials)

C. Under APM 220-80-i ***(not applicable to Deferrals)***
1. I understand I am entitled to receive copies of non-confidential documents and redacted copies of confidential documents in the event a preliminary assessment is contrary to the department recommendation for promotions and appraisals. In such an instance, I request that copies of the below-marked documents be forwarded to me as quickly as possible after the preliminary determination is communicated. I understand that copies of the documents I request will also be provided to the department and Dean.

D. Under APM 220-80-i ***(not applicable to Deferrals)***
1. I was informed of the right to receive a written statement of reasons for the final administrative decision. I was also informed that I am entitled to copies of non-confidential documents and redacted copies of confidential documents once the final decision is communicated. I request that a copy of the following material in my current academic personnel review file be forwarded to me after the review is completed:

Confidential (redacted form)		**Non-confidential**
___Extramural letters	___ Chair's letter	___Dean's letter
___Student letters	___ Other confidential	___CAP report
___Ad Hoc committee report		___Department letter (if not received earlier).

_____ _____
Candidate's Signature Date

Section II. After the Department meeting: ***(not applicable to Deferrals)***

E. Under APM 220-80-e
1. I was informed of the specific departmental vote and whether the vote was unanimous, by a strong majority, or by a narrow majority.
2. I was informed of the departmental recommendation and of the substance of the departmental evaluations under each of the applicable criteria. *I request a copy of the department letter and acknowledge* that I received a copy of the department letter on _____.
3. I was informed of the right to make written comments on the departmental recommendation within five business days of receiving it and to direct transmittal of these comments to the Chair, the Dean, or the VPAP as described in section II.A.9.b of the Call on or before _____ at _____(a.m./p.m.).
4. I was informed that if I wish to waive my right to respond to the departmental recommendation I may do so in writing (email or written correspondence – attach if applicable) prior to the date/time noted in Section II. E.3. or by signing and dating here: _____ (Candidate's signature) _____(Date).

_____ _____
Candidate Signature Date

_____ _____
Chair Signature Date

ATTACHMENT B-2

SIGNED STATEMENT ATTESTING TO PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS
(Part 2)

I CERTIFY THAT:

I was informed of the addition/deletion/correction of the following material and informed by the Chair of the content.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

_____
Print Name

_____
Signature

_____
Date

If the above changes resulted in a new department letter or an addendum, then:

C. Under APM 220-80-e

1. I was informed of the departmental recommendation and of the substance of the departmental evaluations under each of the applicable criteria. I received a copy of the department letter on _____.
2. I was informed of the specific departmental vote or whether the vote was unanimous, by a strong majority, or by a narrow majority.
3. I was informed of the right to make written comments on the departmental recommendation within five business days of receiving it and to direct transmittal of these comments to the Chair, the Dean, or the VPAP as described in section II.A.9.b of the Call. I have chosen to:
   __ respond in writing to the departmental recommendation within 5 business days (use Atachment H)
   __ not respond to the departmental recommendation and waive the 5 day waiting period.

Attachment C-1

CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR **APPRAISALS**

Name: _____ Department: _____

Submit original:

☐ A. Checklist of Documents in File
☐ B Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
☐ C. Candidate Statement for Conflict of Commitment
** ☐ D. Chair's Letter (*optional*)
☐ E. Departmental letter (must include vote)
☐ F. Minority Report (*if applicable*)
☐ G. Candidate's Response to department letter *(optional)*
☐ H. Candidate's Self-Statement (*optional* ***but strongly encouraged*****)**
☐ I. Candidate's Response to material in the file *(optional)*

Indicate # included **

J. Student Letters Evaluating Teaching (*required if non-confidential teaching evaluations are not provided)*
☐ Solicitation letter or statement as to how obtained

☐ K. Current Biography
☐ L. Current Bibliography of Publications and Creative Activity *(include candidate's contributions to joint-authored work since appointment at UCR)*
☐ M. List of Professional Activity and Service *(since appointment, include the current year)*
☐ N. List of University/Public Service (s*ince appointment, include the current year*)
☐ O. Grant Activity (*if applicable, since appointment, include the current year*)
☐ P. Teaching Load Data Form (include teaching activity for the previous three years)
☐ Q. Student Evaluation of Teaching (include evaluations for the previous three years)
☐ R. Letters From Other Departments/Programs/Institutes/Centers (*optional*)
** ☐ S. Other- Confidential (specify item(s) below):

_____

_____

☐ T. Other- Non-Confidential (specify item(s) below)

_____

**** = Confidential**

==========

File Tracking

_____file sent to Dean's office
dept Chair initial & date

Received in Deans office	Returned for corrections			Received in APO	Returned for corrections		Sent to Ad Hoc	Ad hoc report received	Ad hoc report sent to Dean	Dean letter received in APO	Sent to CAP	CAP vote date	CAP minute received	Sent to VPAP	Sent to EVCP	Sent to Chancellor	Final Decision	Announced
	sent	sent	sent		Sent	sent												
	recvd	recvd	recvd		Recvd	recvd												

Attachment C-2

CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR **CAREER REVIEW**

Name: _____ Department: _____

Submit original:

☐ A. Checklist of Documents in File
☐ B. Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
☐ C. Candidate Statement for Conflict of Commitment
** ☐ D. Chair's Letter (*optional*)
☐ E. Department Letter (must include vote)
☐ F. Minority Report (*if applicable*)
☐ G. Candidate's Response to the department letter (*optional*)
☐ H. Candidate's Self-Statement (*optional* ***but strongly encouraged***)
☐ I. Candidate's Response to the material in the file *(optional)*

Indicate # included ** _____ J. Extramural Letters (*required*)
Include letters of declination and count in total number
Include the following:
☐ Solicitation Letter
☐ Indicate those suggested by department, by candidate as well as a brief statement regarding academic standing of each letter writer
☐ The packet of information sent to extramural referees, if different from the documents submitted as part of the file

Indicate # included ** _____ K. Student Letters Evaluating Teaching (required if non-confidential teaching evaluations are not provided)
☐ Solicitation letter or statement as to how obtained

☐ L. Current Biography
☐ M. Current Bibliography of Publications/Creative Activity *(include candidate's contributions to joint-authored works since last advance)*
☐ N. Professional Activity and Service (*see Section III.R. of The Call for the period of review) – include the current year*
☐ O. University and Public Service (*see Section III.Y of The Call for the period of review) - include the current year*
☐ P. Grant Activity (*if applicable, see Section III.N of The Call for the period of review) – include the current year*
☐ Q. Teaching Load Data Form (*include teaching activity for the previous three years; see The Call, Section III.X for the period of review for listing Graduate Student Instruction*)
☐ R. Student Evaluation of Teaching (*include evaluations for the previous three years, to coincide with the teaching activity)*
** ☐ S. Letters From Other Departments/ Programs/ Institutes/ Centers (*optional*)
☐ T. Other - Confidential (specify item(s) below):

_____
_____

☐ U. Other - Non-confidential (specify item(s) below): *(a full CV is optional but encouraged)*

_____

**** = Confidential**

==========

File Tracking

_____file sent to Dean's office
dept Chair initial & date

Received in Deans office	Returned for corrections			Received in APO	Returned for corrections		Sent to Ad Hoc	Ad hoc report received	Ad hoc report sent to Dean	Dean letter received in APO	Sent to CAP	CAP vote date	CAP minute received	Sent to VPAP	Sent to EVCP	Sent to Chancellor	Final Decision	Announced
	sent	sent	sent		Sent	sent												
	recvd	recvd	recvd		Recvd	recvd												

Attachment C-3

SIGNED STATEMENT REQUESTING FOR A DEFERRAL

Name	
College	
Department	
Years at Rank/Step	
Current Title	
Enclosures (if applicable)	

Candidate's Comments: (Use a separate sheet if necessary)

Signature Date

Chair's Comments: (Use a separate sheet if necessary)

Signature Date

Dean's Comments: (Use a separate sheet if necessary)

Signature Date

*This form and a signed Procedural Safeguard Statement (Attachment B-1) are required by the Office of Academic Personnel. Please retain copies in the college.

Office of Record: Academic Personnel (APO) will remain the office of record for these delegated actions. This form and a signed Procedural Safeguard Statement (Attachment B-1) should be sent to Academic Personnel once the action is complete. The information will be provided by APO to CAP.

Attachment C-4

CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR **MERITS**

Name: _____ Department: _____

Submit original:

	☐	A	Checklist of Documents in File
	☐	B.	Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
	☐	C.	Candidate Statement for Conflict of Commitment
**	☐	D.	Chair's Letter (*optional*)
	☐	E.	Departmental Letter (*must include vote) 2 page maximum*
	☐	F.	Minority Report (*if applicable*) *2 page maximum*
	☐	G.	Candidate's response to the Department Letter *(optional) 2 page max*
	☐	H.	Candidate's Self-Statement *(optional but strongly encouraged) 2 page maximum*
	☐	I.	Candidate's Response to material in the file *(optional)*
Indicate # included **		**J**.	Student Letters Evaluating Teaching (*required if non-confidential teaching evaluations are not provided)*
			☐ Solicitation letter or statement as to how obtained
	☐	K.	Current Biography
	☐	L.	Current Bibliography of Publications/Creative Activity
	☐	M.	Bibliography at Last Advance
	☐	N.	Difference List with items to be credited since last advance *(blue paper)*
			☐ Difference List cover sheet included *(blue paper) (optional)*
	☐	O.	Professional Activity and Service *(since last advance or last merit if following a lateral promotion; include the current year)*
	☐	P.	University and /Public Service *(since last advance or last merit if following a lateral promotion; include the current year).*
	☐	Q.	Grant Activity (*if applicable, since last advance or last merit if following a lateral promotion; include the current year*)
	☐	R.	Teaching Load Data Form since last advance *(include teaching activity for the previous three years or the last advance; whichever period of time is shorter)*
	☐	S.	Student Evaluation of Teaching (include *evaluations for the previous three years or the last advance; whichever period of time is shorter)*
	☐	T.	Letters From Other Departments/ Programs/ Institutes/ Centers (*optional*)
**	☐	U.	Other - Confidential *(specify item(s) below)*:
			_____
			_____
	☐	V.	Other - Non-confidential *(specify item(s) below):*
			_____
			_____

**** Confidential**

==========

File Tracking

_____ file sent to Dean's office
Chair Signature & Date

Received in Deans office	Returned for corrections			Received in APO	Returned for corrections		Sent to Ad Hoc	Ad hoc report received	Ad hoc report sent to Dean	Dean letter received in APO	Sent to CAP	CAP vote date	CAP minute received	Sent to VPAP	Sent to EVCP	Sent to Chancellor	Final Decision	Announced
	Sent	Sent	Sent		Sent	Sent												
	Recvd	Recvd	Recvd		Recvd	Recvd												

Attachment C-4A

CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR **MERITS LECTURERS & SENIOR LECTURERS WITH SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT OR WITH POTENTIAL SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT**

Name: _____ Department: _____

Submit original:

☐ A Checklist of Documents in File
☐ B. Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
☐ C. Candidate Statement for Conflict of Commitment
☐ D. Chair's Letter (optional) – *refer to APM 210-3.c*
☐ E. Departmental Letter (*must include vote) 2 page maximum*
☐ F. Minority Report (*if applicable*) *2 page maximum*
☐ G. Candidate's response to the Department Letter *(optional) 2 page max*
☐ H. Candidate's Self-Statement *(optional but strongly encouraged) 2 page maximum*
☐ I. Candidate's Response to material in the file *(optional)*
Indicate # included ** _____ J. Student Letters Evaluating Teaching (*required if non-confidential teaching evaluations are not provided.*
☐ Solicitation letter or statement as to how obtained
☐ K. Current Biography
☐ L. Current Bibliography, if applicable
☐ M. Bibliography at Last Advance, if applicable
☐ N. Difference List with items to be credited since last review, if applicable *(blue paper)*
☐ Difference List cover sheet included *(blue paper) (optional)*
☐ O. Professional Achievement/Professional Activity *(since last review; include the current year)*
☐ P. University and Public Service *(since last review; include the current year).*
☐ Q. Grant Activity (*if applicable, since last review; include the current year*)
☐ R. Teaching Load Data Form since last review *(include all teaching activity since last review)*
☐ S. iEval Student Evaluation of Teaching *(include all teaching activity since last review)*
☐ T. Letters From Other Departments/ Programs/ Institutes/ Centers (*optional*)
Indicate # included _____ U. Classroom Observations.
** ☐ V. Other - Confidential *(specify item(s) below)*:

_____
_____

☐ W. Other - Non-confidential *(specify item(s) below):*

_____
_____

**** Confidential**

==========

File Tracking

_____ file sent to Dean's office
Chair Signature & Date

Received in Deans office	Returned for corrections			Received in APO	Returned for corrections		Sent to Ad Hoc	Ad hoc report received	Ad hoc report sent to Dean	Dean letter received in APO	Sent to CAP	CAP vote date	CAP minute received	Sent to VPAP	Sent to EVCP	Sent to Chancellor	Final Decision	Announced
	Sent	Sent	Sent		Sent	Sent												

Attachment C-5

CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR **PROMOTIONS, ADVANCEMENTS to PROFESSOR VI, PROFESSOR ABOVE-SCALE OR WITHIN PROFESSOR ABOVE-SCALE**

Name: _____ Department: _____

Submit original: **** Confidential**

- ☐ A. Checklist of Documents in File
- ☐ B. Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
- ☐ C. Candidate Statement for Conflict of Commitment
- ** ☐ D. Chair's Letter (*optional*)
- ☐ E. Departmental Letter (*must include vote)*
- ☐ F. Minority Report (*if applicable*)
- ☐ G. Candidate's response to the Department Letter *(optional)*
- ☐ H. Candidate's Self-Statement *(optional **but strongly encouraged**)*
- ☐ I. Candidate's response to material in the file

Indicate # included ** ____ J. Extramural Letters (*required for promotions; Step VI & To A/S*)
Include letters of declination and count in total number
Include the following:
- ☐ Solicitation Letter
- ☐ List of extramural reviewers. Indicate those suggested by department, by candidate as well as a brief statement regarding academic standing of each letter writer
- ☐ The packet of information sent to extramural referees, if different from the documents submitted as part of the file. Please include CV sent to extramural reviewers. (See Section III.M)

Indicate # included ** ____ K. Student Letters Evaluating Teaching (required if non-*confidential* teaching evaluations are not provided)
- ☐ Solicitation letter or statement as to how obtained

- ☐ L. Current Biography
- ☐ M. Current Bibliography of Publications/Creative Activity
- ☐ N. Bibliography at Last Advance
- ☐ O. Difference List with items to be credited since last advance *(blue paper)*
  - ☐ Difference List cover sheet included *(blue paper) (optional)*
- ☐ P. Professional Activity and Service (*see Section III.R. of The Call for the period of review) – include the current year*
- ☐ Q. University and Public Service (*see Section III.Y of The Call for the period of review) - include the current year*
- ☐ R. Grant Activity (*if applicable, see Section III.N of The Call for the period of review) – include the current year*
- ☐ S. Teaching Load Data Form (*include teaching activity for the previous three years; see The Call, Section III.X for the period of review for listing Graduate Student Instruction*)
- ☐ T. Student Evaluation of Teaching (*include evaluations for the previous three years, to coincide with the teaching activity)*
- ☐ U. Letters From Other Departments/ Programs/ Institutes/ Centers (*optional*)
- ** ☐ V. Other - Confidential *(specify item(s) below):*

_____
_____

- ☐ W. Other - Non-confidential *(specify item(s) below):*

_____
_____

Note: For advancements to Prof VI and within Prof Above-Scale, do not forward publications, but keep them available in the department.

==========

File Tracking

_____file sent to Dean's office
dept Chair initial & date

Received in Deans office	Returned for corrections			Received in APO	Returned for corrections		Sent to Ad Hoc	Ad hoc report received	Ad hoc report sent to Dean	Dean letter received in APO	Sent to CAP	CAP vote date	CAP minute received	Sent to VPAP	Sent to EVCP	Sent to Chancellor	Final Decision	Announced
	sent	sent	sent		sent	sent												
	recvd	recvd	recvd		recvd	recvd												

Attachment C-5A

CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR **PROMOTIONS TO LECTURER OR SENIOR LECTURER WITH SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT, OR TO SENIOR LECTURER WITH POTENTIAL SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT**

Name: _____ Department: _____

Submit original: **** Confidential**

- ☐ A. Checklist of Documents in File
- ☐ B. Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
- ☐ C. Candidate Statement for Conflict of Commitment
- ☐ D. Chair's Letter (optional) – *refer to APM 210-3.c*
- ☐ E. Departmental Letter (*must include vote)*
- ☐ F. Minority Report (*if applicable*)
- ☐ G. Candidate's response to the Department Letter *(optional)*
- ☐ H. Candidate's Self-Statement *(optional, **but strongly encouraged**)*
- ☐ I. Candidate's response to material in the file

Indicate # included ** _____ J. Student Letters Evaluating Teaching solicited from students in the candidate's classes taught since the last review. (*required for promotions; refer to APM 210-3. c.(1)*)
Include replies of declination and count in total number
Include the following:
☐ Solicitation Letter or email solicitation, or statement as to how obtained

- ☐ K. Current Biography
- ☐ L. Current Bibliography, if applicable
- ☐ M. Bibliography at Last Advance, if applicable
- ☐ N. Difference List with items to be credited since last advance, if applicable *(blue paper)*
  ☐ Difference List cover sheet included *(blue paper) (optional)*
- ☐ O. Professional Achievement/Professional Activity (since last review; include the current year)
- ☐ P. University and /Public Service *(since last review; include the current year).*
- ☐ Q. Grant Activity (*if applicable, since last review; include the current year*)
- ☐ R. Teaching Load Data Form since last review, modified if necessary to include all information specified in APM 210-3.c *(include all teaching activity since last review)*
- ☐ S. iEval Student Evaluations of Teaching *(include all teaching activity since last review)*

Indicate # included _____ T. Letters From Other Departments/ Programs/ Institutes/ Centers (*optional*)
Indicate # included _____ U. Classroom Observations.

- ☐ V. Chair's written explanation of required documentation omissions in candidate's dossier. (*refer to APM 210-3.c.(1)*)

** ☐ W. Other - Confidential *(specify item(s) below):*

_____
_____

- ☐ X. Other - Non-confidential *(specify item(s) below):*

_____
_____

- ☐ Y. File of Publications/Creative Activity® (1 Set)
  Packaged separately with cover list of contents and marked "Please return to the Department of ____"

==========

File Tracking

_____file sent to Dean's office
dept chair initial & date

Received in Deans office	Returned for corrections			Received in APO	Returned for corrections		Sent to Ad Hoc	Ad hoc report received	Ad hoc report sent to Dean	Dean letter received in APO	Sent to CAP	CAP vote date	CAP minute received	Sent to VPAP	Sent to EVCP	Sent to Chancellor	Final Decision	Announced
	sent	sent	sent		sent	sent												
	recvd	recvd	recvd		recvd	recvd												

Attachment C-6

CHECKLIST FOR **QUINQUENNIAL REVIEWS**

Name: _____ Department: _____

Submit original:

___ A. Checklist of Documents in File
___ B. Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
___ C. Candidate Statement for Conflict of Commitment
** ___ D. Chair's Letter (*optional*)
___ E. Departmental Letter (*vote required)*
___ F. Minority Report (*if applicable*)
___ G. Candidate's response to the Departmental Letter *(optional)*
___ H. Candidate's Self-Statement *(optional but encouraged) 2 page maximum*
___ I. Candidate's response to the material in the file *(optional)*
___ J. Current Biography
___ K. Current Bibliography of Publications/Creative Activity
___ L Bibliography at Last Advance
___ M. Publication and Creative Activity during last 5 years *(include candidate's contributions to joint-authored works during last 5 years)*
___ N. Professional Activity and Service (*for last 5 years*)
___ O. University and Public Service *(for last 5 years, include the current year)*
___ P. Grant Activity *(in last 5 years, if applicable*)
___ Q. Teaching Load Data Form (*showing last 5 years*)
___ R. Student Evaluation of Teaching
Evaluations for all courses taught in last 5 years --campus teaching evaluation forms, etc.
___ S. Letters From Other Departments/ Programs/ Institutes/ Centers (*optional*)
** ___ T. Other – Confidential (*specify items(s) below*):
_____
_____
___ U. Other - Non-confidential *(specify item(s) below):*
_____
_____

****Confidential**

==========

File Tracking

_____file sent to Dean's office
dept Chair initial & date

Received in Deans office	Returned for corrections			Received in APO	Returned for corrections		Sent to Ad Hoc	Ad hoc report received	Ad hoc report sent to Dean	Dean letter received in APO	Sent to CAP	CAP vote date	CAP minute received	Sent to VPAP	Sent to EVCP	Sent to Chancellor	Final Decision	Announced
	sent	sent	sent		sent	sent												
	recvd	recvd	recvd		recvd	recvd												

Attachment C-6A

CHECKLIST FOR **QUINQUENNIAL REVIEWS FOR LECTURERS OR SENIOR LECTURERS WITH SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT**

Name: _____ Department: _____

Submit original:

___ A. Checklist of Documents in File
___ B. Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
___ C. Candidate Statement for Conflict of Commitment
___ D. Chair's Letter (optional) – *refer to APM 210-3.c*
___ E. Departmental Letter (*vote required)*
___ F. Minority Report (*if applicable*)
___ G. Candidate's response to the Departmental Letter *(optional)*
___ H. Candidate's Self-Statement *(optional but encouraged) 2 page maximum*
___ I. Candidate's response to the material in the file *(optional)*
___ J. Current Biography
___ K. Current Bibliography, if applicable
___ L Bibliography at last review, if applicable
___ M. Professional Achievement/Professional Activity during last 5 years *(include candidate's contributions to joint-authored works during last 5 years)*
___ N. University and Public Service *(for last 5 years)*
___ O. Grant Activity *(in last 5 years, if applicable*)
___ P. Teaching Load Data Form (*showing last 5 years*)
___ Q. iEval Student Evaluation of Teaching (*for all courses taught in last 5 years*)
___ R. Classroom Observations *(for last 5 years)*
** ___ S. Other – Confidential (*specify items(s) below*):
_____
_____
___ T. Other - Non-confidential *(specify item(s) below):*
_____
_____

****Confidential**

==========

File Tracking

_____file sent to Dean's office
dept chair initial & date

Received in Deans office	Returned for corrections			Received in APO	Returned for corrections		Sent to Ad Hoc	Ad hoc report received	Ad hoc report sent to Dean	Dean letter received in APO	Sent to CAP	CAP vote date	CAP minute received	Sent to VPAP	Sent to EVCP	Sent to Chancellor	Final Decision	Announced
	sent	sent	sent		sent	sent												
	recvd	recvd	recvd		recvd	recvd												

CHECKLIST FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR I, II AND III APPOINTMENTS

Name: _____ Department: _____

____ Signed Appointment Letter	(Original)
____ Affirmative Action Compliance Report	(Original)
____ Affirmative Action Summary of Recruitment Statistics	(Original)
____ Departmental letter of recommendation (**include eligible faculty vote*)**	(Original)
____ Dean's Approval initials on copy of Cover Sheet or Dean's Letter	(Original)
____ Chair's Letter (optional)	(Original)
____ Letters of recommendation (List #)	(Original)
____ Current signed biography and bibliography (UC format)	(Original)
____ Candidate's Vita	(Original)
____ Teaching Evidence (if applicable)	(Original)
____ Approved authorization for recruitment from EVCP	(Original)
____ Approved o/s memo from EVCP (if applicable) (see Off-Scale Salary section for information)	(Original)

Retain candidate's publications at the department level with a cover list of accepted and submitted items.

Employee Documents for Appointments:
The Department is the Office of Record for the following items and forms:
1. Surepay Authorization Form and its attachment
2. Federal and State Withholding Form
3. Employment Eligibility Verification (I-9) and its attachments
4. Oath of Allegiance/Patent Agreement
5. Affirmative Action Data Transmittal (Shred after PPS Data Entry)
6. Candidate's Publications with cover list of in press items

Following PPS Data Entry, forward the following forms to the Payroll Office and keep a copy on file (if applicable):
1. Statement of Citizenship (required from non-citizens of the USA)
2. Exemption from Withholding on Compensation (8233)
3. Tax Treaty Statement
4. Benefit Forms

*This document check list and its attachments are required by the Office of Academic Personnel. Please retain copies in the college.

Office of Record: Academic Personnel will remain the office of record for these delegated appointments. The original appointment file, original signed accepted formal offer letter, and other documents required should be sent to Academic Personnel no later than four weeks after the offer has been accepted. An annual post audit of appointments will be done in consultation with CAP.

CHECKLIST FOR APPOINTMENTS FOR LECTURER AND SENIOR LECTURER WITH POTENTIAL FOR SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT OR WITH SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT

Name: _____ Department: _____

____ Signed Appointment Letter	(Original)
____ Affirmative Action Compliance Report	(Original)
____ Affirmative Action Summary of Recruitment Statistics	(Original)
____ Departmental letter of recommendation (**include eligible faculty vote*)**	(Original)
____ Dean's Approval initials on copy of Cover Sheet or Dean's Letter	(Original)
____ Letters of recommendation (List #)	(Original)
____ Current signed biography and bibliography (UC format)	(Original)
____ Candidate's Vita	(Original)
____ Evidence of Outstanding Teaching (required)	(Original)
____ Approved authorization for recruitment from EVCP	(Original)

Employee Documents for Appointments:

The Department is the Office of Record for the following items and forms:

1. Surepay Authorization Form and its attachment
2. Federal and State Withholding Form
3. Employment Eligibility Verification (I-9) and its attachments
4. Oath of Allegiance/Patent Agreement
5. Affirmative Action Data Transmittal (Shred after PPS Data Entry)
6. Candidate's Publications with cover list of in press items

Following PPS Data Entry, forward the following forms to the Payroll Office and keep a copy on file (if applicable):

1. Statement of Citizenship (required from non-citizens of the USA)
2. Exemption from Withholding on Compensation (8233)
3. Tax Treaty Statement
4. Benefit Forms

*This document check list and its attachments are required by the Office of Academic Personnel. Please retain copies in the college.

Office of Record: Academic Personnel will remain the office of record for these delegated appointments. The original appointment file, original signed accepted formal offer letter, and other documents required should be sent to Academic Personnel no later than four weeks after the offer has been accepted. An annual post audit of appointments will be done in consultation with CAP.

Attachment C-8

CHECKLIST FOR APPOINTMENTS FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IV & ABOVE

Name: _____ Department: _____

____ Dean's Approval initials on copy of Cover Sheet or Dean's Letter
____ Chair's Letter (optional)
____ Candidate's Curriculum Vita
____ Affirmative Action Compliance Report
____ Affirmative Action Summary of Recruitment Statistics
____ Departmental letter of recommendation (**include eligible faculty vote*)**
____ Current Biography (UCR Format)
____ Current Bibliography of Publications/Creative Activity (UCR format)
____ Publications with cover list of submitted items (tenure appointments: submit 1 set; non tenured appointments: retain 1 set in the department)
____ Extramural Letters (for tenured appointments, include solicitation letter & list of referees; the list should include names suggested by the department and/or Chair and should be evenly balanced)
____ Minority Report (if applicable)
____ Teaching Evaluations or other evidence of teaching effectiveness (required for tenured appointments and if appropriate for non-tenured appointments)

Employee Documents for Appointments:
The Department is the Office of Record for the following items and forms:
1. Surepay Authorization Form and its attachment
2. Federal and State Withholding Form
3. Employment Eligibility Verification (I-9) and its attachments
4. Oath of Allegiance/Patent Agreement
5. Affirmative Action Data Transmittal (Shred after PPS Data Entry)
6. Candidate's Publications with cover list of in press items

Following PPS Data Entry, forward the following forms to the Payroll Office and keep a copy on file (if applicable):
1. Statement of Citizenship (required from non-citizens of the USA)
2. Exemption from Withholding on Compensation (8233)
3. Tax Treaty Statement
4. Benefit Forms

*This document check list and its attachments are required by the Office of Academic Personnel. Please retain copies in the college.

Office of Record: Academic Personnel (APO) is the office of record for appointments. The original appointment file, original signed accepted formal offer letter, and other documents required will be kept in the APO.

Attachment C-9

SIGNED CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR CONFLICT OF COMMITMENT REPORT (APM 025)

This form must be completed, signed and forwarded with the review file. If Conflict of Commitment reporting has not been completed for the review period or the past 3 years, whichever is shorter, the review process will not move forward until such reporting has been completed. To file an electronic report for the current reporting period (FY 2010-2011), please go to the following link: http://conflictofcommitment.ucr.edu.

This section to be completed by Department:

Name	
College	
Department	
Review Period	

This section to be completed and signed by candidate:

Candidate's Comments: (Use a separate sheet if necessary)

I certify that I have filed the appropriate Conflict of Commitment Reports for each year included in the review period or for the past 3 years, whichever is shorter.

Candidate's Signature Date

NOTE(S):

1. For efile, upload the form under Other section.
2. If a report was filed for 7/1/10 – 6/30/11 and the other previous years of review, the requirement has been met and the file would not be held up. The 3-month period 7/1 /11 – 9/30/11 does not require an additional report.
3. Electronic filing is available for 2010 onwards. Please file a paper form for 2009 and earlier. Forms may be downloaded from the APO website at http://academicpersonnel.ucr.edu/coc/APM-025_AnnualReportingForm.pdf.
4. Candidate Statement for Conflict of Commitment is *not* required on a Deferral.

Attachment C-10

CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR **REAPPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT PROFESSORS**

Name: _____ Department: _____

Submit original:

☐ A Checklist of Documents in File
☐ B. Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
☐ C. Candidate Statement for Conflict of Commitment
** ☐ D. Chair's Letter (*optional*)
☐ E. Departmental Letter (*must include vote) 2 page maximum*
☐ F. Minority Report (*if applicable*) *2 page maximum*
☐ G. Candidate's response to the Department Letter *(optional) 2 page max*
☐ H. Candidate's Self-Statement *(optional but strongly encouraged) 2 page maximum*
☐ I. Candidate's Response to material in the file *(optional)*
Indicate # included ** _____ **J**. Student Letters Evaluating Teaching (*required if non-confidential teaching evaluations are not provided)*
☐ Solicitation letter or statement as to how obtained
☐ K. Current Biography
☐ L. Current Bibliography of Publications/Creative Activity
☐ M. Bibliography *(since appointment)*
☐ N. Difference List with items to be credited since last advance or appointment *(optional)*
☐ Difference List cover sheet included *(optional)*
☐ O. Professional Activity and Service *(since appointment)*
☐ P. University and /Public Service *(since appointment)*
☐ Q. Grant Activity (*since appointment*)
☐ R. Teaching Load Data Form *(since appointment)*
☐ S. Student Evaluation of Teaching (include *evaluations since appointment)*
☐ T. Letters From Other Departments/ Programs/ Institutes/ Centers (*optional*)
** ☐ U. Other - Confidential *(specify item(s) below)*:

_____

_____

☐ V. Other - Non-confidential *(specify item(s) below):*

_____

_____

**** Confidential**

==========

File Tracking

_____ file sent to Dean's office
Chair Signature & Date

Received in Deans office	Returned for corrections			Received in APO	Returned for corrections		Sent to Ad Hoc	Ad hoc report received	Ad hoc report sent to Dean	Dean letter received in APO	Sent to CAP	CAP vote date	CAP minute received	Sent to VPAP	Sent to EVCP	Sent to Chancellor	Final Decision	Announced
	Sent	Sent	Sent		Sent	Sent												
	Recvd	Recvd	Recvd		Recvd	Recvd												

Attachment C-10A

CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR **REAPPOINTMENTS**
LECTURERS & SENIOR LECTURERS WITH
SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT OR WITH POTENTIAL SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT

Name: _____ Department: _____

Submit original:

	☐	A	Checklist of Documents in File
	☐	B.	Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
	☐	C.	Candidate Statement for Conflict of Commitment
	☐	D.	Chair's Letter (optional) – *refer to APM 210-3.c*
	☐	E.	Departmental Letter (*must include vote) 2 page maximum*
	☐	F.	Minority Report (*if applicable*) *2 page maximum*
	☐	G.	Candidate's response to the Department Letter *(optional) 2 page max*
	☐	H.	Candidate's Self-Statement *(optional but strongly encouraged) 2 page maximum*
	☐	I.	Candidate's Response to material in the file *(optional)*
Indicate # included **	____	J.	Student Letters Evaluating Teaching (*required if non-confidential teaching evaluations are not provided.*
			☐ Solicitation letter or statement as to how obtained
	☐	K.	Current Biography
	☐	L.	Current Bibliography, if applicable
	☐	M.	Bibliography (*since appointment*), if applicable
	☐	N.	Difference List with items to be credited since last review, if applicable *(optional)*
			☐ Difference List cover sheet included *(optional)*
	☐	O.	Professional Achievement/Professional Activity *(since appointment)*
	☐	P.	University and Public Service *(since appointment).*
	☐	Q.	Grant Activity (*if applicable, since appointment*)
	☐	R.	Teaching Load Data Form since last review *(since appointment)*
	☐	S.	iEval Student Evaluation of Teaching *(since appointment)*
	☐	T.	Letters From Other Departments/ Programs/ Institutes/ Centers (*optional*)
Indicate # included	____	U.	Classroom Observations.
**	☐	V.	Other - Confidential *(specify item(s) below)*:
			_____
			_____
	☐	W.	Other - Non-confidential *(specify item(s) below):*
			_____
			_____

****Confidential**

==========

File Tracking

_____ file sent to Dean's office
Chair Signature & Date

Received in Deans office	Returned for corrections			Received in APO	Returned for corrections		Sent to Ad Hoc	Ad hoc report received	Ad hoc report sent to Dean	Dean letter received in APO	Sent to CAP	CAP vote date	CAP minute received	Sent to VPAP	Sent to EVCP	Sent to Chancellor	Final Decision	Announced
	Sent	Sent	Sent		Sent	Sent												

5. Attachment D-1A – Department Letter Cover Sheet

COMPLETE FOR MERIT/PROMOTION/ADVANCEMENT/CAREER REVIEW

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION
[Action] for [**Candidate]**
In the **Department of [ ]**

Department Meeting Date: | Date Letter prepared: | Date(s) Revised:

PRESENT STATUS (include current full title with step including o/s if applicable. Include other titles being reviewed if applicable.

Rank & Step: | Years at Rank: | Years at Step:

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION (Majority vote. Include final rank/step and o/s if applicable. If negative, indicate "Against" or "No Change".

For/Against/No Change - Rank & Step:

VOTE(S) (Multiple ranks and steps may be proposed in which case all votes must be recorded unless vote for the highest step is unanimous. Add/delete sections as needed. Include reasons for minority votes in narrative below.)

Rank & Step	#Eligible	For	Against	Abstain	Not Voting/Unavailable
Advisory Vote	#Eligible	For	Against	Abstain	Not Voting/Unavailable
Rank & Step	#Eligible	For	Against	Abstain	Not Voting/Unavailable
Advisory Vote	#Eligible	For	Against	Abstain	Not Voting/Unavailable

DEAN'S RECOMMENDATION (Deans may not simply concur in accelerated merit cases or in merit recommendations where there is a split departmental vote, or where there is not a clear majority (i.e. a +2-3 vote).

☐ Concur with Departmental Recommendation. Dean's approval:_____
Date: _____

During the review period, Sabbatical Leave Reports (APM 740-97) are:
Not Due ☐ On file and available upon request ☐ Not on file (include explanation) ☐ N/A ☐
During the review period, a Leave of Absence for a quarter or more (other than Sabbatical) was taken:
Yes ☐ Start Date: End Date: No ☐

COMPLETE FOR QUINQUENNIAL

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION
Quinquennial Review for [**Candidate]**
In the **Department of [ ]**

Department Meeting Date: | Date Letter prepared: | Date(s) Revised:

PRESENT STATUS (include current full title with step including o/s if applicable. Include other titles being reviewed if applicable.

Rank & Step: | Years at Rank: | Years at Step:

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION (Majority vote. Put a checkmark on the outcome. For equally split decisions, check all that apply.)

☐ Satisfactory ☐ Satisfactory with Qualifications ☐ Unsatisfactory

***VOTE(S): (**Include minority votes in narrative below.)

Vote:	#Eligible	Satisfactory	Satisfactory w/Qualifications	Unsatisfactory	Abstain	Not Voting/Unavailable
Advisory Vote	#Eligible	Satisfactory	Satisfactory w/Qualifications	Unsatisfactory	Abstain	Not Voting/Unavailable

During the review period, Sabbatical Leave Reports (APM 740-97) are:
Not Due ☐ On file and available upon request ☐ Not on file (include explanation) ☐ N/A ☐
During the review period, a Leave of Absence for a quarter or more (other than Sabbatical) was taken:
Yes ☐ Start Date: End Date: No ☐

Attachment D-1B – Department Letter Cover Sheet

COMPLETE FOR REAPPOINTMENT

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION
Reappointment for [**Candidate]**
In the **Department of [ ]**

Department Meeting Date: | Date Letter prepared: | Date(s) Revised:

PRESENT STATUS (include current full title with step including o/s if applicable. Include other titles being reviewed if applicable.

Rank & Step: | Years at Rank: | Years at Step:

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION (Majority vote. Include if "For" (positive) or "Against" (negative) reappointment at current rank, step and o/s if applicable).

For/Against Reappointment :

VOTE(S) (Include reasons for minority votes in narrative below.)

Reappointment	#Eligible	For	Against	Abstain	Not Voting/Unavailable
Advisory Vote	#Eligible	For	Against	Abstain	Not Voting/Unavailable

During the review period, Sabbatical Leave Reports (APM 740-97) are:
Not Due ☐ On file and available upon request ☐ Not on file (include explanation) ☐ N/A ☐
During the review period, a Leave of Absence for a quarter or more (other than Sabbatical) was taken:
Yes ☐ Start Date: End Date: No ☐

COMPLETE FOR APPRAISAL

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION
Appraisal for [**Candidate]**
In the **Department of [ ]**

Department Meeting Date: | Date Letter prepared: | Date(s) Revised:

PRESENT STATUS (include current full title with step including o/s if applicable. Include other titles being reviewed if applicable.

Rank & Step: | Years at Rank: | Years at Step:

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION (Majority vote. Put a checkmark on the outcome. For equally split decisions, check all that apply.)

☐ Positive ☐ Qualified Positive ☐ Negative

***VOTE(S) (**Add/delete sections as needed. Include minority votes in narrative below.)

Vote:	#Eligible	Positive	Qualified Positive	Negative	Abstain	Not Voting/Unavailable
Advisory Vote	#Eligible	Positive	Qualified Positive	Negative	Abstain	Not Voting/Unavailable

During the review period, Sabbatical Leave Reports (APM 740-97) are:
Not Due ☐ On file and available upon request ☐ Not on file (include explanation) ☐ N/A ☐
During the review period, a Leave of Absence for a quarter or more (other than Sabbatical) was taken:
Yes ☐ Start Date: End Date: No ☐

Candidate Name: **College:**
Action: **Department:**

BACKGROUND

RESEARCH

TEACHING

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES AND UNIVERSITY/PUBLIC SERVICE

SUMMARY

_____
Name, Department Chair & Professor
Department of [ ]

MODEL LETTER A

The following text must be included in solicitations of letters of evaluation for PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR. <The Chair may add to this language.>

Dear _____:

The Department of _____ is evaluating _____ for possible promotion to the rank of associate professor and tenure. A very critical part of this process is the analysis and evaluation of _____'s research and scholarship by leading professional colleagues in the field. Your contribution is crucial in maintaining the highest scholarly standards of the University of California. We in the Department of _____ will be most grateful if you will assist us in this important assessment.

The University of California standard to which tenure candidates are held uses the language "superior intellectual attainment" in regard to the candidate's record of teaching and research. The measurement of _____'s work against this standard requires careful analysis of the work and of its significance for the field: Has the work made a substantial impact on the discipline? Has the thinking of others in the field been changed by the work? Your response will be most useful to the department's deliberations if it addresses these questions in analytic detail.

In addition, we would value an assessment of ____'s relative standing in [his/her] field. It would be most helpful if you could compare [his/her] research accomplishments with those of other scholars of similar experience and rank in the same discipline.

We would also appreciate your evaluation of the candidate's teaching, if you have the basis for such evaluation.

In writing your response, please take note of the attached University of California policy regarding the confidentiality of letters of evaluation which are included in the personnel review files.

attachment: Attachment E-8

MODEL LETTER B

The following text must be included in solicitations of letters of evaluation for PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR. <The Chair may add to this language.>

Dear _____:

The Department of _____ is evaluating _____ for possible promotion to the rank of full professor. In making its assessment, the department values analysis of _____'s scholarly work by external referees. A very critical part of this process is the analysis and evaluation of ____'s research and scholarship by leading professional colleagues in the field. Your contribution is crucial in maintaining the highest scholarly standards of the University of California. We in the Department of ____ will be most grateful if you will assist us in this important assessment.

Within the University of California, appointment or promotion to Associate Professor (and tenure) requires the demonstration of superior intellectual attainment, evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement. For promotion to full professor, we look for further evidence of this attainment and excellence beyond that which was achieved for promotion to Associate Professor, and for significant impact within the scholarly community. This could include evidence of national/international recognition of scholarship in the discipline, influence on the thinking of others in the discipline, and leadership in research and teaching. Although service is an important component of the record, it cannot substitute for attaining the high standards in research and teaching expected by the University.

We would also appreciate your evaluation of the candidate's teaching, if you have the basis for such evaluation.

Your response will be most useful to the department's deliberations if it addresses the contributions of the candidate's work to his/her field of study directly and in analytic detail.

In writing your response, please take note of the attached University of California policy regarding the confidentiality of letters of evaluation which are included in the personnel review files.

attachment: Attachment E-8

MODEL LETTER C

The following is a sample letter of solicitation of extramural referees for an ADVANCEMENT TO PROFESSOR VI review.

The University of California, Riverside is conducting an exceptional review of the scholarly record of Professor ____ for the rank of Professor, Step VI. In the University of California system this rank would be roughly equivalent to that of a senior Full Professor at a major private research university. A very critical part of this process is the analysis and evaluation of _____'s research and scholarship by leading professional colleagues in the field. Your contribution is crucial in maintaining the highest scholarly standards of the University of California. We in the Department of will be most grateful if you will assist us in this important assessment.

Within the University of California, appointment or promotion to Associate Professor (and tenure) requires the demonstration of superior intellectual attainment, evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement. For promotion to the rank of (full) Professor, we look for further evidence of superior intellectual attainment and excellence beyond that which was achieved for promotion to Associate Professor, and for significant impact within the scholarly community.

The next full career evaluation is typically made in connection with advancement to Professor, Step VI. The criteria for advancement to Professor, Step VI state that this step will be granted upon evidence of great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, in scholarly or creative achievement. A comparison to the work of others in the field is often useful. In addition, there should be evidence of excellent university teaching and highly meritorious service.

We would also appreciate your evaluation of the candidate's teaching, if you have the basis for such evaluation.

Your response will be most useful to the department's deliberations if it addresses the contributions of the candidate's work to his/her field of study directly and in analytic detail.

In writing your response, please take note of the attached University of California policy regarding the confidentiality of letters of evaluation which are included in the personnel review files.

attachment: Attachment E-8

MODEL LETTER D

The following is a sample letter of solicitation of extramural referees for an ADVANCEMENT TO PROFESSOR ABOVE-SCALE (Distinguished Professor) review.

The University of California, Riverside is conducting an exceptional review of the scholarly record of Professor _____ for the rank of Distinguished Professor (Professor Above-Scale). Each campus in the University of California system has only a small number of Distinguished Professors. A very critical part of this process is the analysis and evaluation of _____'s research and scholarship by leading professional colleagues in the field. Your contribution is crucial in maintaining the highest scholarly standards of the University of California. We in the Department of _____ will be most grateful if you will assist us in this important assessment.

Within the University of California, appointment or promotion to Associate Professor (and tenure) requires the demonstration of superior intellectual attainment, evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement. For promotion to Full Professor, we look for further evidence of this attainment and excellence beyond that which was achieved for promotion to Associate Professor, and for significant impact within the scholarly community.

The next full career evaluation is typically made in connection with advancement to Professor, Step VI. The criteria for advancement to Professor, Step VI state that this step will be granted upon evidence of great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, in scholarly or creative achievement. In addition there should be evidence of excellent university teaching and highly meritorious service.

Distinguished Professor (Professor Above-Scale) represents an even higher standard. In making your evaluation of the merits of Professor _____ for the Distinguished Professor rank, please think in terms of comparing the achievements of Professor_____ to those among the most distinguished researchers in the field. Our personnel rules state that advancement to this level "is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed and whose teaching performance is excellent. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Professor, Step IX is not a justification....There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Professor, Step IX was based."

We would also appreciate your evaluation of the candidate's teaching, if you have the basis for such evaluation.

Your response will be most useful to the department's deliberations if it addresses the contributions of the candidate's work to his/her field of study directly and in analytic detail.

In writing your response, please take note of the attached University of California policy regarding the confidentiality of letters of evaluation which are included in the personnel review files.

attachment: Attachment E-8

MODEL LETTER E

(For use when unsolicited letters of evaluation for promotion have been received)

Thank you for sending us the letters of evaluation concerning _____, who is being considered for promotion at _____.

Evaluations submitted in confidence become part of the candidate's official personnel review file. The candidate will, upon request, be provided with a redaction of the confidential documents in the file. Redaction is defined as the removal of identifying information (including name, title, institutional affiliation, and relationship to the candidate) contained either at the top of the letterhead or within and below the signature block of the letter of evaluation.

The full text of the body of your letter will therefore be provided to the candidate if so requested. Although we cannot guarantee that at some future time a court or governmental agency will not require disclosure of the source of confidential evaluations in University of California personnel files, we can assure you that the University will endeavor to protect the identity of authors of letters of evaluation to the fullest extent allowable under the law.

I shall appreciate it if you will inform me whether in light of our policies we may proceed to use the material you have sent to us, or whether you wish us to return the material to you. If you do not request return of the material by _____ it will be maintained in our files.

MODEL LETTER F

(For use when receiving solicited or unsolicited letters of evaluation for academic appointment or promotion which contain restrictions on their use. Note that the bulk of these are likely to be included in a Placement Office file; in these instances a single notification to the Office in question satisfies the notification requirement.)

Thank you for sending us (your placement file on _____) (letters of evaluation concerning _____) (etc.), who is being considered for promotion at _____.

You have asked that this material (not be made a part of the candidate's personnel file) (be returned to you after we have completed our use of it) (be destroyed after we have completed our use of it) (etc.). I am writing to inform you that we are unable to accept and use the material you sent with the constraint on its use which you have stated, and to explain why we are unable to do so.

Under University policy, evaluatory material about a candidate who is being considered for promotion becomes part of the candidate's permanent personnel record.

A candidate may, however, be provided access to such letters of evaluation under certain conditions. These include the candidate's request for such access, the requests being made at certain prescribed stages of the academic personnel review process, and the letters being presented in redacted form. Redaction is defined as the removal of identifying information (including name, title, institutional affiliation, and relationship to the candidate) contained either at the top of the letterhead or within and below the signature block of the letter of evaluation.

Although we cannot guarantee that at some future time a court or governmental agency will not require the disclosure of the source of confidential evaluations in University of California personnel files, we can assure you that the University will endeavor to protect the identity of authors of letters of evaluation to the fullest extent allowable under the law.

I shall appreciate it if you will inform me whether in light of our policies we may proceed to use the material you have sent to us, or whether you wish us to return the material to you. If you do not request return of the material by _____ it will be maintained in our files.

MODEL LETTER G

The following is a sample letter of solicitation of extramural referees for a CAREER REVIEW. This text must be included in solicitations of letters of evaluation for career review.

The University of California, Riverside is conducting an exceptional Career Review of the scholarly record of Professor ___. The purpose of the review is to ascertain the level within the professoriate that Professor __'s record warrants. A very critical part of this process is the analysis and evaluation of Professor __'s research and scholarship by leading professional colleagues in the field. Your contribution and judgment are crucial to our ability to maintain the high scholarly standards of the University of California. We in the Department of _____ will be most grateful if you will assist us in this important assessment.

In making your judgment, it is important to understand that the University of California has a structured matrix of "steps" which define normative movement through the ranks of Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor. This matrix is summarized on the attached table.

Professor ___ is currently at step __ of the rank of __. Professor __'s Career Review will result in one of the following outcomes:

[Here the Chair should list item (i) and the appropriate subset of options ii-vii on the next page.]

For purposes of benchmarking, the University of California has adopted the following language to characterize the achievement necessary for the major advancements within the rank/step system:

> Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure: The candidate must demonstrate superior intellectual attainment in research and excellence in teaching.
>
> Promotion to Full Professor: The candidate must demonstrate excellence beyond that which was achieved for promotion to Associate Professor and significant impact within the scholarly community.
>
> Advancement to Professor VI: Advancement to Professor VI is granted upon evidence of great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, in scholarly or creative achievement. In addition, there should be evidence of excellent university teaching and highly meritorious service. This rank is roughly equivalent to that of a senior Full Professor at a major private research university.
>
> Distinguished Professor (Professor Above-Scale): This rank is reserved for scholars of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed and whose teaching performance is excellent. Mere length of service and continued good performance at Professor IX is not a justification. The candidate must be among the most distinguished researchers in the world in his/her field.

Your assessment of Professor __'s scholarly credentials is critical to our evaluative process. Your response will be most useful to the process if it addresses this issue directly and in analytic detail. A comparison to the work of others in the field is often useful. We would also appreciate your evaluation of Professor __'s teaching and service, if you have the basis for such evaluation.

We understand that the demands on your time are heavy. We assure you that your evaluation is of utmost importance to determining the outcome of this review, and we thank you sincerely for your assistance.

In writing your response, please take note of the attached University of California policy regarding the confidentiality of letters of evaluation which are included in the personnel review files.

(i) No change from present rank & step
(ii) Advancement within the rank of Associate Professor, Steps I, II or III
(iii) Promotion to the rank of Full Professor with a defined step
(iv) Advancement within the Full Professor rank, steps I - V
(v) Advancement to Full Professor, step VI
(vi) Advancement within the Full Professor rank, steps VII, VIII and IX
(vii) Advancement to the Distinguished Professor rank (Professor Above-Scale)

Matrix of Ranks/Steps

Rank	Step	Normal Period of Service at Step
Assistant Professor	I	2 years
	II	2 years
	III	2 years
	IV	2 years
Associate Professor (a)	I	2 years
	II	2 years
	III	2 years
Professor (b)	I	3 years
	II	3 years
	III	3 years
	IV	3 years
	V	open
	VI (c)	open
	VII (d)	open
	VIII (d)	open
	IX (d)	open
	A/S (e)	open

(a) The normal total period of service in the rank of Associate Professor is 6 years. The normal period of service in each step is two years.

(b) The normal period of service at Full Professor is 3 years in each of the first four steps. Service at Step V may be of indefinite duration.

(c) Advancement to Professor VI will be granted upon evidence of highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellent university teaching. In interpreting these criteria, reviewers should require evidence of excellence and high merit in original scholarship or creative achievement, teaching, and service; and, in addition, great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, in scholarly or creative achievement or in teaching. Service at Professor, Step VI may be of indefinite duration.

(d) Advancement from Professor, Step VI to Step VII, from Step VII to Step VIII, and from Step VIII to Step IX usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the lower step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step VI.

(e) Advancement to an above-scale salary is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed and whose teaching performance is excellent. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at Step IX. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not justification for further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step IX was based. 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 increase at intervals shorter than four years be approved.

ATTACHMENT
FOR MODEL LETTERS A-D and G

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA POLICY ON THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF OUTSIDE LETTERS OF EVALUATION

The University of California will keep your name and institutional affiliation confidential. When a faculty member requests to see letters (including declinations) in his or her file, pursuant to state law and University policy, the full text of the body of your letter will be provided to the candidate. However, any identifying information on the letterhead and within your signature block will be removed. In order to keep your identity confidential, you may want to avoid putting information in the body of your letter that would identify you. If you wish, you may provide a brief factual statement regarding your relationship to the faculty member as a separate attachment to your letter which we will not disclose to the candidate.

In those rare instances where a court or government agency seeks to compel the disclosure of the source of a confidential evaluation in University of California academic personnel files, it is the University practice to protect the identity of authors of letters of evaluation to the fullest extent allowable under the law. The judicially mandated disclosure of the identity of confidential evaluations has been extremely rare at the University of California."

EXTRAMURAL GRANT ACTIVITY FORMAT

John Doe October 2000

AGENCY	TITLE	AWARD DATES	PROJECT PERIOD	AMOUNT	PI STATUS	AWARD STATUS
NSF[1]	"The Role of the Educational Levels of Jurors in Deadlocked Panels" Other PI: I.M. Right, P.C. Tech & U.R. Wrong	1/94	2/94 – 1/98	$90,000	PI	
CRB[2]	"A Strategy for Development of After School Programs for Grades 7-12" Other Investigators: None	1/96	7/96 – 6/99	$80,000	PI	

==========

1 National Science Foundation

2 Citrus Research BoardAttachment F

Attachment G-1

TEACHING LOAD DATA

Persons proposed for faculty promotions or merit increases are asked, through their Department Chair, to supply this information about their teaching assignments.

Name: _____ Date: _____

Departmental teaching statement: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

I. Teaching Record - Course Number, Units, Enrollment, Evaluation

Most recent past year:

Fall Quarter				**Winter Quarter**				**Spring Quarter**			
Course No./Title	Units	Enroll.	Eval.	Course No./Title	Units	Enroll.	Eval.	Course No./Title	Units	Enroll.	Eval.

2nd past year:

Fall Quarter				**Winter Quarter**				**Spring Quarter**			
Course No./Title	Units	Enroll.	Eval.	Course No./Title	Units	Enroll.	Eval.	Course No./Title	Units	Enroll.	Eval.

3rd past year:

Fall Quarter				**Winter Quarter**				**Spring Quarter**			
Course No./Title	Units	Enroll.	Eval.	Course No./Title	Units	Enroll.	Eval.	Course No./Title	Units	Enroll.	Eval.

II. Current Fall Quarter Assignments: _____

III. Graduate Student Instruction. List below your responsibilities for the period under review:

Student Name	M.A. or Ph.D.	Role (Major Professor, Thesis Director, Committee Member (with type of committee explained)	Date Completed

Eval. = Indicate Y (Yes) if student evaluations of teaching were conducted for the course. Indicate N (No) if no evaluations were collected.

Attachment G-2

SUPPLEMENTAL TEACHING LOAD DATA

Persons proposed for faculty promotions or merit increases are asked, through their Department Chair, to supply this information about their teaching assignments.

Name:_____ Date:

I. Summer Session *(not University Extention)* Teaching Record - Course Number, Units, Enrollment, Evaluation

(Year) **Summer Quarter**				***(Year)*** **Summer Quarter**				(***Year)*** **Summer Quarter**			
Course No./Title	Units	Enroll	Eval.	Course No./Title	Units	Enroll.	Eval.	Course No./Title	Units	Enroll.	Eval.

Eval. = Indicate Y (Yes) if student evaluations of teaching were conducted for the course
Indicate N (No) if no evaluations were collected.

II. Other Teaching

_____

_____

Candidate's Response to the Departmental Letter

Select one:

a) ___ Addressed to the **Chair**:
This is intended to be included in the file at the departmental level. I understand it will be added to the department's copy of the file and will proceed with the forwarded file through the review process.

b) ___ Addressed to the **Dean**:
This is intended to be included in the file at the Dean's level. I understand the Dean, CAP, and the Chancellor or his designee will see this document, but that it will not be added to the department's copy of the file. The Dean will inform the Department Chair that a written statement has been received without revealing the contents.
Understanding that an ad hoc committee, when used, usually includes one member from the department, I ask that this
(i) _____ be seen by the ad hoc committee (if applicable).
(ii) _____ not be seen by the ad hoc committee (if applicable).

c) ___ Addressed to the **VPAP**:
This is intended to be included in the file at the VPAP level which assures its review by **only** the CAP, and the Chancellor or his designee. The VPAP will inform the Department Chair and Dean that a written statement has been received without revealing the contents.

Candidate's Signature _____

Printed Name _____

Date _____

Department Chair Academic Personnel Review Checklist

This checklist was prepared in compliance with Section 220-80-c of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM): "Each campus shall develop guidelines and checklists to instruct Chairpersons about their duties and responsibilities in connection with personnel reviews." The goal is to answer yes to all the questions on the list; however some elements may be department, college or school specific. For more in-depth instructions, consult the CALL or your Dean.

It is extremely important that the Chair instill in each faculty member a sense of responsibility for preparing accurate files and meeting all deadlines. The Chair, in turn, must exercise strong leadership in managing the file evaluation and submission to the Dean within the agreed upon time frames.

In all of your responsibilities, you should follow the guidelines in the CALL as available on the Academic Personnel website.

*Target Time frames – these dates are only intended as examples to help you adhere to deadlines as established in the CALL

1. Initial Meeting with Candidate

***Spring / Summer**

- ☐ Schedule a meeting with the candidate to discuss upcoming review as well as to answer any questions, and inform candidate of the entire process. In promotion cases, Department Chair should meet with the candidate at least 1 year before proposing the promotion to assess readiness
- ☐ Inform candidate of APM 210-1, 220-80 ,160 and if applicable, APM 133
- ☐ If applicable, remind candidate to suggest names for extramural reviewers
- ☐ If applicable, notify candidate that he/she may provide in writing (to be included in the file) names of persons who may not provide objective evaluations
- ☐ Review text of solicitation letter (if applicable)
- ☐ Discuss materials to be sent to extramural reviewers (if applicable)
- ☐ Remind candidate that a self-statement may be added to the file. If the self-statement sent to the extramural reviewers differs from the self-statement included in III. V. of the CALL, both self-statements must be included in the file.
- ☐ Give any other supplemental instruction in accordance with Dean's Office or Departmental procedures

2. Before the Department Meeting

Month of September/October

- ☐ Extramural letters are solicited.
- ☐ Candidate forwards material for file (ensure cut-off dates specified in the CALL are adhered to)
- ☐ Collect other documents to be included in the file and assure cut-off dates are adhered to, i.e. extramural letters
- ☐ Chair should ensure that file is complete and has been audited for accuracy. Any corrections to the file should occur BEFORE faculty review
- ☐ Candidate completes top portion of procedural safeguard certifying accuracy of information and requesting a copy of the department letter
- ☐ Ensure that any documents in a foreign language include a translation in the file
- ☐ Advise candidate of his/her right to inspect complete file; if requested, forward to him/her redacted copies of confidential material (i.e. extramural letters) and notify candidate of the department meeting date
- ☐ Give candidate the opportunity to include a written statement in response to or commenting on material in the file. The statement must be received 5 days prior to the department meeting
- ☐ Upon receipt of candidate's statement, notify faculty that the file is ready for review
- ☐ Assure departmental faculty have reviewed the file before the department meeting
- ☐ Set deadline for receipt of absentee ballots and/or specify when votes may be received as per departmental procedures
- ☐ Remind departmental faculty that candidate faculty who write letters of evaluation will be disqualified from service on the candidate's ad hoc committee in cases of appraisal and promotion

3. Department meeting

Early November

- ☐ Lead the department meeting in ensuring the departmental review is fair to the candidate and rigorous in maintaining University standards
- ☐ Ensure discussion does not include reference to anything not present in the file
- ☐ Allow equal opportunity for discussion for all present departmental faculty
- ☐ Ensure minority opinions are explained
- ☐ Encourage discussion that is evaluative and analytical in nature, rather than enumerative

4. After the Department meeting

Late November to Early December

Before the Department Letter has been finalized

- ☐ Draft department letter and make draft available for department review

Department Letter Format (introductory information)

- ☐ Note department meeting date on summary section of the department letter
- ☐ List exact votes specifying the number eligible to vote, the number in favor, opposed, abstained and unavailable
- ☐ Include all rank/steps voted on by the department, including off-scales and noting accelerations
- ☐ Identifiers of extramural letters and student letters are limited to numerical or alphabetical designations
- ☐ Merit files (other than advancement to Professor VI, advancement to and within Professor Above-Scale) are limited to a maximum of two pages

Department Letter Content

- ☐ Reports of ad hoc committees, internal to the department, are regarded as working documents and may not be forwarded with the file
- ☐ Describe the significance and impact of the teaching research and service contributions
- ☐ Present any significant evidence and differences of opinion which would explain a minority vote and/or a negative vote
- ☐ References to "top-tier" should include information to support such claim
- ☐ See the CALL for in-depth guidelines on writing departmental letters

- ☐ Provide due date for receipt of any comments on the draft
- ☐ To the extent possible, incorporate departmental faculty comments into the finalized department letter
- ☐ An oral summary of the departmental letter shall be provided to the candidate AFTER the period for the submission of minority reports is expired

After the Department Letter has been finalized

- ☐ Notify departmental faculty that the finalized department letter is ready for review. Allow 5 working days for submission of any minority reports
- ☐ 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
- ☐ Candidate completes Section II of procedural safeguard statement (Attachment B-1, the CALL)
- ☐ Advise candidate of his/her right to submit a response to the department letter. Response may be addressed to the Chair, the Dean or the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (must use attachment H of the CALL)
- ☐ Inform candidate that his/her response to the departmental letter must be received within 5 business days upon receipt of the departmental letter
- ☐ Chair writes (optional) letter for inclusion in the file. This is a confidential document and should be forwarded to the Dean's office, not retained in the department. Upon request by the candidate, access to the Chairs letter will be provided in redacted form after the final administrative decision has been communicated to the candidate, or at the Chancellor's preliminary assessment stage in promotion to tenure cases
- ☐ Copies made and file forwarded to Dean's office (by cut-off dates as listed in the CALL)

Acronyms

Academic Personnel Manual (APM)
Academic Personnel Office (APO)
Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (EVCP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)
Off Scale (O/S)
Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP)
University of California Riverside (UCR)

Glossary of Academic Personnel Terms (see also APM 110)

Above-Scale
An academic appointee who advances beyond the highest step on the salary scale in a series is considered above scale. For example, in the Professor (ladder-rank) series, the highest step on the salary scale is Step IX, so the next advancement would be to Professor, Above Scale. The honorary, unofficial title of Distinguished Professor (see below) is conferred upon those who achieve the rank of Professor, Above Scale.

Academic Appointee
A university employee who is engaged primarily in research and creative work, teaching, and/or public service, and whose duties are closely related to the University's instructional and research functions. Academic appointees include, but are not limited to, academic administrative officers, faculty, research appointees, student appointees, medical residents, University Extension appointees, and librarians.

Academic Administrative Officer
An academic appointee holding an administrative position. Academic Administrative Officers include, but are not limited to, Associate Deans, Divisional Deans, or Directors of Organized Research Units. Faculty members holding certain administrative titles such as Chancellor and Vice Chancellor are also academic administrative officers but are part of the Senior Management Group.

Academic Personnel Manual (APM)
The Academic Personnel Manual sets forth the policies and procedures pertaining to the employment relationship between an academic appointee and the University of California. For academic appointees covered by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), the APM applies only to the extent provided for in the MOU. Academic Personnel Policies are issued by the President of the University of California. The APM is available at: http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/welcome.html

Academic Review File
The academic review file is the portion of a candidate's academic personnel record that is maintained by the University for consideration of personnel actions under the criteria set forth in University policy. An academic review file must be submitted for all personnel actions that require review and approval. Academic review files should contain only material relevant to consideration of personnel actions under these criteria. Final administrative decisions concerning personnel actions, such as appointments, promotions, merit advancements, appraisals, and terminal appointments, are based solely on the material contained in the candidate's academic review file. Also referred to as the *Personnel Review File.*

Academic Senate Member
In accordance with Standing Order of the Regents 105.1, the following academic appointees are members of the Academic Senate: members of the Professor (ladder-rank) series, Professor I
n Residence series, and Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine) series, Associate and Full Acting Professors, full-time Lecturers and Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment, and full-time Lecturers and Senior Lecturers with Potential for Security of Employment. The Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Deans, Provosts, Directors of Organized Research Units, Registrar, and the University Librarian are also members of the Academic Senate.

Academic-Year Appointment
An academic-year appointment is also known as a nine-month appointment and refers to the period in which an academic appointee renders service—i.e., the academic year, from the beginning of the fall quarter through the end of the spring quarter, as opposed to the fiscal year.

Acceleration
An acceleration takes place when an appointee advances to the next rank or step after less than the normal period of service at the current rank or step. It also occurs when, through advancement, an entire step is skipped. The established normal periods of service at each rank and step may be found in the UCR Academic Salary Scales. A proposed promotion from the Assistant level to the Associate level is not considered an acceleration, unless service at the Associate level is bypassed.

Ad Hoc Committee Senate
This refers to a review committee that is nominated by the Committee on Academic Personnel and/or appointed by the Chancellor or a designated representative. It is the duty of these committees to ascertain the present fitness of each candidate and the likelihood of the candidate's pursuing a productive career. *The membership, deliberations, and recommendations of the review committee are strictly confidential*. The report of the review committee forms the basis for further review by the Committee on Academic Personnel and for action by the Chancellor.

Advisory Committee
This refers to a committee selected by the Chair to help advise on review actions. The report of the committee is used to assist and advise the department in their review. Departments should develop their own procedures on how or if they will utilize internal ad hoc committees and reports.

Affiliated Faculty
Professors who have informal associations with departments or programs external to their own departments. Since affiliated faculty have no formal responsibilities, they are not subject to academic review in this informal role.

Appointment
A new appointment is defined as employment of a candidate whose prior status was:
a. not in the employ of the University of California, Riverside, or
b. in the employ of the University of California, Riverside, but in a series that is different than the series being proposed.

Appraisal
A formal evaluation conducted during an Assistant-rank appointee's probationary period for the purpose of determining a preliminary assessment of the appointee's promise for promotion. An appraisal also identifies appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence expected. For the timing of this appraisal, see APM - 220-83 and campus procedures.

Base Salary
The approved annual salary rate associated with a designated rank and step in an appointee's title series. For candidates with off-scale salaries, the base salary includes the published scale rate plus the bonus or market off-scale salary component.

Career Review
A supplemental review, conducted at the time of a regular, on-cycle academic review, to determine whether an appointee is at the appropriate rank and step. A Career Review is initiated at the request of an eligible Senate faculty member.

Change in Series
A change of series is a change from one academic title series to another academic title series without a break in service. A change of series may occur because an individual's duties have changed.

Deferral
The postponement of an academic review based on appropriate justification. When a deferral is approved, the entire academic review process is delayed for one year. Work completed during the deferral period is considered at the time of the deferred review.

Emeritus
An honorary title conferred upon retirement on every Academic Senate member and, with the approval of the President, on other academic appointees who are not Academic Senate members but who meet specific criteria established by the President.

Expiration of Appointment
See Non-Reappointment

Faculty Member
A faculty member is an academic appointee in a school, college, division, or department who has independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.
Students in a UC degree program who teach independently within their disciplines are not considered faculty.
Academic appointees in the following titles or series (including those recalled to active service) are considered faculty:
• Professor series
• Acting titles in the Professor series
• Visiting titles in the Professor series
• Professor In Residence series
• Adjunct Professor series
• Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine) series
• Clinical Professor series
• Supervisor of Teacher Education
• Lecturer or Senior Lecturer
• Lecturer or Senior Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment (PSOE)
• Lecturer or Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment (SOE)

Fiscal-Year Appointment
A fiscal-year appointment refers to the period in which an academic appointee renders service—i.e., throughout the calendar year (12 months), as opposed to the academic year (9 months).

Full-Time Appointment
A full-time academic appointment is defined as an appointment at 100 percent time, regardless of the appointment's duration.

Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)
A budget term, which is abbreviated as FTE, used to describe a unit equal to a full-time (100 percent) position for one year. Allocation of an FTE denotes a permanently budgeted position.

Joint Appointments
Appointments in two (or more) departments. Such appointments may cross divisional, or campus unit boundaries. Joint appointments usually include a salaried appointment in one unit with an additional non-salaried appointment in another unit (e.g., a 100% time appointment as ladder-rank Professor in the Department of Biochemistry, with a non-salaried appointment as Professor in the Department of Statistics.)

Ladder-Rank Faculty
Ladder-rank faculty (LRF) are those appointed in the Professor series. “Ladder-rank” denotes faculty with tenure or on tenure track (at the Assistant Professor rank). Ladder-rank faculty are also referred to as the “regular ranks.” A permanently budgeted position must be allocated for each ladder-rank appointment.

Merit Advancement
A merit advancement is awarded on the basis of a favorable evaluation of an appointee's performance within a single review period. For series in which there is a rank and step system, a merit advancement is a one-step increase in salary within the same rank or an advancement to an above-scale or further above-scale salary. For series in which there is a salary range, a merit advancement is an increase in salary rate without a change in rank or title. Academic appointees in student titles are not eligible for merit advancements.

Non-Reappointment
A non-reappointment occurs when the University does not reappoint an appointee with a term appointment. Also referred to as an *expiration of appointment.*

Non-Senate Academic Appointee
A non-Senate academic appointee is not a member of the UCR Academic Senate. Non-Senate academic appointees include, but are not limited to, appointees in the Adjunct Professor, Health Sciences Clinical Professor, Lecturer or Senior Lecturer, Professional Research (Research Scientist), Project Scientist, Specialist, Academic Coordinator, Academic Administrator, Librarian, Cooperative Extension Specialist, Continuing Educator, and Coordinator of Public Programs series.

Off-Scale Salary (O/S)
The salary for an academic appointee at a given rank and step is designated as off-scale if it is higher than the published salary for that rank and step in the relevant series.

Part-Time Appointment
A part-time appointment is an appointment at less than 100 percent time.

Personnel Review File
See Academic Review File

Salary Increase
An advancement in salary, but not in step.

Salary Scales
Salary scales are published listings of salary rates or salary ranges established for academic series. Salary scales may be divided into steps, or into ranks and steps within the ranks. A salary range is a published listing of the minimum and maximum salary for a particular title. Salary scales are published in http://www.ucop.edu/acadpersonnel/1112/

Security of Employment
This refers to the Lecturer or Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series. An appointee in this series holds a continuous appointment that may not be terminated except for good cause after the opportunity for a hearing before the properly constituted advisory committee of the Academic Senate. A permanently budgeted position must be allocated for each LSOE appointment.

Series
An academic series is a group of academic titles that carry rank designations (e.g., Assistant, Associate, and full Professor), and in which promotion from one rank to a higher rank is possible. The criteria for evaluation and terms of appointment for each series vary and are described in the Academic Personnel Manual and Policy and Procedure Manual.

Split FTE Appointment
An appointment in which the FTE of a tenured/tenure-track (ladder-rank) appointee is divided (split) among two or more departments, divisions, or campus units. An example of a split FTE appointment is 50% time as a ladder-rank professor in the Department of Biochemistry and 50% time as a ladder-rank professor in the Graduate School of Education.

Step
Most academic series have established salary levels within each rank. Each salary level is referred to as a step (e.g., Assistant Professor, *Step II*).

Student Appointee
A student appointee is a registered UCR student who is appointed, usually under the general supervision of a faculty member, at 50 percent time or less during the academic year in an academic title.

Tenure
Tenure is employment that is permanent unless terminated by retirement, demotion, or dismissal. Only appointment as Associate Professor and Professor confer tenure. An appointment with tenure may only be terminated by the Regents for good cause, after the opportunity for a hearing before the properly constituted advisory committee of the Academic Senate.

Term Appointment
A term appointment is an appointment made with a specific ending date. Term appointments end on the established ending date (referred to as non-reappointment), unless the appointee has been recommended for reappointment, and the reappointment is approved as a result of an academic review.

Terminal Appointment
Refers to a reappointment made with the specific intent not to continue the appointment after the ending date. A terminal appointment occurs when an academic review has resulted in a decision not to continue an appointee in his or her series, and a notice of termination period is required. A terminal appointment is distinct from a *term appointment.*

Title
An appointee's academic title indicates the series and rank or level of the position to which he or she is appointed. In appropriate circumstances and in accordance with University policy, certain modifying terms may be added to clarify important aspects of the position.
• Rank, when rank is not implicit in the title itself (i.e., *Associate* Professor, *Senior* Lecturer, *Assistant* Research Scientist).
• The special status of an appointment as compared to others in the same series (i.e., *Acting* Assistant Professor, *Visiting* Research Scientist, Professor *Emeritus*).
• Appointment to a named endowed Chair (i.e., *Stephen Kuffler* Professor of Biology).

Title Code
For purposes of payroll and other reporting requirements, each title is assigned a four-digit title code. Academic title codes range from 0840 to 3999.

Title Series
See Series