

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR SENATE FACULTY

"THE CALL"
2023-2024AY

**OFFICE OF THE PROVOST & EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR
VICE PROVOST FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
JULY 1, 2023**

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

Addendum: Academic Personnel Review and COVID-19 This addendum to the AY23-24 Call provides guidance to address the impact the COVID-19 pandemic will have on the personnel review process of senate faculty. While the addendum specifically applies to AY23-24 files, it may be updated in future years to reflect the evolving impact of the pandemic. The guidelines presented in this addendum emerged from aligning alternative ideas discussed during the consultative process with following set of guiding principles:

1. An overarching goal is to prevent faculty from becoming academic victims of the COVID-19 pandemic.
2. It would be better for our campus as a whole to overestimate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on faculty productivity than to underestimate it.
3. It is important to protect the pursuit of tenure by assistant professors from adverse impacts of COVID-19 that are beyond their control, but it is also important to recognize that associate professors and full professors are also trying to reach important career path milestones.
4. It is important to the campus climate that there be tools in the personnel review process that support faculty in staying on track with their career despite the COVID-19 pandemic.
5. It is recognized that there is a disparity in the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic between disciplines, and even between sub-disciplines.
6. It is recognized that the COVID-19 pandemic will likely have differential impact on different demographic groups, including female faculty, faculty with younger children, and URM faculty.
7. It is recognized that it is not only the campus closure that has caused major disruption in research programs. Other sources of disruption include, for example, travel restrictions, closures of museums, exhibition venues, theatres, and archives, cancellation of conferences and film festivals, family situations, children at home, homeschooling roles, compromised workspace, and even COVID-19 illness.

The following are specific guidelines to the AY23-24 personnel review process of senate faculty intended to adapt the process to reflect the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

1. Stop the Clocks for one year will be granted upon application by assistant professors for issues arising from the COVID-19 pandemic. Assistant Professors will need to use the Stop the Clock Certification Form to make this request. Supporting documentation that is requested on the form does not need to be provided. A COVID-19 related request for Stop the Clock will not count toward the 2-year maximum for Stop the Clock requests. For assistant professors who have reached their 2-year Stop the Clock maximum, the required approval for a third year will receive expedited review by the systemwide Provost, Katherine S. Newman. It remains the case that the maximum number of STCs that can be approved for any reason is three.

As has always been the case, tenured faculty have an option to defer their merit or promotion file. Deferral requests may be submitted on or before the published dates for merits or promotions. A deferral is good for one year. However, all faculty must be reviewed at least every five years.

2. It is understood that faculty may choose not to include teaching evaluations in their files for classes taught during the Spring 2020, but beyond that quarter student teaching evaluations should be included per the guidance provided in APM-210. **Student teaching evaluations from all classes taught between Spring 2020 and Spring 2022 (inclusive) will have a watermark stamped on them indicating they were taught during the pandemic.**
3. Recall that [Section II.A.5](#) (Review Criteria) of the CALL reminds reviewers to recognize faculty achievements that promote equal opportunity and diversity. It is recommended to be intentional about recognizing faculty achievements that promote equal opportunity and diversity. Per APM-210, “Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of California’s diverse population, or research in a scholar’s area of expertise that highlights inequalities.” Teaching, research, and service are the specific review categories for a file. [Section II.A.5](#) (Review Criteria) of the CALL also reminds reviewers that contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can strengthen the existing review categories of research, teaching, and service.
4. Departments should include a separate statement as an addendum to the department letter, limited to one page, that describes the impact to-date of the COVID-19 pandemic on their discipline, including increased specificity for sub-disciplines as necessary.
5. It is recommended that candidates explain the challenges and opportunities presented by the COVID-19 pandemic on their research, teaching, or service when preparing the self-statements and updating their eFilePlus. For this purpose, candidates can either: a) use space in their self-statement, or b) include a separate statement, limited to one page and limited in scope to discussion of individual COVID-19 pandemic challenges. The candidate should offer comments on anomalies in the record that are due to the impact of COVID-19 such as the campus closure, research ramp-down and/or ramp-up activities, restricted travel, event cancellations, and impaired work time. Candidates are advised to exclude personal information, and to keep the focus on how they were impacted and not why. Candidates should also offer comments on the positive contributions they made to help the campus overcome the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic. Departmental reviews, Deans, CAP, the VPAP, the Provost and the Chancellor will take these factors into consideration, as described in (7) - (9) below, when reviewing cases that cover this time period.
6. Recall that [Section II.A.5](#) (Review Criteria) of the CALL reminds reviewers to use the flexibility provided in APM-210 when weighing achievements across the different evaluation areas. It is recommended to use the flexibility provided in APM-210 when weighing

achievements across the different evaluation areas. The relevant verbiage in APM-210 is: “In evaluating the candidate’s qualifications within these areas, the review committee shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing when the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another.” The COVID-19 pandemic will have created situations where faculty have demonstrated exemplary effort in teaching and service that compensate for their reduced opportunity to reach norms in research productivity. Additional relevant verbiage in APM-210 is: “As the University enters new fields of endeavor and refocuses its ongoing activities, cases will arise in which the proper work of faculty members departs markedly from established academic patterns. In such cases, the review committees must take exceptional care to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility.” The COVID-19 pandemic has caused the University to refocus its ongoing activities, and there will be cases where the work of faculty members departs markedly from established academic patterns.

7. When using the flexibility afforded by APM-210 to review personnel files, it is recommended to:
 - a. Give due recognition to faculty community engagements that demonstrate the impact of their research.
 - b. Recall that [Section II.A.5](#) (Review Criteria) of the CALL reminds reviewers to be mindful of rewarding mentoring and advising activities. Per APM-210, “Mentoring and advising of students and faculty members, particularly from underrepresented and underserved populations, should be given due recognition in the teaching or service categories of the academic personnel process.” Encourage the review process to consider the role of the candidate both in the inter-personal aspects of mentoring (what might fall under teaching category) and the scholarly engagement of the candidate in leading and contributing to the advancement of the research (what might blend into the research category).
 - c. Recall that [Section II.A.5](#) (Review Criteria) of the CALL reminds reviewers to encourage candidates to be as specific as possible when writing their contribution statements for collaborative publications. It will be helpful to file reviewers to understand the contributions in the context of them being conceptual contributions, methodological contributions, resource enabling contributions, project administration roles, and dissemination activities.
 - d. Give appropriate consideration to submitted work. Per APM-210, “Work in progress should be assessed whenever possible.” Candidates should be encouraged, for example, to include scholarly work submitted to a peer-review process and comment on completed work that could not be exhibited due to closures of exhibition venues. References to these materials should be reviewed and commented on in the department letter. The department comments on these materials will be considered within the context of relevant auxiliary supporting materials by the later stages of the review process.
 - e. Offer greater reward for scholarly activities that might otherwise be regarded as secondary activities in normal circumstances. As just one illustrative example, in some disciplines a

review paper might be considered a secondary activity, but this activity could be reviewed in the context of how the COVID-19 pandemic hampered other primary activities.

f. Recognize and reward faculty for responding to the need to pivot toward new and equally viable forms of scholarship when the traditional norms were obstructed by the pandemic. This is especially important in order to keep promotion files from being unduly delayed.

8. For AY23-24 an O/S salary increase of half the merit step salary increase can be proposed when an on-schedule merit file is judged insufficient for a merit advance solely due to COVID-19 issues. In these cases, the judgement that should be rendered is that the file was on track for a merit advance until it was derailed by events pertaining to the COVID-19 pandemic during the March 2020 thru September 2023 time-period.

Assistant professors who are not awarded a merit advance, but receive the half step O/S salary increase according to the above provision, will have their merit file marked as “COVID-19 Impacted”, and are recommended to request a one year Stop the Clock if they have not done so already, and should have an updated merit file reviewed again in AY24-25; if the review is positive the half O/S salary increase will be replaced by the scale salary increase that corresponds to the merit advance.

This provision does not apply to accelerated merit advances, merit advances to Professor Step VI, merit advances to Professor Above-Scale, or promotions since those personnel actions occur at barrier steps that involve longer review periods. Nor does the provision apply to files that received a “COVID-19 Impacted” outcome in AY20-21 or AY21-22 or AY22-23.

Assistant professors who are not awarded a merit advance, and do not receive the half step O/S increase according to the above provision, will receive a “Negative” outcome and are recommended to request a one year Stop the Clock if they have not done so already.

Tenured professors who are not awarded a merit advance, and do not receive the half step O/S increase according to the above provision, will receive a “Negative” outcome.

9. Faculty who have positive outcomes in AY23-24 for promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Full Professor are eligible for consideration of a retroactive pay increase for the raise that accompanies the promotion.

For consideration of the retroactive pay increase, faculty who put forward promotion files should submit a COVID-19 Promotion Statement that explains why the effects of the pandemic caused the promotion file to be held back in AY20-21 or AY21-22 or AY22-23. The statement should point to materials that are in the file now but were not there earlier and it should be explained how the pandemic was the reason for the delay.

When review bodies are positive about the promotion, they will also provide a vote on their assessment of the COVID-19 Promotion Statement in terms of whether or not the assertion the promotion was delayed by the pandemic is valid. Faculty who receive a positive outcome to their promotion file along with a determination that the promotion was delayed by the pandemic will receive their salary increase for the promotion retroactive to either July 1, 2021 or July 1, 2022 or July 1, 2023, depending on what was judged to be the length of the delay.

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCEDURES AY23-24

Table of Contents

I.	SCHEDULE FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEWS 2023-2024AY	9
II.	PROCEDURES	10
A.	General Review Procedures for Senate Faculty Academic Personnel Files	10
1.	Role of Academic Personnel Office (APO), Routing, Delegation Chart and eFilePlus	10
2.	Bylaw 55 & Department Voting Rights	10
3.	Extension Requests	11
4.	Procedures Regarding Eligibility	11
5.	Review Criteria	13
6.	Life Event Outcome	16
7.	Procedures Before the Personnel Review File is Assembled	17
8.	Procedures Before the Departmental Recommendation is Determined	18
9.	Procedures During Departmental Review	19
10.	Procedures After the Departmental Recommendation is Determined	21
11.	Procedures During Review Beyond the Department	22
12.	Procedures for Announcement of Administrative Decision	23
13.	Appeals of Promotion and Appointment Cases – 220 Response	24
14.	Procedures for Off-Cycle Appointments	25
B.	Instructions for Specific Actions	25
1.	Advancement to Above-Scale	26
1.1	Special Circumstances That May Result in Advancement to Above Scale	26
2.	Advancement within Above-Scale	26
3.	Advancement to Professor VI	27
4.	Appointment	27
5.	Appraisal	28
6.	Career Review	28
7.	Deferral	29
8.	Lateral Promotion	30
9.	Merit Advancement	30
10.	Off-Scale (O/S) Salary	31
11.	Promotion	32
12.	Quinquennial Review	33

13.	Reappointment of Assistant Professors.....	34
C.	Other Reviews and Recommendations	35
1.	Department Chair.....	35
2.	Joint Appointments in Two or More Units	36
3.	Faculty with Defined Duties in Other Units	37
4.	Professor of Teaching Series (also referred to as Lecturer with Security of Employment Series) (APM 285)	37
5.	Health Science Professor of Clinical X.....	37
D.	Access to Academic Personnel Records (APM 158 & 160).....	38
1.	The basic regulations pertaining to access include:	38
2.	Requests for corrections, deletions, additions to personnel records.....	38
3.	Procedures to be followed by faculty members when requesting access to records	38
4.	Access by Third Parties	38
III.	DOCUMENTS	38
A.	Ad Hoc Review Committee Report (Senate).....	38
B.	Ad Hoc Committee Report (Departmental).....	39
C.	Bibliography of Publications and/or Creative Activity (UC format) – At Last Advance.....	39
D.	Bibliography of Publications and/or Creative Activity (UC format) – Current.....	39
1.	Categories	39
2.	Status.....	40
3.	Patents.....	40
E.	Candidate's Response to Departmental Recommendation (Attachment H).....	41
F.	Candidate's Response to Extramural Letters and/or Other Contents of the File.....	42
G.	Chair's Letter (Optional).....	42
H.	Checklist of Documents.....	43
I.	Dean's Recommendation Letter	43
J.	Departmental Recommendation Letter.....	44
1.	Contents of the Departmental Letter	44
K.	Difference List.....	46
L.	Extramural Letters	47
M.	Fellowship and Grant Activity	50
N.	Letters from Other Departments/Programs/Institutes/Centers.....	51
O.	Minority Reports	51
P.	Procedural Safeguards Statement	51
Q.	Professional Activity and Service.....	51
R.	Publications/Creative Activities	52
S.	Sabbatical Leave Reports and Conflict of Commitment Filing (APM 025)	52
T.	Self-Statement (optional but strongly encouraged)	53
U.	Student or Resident Evaluations of Teaching.....	53
V.	Other Evidence of Teaching and Mentoring Expertise.....	54
W.	Teaching Information (formerly, TLD or Teaching Load Data)	55
X.	University and Public Service	56
Y.	Department Research and Creative Work Statements	56
Z.	Other Letters.....	56

IV. ATTACHMENTS, DEPARTMENT CHAIR CHECKLIST, AND GLOSSARY57

Acronyms 83

Glossary of Academic Personnel Terms (see also APM 110) 83

Note: Checklists for Review Actions, Request for Access to Records, Grant Activity Checklist, Teaching Information Checklist, and Supplemental Teaching Information Checklist are available via the Academic Personnel Office website under Forms and Checklists.

Academic Personnel Review Procedures

I. SCHEDULE FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEWS 2023-2024AY

Chairs and Deans must establish due dates to enable timely handling of files in order to meet the Academic Personnel Office (APO) deadline. The table below lists deadlines, but when the file is ready please forward it to APO so it can be processed as expeditiously as possible.

Personnel Review Action	Date Due in Academic Personnel Office	File Entry Cut Off Date
Promotion to Associate Professor Advancement to Above Scale (A/S)	The third Tuesday in January	September 30
Promotion to Full Professor Advancement to Professor VI Career Review	The first Monday in February	
Reappointment of Assistant Professor	The first Monday in March	
Appraisal Merit Quinquennial Review	One third due the third Monday in November Two thirds due the first Tuesday in April 100% due the first Monday in May	

Note: For all cases, letters should be solicited before September 1 to allow reviewers ample time to respond. For 7th year promotion to Associate Professor cases, extramural letters must not be solicited until after June 30 (or any earlier than the end of the 6th year). (For off-cycle appointments refer to section II.A.14 to see how these dates are adjusted.) 7th year promotion to Associate Professor files may be updated until April 30 of the 7th year. The deadline for receipt of Extramural and Student letters is November 1st. If there is good reason to grant an exception to this deadline and the file will be on time to APO, then the new deadline will be at the discretion of the Dean. Evidence of decanal approval and the reason for granting the extension must be included in the eFilePlus.

Announcements of final Academic Personnel Review decisions will be made 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 set. 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

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 shall be used.

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

The Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP) is designated by the Chancellor and the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (PEVC) 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 PEVC via APO. All items must be submitted to APO via the appropriate Dean’s Office and be addressed to the Chancellor.

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) provides advice to the Chancellor (or designee) on academic personnel matters. The VPAP is the Chancellor’s and PEVC’s designee for facilitating administrative input and advice from CAP. The full committee charge for CAP can be found on [Academic Senate](#).

The Delegation of Authority Chart provides information on the final authority on review actions. It can be found on the APO website: [Policies and Procedures](#).

The eFilePlus System is used for a routed, paperless review of merit and promotion files. Processes outside of eFilePlus 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 eFilePlus system can be found on the eFilePlus website at [APO eFilePlus](#).

NOTE: As of the 2017-2018AY review cycle, the use of eFilePlus is mandatory for all files. Extensive documentation may be uploaded to the Other section as a PDF.

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: [Academic Senate](#) under Committee Listings, Academic Personnel.

The method of voting to comply with Bylaw 55 is left to the discretion of the department. It is important that this be done in a consistent way that results in a clear picture of faculty opinion about the proposed action. Review of departmental delegations and procedures are solicited annually by the Academic Senate Office. Bylaw 55 forms must be completed and submitted to the Academic Senate by the end of October or before the first personnel meeting whichever comes first. CAP shall provide copies to APO and the Dean’s offices by the first week of November.

3. Extension Requests

Extension requests will be granted only under exceptional circumstances and must be approved by the VPAP prior to the final due date for submission to APO published in [Section I](#). Such a request must be forwarded through the Dean's office and must clearly justify 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 additional time to receive extramural letters, then the extension request must additionally request an exception to include letters dated past the due date. If the estimated submittal date for any action is beyond the final date for files to be received by APO (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. **It can be expected that files** received after the extension deadline or beyond the final due date listed on the Schedule for Academic Personnel Reviews **will** 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 review 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	VI		3 or more years
			VII		3 or more years
			VIII		3 or more years
			IX		3 or more years
				no steps/ just merits	4 or more years

*Review for promotion to Associate Professor must occur no later than the 7th 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.7](#) 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 cannot defer (See [Section II.B.7](#)).

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.12-Quinquennial Review](#).)

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 strength in all areas of review during the abbreviated review period. Exceptional strength in one area is not sufficient to offset a weakness in another area. In addition:

- i. For one-year accelerations within rank, the record for the abbreviated review period must reflect a level of **research and/or creative activities that are** commensurate with the normal on-time merit.
- ii. **For multiple year accelerations the record for the abbreviated review period must reflect excellence in all areas of review, and the research and/or creative activities must be commensurate with what would be expected for the proposal advancement.**
- iii. **When evaluating the potential for accelerations within the Professor of Teaching Series, the guidance provided in the UCR Guidelines for the Professor of Teaching Series should be consulted when assessing if the level of achievements within the area of “Professional and/or Scholarly Achievements and Activity” are commensurate with the proposed advance. Other than that, the guidelines for accelerations that are listed above apply.**
- iv. 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 must 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.

The charts below show potential movements at the time of promotion from assistant to associate and from associate to full. The cells in the table labeled “Promotion criteria have been met” correspond to promotions where the achievements in the file meet the expected requirements (with no consideration about the length of time at rank and step) for a promotion, whereas cells identified as accelerated movement correspond to promotions where the achievements in the file go above and beyond the expected requirements. Cells labeled as “Lateral” correspond to promotions where the achievements in the file meet only the minimal requirements for promotion.

CHART I - PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR					
From Assistant Professor	To Associate Professor				
	Steps	I	II	III	IV
	I, II, III, IV	Promotion criteria have been met	2-yr acceleration	4-yr acceleration	6-yr acceleration
	V	Lateral	Promotion criteria have been met	2-yr acceleration	4-yr acceleration
	VI	-	Lateral	Promotion criteria have been met	2-yr acceleration

CHART II - PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO FULL PROFESSOR					
From Associate Professor	To Full Professor				
	Steps	I	II	III	IV
	I, II, III	Promotion criteria have been met	3-yr acceleration	6-yr acceleration	9-yr acceleration
	IV	Lateral	Promotion criteria have been met	3-yr acceleration	6-yr acceleration
	V	-	Lateral	Promotion criteria have been met	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. 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 that 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](#)). The flexibility provided in APM-210-1-d should be used when weighing achievements across the different evaluation areas. The relevant verbiage in APM-210-1-d is: “In evaluating the candidate’s qualifications within these areas, the review committee shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing when the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another.” Some level of compensation between achievements can support a merit advance, but a significant imbalance will not be successful.

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, although the degree of participation may depend on whether the department has 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. Contributions to developing and updating course curriculum should be recognized. Discussion of mentoring (such as of individual undergraduates, undergraduate groups/organizations, individual graduate students, graduate organizations, **international students via education abroad programs**, postdoctoral scholars, project scientists or junior faculty, especially those from groups underrepresented within the discipline) and what has been achieved through that mentoring is expected and appropriate. For example, metrics such as the number of completed or in-progress MS, MA, MFA or PhD students, if graduate students won fellowships, co-authored papers, presented at conferences, gained internship opportunities are indications of positive mentoring. It is appropriate to bring attention to mentoring awards. One way to indicate time and effort dedicated to mentoring within eFilePlus is to go under Other Teaching Info, click on Activity and then choose Other Supervision/Advising. Here one can, for example, list mentoring activities that take place at conferences, on the campus, or within the community as well as names of students mentored. Mentoring activities relating to staff can also be included. Candidates also have the option to discuss their roles in mentoring in a one-page mentorship statement as described in [Section III.V](#).

In the area of research, "There must 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 must 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. Candidates also are encouraged to be as specific as possible when writing their contribution statements for collaborative publications. It will be helpful to file reviewers to understand the contributions in the context of them being conceptual contributions, methodological contributions, resource enabling contributions, project administration roles, and dissemination activities.

Research and scholarship must be performed at the highest level. In many areas, extramural support is essential for a high-quality research program. Although grants are not a necessary metric of research productivity, in many disciplines the receipt of major research grant or fellowship is considered work that has undergone a rigorous peer-review process that can denote current research productivity, sustainability of future research productivity, peer recognition, and leadership. For faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor, Step IV or lower, major research grants or fellowships secured during the merit review period reflect research productivity and impact should be recognized as contributing to the scholarly achievements in the file in the same way as technical journal articles contribute. Additionally, grants or fellowships that recognize overall career accomplishment may be viewed as awards or honors, and faculty who lead large center and/or training grants can have these efforts recognized as contributions to campus service. Moreover, extraordinary success in being awarded extramural grants or fellowships can be the basis for additional off-scale or acceleration.

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.

It is recognized that the timeline from the start of a book project to the appearance of the book in print must nearly always be measured in years, and it often extends across multiple review periods. Withholding credit until publication can thus disadvantage a scholar in a book-based

discipline (disciplines in which a book-length monograph is typically required for promotion) relative to colleagues for whom completion of an item of research has a much shorter arc. To this end, a completed book chapter that is part of an established, single-author book project, (or equivalent, depending on the discipline and as articulated in the department research statement) is eligible to be accepted as sufficient scholarly activity for a merit one time for all faculty at each rank (assistant, associate, full) if it is determined that: 1) the scholarly activity in the file is otherwise insufficient for a merit, 2) the book chapter was completed during the review period, and 3) the book chapter qualifies as an essentially finished entity and its place in the eventual book is identified. The completed book chapter along with the book project plan should be uploaded as one PDF into eFilePlus under Other Information, Non-Confidential Document.

Candidates must indicate their desire to avail themselves to the book chapter accommodation by stating it clearly in their self-statement. Completed but unpublished book chapters cannot be used to support accelerations, promotions, additional off-scale for merits, or additional off-scale for non-barrier step quinquennials; such unpublished book chapters may be considered in cases of barrier step quinquennials as part of an evaluation of whether productivity would be sufficient for a merit if another step existed. If a book chapter that received this accommodation is subsequently published in lieu of the book project (e.g., a stand-alone book chapter or an article in a book) the candidate contribution statement should note that the work was previously credited with this accommodation.

An April 2022 [Memo](#) from the UC Provost encourages that contributions around innovations transfer and entrepreneurship should be recognized and rewarded in the review of merit and promotion files for contributing to a vital part of the mission of the University of California. These contributions include, for example, patent activity, industry-supported research creation and contribution to startup companies, commercialization of scholarly activities, and providing students with translational and entrepreneurial experiences.

For Professional Activity, see [APM 210-1-d \(3\)](#). For University and Public Service see [APM 210-1-d \(4\)](#). The level of involvement in each should be commensurate with stage of career. Thus, for full professors, evidence of leadership in both professional and university service would increasingly be expected with moves to higher steps.

University service would normally graduate over time from contributions to the department at the assistant professor level, to contributions to the college/school, campus, and system-wide levels at the higher professional levels. Service in the Academic Senate should be encouraged and expected at one or more points during the course of a faculty's UCR career. In addition to listing committees they serve on, candidates should also explain their role and provide a sense for the level of their involvement and their specific contributions. Commitment to and potential impact of service are expected to grow with experience.

The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of California's diverse population, or research in a scholar's area of expertise that highlights inequalities. Mentoring and advising of students and faculty members, particularly from underrepresented and underserved populations, should be given due recognition in the teaching or service categories of the academic personnel process ([APM 210-1-d](#)).

While contributions to DEI can strengthen the existing review categories of research, teaching, and service, the language in APM-210-1-d does not add a fourth category of evaluation, and does not imply that research or service that intersects with impacts on URM populations is more valued than other research and service.

a. First Personnel Actions at UCR Only

Items that were not credited at appointment but which have been completed (e.g. grants awarded, papers published, talks given) between the submission of the appointment file and date of appointment may be included. The review period should be adjusted to capture these items. A list of the items that would normally fall under an eFilePlus category must be included on the cover sheet of the Department Letter.

b. Area of Research Not Aligned with Department

Under circumstances when the research has moved beyond, and no longer aligns with, department/college expertise (e.g. a series of romance novels written by a biomedical scientist), a senate ad hoc committee will be required in cases of promotion. The ad hoc committee will be expected to contribute names for extramural letter solicitations, as well as writing their report.

6. Life Event Outcome

Beginning in AY22-23, faculty who are submitting normative time or decelerated merit files have the option to request their file be reviewed for a new Life Event Outcome. Normative time merits refer to merit files that are put forward following normative time (APM-220) at the current rank and step. Decelerated merits are those merits put forward with longer than normative time at the current rank and step. Requests for additional off-scale, accelerated merits, promotions, advancement to VI, and advancement to above scale are not eligible to be reviewed for the Life Event Outcome.

Review for the Life Event Outcome modifies the merit and promotion review process to include an accommodation for reduced scholarly/creative productivity when the reduced productivity is attributable to life events that understandably interrupt the opportunity to achieve. Life Events are defined as childbearing parental leave, parental bonding leave, adoption, serious health conditions (personal or family member), disability, death and bereavement, effects of a natural disaster, effects of significant delays in the provision of research space and/or facilities, effects of significant delays in resources committed to the faculty and necessary for the faculty member's research activities, or other significant circumstance or **events (e.g., the effects of new IT systems or of labor actions by represented employees)** that disrupts an individual faculty member's ability to pursue University scholarly/creative achievements. Each of the Life Events that qualify for the Life Event Outcome review appears in a UC system APM policy as a qualifying event for some type of relief. However, Life Event Outcome reviews do not require the faculty member to have requested relief from any an APM policy.

Life Event Outcomes can be awarded for merit files when: 1) the achievement bars for teaching and service have been reached, and 2) the achievement bar for scholarly/creative activities has not been met but the achievements are evaluated to be have reached at least halfway toward the bar. In these cases, although the merit advance is not awarded, half of the salary increase that would have gone along with a positive merit is awarded as temporary additional off-scale. At the next review that results in a positive merit, the temporary off-scale is removed and replaced by an increase of the scale component of salary that goes along with positive merit. Multiple Life

Event Outcomes are possible over the career of a faculty member. However, back-to-back Life Event Outcome reviews are not allowed and candidates who receive a COVID-IMPACTED outcome for a review may not request a Life Event Outcome review for their subsequent review.

Requests by a faculty member for a Life Event Outcome review requires pre-approval. The procedure for obtaining the approval is as follows:

1. During the preparation of their merit file, **and prior to releasing it to the department for review**, the faculty member sends a request to use the policy to APO along with any required supporting documentation that would be submitted if relief from a related APM policy was being requested.
2. APO will review the request to establish the circumstances qualify as a Life Event within the context of the potential Life Event Outcome, and will also establish that the event overlapped with the period of review for the merit file.
3. The VPAP provides final approval for the request. For approved requests, a letter is sent to the department chair, **with a copy to the college/school AP Director**, indicating that the merit review should also include consideration of the Life Event Outcome. No details about the reason for the request will be shared in the letter to the chair.
4. For approved requests, the department will vote on both the merit and the Life Event Outcome. When a department letter includes a vote on the Life Event Outcome, all upstream review entities will also include a vote on the Life Event Outcome.

7. 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 must not independently add materials to the file that cannot be documented. Only material pertinent to evaluation should be in the review file. 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 must present and contextualize the scholarly and intellectual contributions of the candidate in each area of review. Review shall be based only on what is contained in the file. The candidate must provide all pertinent material and information requested in eFilePlus and certify the file is complete (as verified by the Procedural Safeguard Statement). A separate Promotion file and Merit file cannot be submitted in the same review cycle.

It is the expectation of the Deans, CAP and the VPAP that all faculty having advancement cases shall provide their updated material to the Department/School/Division Chair as early as possible. Cooperation in completion of information in 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. In the case of promotions and advancement to VI, the candidate may wish indicate if placement at a higher than normal step should be reviewed and voted upon. In such a case, the candidate should provide justification for the higher placement in their self-statement.
3. Associate Professors and above may wish to defer review. (For limitations, see Section [II.B.7-Deferral.](#))

4. The faculty member may wish to be considered for a merit if the faculty member is not at the highest step and is not in the 7th year in the Assistant rank.
 - a. The Chair confirms the impending review with the candidate.
 - b. The Chair makes certain the candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process and is made aware of [APM 210-1](#), [APM 220-80](#), and [APM 160](#)
 - c. The Chair makes certain the candidate is given an opportunity to:
 - i. Ask questions.
 - ii. Encourage the candidate to begin updating eFilePlus, including a self-statement (see [Section III. U](#)) and a mentorship statement (see [Section III. V](#))
 - 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.
5. The faculty member may wish to discuss the possibility of an additional O/S or an acceleration if the record warrants this distinction (see [Section II.B.10](#)).

8. Procedures Before the Departmental Recommendation is Determined

- a. The Chair shall provide the candidate the opportunity to inspect all the non-confidential material in the personnel review file. Confidential documents (including declinations from extramural reviewers) shall be made available to the candidate. These documents shall be provided in the form of redacted copies. Per information given to extramural letter writers “The University of California will keep your name and institutional affiliation confidential. Any identifying information on the letterhead and within your signature block will be removed. However, pursuant to state law and University policy, the full text of the body of your letter will be provided to the candidate. **In order to keep your identity confidential, you may want to avoid putting information in the body of your letter that would identify you**”.

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.

- b. The candidate shall be given five (5) business days to submit a written statement in response to or commenting upon material in the file, including confidential documents. The response, if any, shall be included in the review file. Alternatively, the candidate may waive the waiting period.
- c. The file must be opened to faculty in the department, according to departmental Bylaw 55. For Joint Appointments and Faculty with Defined Duties in Other Units, (see [Section II.C](#)). The members of the department who are eligible to vote or have an advisory vote shall be given at least five (5) business days to access and review the file before voting. In the case of absentee ballots, all votes must be received prior to the department meeting.
- d. The candidate must sign Section I of the Procedural Safeguards Statement ([Attachment B-1](#)).

9. 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) must be contacted directly for allegations of procedures which violate the Faculty Code of Conduct (APM-015).
- b. Participation in personnel meetings is considered part of a faculty member's service duties. There must be a concerted effort to ensure participation by as many faculties as possible in department meetings. Academic Personnel may return the file if insufficient departmental votes are recorded. Physical presence of faculty members is required in discussions intended to lead to a vote on academic personnel actions. Physical presence is defined as attending the meeting in person to allow for complete participation in the deliberations, discussions, decisions, and/or voting. Remote attendance is permissible if it can be organized in a way that enables engagement and preserves confidentiality. Under extenuating circumstances, there may be absentee ballots. All absentee votes must be received prior to the departmental meeting. If opinions are expressed via an absentee ballot, then they must be discussed at the 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 does not have any negative votes.
- 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 two (2) business days. It is the department faculty's responsibility to ensure that the letter accurately reflects the discussion. 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 shall be allowed except for corrections of errors of fact).

When the Chair notifies the faculty of the **finalized** departmental letter the faculty have 24 hours to notify the Chair of their intent to write a minority report which is then due five (5) business days after the original Chair notification (i.e. the 24 hours is part of the five (5) business days). If the Chair is not informed of a forthcoming minority report, there is no requirement for the five (5) day period and the file may move forward.

Identifiers of extramural and student letters are to be limited to numerical or alphabetical designations in the department letter. The same protection of confidentiality must also be extended to statements made by 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 must 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.G](#)).

If the personnel action involves the Department Chair, a senior faculty member to act as Chair for the file is designated by the Dean. This faculty member may also prepare a "Chair's Letter."

The candidate will be able to review and discuss with the chair the unredacted finalized department letter and any redacted 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 be confined to the evaluation of teaching, research or service as discussed at the department meeting but not viewed as being represented in the department letter. The report must 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 attempts to revise the departmental letter to more accurately reflect departmental opinion reaches an impasse. 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.

The discussion in minority reports must not invoke the names of extramural referees, eligible voters, or students. The minority report must be signed. A redacted version of the minority report is provided as an addendum to the department letter. Any response to the department letter and minority report must be treated as one document. All minority reports not submitted through the Department Chair and the Dean's office will be returned to the sender. Minority reports are limited to a maximum of two (2) pages.

If a minority report is received by the Chair, the chair must make the document known and available to departmental members eligible to vote on the case. In the Chair's Letter, the Chair may comment on the minority report or other document.

Minority reports and other such documents submitted in accord with the above specified procedures shall 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 their comment to the Dean's or VPAP's office).

- f. After signature by the candidate of Section I of the procedural safeguard, 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](#). If errors are discovered in the file after departmental review and vote.
 - i. The candidate must be informed of the error(s) and subsequent corrections made.
 - ii. If applicable, the candidate shall certify on Part 2 of the Procedural Safeguard Statement indicating that the candidate has been informed of the error(s) and that corrections to the file have been made.
 - iii. If applicable, corrections must have documented departmental review before being forwarded.

If a correction of fact is made to the finalized departmental letter, the corrected departmental letter must show the original date and all subsequent revised dates. Any correction of fact in the finalized departmental letter affords the candidate a five (5) business-day period to respond to the departmental letter and minority report (see [Section II.A.9.b](#)). Alternatively, the candidate may waive the waiting period.

10. Procedures After the Departmental Recommendation is Determined

Before the file is forwarded:

- a. The candidate shall be provided a copy of the departmental letter, including the header page, and all redacted minority reports.
- b. The candidate has the right to make a written comment on the departmental recommendation (including redacted minority reports, if any). The candidate's written comment, to be transmitted within five (5) 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 the procedural safeguard form.). Any response by the candidate to one or both department letters shall be seen by both Chairs and both Deans unless the candidate chooses to address the response to the VPAP. The candidate must use [Attachment H](#) for his or her response, and specify to whom the response is addressed:
 - **If addressed to the Chair(s)**, it shall be added to the department's copy of the file and will proceed with the forwarded file through the review process. Department faculty may not comment on a response to the department letter.
 - **If addressed to the Dean(s)**, it shall not be sent to the department, but the Dean shall 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 shall be forwarded to the VPAP's Office and to CAP but shall 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 shall be reviewed by CAP and the Chancellor or designee.
 - The VPAP shall inform the Department Chair and Dean that a written statement has been received from the candidate without revealing its contents. The written statement shall become a part of the file.

The candidate's written comments in quinquennial reviews and merit files (including Professor within above Scale) are limited to two (2) 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 the Procedural Safeguards Statement ([Attachment B-1](#)).

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

11. Procedures During Review Beyond the Department

a. Corrections to the File

After signature by the candidate of Section I of the procedural safeguard and 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](#). Changes in the status of publications are not corrections. Only corrections of fact are permitted.

If errors are discovered by reviewing bodies beyond the Department:

- i. The nature of the errors shall be communicated to the Chair via the Dean.
- ii. The candidate shall be informed by the Chair of the substance of the errors and shall certify the corrections on Part 2 of the Procedural Safeguards Statement.
- iii. If applicable, corrections must have documented departmental review and be open to all eligible faculty before being forwarded.

The candidate shall certify on Part 2 of the Procedural Safeguards Statement that -they have been informed of the corrections in the file ([Attachment B-2](#)).

If a correction is made to the departmental letter, the corrected departmental letter must show the original date AND all subsequent revised dates. The candidate must certify on Part 2 of the Procedural Safeguards Statement that they have been informed of the changes in the file (see [Attachment B-2](#)). If the candidate wishes to respond to the revised department letter, the candidate must provide the response within five (5) business days ([Section II.A.9.b](#)).

In eFilePlus, the same processes and documentation requirements apply with the update, review, approval and routing done electronically via the eFilePlus 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, PEVC or the Chancellor after CAP's recommendation has been forwarded, CAP shall be informed of the request and the response. Updates cannot not be solicited for accelerations. Deans may also independently ask for clarification on material 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 (see [Section II-A-12](#)) or 7th year promotion to Associate Professor 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. If the candidate wishes to respond to amendments to the file, the candidate must provide a response within five (5) business days.
- vi. The candidate shall certify on Part 2 of the Procedural Safeguards Statement that they have 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 [Section II.B.8](#).

12. Procedures for Announcement of Administrative Decision

a. Merits cases and 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 are not permitted except for procedural violations.

b. Appointment, reappointment, 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 [Section II.A.12](#)):
 - If the Chancellor's preliminary assessment is negative in cases for 7th year promotions, or
 - If the Chancellor's preliminary assessment is negative in cases for reappointments of Assistant Professors, or
 - If the Chancellor's preliminary assessment is negative and 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-7th year promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Professor, or appointment 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 PEVC via APO 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.

c. Candidate's access to records:

Access to designated records on the Procedural Safeguards Statement will be automatically provided by APO.

13. Appeals of Promotion and Appointment Cases – 220 Response

a. Updates:

- i. The 7th year promotion to Associate Professor 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 7th year. New or updated information must be provided as it becomes available, through the appropriate channels. For non-7th year promotions, promotions to full professor, 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 [Section II.A.13.b](#) for details.
- ii. Promotion to Associate Professor cases that are brought before the 7th year, promotions to Professor, appointments, or reappointments are not allowed the continuous update to file. In these instances, the one-time 220 updates 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.13.b](#).
- iii. To facilitate timely progression of the 220 process and because updates are limited in scope, it is expected that file processing will take significantly less time than the original file.

b. Preliminary Contrary or Negative Decisions (220 process; [APM 220-80-j](#) and [APM 220-84-b](#))

If a 220 process is mandatory the VPAP shall initiate the 220 process as follows:

- i. The PEVC 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 PEVC'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. Candidates will automatically be furnished access to records by APO. The Department Chair and the Dean will also be provided with copies of records supplied to the candidate at this time. These materials must 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 [Section II.A.10](#), shall be followed.
- vi. The updated file is forwarded by the Chair to the Dean for review. The Dean shall include their 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 PEVC to the Chair of the department through the Dean. Candidates will automatically be furnished access to records by APO. The Department Chair and the Dean will also be provided with copies of records supplied to the candidate at this time.

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 (See [Section II.B](#)).

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.

14. Procedures for Off-Cycle Appointments

a. File Entry Cut Off Dates

The only change to file entry cutoff dates for off-cycle appointments is with respect to promotion to Associate (both 7th year promotions and non-7th year promotions) and the adjustment is making the date three months after the appointment date.

As examples, a faculty member appointed on January 1st will have a file entry cutoff date of March 31st and a faculty member appointed April 1st will have a file entry cutoff date of June 30th. In each of these examples, the faculty member will have a file entry cutoff date of September 30th for merits.

b. Deadline for Receipt of Extramural Letters and Student Letters

Extramural letters should be solicited within two months after the appointment date. The deadline for receipt of extramural letters, and any student letters, is the first day of the fourth month after the appointment date.

c. Appeals of Promotion and Appointment Cases – 220 Response

7th year promotion to Associate Professor files may be updated continuously until ten months after the appointment date of the 7th year. For non-7th year promotions to associate professor, and appointments, if applicable, a one-time 220 update within 10 months after the appointment date may be made. See section II.A.13 for the type of information that may be provided by the update.

d. Date by which Promotion to Associate Files are due to APO

Promotion to Associate Professor (7th year and non-7th year promotions) are due at APO by the 3rd Tuesday of the 7th month after the appointment date.

B. Instructions for Specific Actions

The Period of Review is listed under each personnel action.

For **First Personnel Actions at UCR only:**

Items that were not credited at appointment but which have been completed (e.g. grants awarded, papers published, talks given) between the submission of the appointment file and date of appointment may be included. The new review period along with a list of the items that would normally fall under an eFilePlus category must be included on the cover sheet of the Department Letter.

1. Advancement to Above-Scale

Period of Review: Entire career with emphasis on activity since Advancement to Professor VI. See also Sections K, U, and W.

Approval Authority: Chancellor

Checklist: [Attachment C-5](#)

Advancements to Professor Above-Scale examine the candidate's file with respect to the criteria as set forth in [APM 220-18-b\(4\)](#). File sent forward for consideration of this advancement must 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 national and 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. This may include prestigious award(s) for 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.

Recommendations for additional off-scale are not applicable to advancement to Above Scale, and neither Departments, Deans, or CAP provide recommendations on the salary increase that results from advancing to Above Scale.

1.1 Special Circumstances That May Result in Advancement to Above Scale

Faculty receiving exceptional external recognition (e.g. Nobel Prize, election to National Academy) may put forward an abbreviated file for advancement to Above Scale where the external recognition is considered in lieu of extramural letters. An abbreviated file consists of the following:

- Evidence of the recognition
- Curriculum vitae
- Departmental vote and letter of support
- Dean's recommendation and letter of support

2. Advancement within Above-Scale

Period of Review: Include activity since last merit within Above-Scale

Approval Authority: PEVC

Checklist: [Attachment C-5](#)

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, but should a candidate decide not to put forward a merit file, a quinquennial review is still needed after each five-year

period. 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\(4\)](#)).

Recommendations on additional off-scale are not applicable to advancement within Above Scale, and neither Departments nor Deans provide recommendations on the salary increase that results from advancing within Above Scale.

3. **Advancement to Professor VI**

Period of Review: Entire career with emphasis since Promotion to Professor. See also [Sections K, U](#), and [W](#).

Approval Authority: PEVC

Checklist: [Attachment C-5](#)

For placement at a higher step, the candidate's record with respect to expectations for the proposed step should be clearly articulated in the department letter. In the absence of such justification, acceleration criteria will apply.

Advancement 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 or internationally, will be required in scholarly or creative achievement or teaching.

All faculty members, including those at open steps (Professor V and above) and those who hold administrative appointments, are required to be reviewed every five (5) years ([APM 200-0](#) and [APM 220-80-b](#)).

4. **Appointment**

Approval Authority:

Assistant Professor I, II & III (ladder rank, In Residence, and Clinical X), Acting Assistant Professor I-II, and Health Sciences Clinical Professors – Dean

Effective October 2019, the title of Assistant and Associate Professor of Teaching is equivalent to the former title of LPSOE and LSOE. This title should be used when referring to these faculty members.

Assistant Professor IV and above (ladder rank, In Residence, and Clinical X), Acting Assistant Professor III and above, Assistant Professor of Teaching – VPAP

Associate and Full Professor (ladder rank, In Residence, and Clinical X), and Associate Professor of Teaching – PEVC

Checklists: [Attachment C-7](#) or [Attachment C-8](#)

Appointments must be offered in writing and signed by the person to whom approval authority has been delegated (see [Delegation of Authority](#)). [APM 133](#) provides a list of titles that 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. The cover sheet must be complete in regard to previous employment at other institution(s).

Refer to the [Academic Hiring Toolkit](#) and the [Affirmative Action Recruitment Guidelines for Academic Positions](#) for a detailed description of the academic appointment process.

5. **Appraisal**

Period of Review: Include activity since Appointment (may include activities as an Assistant Professor at institutions other than UCR, as appropriate)

Approval Authority: VPAP

Checklist: [Attachment C-1](#)

Following APM 220-83-(a), normally each Assistant Professor shall have a one-time appraisal well in advance of possible promotion to tenure rank. Typically, there would be an appraisal in the fifth year of service as Assistant Professor, though a candidate may request an appraisal at any time.

Procedures and criteria for the appraisal of Assistant Professors, to determine whether they are making satisfactory progress toward promotion, are located in [APM 220-82](#) and [APM 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 of non-reappointment 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), a second file must be prepared at the department level and processing would be of two (2) independent files, one for an appraisal and a second for reappointment. See [Section II-B-13](#) for Reappointment of Assistant Professor.

If an Assistant Professor does not provide the required material to prepare an appraisal file by the department 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.

A candidate can put forward both an appraisal file and a merit file during the same review year. However, the two files are prepared and submitted separately.

6. **Career Review**

Period of Review: If time since promotion was greater or equal to five (5) years, include activity since last promotion.
If time since promotion is less than five (5) years, include activity since the previous promotion or appointment or a career review that resulted in a change of rank or step.

Approval Authority: PEVC/Chancellor

Checklist: [Attachment C-2](#)

The purpose of a Career Review is to remedy inequities that may accumulate over time, leading a candidate to be seriously out of step with their appropriate level on the Professorial ladder. Career Reviews are not used for Promotions, Advances from V to VI (or potentially above), or Advances

from IX to A/S reviews. In those cases, candidate should follow the procedures described in the appropriate sub-section of [Section II.B.](#)

The case for action as a result of a Career Review should explain the basis for judging that the current level is seriously different from what would be an equitable placement. Except in circumstances where faculty receive exceptional external recognition (see B.2. **Special Circumstances**), there must have been at least two positive merits and or promotion at UCR before a career review can be initiated. Teaching and Service must both be excellent and approaching the record of faculty at the proposed rank and step (e.g. If the suggestion is to move from Associate I to Professor I the record would indicate service at the mid to high Associate level.) Bearing the previously described limitations in mind, any senate faculty member at Associate Professor or above who thinks that they 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 the possibility that on rare occasions a faculty member may be seriously out of place on the rank/step scale. Candidates for a Career Review are encouraged to submit an optional professional C.V. with the 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 they wish 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 does not have any negative votes.

Alternatively, the candidate may (upon written request to the Dean) elect to have the 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. Also, because this is an optional personnel action no extensions to deadlines will be granted.

Once a Career Review occurs, two (2) positive advancement reviews must be completed before another Career Review may be requested, unless part of a retention proposal.

Departments and Deans must use their professional judgment and experience (in the department/ college/ discipline) and what is written in the outside letters to justify the appropriate rank and step (in this case placement) being recommended. These assessments should be part of the department and Dean’s letters.

7. Deferral

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 Associate Professor review. For Assistant Professors whose merit is denied, a file is required to be submitted the following year.

A senate faculty member with an appointment between Associate Professor and Professor Step V may submit a “Deferral Request” via eFilePlus on or before the published dates for merits or promotions and advancements. The request is routed via eFilePlus 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 **at or 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. However, all faculty must be reviewed every five (5) years (see quinquennial review, [Section II.B.12](#)).

Deferral requests will not be considered as fulfilling the mandatory quinquennial review. A deferral is only good for one year (see Glossary of Terms).

8. Lateral Promotion

Movement between overlapping steps from one rank to another represents a lateral promotion. In cases of lateral promotion, there must also be a vote on a merit.

9. Merit Advancement

Period of Review: Include activity since last advance (lateral promotions and quinquennials are not advances)

Approval Authority: PEVC

Checklist: [Attachment C-4](#)

Candidates who submit Merit files will be evaluated on research/creative activities, teaching, and service since the last merit advance. Merit file materials must be provided promptly to meet department and college evaluation deadlines.

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. If an Associate or Full Professor does not provide the required material to prepare a merit file by the department due date, the candidate will not be able to submit a merit file for consideration until the following year. All faculty members, including those at open steps (Professor V and above) and those who hold administrative appointments, are required to be reviewed every five (5) years ([APM 200-0](#) and [APM 220-80-b](#)).

Assistant professors with a positive merit vote from the department and a final negative decision on the merit do not require a separate and later submission of a new reappointment file. The negative reasons memo will include a statement to the following effect: Although the merit advance has been denied, there will be an automatic reappointment at Assistant Professor, Step [X], valid for two years. Your next merit file is therefore due with a cutoff date of [insert date]. No separate reappointment file is necessary for the [insert cycle] cycle.” If the candidate is ready for a merit in less than two years and puts a file forward after one year, this would not be considered an acceleration.

Assistant Professors whose merit is denied are reappointed for two years. However, a possible outcome of a negative merit review at the department level 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), a second file should be prepared at the department level to include material since appointment and processing would be of two (2) independent files, one for a merit and a second for reappointment.

If a higher step advancement is proposed by the Dean the Department will be asked to provide a vote on the proposal. If a higher step advancement is proposed by CAP, the Dean and the Department will be asked to provide a vote on the proposal. If a higher step advancement is proposed by the Provost, the Department, Dean and CAP will be asked to provide a vote on the proposal. If a candidate receives a lateral promotion, the subsequent merit file that is prepared should contain all materials since last merit advancement. For example, after a lateral promotion from Assistant Professor V to Associate Professor I, the Difference List for advancement to Associate Professor II should contain all materials from the time served as Assistant Professor V and Associate Professor I.

A further merit advancement within Above-Scale must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction.

Appeals are not permitted except for procedural violations.

10. Off-Scale (O/S) Salary

It may be appropriate for the Department to suggest an additional half-step of off-scale when one of the three categories of review demonstrate exceptional achievement but the same level of accomplishment is not present in all three areas of review. Alternatively, an additional half-step of off-scale may also be appropriate when all areas of review are substantially above expectations. DEI contributions can strengthen any of the review area, just like for example, grant/fellowship activity strengthens research. Departments should not propose additional off-scale except in cases where achievements clearly met these high standards. Candidate may discuss this possibility with their Chair if they feel their record warrants this distinction.

When the Department proposes additional off-scale, **or the candidate requests consideration for additional off-scale**, a vote on the proposal should be included in the Department letter. If additional off-scale is proposed by the Dean, the file is not sent back to the Department. If additional off-scale is proposed by CAP or the Provost, the file is not sent back to the Dean or the Department for the additional vote.

A deferral, a quinquennial, an appraisal or a reappointment file may not be combined with a vote recommending additional off-scale, except as follows. Reviewing bodies may recommend and comment on the appropriateness of a half-step of additional off-scale for faculty at a barrier step (Associate Step V, Professor Step V, and Professor Step IX) under a quinquennial review where the outcome will be satisfactory and whose performance is considered sufficient for a normal merit.

Additionally, if an assistant professor is already at Step VI, is not ready for promotion, there is at least one year left on the clock, and the achievements in the file from the past two years would normally be sufficient for a merit, then along with the reappointment vote, the department should include a vote on awarding an additional half-step of off-sale for those achievements. In this case, the half-step of additional O/S is half the difference between the base salaries of Assistant VI and Associate III.

All O/S salary proposals for *new* faculty appointments where the O/S is equal to or less than 25% of base salary can be approved by the Dean. O/S salary proposals greater than 25% of base salary must be submitted to the VPAP for approval with appropriate justification.

The PEVC 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. If a candidate's file is already in progress the same file will be used for CAP's evaluation of the pre-emptive retention. If the preemptive retention documents are added to the file, the department and Dean letters will only contain discussion of the personnel action under review. An additional joint letter from the Chair and Dean for the preemptive retention must be uploaded into the Other section prior to CAP review (see [Preemptive Retention Guidelines](#) under Local Compensation Policy and Guidelines on APO website: [APO Compensation](#)).

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 policy applies to O/S awarded for new appointments effective July 1, 2010 and onwards and new/additional O/S awarded for merit/promotion/ retention actions effective July 1, 2010 and onwards. The complete policy (revised January 19, 2016) is available on the APO website under Compensation > Local Compensation and Guidelines: [Policy on Off-Scale Salaries for Appointees/Merit/Promotion/Retention Actions](#).

11. Promotion

Period of Review: Promotion to Associate Professor – Entire career with emphasis on activity since Appointment, including activities as an Assistant Professor at institutions other than UC, if appropriate. See also [Sections K](#), [U](#), and [W](#).
Promotion to Full Professor – Entire career with emphasis on activity since Promotion to Associate Professor. See also [Sections K](#), [U](#), and [W](#).

Approval Authority: Chancellor

Checklist: [Attachment C-5](#)

A promotion review examines the candidate's record with respect to the criteria as set forth in [Section II.A.5](#). Unless appointed at a barrier step, at least one positive merit will normally be required before a candidate is reviewed for promotion.

A promotion involves reviewing the overall career and reviewing bodies should consider where to place the candidate relative to their record. For placement at a higher step, the candidate's record with respect to expectations for the proposed step should be clearly articulated in the department letter. In the absence of such justification, acceleration criteria will apply. There is no appeal process for decisions on placements.

If a higher than normal placement is proposed by the Dean, the Department will be asked to provide a vote on the proposal. If a higher than normal placement is proposed by CAP, the Dean and the Department will be asked to provide a vote on the proposal. If a higher than normal placement is proposed by the Provost, the Department, Dean and CAP will be asked to provide a vote on the proposal. **Unanimous positive support, excluding abstentions, for a proposed placement renders it unnecessary to vote on any lower placements.**

Only in cases where the departmental recommendation for a normal placement promotion is either negative or is positive but substantially mixed (i.e., one-third or more of the votes cast, excluding abstentions, are negative) should a vote on lateral promotion be taken.

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.7-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-7th year promotion, the Chancellor's first assessment constitutes the final decision and a 220 process will not be initiated.

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).

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

12. Quinquennial Review

Period of Review: Include activity for the past 5 years

Approval Authority: VPAP

Checklist: [Attachment C-6](#)

All faculty members, including those at open steps (Professor V and above) and those who hold administrative appointments, are required to be reviewed every five (5) years ([APM 200-0](#) and [APM 220-80-b](#)). For a 100%-time academic administrator (as defined by APM 246) who has held the administrative position for five (5) years, an administrative review may be used in lieu of a personnel review. Per 240-24-b for initial appointments and five-year reviews, the Chancellor, after consultation with the Academic Senate, shall appoint an advisory committee. In all cases, the Academic Senate and the faculty of the respective Division, College, School, or other similar academic unit will be consulted.

For personnel reviews, the Chair is to prepare a file with the candidate during the fifth year of a no review period. 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.

A quinquennial review file results in a satisfactory 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 (5) 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, commensurable with the candidate's rank and step.

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

Quinquennial reviews are an important option to merit reviews that allow for a change in research focus or a major change in circumstance. However, in the interest of trying to ensure the best career progression for all faculty, and unless the candidate is at a barrier step or in an administrative position, multiple quinquennial reviews will initiate a request from the Vice Provost of Academic Personnel for a mentoring plan from the department chair.

For faculty at a barrier step (Associate Step V, Professor Step V, and Professor Step IX) under a quinquennial review where the outcome will be satisfactory and (1) Whose performance in all three areas of review is considered sufficient for a normal merit or (2) Who has sufficient for a normal merit when expressed as the faculty proportion of a less than 100% faculty administrator position (see [APM 241](#)) and who has served in a significant administrative capacity for at least half of the 5-year period reviewing bodies may recommend and comment on the appropriateness of a salary increment equivalent to half a step. A recommendation for this additional increment occurring after the departmental review does not incur the necessity for the file to be returned to the department for a vote.

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 will receive guidance in putting together an action plan for improvement from the Department Chair, Dean, and/or the Chancellor. In the case of an "unsatisfactory" quinquennial, the review period for an immediately subsequent quinquennial will not include the period covered by the previous "unsatisfactory" quinquennial.

13. Reappointment of Assistant Professors

Period of Review: Include activity since Appointment
Approval Authority: PEVC/Chancellor
Checklist: [Attachment C-10](#)

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 and provided a mandatory (7th year) promotion to Associate Professor is not due. Appraisal eligibility is independent of assistant professor merit or reappointment eligibility.

For subsequent reappointments 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. Alternatively, in rare and compelling cases, the reappointment

process may be initiated by any reviewing body if the record documents obvious and unambiguously severe deficiencies, typically over several review cycles. In these cases, the file should reflect an evident lack of engagement and unacceptable level of performance. Additionally, if an assistant professor is already at Step VI, is not ready for promotion, there is at least one year left on the clock, and the file would normally be sufficient for a merit at this level, then the department and subsequent reviewing bodies may consider award of an additional half step off-scale.

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 220 Process).

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, submitted items, if there are any, should be discussed in the review and mentioned in the department letter. Evaluation should be based on careful reviews of the appointee's progress, promise, and achievement.

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 procedures for 220 response).

C. Other Reviews and Recommendations

1. Department Chair

It is the responsibility of the Dean to initiate academic review of Departmental Chairs. 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.G](#).

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 Units¹

For purposes of the personnel review of joint appointees, one of the departments will be considered as the home 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's home department will be designated in the appointment letter.

The Chair of the home 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. L.](#) 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 home department to arrange to have all information, including external letters obtained by the other department, collected in a single file which can be reviewed 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 [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 home department only.

Each department will independently evaluate the candidate and make a recommendation, emphasizing where appropriate those portions of the candidate's responsibilities that are specific to each department. Department Chairs should reconcile the proposed rank and step before writing the departmental letter. 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 the Chairs will each give the candidate an oral summary of the departmental recommendation. If there is a positive majority a separate meeting is fine; otherwise a joint meeting is required. Any written form of the departmental recommendation will also be given to the other Department Chair and to the candidate, on request. Any response by the candidate to one or both department letters shall be seen by both Chairs and both Deans unless the candidate chooses to address the response to the VPAP.

¹ The unit must be a department, a school, or a division ([APM 220-Appendix A](#)). For CHASS, GSOE, and SPP refer to the [Memorandum of Understanding](#) (MOU) dated 4/5/17 and signed on 6/13/17.

3. Faculty with Defined Duties in Other Units

The merit and promotion process will automatically include a solicitation letter from the Dean to the head of the other unit (e.g. AES, MSE) for a review of the related research and/or teaching. The head of the unit will provide a letter to be included in the personnel file in the Other section. This will be referred to in the Department Letter but its presence in the Other section will allow for full review, if desired.

Directors of Research Cores

The home department will solicit a letter from the Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development (RED) evaluating their performance as director of the core. This letter will be placed in the Other section of the file but its essence will constitute part of the department letter.

4. Professor of Teaching Series (also referred to as Lecturer with Security of Employment Series) ([APM 285](#))

Assistant/Associate/Full Professors of Teaching are members of the Academic Senate when appointed at 100%. Refer to [APM-210-3](#) and UCR Guidelines for Appointment, Compensation, Advancement, and Promotion criteria:

[UCR Guidelines for Professor of Teaching Series.](#)

It is important to keep in mind that for faculty in this series, per [APM-210](#) , the category of “Research and/or Creative Work is relabeled as “Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity,” [APM-210-3-d-2](#) provides the following non-exhaustive list of examples of evidence that may be presented.

(a) Documentation of the development of or contributions to:

(i) Original materials designed to improve learning outcomes;

(ii) Evidence-based design and evaluation of educational curricula or pedagogy;

(iii) Administration and evaluation of a teaching program or a learning center;

(iv) Systematic quality improvement programs and evaluation of their implementation;

(v) Discipline-specific information systems;

(vi) Development and evaluation of community outreach or community-oriented programs.

(b) First, senior, or collaborative authorship of scholarly or professional publication;

(c) Accomplished performance, including conducting and directing;

(d) Accomplished artistic or literary creation, including exhibits;

(e) Accepted invitations to present seminars or lectures at other institutions or before professional societies.

5. Health Science Professor of Clinical X

Assistant/Associate/Full Professors of Clinical X are members of the Academic Senate when appointed at 100%. Refer to [APM-210-2](#) for applicable review criteria.

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

Regulations regarding access by a candidate to academic personnel records appear in [APM 158](#) and [APM 160](#).

1. The basic regulations pertaining to access include:

- a. All documents in their entirety pertaining to a candidate, except confidential documents, shall be accessible for inspection by the candidate ([APM 160-20-b \(2\)](#)).
- b. Candidates can obtain a redaction of confidential documents in such records ([APM 160-20-b \(1\)](#)).

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.

III. DOCUMENTS

It is the candidate's responsibility to document the file in an adequate manner. Review will be based only on what is contained in the file. Accuracy of the file is verified by the candidate through signature on the Procedural Safeguard Statement.

A. Ad Hoc Review Committee Report (Senate)

[APM 210-1-a](#) 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, PEVC 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. Typically, Ad Hoc committees will be comprised of a committee Chair, one or two committee members and one non-voting department representative, although this may vary if appointed by the VPAP, PEVC or Chancellor. The department representative will act as a consultant during discussion but will not be present during the vote of the Ad Hoc committee and will not be given access to the report of the Ad Hoc committee. Redaction of Ad Hoc committee reports will consist of the removal of the names of individual members of the committee (See [APM 160-20-c \(4\)](#)).

B. Ad Hoc Committee Report (Departmental)

Academic personnel actions are the responsibility of departments and not program/organized research units, although as described in II-C, program/organized research units will provide input. If a department chooses to use an Ad Hoc committee, then 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. Composition of any departmental ad hoc committee is confidential to the candidate, but not to voting faculty. Departments may also form advisory committees to work with and advise candidates during the preparation of their files. Members of advisory committees for a candidate may serve on a departmental ad hoc committee for the candidate, but roles in the latter capacity are confidential to the candidate.

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

The bibliography at last advance must 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 [Section II.A.10.a](#) and [Section II.A.10.b](#), this document may not be updated beyond the File Entry dates specified in the Schedule. The current Bibliography is a part of 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, a brief description of ongoing research may be included 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.

UC Format: 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. Categories may be employed according to the norms of the discipline. Items are considered technical/ scholarly when they are directed to other experts in the field. Items are considered semi-technical/scholarly when they are directed to non-experts. Such articles should be listed in a separate category.
- b. Citation of translated items shall be included under the category *Translated Items* and shall not be accorded a separate number in the enumerated list of items.
- c. Citation of reprints shall not be accorded a separate number in the enumerated list of

- items.
- d. 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 individual. 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.
 - e. 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 electronic publications, list page numbers, volume number, and full journal title. If possible, the DOI² (Digital Object Identifier) and article ID number should be listed for electronic publications. 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 refereed 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 or Appraisals, submitted items may be considered 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

² Digital Object Identifier System: doi.org

Patent by US Patent and Trademark Office. While filing a UC Disclosure of Invention and Patent Application Filing with US Patent and Trademark Office are important, issuance of a US Patent by US Patent and Trademark Office provides persuasive evidence of research productivity and impact.”

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

Faculty are encouraged to include, when possible, the amounts of royalty revenue received by the campus and/or their research labs from their UC-owned intellectual property (i.e., patents, provisional patent applications, and other forms of IP). This information can be included in the “more detail” section of the patent information).

E. Candidate's Response to Departmental Recommendation ([Attachment H](#))

The candidate has five (5) business days from receipt of the departmental letter to provide a written response to the departmental recommendation (and redacted minority reports, if any). The response should address the evaluation of teaching, research and service as discussed in the department letter. The response may not introduce material outside of the review period or material not otherwise represented in the file. This response may be addressed to the Chair, the Dean, or the VPAP. For candidates with joint appointments, any response by the candidate to one or both department letters shall be seen by both Chairs and both Deans unless the candidate chooses to address the response to 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 is limited to 10 pages, except in cases where the statement is part of an appeal of a promotion (i.e., a 220 response) in which case there is no page limit.

F. 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 (5) business days prior to the departmental meeting at which review of the file will occur.

G. Chair's Letter (Optional)

In addition to the departmental letter, the Chair 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. While the Chair's letter becomes part of the file, it is not shared with the department. 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.

H. 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-8
Appraisal	Attachment C-1
Career Review	Attachment C-2
Merit and Reappointment	Attachment C-4
Merit and Reappointment for Lecturers/Senior Lecturers with SOE or PSOE	Attachment C-4
Promotion to Associate Professor	Attachment C-5
Promotion to Professor	Attachment C-5
Promotion to Lecturer or Senior Lecturer with SOE or Senior Lecturer with PSOE	Attachment C-5
Quinquennial Review	Attachment C-6
Quinquennial Review for Lecturers/Senior Lecturers with SOE	Attachment C-6
Reappointment of Assistant Professors	Attachment C-10
Reappointment of Lecturer or Senior Lecturer with SOE or Senior Lecturer with PSOE	Attachment C-10

For Appointments see to the [Academic Hiring Toolkit](#).

I. 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 a senate 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 (before and after Ad Hoc recommendation) 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](#)) 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 or are outside of the period of review. 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. The Dean's letter should not refer to any preemptive retention action. This to ensure judgement of the merit/promotion action using standard criteria. Please see (hyperlink for preemptive retention procedure).

In normative time one step merit cases, normative time one step merit cases with additional off-scale, normative time advances within above scale, fifth year appraisals, reappointments and quinquennials with a clear department recommendation, the Dean may simply concur with the department and opt to forego a Dean's letter if the Dean has nothing evaluative or informative to add. Accelerations within the same rank that have unanimous positive support by the department (setting aside abstentions), or have negative votes without explanations, also give the Dean an option to forego a Dean's letter. The Dean will signify concurrence by adding their signature on the department letter or appropriate statement in eFilePlus. CAP, the VPAP, the PEVC and/or the Chancellor reserve the right to request a Dean's letter in cases where the Dean simply concurred.

J. Departmental Recommendation Letter

The Chair or designee 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 (exclusive of Department Letter cover page). Font size equivalent to Arial 11 or Times New Roman 12 must be used (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, such as hearsay remarks. The department letter 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 breach of confidentiality. The department letter should not refer to any preemptive retention action. This to ensure judgement of the merit/promotion action using standard criteria. Please see [Guidelines for Preemptive Retention](#). 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 activity. The 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 discussed at the meeting. It should be reported and explained if options have been exercised without comment. Record all votes taken unless the vote for the higher rank and step is does not have any negative votes. If multiple votes are taken, the candidate may ask to exclude votes for steps higher than the one they wish to forward. Any recommendation for an additional O/S or acceleration in step must be explicitly and separately justified with a discussion of how the achievements in the file measure up to normal expectations.

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;
- ii. rank and step recommended;

- iii. the exact vote specifying the number in favor, opposed, abstained and unavailable; include an explanation for negative and/or minority votes in narrative; when available, provide explanations for abstentions and/or unavailable faculty; otherwise state that no explanations were provided;
- iv. sabbatical leave report status;
- v. for **First Personnel Actions at UCR only**, identify the period of review; items that were not credited at appointment but which have been completed (e.g. grants awarded, papers published, talks given) between the submission of the appointment file and date of appointment may be included.

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 relative to the department norms, variety and difficulty of the teaching assignments, relative successes with undergraduate classes versus graduate classes and the preparation and attention given by the candidate - their teaching responsibilities.
- ii. Any discrepancy between actual teaching load and normative teaching load should be explained by teaching releases that are detailed in the file. Without reconciliation to approved teaching releases, lower than expected teaching load will contribute toward a negative assessment of teaching due to a low volume of productivity. Likewise, more than expected teaching will contribute toward a positive assessment of teaching.
- iii. 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.
- iv. 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 in attracting high caliber graduate students to the campus.
- v. Development of new and effective techniques of instruction; writing of teaching materials, manuals, textbooks.
- vi. 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 their field. Faculty opinions derived from direct observation and anecdotes and information should be shared with colleagues at the departmental personnel meeting concerning the candidate and incorporated into the file provided they have been formally documented as classroom visitation reports.
- vii. Evaluation of teaching by students. See section U below. Materials submitted by students should be discussed by the department in its meeting and summarized and evaluated in the departmental letter. Challenges with teaching particular classes may be discussed to provide context, as appropriate, for student evaluations of teaching. All teaching evaluations performed during the review period, including summer teaching and including teaching abroad evaluations, should be assessed and commented on. Hearsay is not acceptable for use in teaching evaluations.

c. Evaluation of Research and Creative Activity

In the evaluation of Research and Creative Activity, [APM 210-1-d\(2\)](#) must be considered. Department letters must explain the quality of the candidate's publication and creative 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.8](#)).
- 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. 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 department faculty members.
- iv. The validity of a candidate’s submission, when present, of the book chapter accommodation described in [Section II.A.5](#) (Review Criteria).

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. An evaluation of the importance, variety, and commitment to service activities would be most helpful.

K. Difference List

The “Difference List” enumerates the candidate’s recent publications and/or creative activity to be credited since the time of appointment, merit advance, promotion, advancement to VI or advancement to A/S advance. Refer to the table for more information on what to include when creating the Difference List. The numbering and format of publications should be consistent in the Difference List and the current Bibliography.

For **First Personnel Actions at UCR only**, items that were not credited at appointment but which have been completed (e.g. grants awarded, papers published, talks given) between the submission of the appointment file and date of appointment may be included. The review period should be adjusted to capture these items. A list of the items that would normally fall under an eFilePlus category must be included on the cover sheet of the Department Letter.

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 discussed in the meeting and mentioned in the department letter. In these cases, a discussion of the submitted work is expected and the evaluation should be based on careful review 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. Reviews of the candidate's work may go under Other in eFilePlus.

For each co-authored item on the Difference List (excluding abstracts or reports) where the candidate expects significant credit for the publication, the candidate must indicate whether they are the corresponding author and explain their role (a maximum of 3-4 sentences) in terms of both intellectual and practical participation, and provide information about the collaborators that includes their affiliation and title. It is useful for reviewing bodies to know which co-authors come from the candidate's group.

For merits following a lateral promotion, see [Section II.B.8.](#)

An optional one-page cover sheet may be included with the file. The cover sheet should briefly provide a clear description of the quality and characteristics of the venues in which the candidate publishes.

DIFFERENCE LIST	
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	N/A (no Difference List; period of review is since 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 or a career review that resulted in a change of rank or step.
Merit	Last positive review
Promotion to Associate Professor	Appointment
Promotion to Professor	Promotion to Associate Professor
Quinquennial Review	N/A (no Difference List; period of review is past 5 years; file includes a list of Publications and Creative Activities in the last 5 years)
Reappointment of Assistant Professor	Appointment

L. 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. Candidates may provide a list of no more than three (3) individuals from whom they prefer that letters not be solicited. This list should include reasons for potential exclusion. The Chair should make a good faith effort to abide by the candidate's request. The candidate's exclusion list and the Chair's acknowledgement of receipt must be included in the file.

EXTRAMURAL LETTERS	
Type of Action	Activity
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

For Appointments, see the [Academic Hiring Toolkit](#).

The letter of solicitation should include a current curriculum vitae and should clearly specify the action for which the reviewer is being asked to evaluate the candidate.

All letters must be signed unless they came in through the eFilePlus system. Letters that do not have signatures must be accompanied by written documentation (e.g. email from letter writer that they sent the letter). Electronic signatures are acceptable.

For 7th year promotion to Associate Professor 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 Associate Professor files may be solicited after the completion of the 72nd month of appointment (inclusive of prior service). (See [APM 133-17](#))

The candidate determines the items to be included in the request packet. The following items are required or highly recommended: CV (required), a Candidate Self-statement (optional), Teaching Evaluations (optional), Candidate Mentorship Statement (optional), bibliography (optional), re-prints (optional). In conjunction with department policy (refer to [Section III.Y](#)) the candidate may opt to include the department research and creative work statement. If the self-statement sent to extramural referees differs from the self-statement in [Section III.T](#), both self-statements should be included in the file. (See [Section III.L.2.](#))

For single department candidates, 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 their colleagues. For faculty in the Professor of Teaching series it is acceptable for a few of the letters to be outside the candidate's discipline if those referees are in a position to comment on the candidate's teaching skill. For example, Professors of Teaching in other disciplines, particularly within the UC system, may be considered as a referee.

For candidates with joint appointments, letters should be requested from 4-8 referees suggested by the candidate, and from 4-8 referees suggested by the department and/or Chair. In joint appointment cases, the departments are encouraged to solicit letters jointly, or agree to share letters solicited independently. At a minimum, departments should work together to assure that they are not independently contacting the same individuals and that an appropriate mix of evaluators is being contacted.

All extramural letters should be from qualified persons of a rank equal to or above the rank sought by the candidate. It is desirable to include not only the best qualified persons in the field or sub discipline but also external evaluators who are not closely affiliated with the candidate or their work. The external reviewers should include a preponderance of reviewers who have not had a close working relationship with the candidate (e.g., as mentor or collaborator). 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.

It is the Chair's responsibility to ensure sufficient re-solicitation to achieve balance between candidate and department choices with respect to the letters received. If an adequate number and/or balance is not forthcoming the Chair must provide a memo describing efforts to achieve the requirement.

Sample solicitation letters are provided as follows [*Note: Additions to this letter are allowed but the templates cannot be modified*]:

<i>Appointment or promotion to Associate Professor</i>	Model Letter A (Attachment E-1)
<i>Appointment or promotion to Full Professor</i>	Model Letter B (Attachment E-2)
<i>Advancement to Professor VI</i>	Model Letter C (Attachment E-3)
<i>Advancement to Professor Above-Scale</i>	Model Letter D (Attachment E-4)
<i>Career Review</i>	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, mentorship statement, bibliography, and optional curriculum vitae) **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.

M.Fellowship and Grant Activity

All grant and funding activity must be listed. Use the following criteria in the drop-down list in eFilePlus: Date: Project Period From/To (These are the initial dates of funded grant activity not the date of award notification). Awarded (can only be listed for a single period of review), Current (select this if grant is still active but was awarded in a previous review period), Expired (any current grant that has expired during the current review period), Pending (proposal is under review, or proposal has been recommended for funding but the funds have not yet arrived to the campus), and Not Awarded (any proposal that was reviewed and where a decision was made not to fund). Listing of Not Awarded grants is optional, but encouraged.

Ideally, notification of new awards should be uploaded in the appropriate field (right-most column that allows the "Edit" function). Otherwise the chair assumes the responsibility to verify the new award falls within the period of review.

For multi-investigator grants, indicate the candidate's role in the grant (PI, Co-PI, collaborator, consultant), the name of the PI (if not the candidate), the number and names of co-PIs, UCR amount (sum of direct and indirect), and amount to candidate. If the candidate has shared PI status on a grant (e.g. if new dual PI status on NIH grants) choose Co-PI and explain dual PI status under comments. Any granting agency acronyms should be clearly identified.

Examples of other types of grants that should be listed under this category include (but are not limited to) Divisional Senate Awards such as the Senate Omnibus Awards (travel only and/or research and travel), Senate CoR Fellowships, and Regents Faculty Fellowship and/or Development Awards.

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 or a career review that resulted in a change of rank or step.
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 or Fellowships awarded while at 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.

N. 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.

O. Minority Reports

Any minority opinion on a personnel action (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 or 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 nor may it contain information not discussed at the department meeting. Perceived problems with procedures/ processes or comments on procedures should be referred to the [Committee on Privilege and Tenure](#) (P&T). The discussion in minority reports should not invoke the names of extramural referees, eligible voters, or students. 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.

P. 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 Associate Professor or quinquennial review, refer to the instructions provided ([Attachment B-1](#)).

Part 2 of the Procedural Safeguards Statement ([Attachment B-2](#)) must accompany any addition or change to the file.

Q. Professional Activity and Service

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 elsewhere on the file 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.

When possible, candidates listing presentations as “keynote,” “plenary,” or “distinguished” are encouraged to supply supporting material in the form of an invitation email/letter or conference

program brochure (see Glossary for definitions). These items can be placed in Other Section in eFilePlus.

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 or a career review that resulted in a change of rank or step.
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 performed at 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 book series or journals, refereeing articles or other publications, serving on review panels;
2. holding an office in a professional or learned society;
3. presenting papers or Chairing sessions at professional meetings, presenting invited seminars, colloquia, workshops, report writings, etc. including location and date of meeting or presentation;
4. consulting activity.

Please maintain confidentiality of reviewing activities when completing this section by not including names of individuals for whom you have written letters of recommendation.

R. Publications/Creative Activities

eFilePlus users should upload a PDF of the publications or a link to view creative activity such as images or video. For example, a PDF of the program can be uploaded and a link to the image or performance placed under Additional Description. If a web link is provided to a publication, the whole publication must be accessible. For completed clinical trials that do not mature to a publication, a link that provides evidence of completion should be provided. Hard-copy publications should not be forwarded with the file unless requested during the review process.

S. 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. In eFilePlus, this can be uploaded under Other. Conflict of Commitment Reports ([APM 025](#), [APM 671](#) for members of Health Sciences Compensation Plan, HSCP) 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 [Attachment C-9](#) Candidate Statement for Conflict of Commitment.

T. 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, their achievements and recognition within the review period.

Faculty are encouraged to explain the context and impact of their research and service so that reviewers can recognize the uniqueness of their academic endeavors. While all areas of research and scholarship are valued, candidates have the opportunity to highlight unusual and distinguishing features of their work, such as influencing public policy and/or real-world issues, international research and engagement, public scholarship, work with underrepresented groups and work with disadvantaged communities. The self-statement should not include discussion of information that would be outside the scope of the review criteria.

These self-statements are not required but are helpful to the reviewing bodies 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. The candidate should provide context around a book chapter that is submitted in accordance with the book chapter accommodation described in section 5 (Review Criteria). Accuracy of the self-statement is the responsibility of the candidate.

In the case of promotions and advancement to VI, the candidate may wish indicate if placement at a higher than normal step should be reviewed and voted upon. In such a case, the candidate should provide justification for the higher placement in their self-statement.

If there are discrepancies between facts stated on the self-statement and the review file (or eFilePlus snapshot), the reviewing bodies will defer to the snapshot as the true/accurate record. 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 (though in these cases it is highly recommended that candidates do not exceed five pages for review bodies on the campus). There is no page limit on self-statements sent to external reviewers.

If the self-statement sent to extramural referees differs from the self-statement, both self-statements should be included in the file. The extramural self-statement should be uploaded in the Other section of eFilePlus.

U. Student or Resident Evaluations of Teaching

Per APM-210 at least two kinds of evidence for teaching quality should be included with each file. Evidence in the file pertaining to mentoring constitute one source of evidence, and might include, for example, the use of an optional one-page mentorship statement (see section V below) as a supplement to the enumeration of mentoring roles in the file. Student evaluations from most, if not all, of the courses taught by the candidate is a frequently used second source of evidence. If the candidate does not provide student evaluations for specific courses, or they were approved to have selected written comments stricken from the student evaluations, they must discuss the reasons why with the Chair so that they can be adequately explained in the department letter. If the candidate chooses not to provide any student evaluations in the file, they must otherwise provide an adequate source of evidence from among the options presented in APM-210. It is strongly recommended that some type of student feedback be included as evidence.

For merits, student evaluations to assess the quality of teaching should be documented for the period since last advance.

For quinquennials, student evaluations to assess the quality of teaching should be documented for the past five years.

For promotion, advancement to Professor VI, and advancement to Professor Above Scale, student evaluations to assess the quality of teaching should be documented either for the period since last promotion.

For appraisals, student evaluations to assess the quality of teaching should be documented for the period since appointment.

For career review, student evaluations to assess the quality of teaching should be documented for at least the last 5 years of the candidate's career.

Evaluations of University Extension courses for the period under review are not to be included. Summer Session evaluations may be included but the department letter must indicate whether they represent part of the normal load or an overload. Overload teaching is not grounds for consideration of an additional action such as an extra off scale or acceleration.

V. Other Evidence of Teaching and Mentoring Expertise

i. Mentorship Statement (optional)

Candidates may optionally include a one-page mentorship statement that elaborates on their philosophy of mentoring students, including high school, undergraduate, graduate students, and Postdoctoral Scholars. **Mentorship of faculty colleagues may also be discussed.** The statement could highlight milestones achieved by mentees and place those achievements in the context of norms for the faculty member's discipline. The statement provides the candidate an opportunity to discuss their specific role in the mentoring relationship, and an opportunity to highlight DEI contributions through mentoring engagements. **Mentorship of international students through faculty lead education abroad (FLEAP) engagements might be discussed.** Candidates should upload mentorship statements in the same area of eFilePlus where self-statements are uploaded.

ii. Student or Resident 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](#). **The Chair and the candidate may use their combined judgement to decide not include letters that appear to have malicious intent.** 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.

iii. Teaching Portfolio

Aspects of the teaching portfolio such as syllabi should be uploaded under Other and referred to in the self-statement.

W.Teaching Information (formerly, TLD or Teaching Load Data)

Department Chairs are required to provide a brief departmental teaching statement. The statement should be used to explain departmental teaching norms, including whether faculty are expected to financially support graduate students, 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. The teaching statement should also include something about how the department defines good teaching within the discipline. The relative importance of teaching through the faculty lead education abroad program might also be discussed.

For merits, teaching information should be documented for the period since last advance.

For quinquennials, teaching information should be documented for the past five years.

For promotion, advancement to Professor VI, and advancement to Professor Above Scale, teaching information should be documented either for the period since last promotion, or otherwise at least 10 years.

For appraisals, teaching information should be documented for the period since appointment. For career review, teaching information should be documented for at least the last 10 years of the candidate's career

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.

The table below shows the periods for which graduate student instruction should be documented in the file. The role of the candidate on graduate committees should be explained. For graduate student supervision, include major professor's name(s).

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 or a career review that resulted in a change of rank or step.
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.**

X. University and Public Service

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 system wide service under separate categories. Senate Ad Hoc personnel 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 or a career review that resulted in a change of rank or step.
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.*

Y. Department Research and Creative Work Statements

Department Chairs, in consultation with faculty, are required to include a statement about research and creative work norms in the department. This statement should appear in the "Other/Miscellaneous" section of eFilePlus, and should be referenced when discussing the candidate's research and creative work productivity in the department letter. The statement should address basic issues such as the conventions on authorship order, the view of multi-authored papers, the prestige of book chapters and articles in books, the necessity and/or prestige of grant supported research, the prestige of performance venues, the significance of particular performances, and the opportunity and need for graduate student mentoring. The statement should also discuss how research and creative work norms vary by sub-discipline, the role of public scholarship, and should address how norms vary depending on professor series versus professor of teaching series. The statement should also discuss what is reasonable to expect in the way of scholarly activity for a first merit review at UCR for assistant professors who are just embarking on their professorial career. Individual departments should discuss and vote on the option to allow candidates to include the department research and creative work statement with the solicitations of external letters.

Z. Other Letters

Letters that were not solicited by the Department Chair may be included in the file at the discretion of the candidate in the Other section.

IV. ATTACHMENTS, DEPARTMENT CHAIR CHECKLIST, AND GLOSSARY

Note: Checklists for Review Actions, Request for Access to Records, Grant Activity Checklist, Teaching Information Checklist, and Supplemental Teaching Information Checklist are available via the Academic Personnel Office website under Forms and Checklists.

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 the faculty member 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 the Department Chair advised the candidate of the process.

FOR CANDIDATE: 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 or Dean. 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 (per APM 210-1, 220-80 and 160).
 - 2. I was provided the opportunity to ask questions, supply information and evidence, 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 non-redacted confidential documents.
 - 3. I certify that the department provided the following redacted documents **before the department meeting**:
☐ Extramural letters ☐ Student letters ☐ Other confidential on _____ (date).
 - 4. 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)

Candidate's Signature

Date

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

- C. Under APM 220-80-i, I understand access to designated records on the Procedural Safeguards Statement will be provided to me and in cases of appeal those that pertain to each round of review. I understand that copies of the documents I request will also be provided to the Department Chair and Dean.
- D. Under APM 220-80-i, I was informed that I will receive a written statement of reasons for the final administrative decision.
- E. Under APM 220-80-e,
 - 1. I and acknowledge that I received a copy of the department letter on _____.
 - 2. 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.).
 - 3. 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's Signature

Date

Chair Signature

Date

SIGNED STATEMENT ATTESTING TO PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS - (Part 2)

I CERTIFY THAT:

I was informed of the following addition/deletion/correction made to the file.

Candidate's Name

Candidate's Signature

Date

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

C. Under APM 220-80-e

1. I received a copy of the department letter on _____.
2. I was informed of the right to make written comments on the departmental recommendation within five (5) 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 Attachment H)
☐ not respond to the departmental recommendation and waive the five (5) day waiting period.

SIGNED CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR CONFLICT OF COMMITMENT REPORT - (APM 025, APM 671)

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 2019-20), please go to the following link: ucoats.org.

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 eFilePlus, upload the form under Other Section.
2. If a report was filed for 7/1/22 – 6/30/23 and the other previous years of review, the requirement has been met and the file would not be held up. The 3-month period 7/1/2023 – 9/30/2023 does not require an additional report.

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 <u>including o/s</u> 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:					
REVIEW PERIOD (complete for first personnel action at UCR only) <input type="checkbox"/> First Personnel Action at UCR only Use the space provided if there were items that were not credited at appointment but which have been completed (e.g. grants awarded, papers published, talks given) between the submission of the appointment file and date of appointment. List items that would normally fall under an eFilePlus category and the new review period.					
VOTE(S) (Multiple ranks and steps may be proposed in which case all votes must be recorded unless vote for the highest step does not have any negative votes. 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
During the review period, Sabbatical Leave Reports (APM 740-97) are: Not Due <input type="checkbox"/> On file and available upon request <input type="checkbox"/> Not on file (include explanation) <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> During the review period, a Leave of Absence for a quarter or more (other than Sabbatical) was taken: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Start Date: _____ End Date: _____ No <input type="checkbox"/>					

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 <u>including o/s</u> 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.)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory					
*VOTE(S): (Include minority votes in narrative below.)					
Vote:	#Eligible	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Abstain	Not Voting/Unavailable
Advisory Vote:	#Eligible	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Abstain	Not Voting/Unavailable
During the review period, Sabbatical Leave Reports (APM 740-97) are: Not Due <input type="checkbox"/> On file and available upon request <input type="checkbox"/> Not on file (include explanation) <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>					
During the review period, a Leave of Absence for a quarter or more (other than Sabbatical) was taken: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Start Date: _____ End Date: _____ No <input type="checkbox"/>					

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 <u>including o/s</u> 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 <input type="checkbox"/> On file and available upon request <input type="checkbox"/> Not on file (include explanation) <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> During the review period, a Leave of Absence for a quarter or more (other than Sabbatical) was taken: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Start Date: _____ End Date: _____ No <input type="checkbox"/>					

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 <u>including o/s</u> 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.)						
<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Qualified Positive <input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input type="checkbox"/> On file and available upon request <input type="checkbox"/> Not on file (include explanation) <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> During the review period, a Leave of Absence for a quarter or more (other than Sabbatical) was taken: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Start Date: _____ End Date: _____ No <input type="checkbox"/>						

Candidate Name:
Action:

College:
Department:

BACKGROUND

RESEARCH

TEACHING

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES AND UNIVERSITY/PUBLIC SERVICE

SUMMARY

Name, Department Chair & Professor
Department of []

MODEL LETTER A: APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

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

Dear _____:

The Department of _____ is evaluating _____ for possible [appointment/promotion] to the rank of associate professor with tenure. A critical part of this process is the analysis and evaluation of _____'s research and scholarship by leading professional colleagues in the field. This evaluation is crucial in maintaining the high scholarly standards of the University of California. We in the Department of _____ would be most grateful if you would assist us in this important assessment.

The University of California standard to which tenure candidates are held uses the language "superior intellectual attainment" to describe the candidate's record of research and teaching. The measurement of _____'s work against this standard requires careful analysis of the work and of its significance in 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 analytical detail. Please note that review committees on campus focus on accepted publications when determining whether or not the standard has been met.

In addition, we would value an assessment of _____'s relative standing in their field. It would be most helpful if you could compare their research accomplishments with those of other scholars of similar experience in the same discipline and comment on if/how the accomplishments meet, exceed, or far exceed those of the comparable scholars.

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

Please note that the University of California encourages its faculty members to consider approved extensions of the pre-tenure/review period under circumstances that could interfere significantly with development of the qualifications necessary for tenure/advancement. Examples of such circumstances may include birth or adoption of a child, extended illness, care of an ill family member, disruptions to their research space, and challenges arising from the recent pandemic.

Attachment: Attachment E-8

MODEL LETTER B: APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

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

Dear _____:

The Department of _____ is evaluating _____ for possible [appointment/promotion] to the rank of full professor. A critical part of this process is the analysis and evaluation of _____'s research and scholarship by leading professional colleagues in the field. The evaluation is crucial in maintaining the high scholarly standards of the University of California. We in the Department of _____ would be most grateful if you would assist us in this important assessment.

Within the University of California, appointment or promotion to Associate Professor (with tenure) requires the demonstration of superior intellectual attainment, evidenced both in research, teaching or other creative achievement. For promotion to full professor, we look for further evidence of this attainment and excellence beyond that 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 excellence in 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.

In addition, we would value an assessment of _____'s relative standing in their field. It would be most helpful if you could compare their research accomplishments with those of other scholars of similar experience in the same discipline and comment on if/how the accomplishments meet, exceed, or far exceed those of the comparable scholars.

Your response would be most useful to the department's deliberations if it addresses the contributions of the candidate's work to their field of study directly and in analytical detail. Please note that review committees on campus focus on accepted publications when determining whether or not the standard has been met.

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

Attachment: Attachment E-8

MODEL LETTER C: APPOINTMENT OR ADVANCEMENT TO PROFESSOR STEP VI

The following is a sample letter of solicitation of extramural referees for an APPOINTMENT OR 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 critical part of this process is the analysis and evaluation of _____'s research, scholarship or other creative achievement by leading professional colleagues in the field. The evaluation is crucial in maintaining the high scholarly standards of the University of California. We in the Department of _____ would be most grateful if you would assist us in this important assessment.

Within the University of California, appointment or promotion to Associate Professor (with 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 evaluation is typically made in connection with advancement to Professor, Step VI. Advancement to Professor, Step VI or higher, involves an evaluation of the candidate's entire career but with emphasis on accomplishments since achievement of the rank of Full Professor. There must be evidence of sustained and continuing excellence. Criteria include 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.

Your response would be most useful to the department's deliberations if it addresses the contributions of the candidate's work to their field of study directly and in analytical detail. Please note that review committees on campus focus on accepted publications when determining whether or not the standard has been met.

In addition, we would value an assessment of _____'s relative standing in their field. It would be most helpful if you could compare their research accomplishments with those of other scholars of similar experience in the same discipline and comment on if/how the accomplishments meet, exceed, or far exceed those of the comparable scholars.

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

Attachment: Attachment E-8

MODEL LETTER D: APPOINTMENT OR ADVANCEMENT TO PROFESSOR ABOVE SCALE

The following is a sample letter of solicitation of extramural referees for an APPOINTMENT OR 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 critical part of this process is the analysis and evaluation of _____'s research and scholarship by leading professional colleagues in the field. The evaluation is crucial in maintaining the high scholarly standards of the University of California. We in the Department of _____ would be most grateful if you would 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, which calls for evidence of sustained and continuing excellence. 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."

In addition, we would value an assessment of _____'s relative standing in their field. It would be most helpful if you could compare their research accomplishments with those of other scholars of similar experience in the same discipline and comment on if/how the accomplishments meet, exceed, or far exceed those of the comparable scholars.

Your response would be most useful to the department's deliberations if it addresses the contributions of the candidate's work to their field of study directly and in analytical detail. Please note that review committees on campus focus on accepted publications when determining whether or not the standard has been met.

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

Attachment: Attachment E-8

MODEL LETTER F: RESPONSE TO UNSOLICITED LETTERS

(For use when receiving solicited or unsolicited letters of evaluation for academic appointment or promotion which contain restrictions on their use.)

Thank you for sending us your letter on _____ 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 letter you sent with the constraint on its use you have stated, and to explain why we are unable to do so.

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

MODEL LETTER G: CAREER REVIEW

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 critical part of this process is the analysis and evaluation of Professor _____'s research and scholarship by leading professional colleagues in the field. The evaluation is crucial to our ability to maintain the high scholarly standards of the University of California. We in the Department of _____ would be most grateful if you would 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: 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 must 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 their field.

Your assessment of Professor _____'s scholarly credentials is critical to our evaluative process. Your response would 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. Please note that review committees on campus focus on accepted publications when determining whether or not the standard has been met. 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 the 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)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA 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
	Distinguished Professor (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 Distinguished Professor is reserved for scholars 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.

*Note that Assistant Professors are often appointed anywhere in this range dependent on prior experience.

UC POLICY ON THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF OUTSIDE LETTERS OF EVALUATION

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

The University of California will keep your name and institutional affiliation confidential. Any identifying information on the letterhead and within your signature block will be removed. However, pursuant to state law and University policy, the full text of the body of your letter will be provided to the candidate. **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 that 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."

MODEL LETTER H: APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN RESIDENCE (SOM)

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

Dear Dr. _____:

The University of California, Riverside (UCR) School of Medicine within the Division of Clinical Sciences has under consideration the appointment of Dr. _____ to Assistant Professor in Residence. We are seeking your assistance in providing an assessment of Dr. _____. We have provided a copy of their Curriculum Vitae for your reference.

Appointments in this series in the UCR School of Medicine are made in cases of academically qualified individuals whose predominant responsibilities are to engage in teaching, research, or other creative work, and University and public service to the same extent and at the same level of performance as those holding corresponding titles in the Professor series in the same department. If possible, your letter should attest to all areas of review with which you are familiar. Accordingly, I am writing to request that you provide me with your analysis and evaluation of Dr. _____.

Under University of California policy, the letters of evaluation authors will be held in confidence. A candidate may request to see letters in the file, and 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.

If requested, the letter will be provided to the candidate in redacted form. Thus, in order to keep your identity confidential, you may want to refrain from providing information in the body of the letter that would reveal your identity. If you wish, you may provide a brief factual statement regarding your relationship to the candidate as a separate attachment to your letter, or below the signature block which will not be disclosed 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 letters of evaluation authors to the fullest extent allowable under the law. The judicially mandated disclosure to identify confidential evaluations has been extremely rare at the University of California.

We recognize how much time and effort are involved in responding to this request, but please be assured that we place great importance upon your evaluation. Although we will be grateful for your response at any time, we hope that you can return your letter by recommend 2 weeks so that it can be included in the candidate's dossier. A signed PDF file e-mailed to _____.

Attachment: Attachment E-8

MODEL LETTER I: APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO ASSISTANT OR ASSOCIATE CLINICAL X PROFESSOR (SOM)

The following text must be included in solicitations of letters of evaluation for APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO ASSISTANT OR ASSOCIATE CLINICAL X PROFESSOR.

Dear Dr. _____

The School of Medicine (SOM) at the University of California at Riverside has under consideration the appointment of Dr. _____ to (**ASSISTANT OR ASSOCIATE**) Professor of Clinical _____. We are seeking your assistance in providing an assessment of Dr. _____. Your letter should attest to all areas of review with which you are familiar, especially those of clinical competence and creative teaching activity. Attached is a copy of Dr. _____'s curriculum vitae for your reference.

In the Professor of Clinical X series, candidates are expected to contribute with distinction in the areas of teaching and professional competence, as well as to make significant contributions in the area of creative activity. Candidates are also expected to participate in University, public service and/or service to their profession. Excellence in and a devotion to teaching is required. Candidates are expected to have achieved stature in their field by virtue of their professional competence as a clinician and/or educator.

If possible, your letter should attest to all areas of review with which you are familiar, especially those involving teaching and patient care. Accordingly, I am writing to request that you provide me with your analysis and evaluation of Dr. _____'s contributions, with particular reference to clinical teaching and patient care.

The University of California will keep your name and institutional affiliation confidential. When a faculty member requests to see letters in their 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 identify of confidential evaluations has been extremely rare at the University of California.

We recognize how much time and effort are involved in responding to this request, but please be assured that we place great importance upon your evaluation. Although we will be grateful for your response at any time, we hope that you can return your letter by (date) so that it can be included in the candidate's dossier. You can e-mail a copy of your letter to (email address).

Attachment: Attachment E-8

MODEL LETTER J: APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO FULL CLINICAL X PROFESSOR (SOM)

The following is a sample letter of solicitation of extramural referees for a APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION FOR TO FULL CLINICAL X PROFESSOR. This text must be included in solicitations of letters of evaluation for career review

Dear Dr. _____:

The School of Medicine (SOM) at the University of California at Riverside has under consideration the appointment of Dr. _____ to Professor of Clinical _____. We are seeking your assistance in providing an assessment of Dr. _____. Your letter should attest to all areas of review with which you are familiar, especially those of clinical competence and creative teaching activity. Attached is a copy of Dr. _____'s curriculum vitae for your reference.

In the Professor of Clinical X series, candidates are expected to contribute with distinction in the areas of teaching and professional competence, as well as to make significant contributions in the area of creative activity. Candidates are also expected to participate in University, public service and/or service to their profession. Excellence in and a devotion to teaching is required. Candidates are expected to have achieved stature in their field by virtue of their professional competence as a clinician and/or educator. Candidates are also expected to participate in University and public service and service to their professional. Excellence in and a devotion to teaching is required.

At the full Professor rank, candidates are expected to have achieved national stature in their field by virtue of their professional competence as a clinician and/or creative contributions. To achieve the rank of full Professor of Clinical X, exceptional stature as a clinician is required. In order to be appointed to the full Professor rank in this series, candidates "shall have made a significant contribution to knowledge and/or practice in the field. The appointee's creative work shall have been disseminated, for example, in a body of publications, in teaching materials used in other institutions, or in improvements or innovations in professional practice which have been adopted elsewhere."

Independence in creative activity is required. In many fields, research and creative activity are necessarily collaborative. In these cases, candidates are expected to perform a distinctive contribution to the collaborative research effort. Remarks regarding individual contributions in a collaborative research environment are exceptionally useful in the academic review process.

If possible, your letter should attest to all areas of review with which you are familiar, especially those involving teaching and patient care. Accordingly, I am writing to request that you provide me with your analysis and evaluation of Dr. _____'s contributions, with particular reference to clinical teaching and patient care.

The University of California will keep your name and institutional affiliation confidential. When a faculty member requests to see letters in their 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.

We recognize how much time and effort are involved in responding to this request, but please be assured that we place great importance upon your evaluation. Although we will be grateful for your response at any time, we hope that you can return your letter by (date) so that it can be included in the candidate's dossier. You can e-mail a copy of your letter to (email address).

Attachment: Attachment E-8

MODEL LETTER K: APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF TEACHING

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

Dear _____:

The Department of _____ is evaluating _____ for possible [appointment/promotion] to the rank of Associate Professor of Teaching. A critical part of this process is the analysis and evaluation of _____'s academic standing by leading professional colleagues in the field. This evaluation is crucial in maintaining the high scholarly standards of the University of California. We in the Department of _____ would be most grateful if you would assist us in this important assessment.

Associate Professor of Teaching are expected to function as scholars of teaching and learning. The teaching load for _____ is ____% higher than regular ladder rank faculty in the department and this should be considered when formulating your opinion. The four criteria for promotion, with the greatest weight placed on the first, are

1. specialized teaching of truly exceptional quality;
2. professional and scholarly achievement and activity. This may include research within their discipline, especially if such research has involved undergraduates, or it may be pedagogical, or a combination of the two;
3. University and public service and educational leadership recognized beyond the campus; and
4. contributions to instruction-related activities (e.g., training of teaching assistants and development of instructional materials, accreditation activities).

The University of California standard to which candidates are held uses the language "superior intellectual attainment" to describe the candidate's record of teaching and research. The measurement of _____'s work against this standard requires careful analysis of the teaching record and of the significance of the professional and/or scholarly activity: Has the work made a substantial impact beyond individual classroom settings? Has the work begun to change the thinking of others in the field? Your response will be most useful to the department's deliberations if it addresses these questions in analytical detail. Please note that in regards to scholarly activity, review committees on campus focus on accepted publications when determining whether or not the standard has been met.

In addition, we would value an assessment of _____'s relative standing in their field. It would be most helpful if you could compare their accomplishments with those of other scholars of similar experience in the same discipline and comment on if/how the accomplishments meet, exceed, or far exceed those of the comparable scholars.

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

MODEL LETTER K: APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR OF TEACHING

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

Dear _____:

The Department of _____ is evaluating _____ for possible [appointment/promotion] to the rank of Full Professor of Teaching. A critical part of this process is the analysis and evaluation of _____'s academic standing by leading professional colleagues in the field. The evaluation is crucial in maintaining the high scholarly standards of the University of California. We in the Department of _____ would be most grateful if you would assist us in this important assessment.

Full Professors of Teaching are expected to function as scholars of teaching and learning. The teaching load for _____ is ____% higher than regular ladder rank faculty in the department, and this should be considered when formulating your opinion. The four criteria for promotion, with the greatest weight placed on the first, are

1. specialized teaching of truly exceptional quality;
2. professional and scholarly achievement and activity. This may include research within their discipline, especially if such research has involved undergraduates, or it may be pedagogical, or a combination of the two;
3. University and public service and educational leadership recognized beyond the campus; and
4. contributions to instruction-related activities (e.g., training of teaching assistants and development of instructional materials, accreditation activities).

Within the University of California, appointment or promotion to Associate Professor of Teaching (with tenure) requires the demonstration of superior intellectual attainment, evidenced both in professional and/or scholarly activity and teaching. For promotion to Full Professor, we look for further evidence of this attainment and excellence beyond that achieved for promotion to Associate Professor of Teaching, and for significant impact that extends beyond the local campus and into the broader scholarly community. This could include evidence of national/international recognition of professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity in the discipline, influence on the thinking of others in the discipline, and leadership in research and excellence in teaching. Although service is an important component of the record, it cannot substitute for attaining the high standards in professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity and teaching expected by the University.

In addition, we would value an assessment of _____'s relative standing in their field. It would be most helpful if you could compare their accomplishments with those of other scholars of similar experience in the same discipline and comment on if/how the accomplishments meet, exceed, or far exceed those of the comparable scholars.

Your response would be most useful to the department's deliberations if it addresses the contributions of the candidate's work to their field of study directly and in analytical detail. Please note that review

committees on campus focus on accepted publications when determining whether or not the standard has been met.

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

CANDIDATE'S RESPONSE TO THE DEPARTMENTAL LETTER

Candidate's Name: _____ Date: _____

Select one:

- A. ☐ Addressed to the **Chair(s)**:
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. 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.
- B. ☐ Addressed to the **Dean(s)**:
This is intended to be included in the file at the Dean's level. I understand the Dean, CAP, and the Chancellor or Chancellor's 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
(ii) ☐ be seen by the Ad Hoc committee (if applicable).
(iii) ☐ not be seen by the Ad Hoc committee (if applicable).
- C. ☐ Addressed to the **VPAP at vpap@ucr.edu and apomail@ucr.edu** :
This is intended to be included in the file at the VPAP level which assures its review by CAP, and the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee. The VPAP will inform the Department Chair and Dean that a written statement has been received without revealing the contents.
If CAP, VPAP, PEVC or Chancellor convenes a Senate Ad Hoc committee the candidate's response to the departmental letter will be in the file.

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).

See section III.E for Attachment H page limitations that apply.

Candidate's Signature: _____

DEPARTMENT CHAIR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW CHECKLIST

This checklist was prepared in compliance with [APM 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 responsibilities, the Chair must 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	<input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input type="checkbox"/> Inform candidate of APM 210-1, 220-80, 160 and if applicable, APM 133 <input type="checkbox"/> If applicable, remind candidate to suggest names for extramural reviewers <input type="checkbox"/> If applicable, notify candidate that they may provide in writing (to be included in the file) names of persons who may not provide objective evaluations <input type="checkbox"/> Review text of solicitation letter (if applicable) <input type="checkbox"/> Discuss materials to be sent to extramural reviewers (if applicable) <input type="checkbox"/> Encourage candidate to include a self-statement in the file that contextualizes, rather than merely enumerates, the items in the file. The self-statement should address research/creative activity, teaching and service. If the self-statement sent to the extramural reviewers differs from the self-statement reviewed by the department, both self-statements must be included in the file. <input type="checkbox"/> Give any other supplemental instruction in accordance with Dean’s Office or Departmental procedures
2. Before the Department Meeting	
Month of September/October	<input type="checkbox"/> Extramural letters are solicited. <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate prepares the file (ensure file cut-off dates specified in the CALL are adhered to) <input type="checkbox"/> Collect other documents to be included in the file and assure cut-off dates are adhered to, e.g. extramural letters <input type="checkbox"/> Chair must ensure that file is complete and has been audited for accuracy. Any corrections to the file must occur BEFORE faculty review <input type="checkbox"/> Advise candidate to complete file and notify the candidate of the department meeting date. <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate completes top portion of procedural safeguard certifying accuracy of information. <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure that any documents in a foreign language include a translation in the file <input type="checkbox"/> Give candidate redacted extramural letters and the opportunity to include a written statement in response to or commenting on these or other material in the file. The statement must be received 5 days prior to the department meeting <input type="checkbox"/> Upon receipt of candidate’s statement, notify faculty that the file is ready for review <input type="checkbox"/> Assure departmental faculty have reviewed the file before the department meeting <input type="checkbox"/> Assure that absentee ballots are received prior to departmental meeting <input type="checkbox"/> Remind departmental faculty that those who write letters of evaluation will be disqualified from service on the candidate’s Ad Hoc committee

3. Department meeting	
Early November	<input type="checkbox"/> Lead the department meeting, ensuring the departmental review is fair to the candidate and rigorous in maintaining University standards <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure discussion does not include reference to anything not present in the file with the exception of comments accompanying absentee ballot <input type="checkbox"/> Allow equal opportunity for discussion for all present departmental faculty <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure minority opinions are explained <input type="checkbox"/> 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
	<input type="checkbox"/> Draft department letter and make draft available for department review
	Department Letter Format (introductory information)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Note department meeting date on summary Section of the department letter <input type="checkbox"/> List exact votes specifying the number eligible to vote, the number in favor, opposed, abstained and unavailable <input type="checkbox"/> Include all rank/steps voted on by the department, including off-scales and noting accelerations <input type="checkbox"/> Identifiers of extramural letters and student letters are limited to numerical or alphabetical designations <input type="checkbox"/> 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
	<input type="checkbox"/> Reports of Ad Hoc committees, internal to the department, are regarded as working documents and may not be forwarded with the file <input type="checkbox"/> Describe the significance and impact of the teaching research and service contributions <input type="checkbox"/> Present any significant evidence and differences of opinion which would explain a minority vote and/or a negative vote <input type="checkbox"/> References to “top-tier” must include information to support such claim <input type="checkbox"/> See the CALL for in-depth guidelines on writing departmental letters
	<input type="checkbox"/> Provide due date for receipt of any comments on the draft <input type="checkbox"/> To the extent possible, incorporate departmental faculty comments reflecting the discussion into the finalized department letter
	After the Department Letter has been finalized
	<input type="checkbox"/> When the Chair notifies the faculty of the finalized departmental letter the faculty have 24 hours to notify the Chair of their intent to write a minority report which is then due five (5) business days after the original Chair notification (i.e. the 24 hours is part of the five (5) business days). If the Chair is not informed of a forthcoming minority report there is no requirement for the five (5) day period. <input type="checkbox"/> The candidate will be able to review the unredacted finalized department letter and any redacted minority reports as soon as available. <input type="checkbox"/> Discuss the content of the department letter and any redacted minority report with the candidate. <input type="checkbox"/> Advise candidate of their right to submit a response to the department letter. Response may be addressed to the Chair(s), the Dean(s) or the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (must use attachment H of the CALL). <input type="checkbox"/> Inform candidate that their response to the departmental letter must be received within 5 business days upon receipt of the departmental letter. Alternatively, the candidate may waive the waiting period. <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate completes Section II of procedural safeguard statement (Attachment B-1, the CALL) <input type="checkbox"/> Chair(s) may write (optional) letter for inclusion in the file. This is a confidential document and must be forwarded to the Dean’s office, not retained in the department. <input type="checkbox"/> The file is routed to the Dean’s office by the due dates set by the Deans

Acronyms

Academic Personnel Manual (APM)
Academic Personnel Office (APO)
Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (PEVC)
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 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:

<https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/academic-personnel-policy/>

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 must 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 (eFilePlus Snapshot)*.

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 of Teaching series, Professor In Residence series, and Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine) series, Associate and Full Acting Professors, full-time Associate Professor of Teaching, and full-time Assistant Professor of Teaching. 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 is available in the CALL. A proposed promotion from the Assistant 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. *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 advice on review actions. The report of the committee is used to assist and advise the department in their review. Departments must develop their own procedures on how or if they would 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. 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 (see UC Salary Scale). 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 academic review, to determine whether an appointee is at the appropriate rank and step. A Career Review is initiated at the request of the candidate who is a Senate faculty member at the rank of Associate or above.

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

This applies only to faculty at the rank of Associate or above. 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
- Professor of Teaching 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

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 or colleges. 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” denotes faculty with tenure or on tenure track (at the Assistant Professor rank).

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

Professional Presentations

Faculty research presentations are a key element in merit and promotion file evaluation and reflect a faculty member's engagement with their profession as well as recognition by their peers. To help guide faculty in the classification of their professional presentations, clarification of the presentation classes is provided. Presentations types vary among the disciplines and the type of meeting/symposium that is attended. For faculty review, all presentation types listed below are considered significant. Invited presentations are particularly noteworthy and acknowledge recognition in a faculty member's discipline. At the pinnacle is presentations that are designated as Keynote, Plenary and Distinguished speaker; these designations should only be used when they are explicitly stated in an invitation or program. Faculty are strongly encouraged to provide documentation (ex. letter of invitation or program agenda) that can verify Keynote, Plenary and Distinguished speaker presentations. Faculty are encouraged to provide additional comments (when needed) to clarify the importance or nature of a particular presentation in the comments section of eFilePlus' Presentations or to address these issues within their Self-statement.

Keynote Talk (invited)

A Keynote talk is an invited talk and the main speech given at a meeting. It is usually delivered at a time when everyone can attend. Keynote speeches are often delivered to set the tone of a meeting or symposium. A keynote talk is explicitly designated as such on a program or in a letter of invitation.

Plenary Talk (invited)

A Plenary talk is an invited speech at a conference or symposium or a discipline that is scheduled at a time when all meeting participants (or participants in a sub-discipline for very large meetings) can attend. A Plenary talk or panel is explicitly designated as such on a program or in a letter of invitation. Faculty should distinguish between an individual Plenary Lecture and participation on a plenary panel.

Distinguished Speaker (invited)

A Distinguished Speaker talk is an invited talk that has more prestige associated with it than an invited talk at a professional meeting or department/college seminar. Distinguished Speaker talks are usually associated with larger celebratory events (ex. college graduation, a series of seminars/talks called a "Distinguished Speaker" series, a university- or college-wide seminar, or a major talk named in honor of an individual in a profession). A Distinguished Speaker talk is explicitly designated as such on a program or in a letter of invitation.

Presenter (invited or not invited)

Any speech/lecture/presentation that is given at a university, college, professional conference or symposium, and is given in response to an invitation, is considered an invited presentation. Invitations by

peers to speak in departments, centers, institutes, or national or international meetings signify recognition of research, scholarship or creative activity excellence by peers. In some disciplines, this might be called a lecture. However, this excludes invited lectures for classes.

Oral, poster, or panel presentations that are selected from a pool of applicants for a meeting session are not considered invited presentations. Oral and poster presentations signify a faculty member's engagement with their profession. If the acceptance of oral/poster presentations is a highly selective process and therefore deserves additional recognition, this should be indicated in the comments section of eFilePlus Presentation category or indicated in the faculty member's self-statement. If possible, provide the % acceptance rate for the venue.

Co-authored (invited or not invited)

A co-authored presentation is a presentation of your research by a collaborator, student, or postdoctoral fellow. This may be invited or not invited. This signifies a faculty member's engagement with their profession.

Other

For presentations that do not fall into any of the eFilePlus Presentation categories above, the "Other" category must be used. Use the comments box as needed to provide perspective on the nature and importance of the presentation if needed.

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: [Academic Personnel and Programs/Compensation](#).

Senate Academic Appointee

A Senate Academic Appointee is a member of the UCR Academic Senate. Senate academic appointees include appointments in the Professor (including Acting), Professor in Residence, Professor of Clinical X, and the Professor of Teaching series.

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.

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, resignation, involuntary demotion, or dismissal. 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 s/he 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