

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCEDURES

**"THE CALL"
2007-2008**

**OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR & PROVOST
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL OFFICE
MAY 3, 2007**

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

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCEDURES
2007-2008
Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. SCHEDULE	3
II. PROCEDURES	4
A. General Review Procedures for Academic Personnel Files	4
1. Bylaw 55	4
2. Procedures for Extension requests	4
3. Procedures regarding Eligibility	4
4. Review Criteria	5
5. Procedures Before the Personnel Review File is Assembled	6
6. Procedures Before the Departmental Recommendation is Determined	7
7. Procedures During Departmental Review	7
8. Procedures After the Departmental Recommendation is Determined	8
9. Procedures During Review Beyond the Department	8
10. Procedures for Announcement of Administrative Decision	9
B. Instructions for Specific Actions	11
1. Advancement to Above Scale	11
2. Advancement within Above Scale	11
3. Advancement to Professor VI	11
4. Appraisal	11
5. Career Review	12
6. Deferral	12
7. Lateral Promotion	13
8. Merit	13
9. Off-Scale	13
10. Promotion	13
11. Quinquennial Review	13
C. Other Reviews	14
1. Department Chair	14
2. Joint Appointments	14
D. Access to Academic Personnel Records	15
III. DOCUMENTS	16
A. Ad Hoc Committee Report (Senate)	16
B. Ad Hoc Committee Report (Departmental)	16
C. Bibliography of Publications and/or Creative Activity - At Last Advance	16
D. Bibliography of Publications and/or Creative Activity - Current	17
E. Biography Form - Current	18
F. Candidate's Response to Departmental Recommendation Letter	18
G. Candidate's Response to Extramural Letters	19

H.	Chair's Letter (optional)	19
I.	Checklist of Documents	19
J.	Dean's Recommendation Letter	20
K.	Departmental Recommendation Letter	20
L.	Difference List	22
M.	Extramural Letters	23
N.	Grant Activity	24
O.	Letters from Other Departments/Programs	25
P.	Minority Reports	25
Q.	Procedural Safeguard Statement	26
R.	Professional Activity and Service	26
S.	Publications	27
T.	Sabbatical Leave Reports	27
U.	Self-Statement	27
V.	Student Evaluations of Teaching	27
W.	Student Letters	27
X.	Teaching Load Data Form	27
Y.	University and Public Service	28
Z.	Unsolicited Letters	28

IV. ATTACHMENTS 29

A.	Access to Records	
	1. By the Candidate	29
	2. By a Third Party	30
B.	Procedural Safeguard Statement	31
C.	Checklists	
	1. Appraisal	33
	2. Career Review	34
	3. Deferral	35
	4. Merits	36
	5. Promotions to Associate Professor or Professor or Advancement to Professor VI, Professor Above-Scale or Within Professor Above-Scale	37
	6. Quinquennial Review	38
D.	Departmental Recommendation	39
E.	Extramural Review Solicitation Letters	
	1. Letter for Appointment or Promotion to Associate Professor	40
	2. Letter for Appointment or Promotion to Full Professor	41
	3. Letter for Advancement to Professor VI	42
	4. Letter for Advancement to Professor Above-Scale	43
	5. Response to Unsolicited Letters	44
	6. Response to Unsolicited Letters with restrictions	45
	7. Letter for Career Review	46
	8. UC Policy on Confidentiality of Outside Letters of Evaluation	49
F.	Grant Activity	50
G.	Teaching Load Data Form	51

H.	Candidate's Response to the Departmental Recommendation	53
I.	Departmental Voting Policies	54

DRAFT

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCEDURES
SCHEDULE FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEWS
2006-2007

Personnel Review Action	Date due in Deans' offices	Date due in Academic Personnel	File Entries* as of this date
Promotion to Associate Professor	December 7, 2007	January 18, 2008	September 30, 2007 7th year promotion to tenure Files may be updated continuously. Other promotion to tenure files may be updated until Feb 29, 2008.
Appraisal			September 30, 2007 Files may be updated until Feb. 29, 2008
Merit	*25 % by Nov. 16, 2007	*25% by Jan. 4, 2008	September 30, 2007
Quinquennial Review	*25% by Dec. 14, 2007	*25% by Feb. 8, 2008	September 30, 2007
Promotion to Full Professor	*25% by Jan. 18, 2008	*25% by Mar. 7, 2008	September 30, 2007 (**Extramural and student letters may be received to November 1, 2007)
Advancement to Professor VI, Professor Above-Scale, Within Professor Above-Scale	*25% by Feb. 22, 2008	*25% by Apr. 4, 2008	September 30, 2007 (**Extramural and student letters may be received to November 1, 2007)
Career Review	*combination of any action	*combination of any action	September 30, 2007 (**Extramural and student letters may be received to November 1, 2007)
** All documents unless otherwise specified have a file entry date of September 30, 2007.			

Announcement of final Academic Personnel Review decisions will be made as follows:

January 31, 2008	January Announcements
February 29, 2008	February Announcements
March 31, 2008	March Announcements

Announcements after March 31 will be made once a week on every Friday. 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, the Committee on Academic Personnel, and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel feel no obligation to consider cases in which a faculty member does not supply documents and information by the deadlines that Chairs may set.

II. PROCEDURES

A. General Review Procedures for Senate Faculty Academic Personnel Files

1. Bylaw 55 & Department Voting

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.

Department voting policies and procedures must be submitted annually to the Academic Personnel Office for use by the Committee on Academic Personnel. [Use Attachment I](#). **Voting policies must be submitted to the Academic Personnel Office by October 15 or prior to the first department meeting. Departments are not required to re-vote each year but Department Chairs should review the current voting procedures with his/her faculty.**

2. Procedures for Extension Requests

A request for a later submission of the file must be for extraordinary reasons and be approved by the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel prior to the due date for submission to the Dean's office published in [Section I](#). Such a request must be forwarded through the Dean's office and will specify the reason for the delay. If the extension request is for an action which requires extramural letters, then the extension request must additionally request an exception to include letters dated past the cut-off date. The Deans, the Committee on Academic Personnel and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel feel no obligation to consider cases in which a faculty member does not supply documents and information by the deadlines that Chairs may set. Files received after the extension deadline may be returned for re-submission during the next academic year.

3. Procedures regarding Eligibility

Academic employees 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.3.b](#) below for the concept of acceleration.

a. Normal Time in Step

Rank	Step	Normal Period of Service at Step
Assistant Professor	I	2 years
	II	2 years
	III	2 years
	IV	2 years *
	V	2 years
	VI	2 years
Associate Professor	I	2 years
	II	2 years
	III	2 years
	IV	3 years
	V	3 years
Professor	I	3 years
	II	3 years
	III	3 years
	IV	3 years
	V,VI,VII,VIII, IX	--•
	Above-Scale	--•

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

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

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

b. Acceleration

Advancement to a higher step before normal eligibility constitutes acceleration. The campus strongly encourages departments to put forward deserving candidates for acceleration.

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. In cases proposed for acceleration, there must be evidence of high quality in all areas of evaluation. Lesser quality in any area of evaluation cannot be counterbalanced by higher quality or quantity in other areas. Assuming that there is evidence of high quality in all areas of evaluation, the case for acceleration must be made in terms of exceptional performance in one or more areas.

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.

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 question of acceleration should not be an issue in promotion to Associate Professor and Professor cases or advancement to Professor VI and Professor Above-Scale cases: the issue is whether the candidate has met the criteria, not whether the criteria have been met in a particular time frame.

c. Overlapping Steps

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

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

4. Review Criteria

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. 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. The file should present the scholarly and intellectual contributions of the candidate in each area of review. Review will be based only on what is contained in the file. It is in the candidate's interest to provide all pertinent material and information to the department and to be certain the file is complete (as verified by the Procedural Safeguard Statement).

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

Faculty members in the second year of Assistant Professor IV, V, VI or Associate Professor III, or in the third year of Associate Professor IV or V, are regarded as completing a normal period of service in step and are eligible for advancement. 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, suitable for ad hoc committee review and including extramural letters, shall be prepared.
2. The faculty member may wish to defer review. (For limitations, see section [II.B.6-Deferral](#).)
3. The faculty member may wish to be considered for a merit if he/she is not at the highest step and is not in the 7th year in the Assistant rank.
 - a. The Chair notifies the candidate of the impending review.

- b. The Chair makes certain the candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process and is made aware of [APM 210-1](#), [220-80](#) and [APM 160](#).
- c. The Chair makes certain the candidate is given an opportunity to:
 - (i) Ask questions.
 - (ii) Supply pertinent information and evidence, including a self-statement if desired
 - (iii) Suggest, where relevant, names of persons to be solicited for letters of evaluation
 - (iv) Provide in writing to the Chair names of **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.

6. Procedures Before the Departmental Recommendation is Determined

- a. The Chair shall provide the candidate the opportunity to inspect all documents to be included in the personnel review file other than confidential documents.
- b. The Chair shall provide to the candidate, upon request in writing, a redacted copy of the confidential documents in the file (including declinations from extramural evaluators). If redacted confidential documents are not obtained by the candidate at this time, the candidate may not have access to this material until after the decision. (An exception to this applies when the Chancellor's preliminary assessment is to make a terminal year appointment or a non-reappointment of an assistant professor, or when the Chancellor's preliminary assessment is provided in a promotion **or appraisal** case. See sections [II.A.10.b\(iv\)](#) and [II.A.10.c\(ii\)](#).

Note: The identities of persons who were the sources of these documents shall not be disclosed.

- c. Seven calendar days before the departmental meeting for review of the file, the candidate may submit for inclusion in the personnel review file a written statement in response to or commenting upon material in the file.
- d. The candidate shall sign Section I of the Procedural Safeguards Statement ([Attachment B-1](#))

7. 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.
- b. The Chair has the responsibility of making the complete file available for inspection by the voting members of the department before the departmental vote is taken. In the case of absentee ballots, all votes should be received prior to the department meeting.
- c. **All ranks/steps requested by the candidate must be considered and voted upon by the voting members of the department. All votes must be included in the header of the department letter.**
- 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, or by a designated committee or group of such members.

When the **draft** of the departmental recommendation letter is ready for review by eligible voting members of the faculty, the Chair is responsible for communicating to the faculty where the **draft** is available for review. For security reasons, email review is strongly discouraged. The Chair must also provide the faculty with a due date for receipt of any comments to the draft. Once the due date has passed, the Chair must review any comments received from the faculty, and to the extent possible, incorporate those comments into the **finalized** departmental recommendation letter.

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

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

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

8. Procedures After the Departmental Recommendation is Determined

Before the file is forwarded:

- a. The candidate shall be provided a copy of the departmental letter and all minority reports if requested on Section I of the procedural safeguard form and shall be informed orally of the following:
 - (i) The departmental recommendation including the nature of the departmental vote.
 - (ii) The substance of the departmental evaluations under each of the criteria.
- b. The candidate has the right to make a written comment on the departmental recommendation (and minority reports, if any). The candidate's written comment, to be transmitted within seven calendar days of receipt of the departmental letter, may be addressed to the Chair, the Dean, or the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel. (It is the joint responsibility of the candidate and the department to verify the date the candidate received a copy of the departmental letter as noted on Section [II E.3](#) of the procedural safeguard form.) The candidate must use [Attachment H](#) for his or her response, taking care to specify to whom the response is addressed:
 - If addressed to the Chair it will be added to the department's copy of the file and will proceed with the forwarded file through the review process. **The Chair must make the document known and available to departmental faculty members eligible to vote on the case. Department faculty may not comment on a response to the department letter.**
 - If addressed to the Dean, it will not be sent to the department, but the Dean will inform the Department Chair that a written statement has been received from the candidate without revealing the contents. A written statement that is addressed directly to the Dean will be forwarded to the Vice Provost's Office and to the Committee on Academic Personnel but will not be sent to an ad hoc review committee, unless the candidate specifically requests that the statement be included in the file that goes to the ad hoc committee.
 - If addressed to the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, the response will be reviewed by only the Committee on Academic Personnel and the Chancellor or his/her designee. The Vice Provost for Academic Personnel will inform the Department Chair and Dean that a written statement has been received from the candidate without revealing its contents.

The candidate's written comment is limited to a maximum of two pages for merit files (other than advancements to Professor VI, Professor Above-Scale, and within Professor Above-Scale).

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

9. Procedures During Review Beyond the Department

a. Additions and Changes to the File

After review by the department faculty, apart from recommendations of subsequent reviewing bodies, no additions to the file are permitted except as noted in section [II.A.8.b](#) or in the [final paragraph](#) in this section. No changes in the status of publications may be made. Only corrections of fact are permitted. The candidate must be informed of any correction. Permitted additions or updates must have documented departmental review before being forwarded.

If the correction is on the list of publications, the department should submit a new page or pages reflecting the change. The candidate shall certify on Part 2 of the Procedural

Safeguards Statement that he/she has been informed of the changes in the file. ([Attachment B-2](#)) The new page should be dated and should be submitted with a note indicating what the changes are and which existing page in the list of publications is being replaced with the substituted page. (The old page will be discarded by the departmental office, Dean's office and the Academic Personnel Office.) The new page will then become part of the original file and will be considered as such.

If a correction is made to the departmental letter, the corrected departmental letter should show the original date AND the revised date. The candidate shall certify on Part 2 of the Procedural Safeguards Statement that he/she has been informed of the changes in the file. (see [Attachment B-2](#)). Any revision in the departmental letter affords the candidate a seven-day period to respond to the departmental letter ([see section II.A.8.b](#))

IN THE CASE OF 7TH YEAR PROMOTION TO TENURE FILES AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF NON-REAPPOINTMENT, NEW OR UPDATED INFORMATION SHOULD BE PROVIDED AS IT BECOMES AVAILABLE, THROUGH THE APPROPRIATE CHANNELS. **OTHER PROMOTION TO TENURE FILES AND APPRAISALS MAY BE UPDATED UNTIL MARCH 1st.**

Acceptable updates include significant service commitments, additional teaching evaluations, grant awards, publications, and in the case of promotions, 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.

b. Additional Information Solicited During Review

- (i) If additional information is requested by the Dean, by an ad hoc committee (in cases involving ad hoc committees), **by the VPAP**, or by the Committee on Academic Personnel, such information shall be solicited through the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP).
- (ii) All responses shall be limited to the specific information requested in the memo from the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and will be added to the file at the department level. The department may comment on the new material. The requesting body will specify whether or not a department vote is required with the new material.
- (iii) A new department vote will require an addendum to the department letter and subsequent waiting periods.
- (iv) The candidate shall be informed by the Chair of the substance of the changes in the file, without disclosure of the identities of sources of confidential documents, and may be provided access to the new material in accord with [APM-220-80-d](#).
- (v) The candidate shall be provided the opportunity to make a timely written statement on the amended file for inclusion in the file.
- (vi) The candidate shall certify on Part 2 of the Procedural Safeguards Statement that he/she has been informed of the changes in the file. ([Attachment B-2](#))

10. Procedures for Announcement of Administrative Decision

- a. Merit cases (including advancements to Professor VI and Professor Above-Scale [A/S])
 - (i) The decision on the candidate's file will be communicated to the Chair through the Dean. The Chair shall promptly communicate the decision to the candidate.
 - (ii) Appeals to merit decisions are not permitted.
 - (iii) The candidate may request access to records (including the CAP report, the Dean's letter and the Chair's letter, if any) as outlined in section [II.D](#), after the Chancellor's or his/her designee's final decision has been communicated. If the candidate has requested access to designated records on the [Procedural Safeguards Statement](#), these will be automatically furnished by the Academic Personnel Office.

b. Promotions, Appraisals and Appointments

If the preliminary assessment is contrary to the recommendation of the department:

- (i) The Chancellor shall write to the department indicating the reasons and asking for any further information which might support a different decision.
- (ii) The Chair shall provide the candidate with a copy of the Chancellor's statement.
- (iii) If a merit is approved at the time of the preliminary assessment, the merit decision will be announced on the Chancellor's statement.
- (iv) For promotion to tenure and promotion to professor cases, the candidate shall then have the opportunity to request (in writing) access to records from the Academic Personnel Office. The request form is given as [Attachment A](#). If the candidate has requested access to designated records on the Procedural Safeguards Statement, these will be automatically furnished by the Academic Personnel Office. The Department Chair and Dean will also be provided with copies of records supplied to the candidate at this time. These should be shared with the voting faculty in the Department.
- (v) The candidate may respond in writing and provide additional information and documentation, through appropriate channels, by the deadline specified for appeal. This information may include additions to the originally submitted file, such as publications and/or teaching evaluations. Extramural letters shall not be solicited. When resubmitting the file, a new departmental vote must be included.
- (vi) The resubmitted file is reviewed by the Dean and the Committee on Academic Personnel and a final decision is made. 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 or merit is approved as a result of the response to the preliminary assessment, the decision is based on the resubmitted file. If the promotion is denied, and a merit was approved at the preliminary assessment stage, the merit decision is based on the file before the addition of the response material.
- (viii) After the Chancellor's final decision has been communicated to the candidate, the candidate may request access to records. The request form is given as [Attachment A](#). If the candidate has requested access to designated records on the Procedural Safeguards Statement, these will be automatically furnished by the Academic Personnel Office.

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.

If a recommendation for the terminal appointment of an Assistant Professor is made by a Dean, campus ad hoc review committee, and/or the Committee on Academic Personnel, 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:

- (i) The Chair shall be notified of the recommendation or preliminary assessment in writing by the Chancellor (including a statement of reasons).
- (ii) The Chair shall provide the candidate with a copy of the Chancellor's statement. The candidate shall then have the opportunity to request (in writing) access to records from the Academic Personnel Office. The request form is given as Attachment A. If the candidate has requested access to designated records on the Procedural Safeguards Statement, these will be automatically furnished by the Academic Personnel Office. The Department Chair and Dean will also be provided with copies of records supplied to the candidate at this time. These may be shared with the voting faculty in the Department.
- (iii) The candidate may respond in writing to the preliminary assessment and provide additional information and documentation to the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, through the appropriate channels by the deadline specified for appeal. This information may include additions to the originally submitted file, such as publications and/or teaching evaluations. Extramural letters shall not be solicited. When resubmitting the file, a new departmental vote must be included.

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

- (iv) The personnel review file, as augmented by the new material, shall then be considered in the review process by the Dean and the Committee on Academic Personnel before a final decision is reached by the Chancellor.
- (v) After the Chancellor's final decision has been communicated to the candidate, the candidate may request access to records. The request form is given as [Attachment A](#). If the candidate has requested access to designated records on the Procedural Safeguards Statement, these will be automatically furnished by the Academic Personnel Office.

B. Instructions for Specific Actions

1. Advancement to Above-Scale

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

Use the checklist found in [Attachment C-5](#)

Files sent forward for consideration of this advancement should include the following:

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

Advancements to Above-Scale will include an ad hoc review by a committee comprised primarily of Above-Scale faculty.

2. Advancement within Above-Scale

Use the checklist found in [Attachment C-5](#).

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

3. Advancement to Professor VI

Advancements to Professor VI examine the candidate's record with respect to the criteria as set forth in [APM 220-18-b](#).

Use the checklist found in [Attachment C-5](#).

4. Appraisal

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

Procedures and criteria for the appraisal of Assistant Professors, to determine whether they are making satisfactory progress toward tenure rank, will be found in [APM 220-82](#) and [220-83](#). Appraisals may be referred to ad hoc committees.

The possible outcomes for an appraisal are positive (with or without qualification) or negative. If the appraisal leads to a decision not to reappoint the candidate, procedures as outlined in [APM 220-84](#) are followed.

Use the checklist found in [Attachment C-1](#).

5. Career Review

A career review is intended for Academic Senate ladder-rank faculty only. Any faculty member who thinks that he/she may not be at the appropriate level on the rank/step scale has the right to be evaluated by the process of Career Review. Departments and Deans should also be alert to this possibility that on rare occasions a faculty member may be seriously out of place on the rank/step scale. The purpose of a Career Review is to assess the candidate's overall record in order to determine the appropriate rank/step placement. Candidates for a Career Review are encouraged to submit an optional professional C.V. with his/her file in the "Other" section.

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

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

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

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

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

Use the checklist found in [Attachment C-2](#).

6. Deferral

Deferral files should be submitted to the Dean on or before the published dates for merits or promotions, according to the candidate's eligibility. Deans have final authority for approval (concurrence) for all deferral files. Each Dean's office should announce final deferral decisions as scheduled on [page 3 of the CALL](#).

A file must be submitted for academic employees at normal time in step. If a faculty member who is eligible for normal advancement requests (or agrees) that a merit or promotion review be deferred, a file should be forwarded through the appropriate department to the college/school Dean. The departmental faculty must review and vote on the request, and a departmental letter addressing the proposed action and the reasons for it must accompany the abbreviated file through

the channels described above. If the departmental recommendation is for advancement, a complete file should be forwarded if the candidate concurs.

Assistant Professors may not defer consideration for merit increases.

If a candidate is normally eligible for promotion, he or she may elect to defer consideration for promotion, and instead (see [section II.B.3.c-Overlapping Steps](#)), be considered for merit advancement to Assistant Professor V or VI, provided this is not the 7th year at the Assistant rank.

Because there is no specified normal time at Professor V, VI, VII, VIII, IX and Above-Scale, service at these steps may be of indefinite duration. Therefore it is not necessary to request deferral when individuals at these steps are not being proposed for advancement. (However, see section [II.B.11-Quinquennial Reviews](#).)

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

For deferrals, use the checklist in [Attachment C-3](#).

7. Lateral Promotion

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

8. Merit Advancement

Use the checklist found in [Attachment C-4](#). Merit candidates should not add copies of publications or creative work to the file unless requested during the review process.

Appeals to merit decisions are not permitted.

9. Off-scale Salary

It is not permitted to recommend an off-scale salary unaccompanied by a recommendation (positive or negative) on a merit increase or promotion. A deferral of a merit combined with a vote recommending an off-scale salary may not be proposed.

10. Promotion

A promotion review examines the candidate's record with respect to the criteria as set forth in section [II.A.4](#). The question of acceleration should not be an issue in promotion to Associate Professor and Professor cases: the issue is whether the candidate has met the criteria, not whether the criteria have been met in a particular time frame.

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

Use the checklist found in [Attachment C-5](#).

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 acted upon by the department, or a merit file may be pursued. An ad hoc committee will not be appointed. (Again, see section II.B.7-Deferral.) However, it should be noted that all solicited letters will be used in the subsequent promotion file. Assistant Professors may not defer but may instead opt to submit a merit file, provided the candidate is not in his/her 7th year.

11. Quinquennial Review

Although service at open steps (Professor V and above) may be of indefinite duration, the APM ([200-0](#) and [220-80-b](#)) requires that each faculty member be reviewed no less frequently than every five years. For such cases, the Chair is to prepare a file with the candidate AFTER the fifth year with no review. The candidate may choose whether to submit a merit, promotion (if appropriate) or quinquennial review file. Merit and promotion files would follow their normal procedures.

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 years:

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

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

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

A deferral does not qualify as a quinquennial review.

For quinquennial reviews, use the checklist found in [Attachment C-6](#).

C. Other Reviews and Recommendations

1. Department Chair

It is the responsibility of the Dean to initiate review of Departmental Chairs who have completed normal time in rank and step. In those cases in which a Chair will be put up for advancement, the procedures are identical to those for any candidate except that the Dean designates a senior member of the department to fulfill the Chair's duties in the case, including preparation of the departmental letter. This faculty member may also submit a letter equivalent to the Chair's letter, which shall be added to the file at the Dean's office (the office of record) and forwarded with the file. The candidate may be provided access to this "Chair's letter" as outlined in section [III.H](#).

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

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

2. Joint Appointments in two or more **units***

For purposes of the personnel review of joint appointees, one of the departments will be considered as the principal department. Ordinarily this will be the department with the larger percentage of FTE. For joint appointments in which the FTE split is 50-50, the candidate will write a brief memo to the Chancellor's Office requesting that one of the two departments be designated as the

principal department. This declaration, once made applies indefinitely and need not be restated. The request should be forwarded via the Chairs of both departments and the Dean(s) for their reviews.

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

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

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

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

Each department will independently evaluate the candidate and make a recommendation, emphasizing where appropriate those portions of the candidate's responsibilities which are specific to that department. The Chair of each department will prepare a departmental letter to be sent to the Dean (and, if another college or school is involved, to the other Dean as well). When both departments are ready to forward their respective recommendations, there shall be a meeting of both Chairs and the candidate, during which each Chair will give the candidate an oral summary of his/her departmental recommendation. The candidate will not be given such an oral summary except at that meeting with both Chairs present. Any written form of the departmental recommendation will also be given to the other Department Chair.

*The unit must be a department, a school, or a division ([APM 220 – Appendix A](#)).

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

Regulations regarding access by an individual to his/her academic personnel records appear in [APM 158](#) and [160](#).

1. The basic regulations pertaining to access include:

- a. All documents pertaining to an individual, except confidential documents, shall be accessible for inspection by the individual ([APM160-20-b-2](#))
- b. Individuals can obtain a redaction of confidential documents in such records ([APM 160-20-b-1](#))
- c. If an individual has requested access to academic personnel records pertaining to that individual, material other than that called for under the conditions of redaction shall not be deleted from such records.

2. Requests for corrections, deletions, additions to personnel records

[APM 160-30](#) contains provisions whereby an individual 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 **Vice Provost for Academic Personnel** who shall, within 30 calendar days, determine whether the request shall be granted. In any event, the individual shall have the right to

have inserted in the appropriate record any statement the individual wishes in response to or commenting upon the challenged material.

3. **Procedures to be followed by faculty members when requesting access to records**

The specific procedures are divided into two categories: procedures in relation to an ongoing personnel review ([APM 220](#)) and procedures for access to all other records ([APM 160](#)).

4. **Access by Third Parties**

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

III. DOCUMENTS

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

A. Ad Hoc Committee Report (Senate)

The following list shows instances when ad hoc committees are automatic. When an ad hoc committee is automatic, its review of the file will precede the Dean's review. In cases when a discretionary 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 be given the opportunity to respond. Both of the Dean's letters will then be added to the file and will remain as part of the file.

Ad hoc committees will be comprised of a committee Chair, typically one or two committee members and one non-voting department representative. The department representative will act as a consultant during discussion, will not be present during the ad hoc vote and will not be given access to the ad hoc report.

	<u>Ad Hoc Committee</u>
Advancement to Professor VI	Discretionary
Advancement to Above-Scale	Automatic (3 person committee)
Advancement within Above-Scale	Discretionary
Appointments	Discretionary
Appraisals	Discretionary
Career Review	Discretionary
Deferrals	Not required
Merits and Accelerated Merits	Discretionary
Promotions to Tenure	Automatic (3 or 4 person committee)
Promotions to Full Professor	Discretionary
Quinquennial Reviews	Discretionary

B. Ad Hoc Committee Report (Departmental)

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

C. Bibliography of Publications and/or Creative Activity - At Last Advance

The bibliography at last advance will be retained at the CHASS, COE and CNAS Dean's offices. The School of Education, Division of Biomedical Sciences and Anderson Graduate School of Management should include the bibliography at last advance in the file forwarded to the Academic Personnel Office.

D. Bibliography of Publications and/or Creative Activity - Current

Except as noted in Sections [II.A.9a](#) and [II.A.9.b](#), this document may not be updated beyond the File Entry dates specified in [Section I. Schedule](#). **The current Bibliography will be forwarded with the file.**

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

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

1. Categories

- a. Separate categories may include: technical journal articles, semi-technical journal articles, review articles, book reviews, conference proceedings, book chapters and contributions to edited volumes, books, monographs, edited volumes, textbooks, etc. Departments may be flexible in employing the categories as relevant for their discipline. Items are considered technical when they are directed to other scholars in the field. Items that have a scholarly basis but are directed to non-experts are considered semi-technical and should be listed in a separate category.
- b. Citation of reprinted and/or translated items shall be included immediately after the original item and shall not be accorded a separate number in the enumerated list of items.
- c. List edited volumes 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 individual, then the work should be listed in the professional service activity portion of the file. This would apply for editorial work as a journal or series editor.
- d. **Conference proceedings that subsequently appear as journal articles should be so noted.** Abstracts and reports may be included at the author's discretion.

2. Status

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

acceptance for publication. Append an explanatory note if this would provide additional clarity

- b. In Press. Items that have been unconditionally accepted for publication are included 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 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 secured contract with a publishing company.
- c. Submitted. Items under submission may be included on the Bibliography, at the author's discretion. Submitted items should include the submission date, publisher, number of manuscript pages, and order of authorship as it appears on the manuscript. **Submitted items should not be counted in the review nor discussed in the department letter except briefly.**
5. Patents

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

a) UC Disclosure of Invention.

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

SMITH, MARY (List all names on disclosure)

UC Case No.: 1999-008-4

Title: "A NOVEL FORMULATION OF PHOSPHORUS FERTILIZERS FOR PLANTS"

Status: Disclosure

Date Disclosed: June 03, 1999

b) Patent Application Filing with US Patent & Trademark Office

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

SMITH, MARY (List all names on disclosure)

UC Case No.: 1999-008-4

Title: "A NOVEL FORMULATION OF PHOSPHORUS FERTILIZERS FOR PLANTS"

Status: Patent Pending

Date Filed: February 23, 2000

Disclosure

Date Disclosed: June 3, 1999

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

Patent Pending

Date Filed: February 23, 2000

Disclosure

Date Disclosed: June 3, 1999

E. Biography Form - Current

The Biography form must be signed.

F. Candidate's response to Departmental Recommendation

The candidate has seven calendar days from receipt of the departmental letter to provide a written response to the departmental recommendation (and minority reports, if any). This response may be addressed to the Chair, the Dean, or the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.

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

If addressed to the Dean, it will not be sent to the department, but the Dean will inform the Department Chair that a written statement has been received from the candidate without revealing its contents. A written statement that is addressed directly to the Dean will be forwarded to the Chancellor's Office and to the Committee on Academic Personnel, but will not be sent to an ad hoc review committee, unless the candidate specifically requests that the statement be included in the file reviewed by the ad hoc committee.

If addressed to the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, the response will be seen by only the Committee on Academic Personnel, and the Chancellor or his/her designee. The Vice Provost for Academic Personnel will inform the Department Chair and Dean that a written statement has been received from the candidate without revealing its contents.

The candidate's statement is limited to a maximum of two pages for merit files (other than, advancement to Professor VI, Professor Above-Scale or within Professor Above-Scale.)

Use [Attachment H](#) for the Candidate's Response to the Departmental Recommendation.

G. Candidate's Response to Extramural Letters

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 seven calendar days prior to the departmental meeting at which review of the file will occur.

H. Chair's Letter (Optional)

In addition to the departmental letter, the Chair, at his/her discretion may elect to write a separate letter, known as the Chair's letter. Such a letter can be an important part of the file, especially when significant differences of opinion and voting are expressed in the departmental letter. The Chair's letter is a confidential document (See [APM 160-20-b-1-b](#)) and should be forwarded to the Dean's office and not retained in the department. The Chair's letter is prepared AFTER the Chair has informed the candidate about the departmental recommendation. Upon request by the candidate, access to the Chair's letter will be provided in redacted form after the final administrative decision has been communicated to the candidate, or at the Chancellor's preliminary assessment stage in promotion and appraisal.

I. Checklist of Documents

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

Type of Action	Checklist Attachment #
Appraisal	Attachment C-1
Career Review	Attachment C-2
Deferral	Attachment C-3
Merit	Attachment C-4
Promotion to Associate Professor	Attachment C-5
Promotion to Professor	Attachment C-5

Advancement to Professor VI	Attachment C-5
Advancement to Above-Scale	Attachment C-5
Advancement within Above-Scale	Attachment C-5
Quinquennial Review	Attachment C-6

J. Dean's Recommendation Letter

The Dean's letter is not a confidential document. The letter is forwarded to Academic Personnel with the file for merit cases. Whenever a Senate ad hoc committee is required (e.g., promotions to tenure, advancement to Above-Scale), the Dean's letter of recommendation will be solicited after the ad hoc committee recommendation is finalized. In cases when a discretionary ad hoc is utilized, the Dean's letter will be removed from the file being forwarded to the ad hoc committee. The redacted ad hoc report will be forwarded to the Dean and the Dean will be given the opportunity to respond. Both Deans' letters will then be added to the file and will remain as part of the file.

The Dean's letter should briefly evaluate the file in light of the review criteria (see section [II.A.4](#)) 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.

In merit file cases where the Dean has nothing evaluative or informative to add, the Dean may simply concur with the department and opt to forego a Dean's letter. The Dean will signify his/her concurrence by signature on the department letter. Deans may not simply concur in cases of acceleration or split departmental votes.

K. Departmental Recommendation Letter

The Chair has the responsibility of writing the departmental letter which provides, from the perspective of the voting faculty of the department, an evaluation of the file and a departmental recommendation. For promotions to Associate Professor and Professor and for advancements to Professor VI, Professor Above-Scale, and within Professor Above-Scale, 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.

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

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

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

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

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

In units where there is no Chair, the "departmental letter" summarizing the case should be prepared by a senior faculty member designated by the Dean. The same member should be responsible for

preparing the letters for all candidates in the unit. This faculty member may also prepare a "Chair's letter." (See section [III.1](#))

1. Contents of the Departmental Letter

The departmental letter must not simply enumerate that which the file contains, but must analyze the materials and describe the **significance and impact** of the teaching, research, and service contributions. This letter shall include the departmental vote(s) in the heading and shall present any significant evidence and differences of opinion which would explain a minority vote. If options have been exercised without comment, that should also be reported.

a. Introductory Information

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

- (i) present title, rank and step of the candidate and the number of years at the present rank and step. (Previous advancement information should not be included.)
- (ii) rank and step recommended.
- (iii) the exact vote specifying the number in favor, opposed, abstained and unavailable. (See section [II.A.1](#))
- (iv) sabbatical leave report status.

b. Evaluation of Teaching

In the evaluation of teaching [APM 210-1-d](#) must be considered

Where possible and applicable, the departmental letter should comment on items such as the following:

- (i) The role of the candidate in the **graduate and undergraduate** instructional program including such items as the amount, variety and difficulty of the teaching assignments and the preparation and attention given by the candidate to his/her teaching responsibilities. Make reference to teaching load data form.
- (ii) Out-of-class teaching and advising **at both the graduate and undergraduate levels** (careful thought should be given to the advising role of each candidate): directed research, special studies, help given to students, office hours with students, contributions to the teaching of other faculty, etc.
- (iii) Graduate student supervision and advising: PhDs, **Masters**, committees, post-doctoral, **and Graduate Research Assistant** supervision. **Attention may be given to the role of the candidate and the candidate's field in attracting high caliber graduate students to the campus.**
- (iv) Development of new and effective techniques of instruction; writing of teaching materials, manuals, textbooks.
- (v) Evaluation of teaching as judged by departmental colleagues. Guidelines dealing with the evaluation of teaching are contained in [APM 210-1](#) and should be consulted by Chairs on behalf of their departments. Among other elements of teaching, faculty colleagues are particularly well qualified to make thoughtful and substantial assessments of the candidate's command of subject matter and continuous growth in his/her field. Faculty perceptions and information should be shared with colleagues at the departmental personnel meeting concerning the candidate and incorporated into the file in an appropriate manner. Departments should be mindful that individual faculty who write letters of evaluation will be disqualified from service on the candidate's ad hoc committee in cases of appraisal and promotion. In anticipation of such situations, the information may better be incorporated in the departmental letter.

(vi) Evaluation of teaching by students. Materials submitted by students ([see III.V](#)) should be discussed by the department in its meeting and summarized and evaluated in the departmental letter. All levels of instruction (lower-division, upper-division, and graduate) performed during the review period should be assessed and commented on. Hearsay is not acceptable for use in teaching evaluations.

c. Evaluation of Research and Creative Activity

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

The departmental letter should evaluate specifically the following:

(i) Contribution to the Scholarly Field

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

d. Evaluation of Professional Activity and University and Public Service

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

e. Departmental Letter Format

The format of the Departmental Letter should be as shown in [Attachment D](#).

L. Difference List

On a separate blue colored sheet (the "Difference List"), enumerate the candidate's recent publications and/or creative activity to be credited since the time of appointment or last positive review. The numbering and format of publications should be consistent in the Difference List and the current Bibliography. **The header of the Difference List should include the applicable review period.** It is recommended that items on the Difference List be grouped together by type of publication then by status, such as in the following example:

I. Technical Journal Articles

- a. Technical Journal Articles Published
- b. Technical Journal Articles In Press
- c. Technical Journal Articles Submitted

II. Semi-Technical Journal Articles

- a. Semi-Technical Journal Articles Published

- b. Semi-Technical Journal Articles In Press
- c. Semi-Technical Journal Articles Submitted

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. **Submitted items should not be counted nor discussed in the department letter except briefly.** Conditionally or provisionally accepted items should be not be listed.

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.

A brief description (a maximum of 3-4 sentences) of the candidate's role in products of joint effort shall be included directly following each citation (**excluding abstracts or reports**). Candidates should also give some information on the collaborator, i.e. the rank of the collaborator, the association to the candidate etc.

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

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

M. Extramural Letters

Extramural letters solicited by the candidate's Department Chair are required as specified below. Candidates may not solicit their own extramural letters.

Extramural Letters	
Advancement to Professor VI	Required
Advancement to Above-Scale	Required
Advancement within Above-Scale	Not required
Appraisals	Not required *
Career Review	Required
Deferrals	Not allowed
Merits and Accelerated Merits	Not allowed
Promotions	Required
Quinquennial Reviews	Not required
* Candidates are strongly discouraged from requesting extramural letters at time of appraisal. Instead, candidates are encouraged to wait to solicit extramural letters until review for promotion to tenure so as to not overburden extramural letter writers.	

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

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

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

All extramural letters should be from qualified persons of a rank equal to or above the rank sought by the candidate. The reviewers' qualifications should include an established reputation

and a disciplinary expertise enabling them to comment and assess in an informed manner. Preferably such persons should be affiliated with institutions comparable in quality to the University of California. Letters should be requested from 3-6 referees suggested by the candidate, and from 3-6 referees suggested by the department and/or Chair; the list of referees should be adequately balanced between the candidate's suggestions and those of his/her colleagues. In suggesting referees, it is desirable to include not only the best qualified persons in the field or subdiscipline but also some not closely affiliated with the candidate or his/her work.

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

Sample solicitation letters are provided as follows:

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

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

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

The extramural letters should be numbered or referenced by alpha characters, stapled as a packet, and attached to the front of the packet should be:

1. The letter soliciting the extramural letters.
2. The packet of information sent to extramural referees (including such items as a self-statement, bibliography, and optional curriculum vita), *if different from the documents submitted as part of the file.*
3. The list of persons from whom extramural letters were sought 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.
4. The Chair should provide, on the list in #3 above, a brief (one or two sentences) comment on the academic standing and reputation of each letter writer. This does not need to be provided for those who declined or did not respond to the solicitation letter. This information is confidential and is not to be released to the candidate (See [APM 160-20-b-1-d](#)).
5. English translations must be provided for extramural letters written in another language.

N. Grant Activity

All grant and funding activity should be listed on a separate page in the format shown in [Attachment F](#).

It may be helpful to include a legend of granting agencies when using acronyms. In addition, the list should include a brief contribution statement for grants with a CoPI (maximum 2-3 sentences). **Candidates with sub-contracts should include a brief statement of the (approximate) funding amount awarded to the candidate's research program.**

GRANT ACTIVITY	
For Consideration of:	Include Activity Since:
Appraisal	Appointment
Merit	Last advance
Merit following lateral promotion	Last merit
Promotion to Associate Professor	Appointment
Promotion to Professor	Promotion to Associate Professor
Advancement to Professor VI	Promotion to Professor
Advancement to Above Scale	Advancement to Professor VI
Advancement within Above Scale	Last advance
Career Review	Last promotion if promotion was greater than 5 years past If ≤5 years, then include activity since the previous promotion or appt.
Quinquennial Review	For past 5 years

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

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

P. Minority Reports

In the departmental review of an appointment, appraisal, merit or promotion case:

1. Any minority opinion on a faculty member (or any other solicited or unsolicited document) which is intended for consideration by the Committee on Academic Personnel or the Chancellor's Office is viewed as non-confidential. Names of extramural referees, eligible voters, and students must not be disclosed in minority reports. The minority opinion must be signed and forwarded as an addendum to the departmental letter. The addendum is considered part of the department letter, not a separate document on which the candidate may comment. All documents not submitted through the Department Chair and the Dean's office will be returned to the sender. Minority reports for merit files (other than advancements to Professor VI, Professor Above-Scale, and within Professor Above-Scale) are limited to a maximum of two pages.

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

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

and final letter of recommendation is to be forwarded, all accompanying documents must be submitted.

3. In an addendum to the departmental letter, the Chair may comment on the minority report or other document. The addendum to the departmental letter, like the letter itself, is to be shared with the department before the file is submitted. The addendum is considered part of the department letter, not a separate document on which the candidate may comment. The intent should be to acknowledge the department's awareness of the minority report or succinctly to address items in the minority report germane to the case and not already adequately considered in the department letter. Minority reports on minority reports or individual faculty comments to minority reports are not permitted.
4. Minority reports and other such documents submitted in accord with the above specified procedures will be a part of the file as it is considered by all of the subsequent reviewing agencies (see section [II.A.8.b](#) for exception, relating to the candidate's option of sending his/her comment to the Dean's office).
5. The candidate will be able to review the unredacted **finalized** letter and any minority reports after the period for submission of minority reports is expired.

Q. Procedural Safeguards Statement

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

R. Professional Activity and Service

The 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, including beginning and ending year(s) of participation, rather than repeating an activity.

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

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

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY AND SERVICE	
For Consideration of:	Include Activity Since:
Appraisal	Appointment
Merit	Last advance
Merit following lateral promotion	Last merit
Promotion to Associate Professor	Appointment
Promotion to Professor	Promotion to Associate Professor
Advancement to Professor VI	Promotion to Professor
Advancement to Above Scale	Advancement to Professor VI
Advancement within Above Scale	Last advance
Career Review	Last promotion if promotion was greater than 5 years past If ≤5 years, then include activity since the previous promotion or appt.
Quinquennial Review	For past 5 years

Professional Activity includes such things as:

1. editing books or journals, refereeing articles or other publications, serving on review panels
2. holding an office in a professional or learned society
3. awards, prizes, honors received from professional organizations, foundations, etc.
4. presenting papers or chairing sessions at professional meetings, presenting invited seminars, colloquia, workshops, report writings, etc. including location and date of meeting or presentation
5. consulting activity

S. Publications

One copy of the actual publications and in press material should be forwarded with cases of promotion, appraisal, and advancements to Professor Above-Scale. For advancements to Professor VI and within Professor Above-Scale, do not forward publications, but keep them available in the department. Attach a list of the publications to the top of the publications file. For merit files, copies of publications or creative work should be provided to the department and retained there. Merit file publications should not be forwarded with the file unless requested during the review process.

T. Sabbatical Leave Reports

Sabbatical leave reports do not need to be forwarded, but should be available upon request.

U. Self-Statement (optional but encouraged)

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

V. Student Evaluations of Teaching

The APM requires student evaluation of teaching. It should normally cover teaching done in the period under review. **All actions should include evaluations for all courses since last advance.** Quinquennial reviews must include teaching evaluations for the last five years. All available evaluations should be included in the file. Departmental summaries (for the candidate's principal department) should also be included in the file for every quarter in which any course taught by a candidate is evaluated.

Evaluations of University Extension courses are not to be included.

Summer teaching will be recorded on the Supplemental Teaching Load Data Form.

W. Student Letters Evaluating Teaching

For areas of teaching not covered by standardized evaluations, student letters of evaluation should be solicited. In this case, include a statement showing how student letters were obtained (i.e. random sample of all students, solicitation of all graduate students, etc.). The letter of solicitation of such evaluations should be included and should include a statement of legal safeguard of the sort indicated in [Attachment E-8](#). Oral or other informal request mechanisms are not sufficient.

Student letters evaluating teaching are confidential documents.

Student letters from previous unsuccessful files should be included if they serve to complete teaching documentation for the same two or three year period shown on the Teaching Load Data Form. If sufficient standardized evaluations are provided to assess teaching skill and effectiveness, these letters are not required to be included.

X. Teaching Load Data Form

Department Chairs are required to provide a brief departmental teaching statement. The statement should be used to explain departmental teaching norms, any course releases, the unusual circumstance which lead to some courses not being evaluated, and other elements of teaching that may be unique to the department. **The TLD should only include courses evaluated since the last advance. Quinquennial Reviews will include the last 5 years.**

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

The role of the candidate on graduate committees should be explained.

GRADUATE STUDENT INSTRUCTION	
For Consideration of:	Include Students Since:
Appraisal	Appointment
Merit	Last advance
Merit following lateral promotion	Last merit
Promotion to Associate Professor	Appointment
Promotion to Professor	Promotion to Associate Professor
Advancement to Professor VI	Promotion to Professor
Advancement to Above Scale	Advancement to Professor VI
Advancement within Above Scale	Last advance
Career Review	Last promotion if promotion was greater than years past If ≤ 5 years, then include activity since the previous promotion or appt.
Quinquennial Review	For past 5 years

Y. 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, rather than repeating an activity. List department, college, Senate, administrative and systemwide service under separate categories. Ad hoc committee service (without revealing the name of the candidate) should be listed under Senate service.

UNIVERSITY AND PUBLIC SERVICE	
For Consideration of:	Include Activity Since:
Appraisal	Appointment
Merit	Last advance
Merit following lateral promotion	Last merit
Promotion to Associate Professor	Appointment
Promotion to Professor	Promotion to Associate Professor
Advancement to Professor VI	Promotion to Professor
Advancement to Above-Scale	Advancement to Professor VI
Advancement w/in Above-Scale	Last advance
Career Review	Last promotion if promotion was greater than 5 years past If ≤ 5 years, then include activity since the previous promotion or appt.
Quinquennial Review	For past 5 years

Z. Unsolicited Letters

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

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

DRAFT

REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO RECORDS
FOR ALL FILES

Name _____ Department _____

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

Confidential (redacted form)

- ___ Extramural letters
- ___ Student letters
- ___ Chair's letter
- ___ Ad Hoc committee report
- ___ Other confidential

Non-confidential

- ___ Dean's letter
- ___ CAP report
- ___ Department letter (if not received earlier)
- ___ Other

Signature _____ Date _____

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

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL OFFICE USE ONLY

- _____ 1. Request received
- _____ 2. Documents with cover letter sent to candidate.

REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO RECORDS
BY A THIRD PARTY

Name _____ Department _____

Title: _____

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

The reason(s) for this request are: _____

Confidential (redacted form)

Non-confidential

- ___ Extramural letters
- ___ Student letters
- ___ Chair's letter
- ___ Ad Hoc committee report
- ___ Other confidential

- ___ Dean's letter
- ___ CAP report
- ___ Department letter (if not received earlier)
- ___ Other

Signature _____ Date _____

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

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL OFFICE USE ONLY

_____ 1. Request received _____ Approved _____ Denied

_____ 2. Documents with cover letter sent to _____

_____ 3. Copy of documents sent to candidate

SIGNED STATEMENT ATTESTING TO PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS (Part 1)

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

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

Section I. Initial stages of review process prior to Department review:**I CERTIFY THAT:****A. Under APM 220-80-c**

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

B. Under APM 220-80-d

- All documents and information I have provided are accurate to the best of my knowledge.
- I had the opportunity to inspect all documents to be included in the file other than confidential documents.
- I request redacted copies of confidential documents in this file and certify that I received the following:
____ Extramural letters ____ Student letters ____ Other confidential on _____ (date).
- I had the opportunity to provide a written statement for inclusion in this file in response to or commenting upon material in the file.

C. Under APM 220-80-i

- I understand I am entitled to receive copies of non-confidential documents and redacted copies of confidential documents in the event a preliminary assessment is contrary to the department recommendation for promotions and appraisals. In such an instance, I request that copies of the below-marked documents be forwarded to me as quickly as possible after the preliminary determination is communicated. I understand that copies of the documents I request will also be provided to the department and Dean.

D. Under APM 220-80-j

- I was informed of the right to receive a written statement of reasons for the final administrative decision. I was also informed that I am entitled to copies of non-confidential documents and redacted copies of confidential documents once the final decision is communicated. I request that a copy of the following material in my current academic personnel review file be forwarded to me after the review is completed:

Confidential (redacted form)

____ Extramural letters ____ Chair's letter
____ Student letters ____ Other confidential
____ Ad Hoc committee report

Non-confidential

____ Dean's letter
____ CAP report
____ Department letter (if not received earlier).

Candidate's Signature_____
Date**Section II. After the Department meeting:****E. Under APM 220-80-e**

- I was informed of the specific departmental vote and whether the vote was unanimous, by a strong majority, or by a narrow majority.
- I was informed of the departmental recommendation and of the substance of the departmental evaluations under each of the applicable criteria. I request a copy of the department letter and acknowledge that I received a copy of the department letter on _____.
- I was informed of the right to make written comments on the departmental recommendation within seven calendar days of receiving it and to direct transmittal of these comments to the Chair, the Dean, or the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel as described in section II.8.b of the Call on or before _____ at _____ (a.m./p.m.).
- I was informed that if I wish to waive my right to respond to the departmental recommendation I may do so in writing (email or written correspondence – attach if applicable) prior to the date/time noted in Section II. E.3. or by signing and dating here: _____ (Candidate's signature) _____ (Date).

Candidate Signature_____
Date_____
Chair Signature_____
Date

**SIGNED STATEMENT ATTESTING TO PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS
(Part 2)**

I CERTIFY THAT:

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

Print Name

Signature

Date

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

C. Under APM 220-80-e

1. I was informed of the departmental recommendation and of the substance of the departmental evaluations under each of the applicable criteria. I received a copy of the department letter on _____.
2. I was informed of the specific departmental vote or whether the vote was unanimous, by a strong majority, or by a narrow majority.
3. I was informed of the right to make written comments on the departmental recommendation within seven calendar days of receiving it and to direct transmittal of these comments to the Chair, the Dean, or the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel as described in section II.8.b of the Call. I have chosen to:
___ respond in writing to the departmental recommendation within 7 days (use Attachment H).
___ not respond to the departmental recommendation and waive the 7 day waiting period.

CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR APPRAISALS

Name: _____ Department: _____

Submit **four** copies of each item (original plus three copies)

- A. Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
- B. Checklist of Documents in File
- ** C. Chair's Letter (*optional*)
- D. Departmental letter (must include vote)
- E. Minority Report (*if applicable*)
- F. Candidate's Response to department letter (*optional*)
- G. Candidate's Self-Statement (*optional but encouraged*)
- H. Candidate's Response to material in the file (*optional*)
- I. Candidate's request for redacted confidential documents
- Indicate # included ** J. Student Letters Evaluating Teaching (*required if non-confidential teaching evaluations are not provided*)
 Solicitation letter or statement as to how obtained
- K. Current Biography
- L. Current Bibliography (*include contributions to joint-authored works since arrival at UCR*)
- M. List of Professional Activity and Service (*since appointment, include the current year*)
- N. List of University/Public Service (*since appointment, include the current year*)
- O. Grant Activity (*if applicable, since appointment*)
- P. Teaching Load Data Form
- Q. Student Evaluation of Teaching
Evaluations for all courses taught since last advance--campus teaching evaluation forms, etc.
- ** R. Letters From Other Departments/Programs (*optional*)
- ** S. Other- Confidential (specify item(s) below):

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

- U. File of Publications/Creative Activity (*one copy only*)
Package separately with cover list of contents and mark "Please return to the Department of _____"

** = Confidential

File Tracking

_____ file sent to Dean's office
dept chair initial & date

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

CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR CAREER REVIEW

Name: _____ Department: _____

Submit **four** copies of each item (original plus three copies)

- A. Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
- B. Checklist of Documents in File
- ** C. Chair's Letter (*optional*)
- D. Department Letter (must include vote)
- E. Minority Report (*if applicable*)
- F. Candidate's Response to the department letter (*optional*)
- G. Candidate's Self-Statement (*optional but encouraged*)
- H. Candidate's request for redacted confidential documents
- I. Candidate's Response to the material in the file (*optional*)
- Indicate # included ** J. Extramural Letters (*required*)
 Include letters of declination and count in total number
 Include the following:
 Solicitation Letter
 Indicate those suggested by department, by candidate as well as a brief statement regarding academic standing of each letter writer
 The packet of information sent to extramural referees, if different from the documents submitted as part of the file
- Indicate # included ** K. Student Letters Evaluating Teaching (required if non-confidential teaching evaluations are not provided)
 Solicitation letter or statement as to how obtained
- L. Current Biography
- M. Current Bibliography of Publications/Creative Activity (*include contributions to joint-authored works since last advance*)
- N. Professional Activity and Service (*see page 33 of the CALL*) – include the current year
- O. University and Public Service (*see page 36 of the CALL*) - include the current year
- P. Grant Activity (*if applicable, see page 32 of the CALL*) – include the current year
- Q. Teaching Load Data Form
- R. Student Evaluation of Teaching
 Evaluations for all courses taught since last advance –(campus teaching evaluation forms, etc.
- ** S. Letters From Other Departments/Programs (*optional*)
- T. Other - Confidential (specify item(s) below):

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

- V. File of Publications/Creative Activity
 Packaged separately with cover list of contents and marked "Please return to the Department of _____"

** = Confidential

File Tracking

_____ file sent to Dean's office
 dept chair initial & date

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

CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR **DEFERRAL (abbreviated file)**

Name: _____ Department: _____

Submit **original** copy of each item

- A. Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement Form
- B. Checklist of Documents in File
- ** C. Chair's Letter (*optional*)
- D. Departmental Letter (must include vote)
- E. Minority Report (*if applicable*)
- F. Candidate's Response to Department Letter (*optional*)
- G. Candidate's Response to material in the file (*optional*)
- H. Candidate's request for redacted confidential documents
- I. Candidate's Letter Requesting Deferral
- J. Current Biography
- K. Current Bibliography of Publications/Creative Activity
- L. Teaching Load Data Form **since last advance**
- M. Student Evaluation of Teaching
Evaluations for all courses taught **since last advance** --campus teaching evaluation forms, etc.
- N. Letters From Other Departments/Programs (*optional*)
- ** O. Other - Confidential (specify item(s) below):

- P. Other - Non-Confidential (specify item(s) below):

** = Confidential

File Tracking

_____ file sent to Dean's office
dept chair initial & date

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

CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR MERITS

Name: _____ Department: _____

Submit **four** copies of each item (original plus three copies)

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

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

** = Confidential

File Tracking

_____ file sent to Dean's office

Chair Signature & Date

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

Attachment C-5

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

Name: _____ Department: _____

Submit **four** copies of each item (original plus three copies)

**** = Confidential**

- A. Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
- B. Checklist of Documents in File
- **** C. Chair's Letter (*optional*)
- D. Departmental Letter (*must include vote*)
- E. Minority Report (*if applicable*)
- F. Candidate's response to the Department Letter (*optional*)
- G. Candidate's Self-Statement (*optional but encouraged*)
- H. Candidate's request for redacted confidential documents
- I. Candidate's response to material in the file
- Indicate # included ****** J. Extramural Letters (*required for promotions; Step VI & To A/S*)
 Include letters of declination and count in total number
 Include the following:
 Solicitation Letter
 Indicate those suggested by department, by candidate as well as a brief statement regarding academic standing of each letter writer
 The packet of information sent to extramural referees, if different from the documents submitted as part of the file
- Indicate # included ****** K. Student Letters Evaluating Teaching (required if non-*confidential* teaching evaluations are not provided)
 Solicitation letter or statement as to how obtained
- L. Current Biography
- M. Current Bibliography of Publications/Creative Activity
- N. Bibliography at Last Advance (*retained at Dean's office*)
- O. Difference List with items to be credited since last advance (*blue paper*)
 Difference List cover sheet included (*blue paper*) (*optional*)
- P. Professional Activity and Service (*Include the current year*)
- Q. University and Public Service (*Include the current year*)
- R. Grant Activity (*if applicable*)
- S. Teaching Load Data Form
- T. Student Evaluation of Teaching **since last advance**
 Evaluations for all courses taught **since last advance**
- U. Letters From Other Departments/Programs (*optional*)
- **** V. Other - Confidential (*specify item(s) below*):

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

- X. File of Publications/Creative Activity[®]
 Packaged separately with cover list of contents and marked "Please return to the Department of _____"

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

File Tracking

_____ file sent to Dean's office
 dept chair initial & date

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

CHECKLIST FOR QUINQUENNIAL REVIEWS

Name: _____ Department: _____

Submit **four** copies of each item (original plus three copies)

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

- ____ U. Other - Non-confidential (*specify item(s) below*):

** = Confidential

File Tracking

_____ file sent to Dean's office
dept chair initial & date

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

**DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION
Action for Candidate**

In the **Department of**

Department Meeting Date: _____ Date Letter prepared: _____ Date Revised: _____

Present Status

Departmental Recommendation

Rank & Step: _____ Rank & Step: _____
 Years at Rank: _____ Years at Step: _____

Vote

#Eligible	For	Against	Abstain	Unavailable
Advisory Vote Eligible	For	Against	Abstain	Unavailable

Dean

Concur with Department Recommendation. Dean's approval: _____
 Date: _____

Sabbatical Leave Reports are on file in the department for the period under review and are available upon request.

Yes No Not Applicable If no, explain: _____

* Include reasons for minority votes in narrative below

RESEARCH

TEACHING

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES AND UNIVERSITY/PUBLIC SERVICE

 Name, Chair

MODEL LETTER A

The following text must be included in solicitations of letters of evaluation for promotion to associate professor. <The Chair may add to this language.>

Dear _____:

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

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

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

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

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

attachment: Attachment E-8

MODEL LETTER B

The following text must be included in solicitations of letters of evaluation for promotion to full professor. <The Chair may add to this language.>

Dear _____:

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

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

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

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

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

attachment: Attachment E-8

MODEL LETTER C

The following is a sample letter of solicitation of extramural referees for an advancement to Professor VI review.

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

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

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

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

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

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

attachment: Attachment E-8

MODEL LETTER D

The following is a sample letter of solicitation of extramural referees for an advancement to Professor Above-Scale (Distinguished Professor) review.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

attachment: Attachment E-8

MODEL LETTER E


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

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

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

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

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



MODEL LETTER F

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MODEL LETTER G

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

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

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

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

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

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

Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure: The candidate must demonstrate superior intellectual attainment in research and excellence in teaching.

Promotion to Full Professor: The candidate must demonstrate excellence beyond that which was achieved for promotion to Associate Professor and significant impact within the scholarly community.

Advancement to Professor VI: Advancement to Professor VI is granted upon evidence of great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, in scholarly or creative achievement. In addition, there should be evidence of excellent university teaching and highly meritorious service. This rank is roughly equivalent to that of a senior Full Professor at a major private research university.

Distinguished Professor (Professor Above-Scale): This rank is reserved for scholars of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed and whose teaching performance is excellent. Mere length of service and continued good performance at Professor IX is not a justification. The candidate must be among the most distinguished researchers in the world in his/her field.

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

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

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

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

DRAFT

Matrix of Ranks/Steps

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

- (a) The normal total period of service in the rank of Associate Professor is 6 years. The normal period of service in each step is two years.
- (b) The normal period of service at Full Professor is 3 years in each of the first four steps. Service at Step V may be of indefinite duration.
- (c) Advancement to Professor VI will be granted upon evidence of highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellent university teaching. In interpreting these criteria, reviewers should require evidence of excellence and high merit in original scholarship or creative achievement, teaching, and service; and, in addition, great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, in scholarly or creative achievement or in teaching. Service at Professor, Step VI may be of indefinite duration.
- (d) Advancement from Professor, Step VI to Step VII, from Step VII to Step VIII, and from Step VIII to Step IX usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the lower step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step VI.
- (e) Advancement to an above-scale salary is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed and whose teaching performance is excellent. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at Step IX. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not justification for further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step IX was based. A further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an above-scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Continued good service is not an adequate justification. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinite, and only in the most superior cases where there is strong and compelling evidence will increase at intervals shorter than four years be approved.

ATTACHMENT
FOR MODEL LETTERS A-D and G

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

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

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

DRAFT

EXTRAMURAL GRANT ACTIVITY FORMAT

John Doe

October 2000

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

=====

1 National Science Foundation
2 Citrus Research Board

DRAFT

TEACHING LOAD DATA

Persons proposed for faculty promotions or merit increases are asked, through their Department Chair, to supply this information about their teaching assignments. **Only list those courses taught since the last advance.**

Name: _____ Date: _____

Departmental teaching statement: _____

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

Most recent past year:

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

2nd past year:

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

3rd past year:

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

II. Current Fall Quarter Assignments: _____

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTAL TEACHING LOAD DATA

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

Name: _____


Date: _____

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

<u>(Year)</u> Summer Quarter				<u>(Year)</u> Summer Quarter				<u>(Year)</u> Summer Quarter			
Course No./Title	Units	Enroll.	Eval.	Course No./Title	Units	Enroll.	Eval.	Course No./Title	Units	Enroll.	Eval.

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

II. Other Teaching



Candidate's Response to the Departmental Letter

Select one:

- a) ___ Addressed to the **Chair**:
This is intended to be included in the file at the departmental level. I understand it will be added to the department's copy of the file and will proceed with the forwarded file through the review process.
- b) ___ Addressed to the **Dean**:
This is intended to be included in the file at the dean's level. I understand the Dean, the Committee on Academic Personnel, and the Chancellor or his designee will see this document, but that it will not be added to the department's copy of the file. The Dean will inform the Department Chair that a written statement has been received without revealing the contents. Understanding that an ad hoc committee, when used, usually includes one member from the department, I ask that this
(i) ___ be seen by the ad hoc committee (if applicable).
(ii) ___ not be seen by the ad hoc committee (if applicable).
- c) ___ Addressed to the **Vice Provost for Academic Personnel**:
This is intended to be included in the file at the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel level which assures its review by **only** the Committee on Academic Personnel, and the Chancellor or his designee. The Vice Provost for Academic Personnel will inform the Department Chair and Dean that a written statement has been received without revealing the contents.

Candidate's Signature _____ Date _____

Printed Name _____

By Law 55 - Department Voting Rights

Department:	Chair:
Academic Year:	Date of Meeting to determine voting procedures & extend rights

APPOINTMENTS

To Assistant Professor:	Tenured Faculty	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assistant Professors	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
			Voting details to extend rights: Eligible Yes No Abstentions		
To Associate Professor:	Tenured Faculty	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assistant Professors	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
			Voting details to extend rights: Eligible Yes No Abstentions		
To Full Professor:	Tenured Faculty	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assistant Professors	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
			Voting details to extend rights: Eligible Yes No Abstentions		

PROMOTIONS

To Associate Professor:	Tenured Faculty	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assistant Professors	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
			Voting details to extend rights: Eligible Yes No Abstentions		
To Full Professor:	Full Professors	<input type="checkbox"/>	Associate Professors	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
			Voting details to extend rights: Eligible Yes No Abstentions		
			Assistant Professors	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
			Voting details to extend rights: Eligible Yes No Abstentions		

NONREAPPOINTMENTS OR TERMINATIONS OF ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

	Tenured Faculty	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assistant Professors	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
			Voting details to extend rights: Eligible Yes No Abstentions		

APPRAISALS

	Tenured Faculty	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assistant Professors	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
			Voting details to extend rights: Eligible Yes No Abstentions		

MERITS

Within Assistant Prof:	Tenured Faculty	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assistant Professors	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
			Voting details to extend rights: Eligible Yes No Abstentions		
Within Assoc Professor:	Tenured Faculty	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assistant Professors	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
			Voting details to extend rights: Eligible Yes No Abstentions		
Within Full Professor:	Full Professors	<input type="checkbox"/>	Associate Professors	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
			Voting details to extend rights: Eligible Yes No Abstentions		
			Assistant Professors	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
			Voting details to extend rights: Eligible Yes No Abstentions		

Recalled Emeritae/i vote on:	
All Emeritae/i vote on:	

Comments (you may include specific voting procedures, advisory extensions, or other miscellaneous information in this section): _____