

## UC Davis Academic Personnel Manual

### Appointment and Promotion

#### Section UCD 220, Academic Senate Review and Advancement

Date: August 5, 2021

Supersedes: August 8, 2003

Responsible Department: Academic Affairs

Source Document: UCD APM 220

---

## I. Purpose

This section summarizes the principles, policies, and procedures at UC Davis that govern the evaluation and review of academic performance of all members of the Academic Senate and Academic Federation (with the exception of Unit 17 and Unit 18 titles) for appointments, and of all Academic Senate and limited Federation titles (as listed below) for appraisal, career equity review, deferral, five-year review, merit and promotion. The information provided in this document also serves as a guide for the form and content of an employee's review file. Step-by-step procedures, checklists, guidelines, and forms are available through the links provided in Section VII at the end of this document.

Applicable Academic Senate title series:

- Acting Professor of Law (APM 220)
- Lecturer with Security of Employment/ Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment (APM 285)
- Professor (APM 220)
- Professor of \_\_\_ in Residence (APM 270)
- Professor of Clinical \_\_\_ (APM 275)

Applicable Academic Federation title series:

- Adjunct Professor (APM 280)
- Agronomist (\_\_\_ in the Agricultural Experiment Station) (APM 320), when also appointed to Academic Senate title
- Health Sciences Clinical Professor (APM 278)
- Professional Research (APM 310)
- Project Scientist
- Specialist
- Specialist in Cooperative Extension
- Specialist (in the AES)

## II. Access of the Candidate to Review Records

- A. The following are deemed "confidential academic review records" as defined in APM 160 20 b. (1), and if included in the dossier, these records will either be redacted for the candidate or not provided, as noted below. See APM 160 20 c. (4) for instructions on redacting letters.
1. Extramural letters (redacted).
  2. List of extramural reviewers (not provided).
  3. Sample solicitation letter to extramural reviewers (redacted, if sample identifies reviewer).
  4. Intramural letters by clinical supervisors and residents (redacted).
  5. The chair's confidential letter (redacted).
  6. Reports from shadow committees (acting on behalf of a personnel committee when a

committee member is under review by that committee) and Ad hoc committees, including reports by Faculty Personnel Committees when serving as an ad hoc (redacted, the names of the committee members are not provided).

- B. The following are deemed "non-confidential academic review records" as defined in APM 160 20 b. (2), and will be provided, without redaction, to the candidate if they are part of the review file.
1. Department letter.
  2. Letters from directors, associate directors, and service chiefs in Veterinary Medicine.
  3. Dean's letter.
  4. Comments by Committee on Academic Personnel.
  5. Comments by Faculty Personnel Committee.
  6. Intramural letters from colleagues regarding peer review of teaching.
  7. Intramural letters providing input on the specific role of the candidate in collaborative research.
  8. Intramural letter from Dean-Graduate Studies for evaluation of graduate group chair service.
  9. Intramural letters from chairs of Academic Senate committees for evaluation of Academic Senate committee service.
- C. Before the dossier leaves the department, candidates under review are required to sign and date the Candidate's Disclosure Certificate to indicate that the department has followed all required procedures and to show that candidates have been consulted with regards to the contents of their review file. Since the candidate is to review the entire dossier, the Candidate's Disclosure Certificate should be dated no earlier than the date of the department letter. If the candidate refuses to sign the Candidate's Disclosure Certificate, the department chair should prepare a letter explaining the circumstances (candidate must receive a copy of this letter) and forward with the dossier.
- D. After the decision is made and announced on a proposed advancement action, the candidate shall receive the following items, if applicable (note the confidential items that require redaction).
1. Chair's confidential letter (redacted).
  2. Ad hoc committee reports, including reports by the Faculty Personnel Committee when acting as the ad hoc (redacted).
  3. Dean's letter (entirety).
  4. Comments from Committee on Academic Personnel (entirety).
  5. Comments from Faculty Personnel Committee (entirety).
  6. Comments from Vice Provost--Academic Affairs (entirety).

### **III. Appointment**

An appointment is the initial employment of an individual into an academic position, employment into an academic title from any other academic title (appointment via change in title), the addition of an academic title in the same or different department (appointment via change in department), or an appointment via change in department of an academic appointment into a different title series.

#### IV. Advancement and Review

##### A. Eligibility for Advancement

There are established periods of service at each rank and step that indicate the normative intervals for advancement to the next step. Refer to Section IV. B. below for detailed information. Note that although these time periods indicate the standard intervals between advancements, they do not preclude more gradual advancement when warranted or more rapid promotion in the case of exceptional progress toward promotion.

Departments should maintain accurate records for eligibility for advancement for their academic appointees. The Vice Provost's Office provides access to an eligibility list for all academic appointees that should be reviewed by deans' offices and departments to determine the advancement actions or reviews that should occur in the next review cycle.

##### B. Special notes

###### 1. Overlapping steps

- a. Steps 5 through 6.5 of the Assistant Professor rank are normally used only when initial appointment has been at Step 2 or higher, and only if promotion to Associate Professor can reasonably be expected by the following review cycle. The salary levels for these steps overlap those of Associate Professor, Steps 1 through 2.5. When and if promotion is ultimately achieved, the level of the promotion is normally such as to avoid loss of salary. Advancements to Assistant Professor, Steps 5 through 6.5 are not to be considered decelerations.
- b. Similarly, Steps 4 through 5.5 of the Associate Professor rank are normally used only when initial appointment or promotion has been at Associate Professor, Step 2 or higher, and only if promotion to Professor can reasonably be expected by the following review cycle. The salary levels for these steps overlap with Professor, Steps 1 through 2.5 of the full Professor rank. When and if promotion is ultimately achieved, the level of the promotion is normally such as to avoid loss of salary. Advancements to Associate Professor, Steps 4 through 5.5 are not to be considered decelerations.
- c. Academic appointees who have served six years or more at the Associate rank are expected to be ready for promotion. Should promotion to full Professor rank not be approved for an academic appointee at Associate Professor, Steps 3 or 3.5, a 1.0-step merit advancement to Associate Professor, Steps 4 or 4.5, may be recommended if evidence in the file supports it. An example of such a case would be one in which reviewers would recommend promotion following the publication of a work just completed or in progress, or if reviewers suggest that work in the late stages of completion would support promotion in the near future.
- e. For merit advancement to an overlapping step, it is especially important to document progress on scholarly and creative works such as grant proposals or manuscripts that are nearing completion or submitted. Progress towards promotion should clearly be described and discussed in the candidate's statement and the department letter.

###### 2. Advancement for joint appointees

- a. All departments and colleges/divisions/schools in which a candidate holds academic appointments take part in the review of the faculty member. The home department has primary responsibility for ensuring that the review file is complete and that all appropriate consultations are made. The chair of the home department is responsible for consulting with the other department(s) to identify a list of

extramural reviewers. The home dean has responsibility for ensuring the other dean(s) are consulted. The home dean has responsibility for making the dean's decision or recommendation on the personnel action following that consultation.

- b. Without-salary joint appointments are those where the faculty member has a salaried appointment in one department and one or more without-salary appointments in other departments. All departments in which a candidate holds a without-salary appointment must have input in the review process. The nature of that input is determined by the approved voting procedures of the without-salary department(s). The home department has primary responsibility for ensuring that the review file is complete and that all appropriate consultations are made. The chair of the home department is responsible for consulting with the other department(s) to identify a list of extramural reviewers. The dean of the without-salary department will also comment on the file. The home dean is responsible for ensuring the other dean(s) are consulted. The home dean has responsibility for making the dean's decision or recommendation on the personnel action following that consultation.
- c. When a candidate holds both Academic Senate and Academic Federation titles:
  - 1) For the Academic Senate title, follow the procedures outline in this policy.
  - 2) For the Academic Federation title, see the Academic Federation policy (APM UCD 220AF).

Example: For candidates holding Professorial and Specialist in Cooperative Extension appointments, the review by the Joint Academic Senate/Federation Personnel Committee (JPC) is conducted first. A recommendation from the JPC is then forwarded to the Committee on Academic Personnel or Faculty Personnel Committee for review, depending on the delegation of authority for the recommended action. The Committee on Academic Personnel/Faculty Personnel Committee is responsible for reviewing the portion of the appointment that falls under the Academic Senate title. After making its separate assessment of performance relevant to the Academic Senate title, the Committee on Academic Personnel/Faculty Personnel Committee makes an overall recommendation with regard to the proposed action. In reaching its overall recommendation on the personnel action, the Committee on Academic Personnel/Faculty Personnel Committee should use the information and recommendations contained in the recommendation from the JPC.

Exception: For appointees holding Professorial and \_\_\_\_ in AES (Agronomist series) appointments or Professorial and Professional Researcher, the entire review is conducted in accordance with the Academic Senate title.

3. Mid-year appointments and the effect on the review cycle.

Refer to APM 133 for additional information on the 8-year service limit.

- a. Service provided by an academic-year appointee of just one quarter in any fiscal year (July 1 through June 30) will not count toward normative time for that year at rank and step, although that time will count in the 8-year service limit. Service provided by an academic-year appointee of at least two full quarters or one full semester in any fiscal year (July 1 through June 30) will count toward normative time at rank and step.
- b. Service provided by a fiscal-year appointee who is appointed during the period July 1 through January 1 counts toward normative time at rank and step. Service provided by a fiscal-year appointee who is appointed during the period January 2 through June 30 will not count toward normative time for that year at rank and step, although that time will count in the 8-year service limit.

4. Retroactive Actions

- a. Retroactive actions are those submitted for review in the current academic year (in which the usual effective date is July 1, 20XX), but for which the requested effective date is July 1, 20XX of the previous academic year. Generally, retroactive actions are not permitted and should be sought only under special circumstances.
- b. Administrative Retroactive Actions: Any action that has not been finalized within 60 days of the effective date (e.g., by August 31 for academic reviews with an effective date of July 1) shall be reviewed as a non-redelegated action.

5. Non-Reappointment of an Assistant Professor before the 7th year

If the department chair, in consultation with the dean and Vice Provost—Academic Affairs, determines that it is appropriate to recommend non-reappointment of an Assistant Professor before the 7th year, including Preliminary Assessment, see APM – 220 80, 220 82, 220 83, 220 84, and 220 85 and APM UCD 220 Procedure 2 for details about the processes of review. A final decision regarding non-reappointment is made by the Chancellor.

C. Merit Advancement

1. Definition: Merit advancement occurs as an increase in step and salary within a specific rank of a title series (for example, from Assistant Professor, Step 1, to Assistant Professor, Step 2). Review for merit advancement does not occur sooner than the normative time interval for the candidate's current rank and step.
2. For merit advancement, the period covered by the review and the normative time that must be spent at the candidate's current step are as follows (for promotions, see section APM 220 18(b) and UCD APM 220 IV. E.):
  - a. For merit advancement to Assistant Professor, Step 2, through Professor, Step 5.5: The review period includes all achievements and activities subsequent to those counted for advancement to the current step. The normative time between merit reviews is 2 years for all candidates below Associate Professor, Step 4. Subsequently, the normative time between merits reviews is 3 years for all candidates below Professor, Step 9.
  - b. For advancement to Professor, Step 6: The review period includes all achievements and activities since advancement to the rank of full Professor. This includes periods when the candidate was a full rank or equivalent Professor at another institution. Review does not occur before three years at current step.
  - c. For advancement from Professor, Step 6, through Professor, Step 8.5: The review period includes all achievements and activities subsequent to those counted for advancement to the current step. Review for advancement does not occur before three years at the current step.
  - d. For advancement from Professor, Step 9 or Professor, Step 9.5: The review period includes all achievements and activities subsequent to those counted for advancement to the current step. Review for advancement does not occur before four years at the current step.
  - e. For advancement to above-scale: The review period includes all achievements and activities since advancement to the rank of full Professor. This includes periods when the candidate was a full rank or equivalent at another institution. Review for advancement does not occur before normative time at the current step (i.e., three years at Step 8 or 8.5, or four years at Step 9 or 9.5).
  - f. For advancement further above-scale: The review period includes all achievements

and activities since advancement to the current salary level. Review does not occur before four years at the current above-scale salary level.

3. Merit advancements are based on academic attainment, experience, and performance; they are not automatic. The basic standard of superior intellectual attainment in teaching, scholarly and/or other creative achievement, professional competence and activity, and University and public service is the indispensable prerequisite for advancement. Refer to the APM section for each series for specific requirements.
4. Principles of advancement to upper level steps (refer to APM 220 18 b. (4))
  - a. Advancement that crosses the benchmark of Professor, Step 6 will be granted on "evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in each of the following three categories: (1) scholarship or creative achievement, (2) University teaching, and (3) service. Above and beyond that, great academic distinction, recognized nationally, will be required in scholarly or creative achievement or teaching." Many accomplished professors will not qualify for this advancement and will remain indefinitely at Step 5 or 5.5. For advancement to or crossing over Professor, Step 6, the total career of the candidate must have distinction when considered as a whole, and the candidate's reputation and influence should continue to grow.
  - b. Advancement to Professor, Steps 7 through 9.5, calls for "continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step 6." The record should continue to show achievement in all the normal categories of performance (teaching, scholarly or creative activities, University and public service, and professional competence). Many Professors will not qualify for further upper-level advancement and will remain indefinitely at their current step.
  - c. Advancement to Professor with an above-scale salary involves "an overall career review and is reserved for the most highly distinguished faculty (1) whose work of sustained and continuing excellence has attained national and international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact; (2) whose University teaching performance is excellent; and (3) whose service is highly meritorious. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at [Step 9 or 9.5] is not justification for further advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to [Step 9 or 9.5] was based." The record should show sustained and continuing excellence in all the normal categories of performance (teaching, scholarly or creative activities, University and public service, and professional competence). The total career of candidates must have distinction when considered as a whole, and their reputation and influence should continue to grow. Many professors will not qualify for further upper-level advancement and will remain indefinitely at their current step.
  - d. Further advancement for a candidate already serving at above-scale "must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Continued good service is not an adequate justification." The criteria for advancement at the above-scale level are more demanding than those required for advancement from Professor, Steps 6 through 9.5. The new evidence of merit and distinction may be somewhat less than that necessary for advancement to first above-scale; however, it must be distinguished in its own right and commensurate with the very high standards required for above-scale status. Many professors will not qualify for further above-scale advancement and will remain indefinitely at their current above-scale salary level.

See the delegation of authority, UCD APM Procedure 2, and the [checklist for merit increases](#).

#### D. Appraisal

1. An appraisal is a detailed analysis and evaluation of an academic appointee's past achievement and normally occurs in the fourth year at the rank of assistant professor (or in combination with other eligible titles, see APM 133). The appraisal is intended to provide junior faculty members with their peers' and colleagues' frank and candid assessments of their performance, as well as collegial recommendations for further career development. The appraisal is not an administrative judgment; rather, it is collegial advice. It is imperative that the department forward more than a discursive, noncommittal account of the academic appointee's performance. The department's letter should make as definite an appraisal as the evidence warrants of the achievement and promise of the candidate with regard to teaching, research or other creative work, University and public service, and professional competence and activity. A clear statement regarding the appraisee's prospects for achieving or not achieving tenure in due course should also be included in department appraisals.
2. In an effort to provide consistent data for committees when reviewing an appraisal, department faculty votes should indicate the number of faculty who are voting for a "positive appraisal," the number voting for a "guarded appraisal," and the number voting for a "negative appraisal." Department votes should not be listed as "yes" or "no".
3. The period covered for the appraisal is from initial appointment to date. Appraisals may occur earlier than the fourth year if requested by the candidate, department chair, dean, personnel committee, Vice Provost, Provost, or Chancellor.
4. No appraisal shall be required if the Assistant Professor is being recommended for promotion to take effect within a year, has given written notice of resignation, or is under written notice that the Assistant Professor will not be reappointed following proper review.

See the UCD APM Procedure 2 and the [checklist for appraisals](#).

#### E. Promotion

1. Promotion is advancement from one rank in a specific title series to a higher rank within the same academic title series (for example, from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor).
  - a. Accelerated promotion: promotion at a rate faster than that prescribed by section APM 220 18 b.
2. The period of service covered by a review for promotion is as follows:
  - a. To Associate Professor: since acquisition of the terminal degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., D.V.M.) to date.
  - b. To Lecturer SOE: since acquisition of the terminal degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., D.V.M.) to date.
  - c. To Full Professor: since promotion or appointment to Associate Professor.
  - c. To Senior Lecturer SOE: since promotion or appointment to Lecturer SOE, or since appointment to Senior Lecturer with Potential SOE.
3. Promotion from Assistant to Associate rank
  - a. Generally, candidates at the Assistant rank may serve at that rank no more than a total of eight years. As described in APM 133, the candidate must promote no later than the end of the seventh year of service, even if they have spent less than normative time at their current step, because notice of termination is required (see APM 220 20 c. (3)).
  - b. Faculty members who have obtained new children through birth, adoption or foster

placement will receive a one-year extension of the tenure clock for each event. No more than two extensions on the clock may be granted. Information is found on the Work Life section of the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs website, as well as APM 760.

4. Promotion from Associate to Full rank

Promotion beyond the rank of Associate Professor is based on continued demonstration of superior intellectual attainment in all areas of academic performance. Promotion, following normal progress, usually occurs after six years of service at the Associate rank or after two years at Associate Professor, Step 3.

See the delegation of authority, UCD APM Procedure 2, and [checklist for promotions](#).

F. Deferral

When a faculty member who is eligible for normative advancement does not come forward for review, a deferral must be requested. If the candidate refuses to participate, the department must notify the candidate in writing that materials for the deferral will be submitted on their behalf. Exception: Service may be of indefinite duration in some titles once a specific high-level Step has been achieved and deferrals are no longer required. Refer to the salary scales and applicable policies to identify when a deferral is no longer needed. If a deferral coincides with the fifth year since the faculty member has been reviewed, a five-year review must be done in lieu of the deferral request.

See the [delegation of authority](#), UCD APM Procedure 3, and the [checklist for deferrals](#).

G. Postponement

Faculty may apply for postponement of merits and promotions to accommodate childbearing, childrearing, adoption or placement, without prejudice or penalty. See the UC Davis Work Life Program for details and requirements. Personnel reviews that are postponed due to a family accommodation as defined in APM 760 should be treated procedurally in the same manner as personnel reviews conducted at the usual intervals. The length of postponement may not exceed one year per event for a total of two years.

H. Five-year review

1. All faculty, regardless of rank and step, must be reviewed at least once every five years. If the candidate refuses to participate, the department must notify the candidate in writing that materials for the five-year review will be submitted on their behalf. (APM 200)

This is applicable to the following title series:

- Professor
- Acting Professor of Law
- Lecturer/Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment
- Professor In Residence
- Professor of Clinical \_\_\_\_

In addition, the five-year review also applies to the following Academic Federation title series:

- Adjunct Professor
- Agronomist (\_\_\_\_ in the Agricultural Experiment Station): this review should only be completed in conjunction with the Professorial series five-year review in the case of split appointments.
- Health Sciences Clinical Professor
- Professional Researcher: this review should be completed in conjunction with the Professorial series five-year review in the case of split appointments. If Professional



- Researcher is the sole title a five-year review must be conducted (APM 310).
    - Project Scientist
    - Specialist
    - Specialist in Cooperative Extension
    - Specialist (in the AES)
2. The five-year review occurs during the fifth academic year since the last review, if there has been no advancement review within the last five years. The five-year review policy ensures that the performance of every faculty member is appraised at regular intervals. A faculty member may not decline a five-year review. Requests from the chair for deferral of the five-year review are considered only in exceptional circumstances (e.g., for a faculty member planning to retire within the year).
  3. This policy applies to all titles listed above, including those who have achieved a Step for which service can be of indefinite duration. In cases where such high-level faculty members are continuing a productive career, but have not met the stringent requirements for advancement to the next step or further above-scale, an assessment of "Satisfactory, no advancement" is usually appropriate. (See APM UCD 220 IV. H. 6.)
  4. Faculty who have not achieved a Step for which service can be of indefinite duration and have not been reviewed or advanced in the previous five years (i.e., have deferred) are presumably less than fully productive. For this group, the purpose of the review is to assess their productivity since the last successful advancement, the plan for progress submitted at their previous deferral, and to identify what needs to be accomplished for subsequent advancement.
  5. The five-year review is conducted either by the department chair, or in accordance with department procedures on voting, depending on the preference of the department chair. The department chair must follow the approved voting procedures if the procedures address the five-year review.
- Refer to the delegation of authority, procedure and checklist for five-year reviews.
6. There are three possible results of a five-year review:
    - a. Satisfactory performance, advancement. When performance warrants advancement, and after consultation with the academic appointee, a merit or promotion is prepared in accordance with regular policies and procedures for merit or promotion. If the academic appointee elects not to pursue the advancement, the outcome of the five-year review is "satisfactory five-year review, no advancement".
    - b. Satisfactory performance, no advancement. This conclusion is reached when the candidate's performance continues to meet the criteria for the current step, but does not warrant advancement. The chair's letter should identify what additional accomplishments are needed for advancement in the future. The faculty member remains eligible for advancement the following year.
    - c. Unsatisfactory performance, no advancement. This conclusion is reached when some aspect(s) of the performance are less than satisfactory for meeting the criteria that apply to the candidate's current step. When the department reaches this conclusion, the department chair and the faculty member must submit a plan for progress. The department chair monitors the performance of the faculty member according to the timetable included in the plan for progress that was prepared for the review. If no progress is evident, then the chair may reappoint a professor's duties, reassign space or facilities, or recommend against a request for sabbatical. The faculty member remains eligible for advancement the following year.
  7. If a faculty member's performance is deemed unsatisfactory for an extended period of time, the department chair, and the dean, in consultation with the Vice Provost--Academic

Affairs, should consider recommending further action that is consistent with current UC policy (APM 075) that governs incompetent performance by a faculty member.

I. Career Equity Review

A Career Equity Review (CER) is a review that is designed to examine those rare cases in which normal personnel actions, from the initial hiring onward, may have resulted in an inappropriate rank and step for a candidate—that is, the rank and step may not be commensurate with the record. The purpose of a CER is to recalibrate rank and step, not salary.

- A CER is required to come forward with a merit or promotion action, but as a separate action, since the review period includes the entire career and may have a different final decision than the merit or promotion action.
- CERs may not be requested more frequently than once every six years.
- Faculty members who previously submitted a CER may not resubmit the same arguments in any new request.
- Only faculty who have held an eligible title (refer to checklist for list of titles) for at least four years and have not been reviewed by CAP during the last four years can be considered for a CER

See [Procedures, Checklist and FAQ](#) regarding the CER process.

J. Appeals

An appeal of a merit or promotion decision must provide evidence of failure to follow established procedure or of reviewers' failure to apply established standards of merit. Administrative reviews (e.g., endowed chair and department chair appointments/reappointments) may not be appealed. Appeals are considered by the Appellate Subcommittee of the Committee on Academic Personnel. An appeal must be received in the Vice Provost's office for non-redelegated actions, or in the dean's office for redelegated actions, within 30 calendar days of written notification of said decision. A new Candidate's Disclosure Certificate is required with the appeal. Unsolicited letters of support cannot be included in the dossier and will not be considered in the appeal review.

See the UCD APM Procedure 5 for appeal.

When administrative appeals have been exhausted, Academic Senate members have the right to consult and file a grievance directly with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

**V. Conducting review for appointment or advancement**

A. Confidentiality during the review process

Confidentiality is imperative at every level of review of candidate files, discussions during faculty meetings involving appointments, advancement or other personnel review actions, submission of internal letters of evaluation, and serving on ad hoc, college or campus personnel committees. The identities of those writing extramural letters, serving on ad hoc committees, and speaking during faculty discussions, as well as the contents of their evaluations, must be kept confidential if candid assessments are to occur. It is a violation of the system-wide Faculty Code of Conduct (APM 015 Part II D. 5.) to breach established rules governing confidentiality in personnel procedures.

B. Review process

1. The department chairperson is responsible for:
  - a. Advising the candidate about the process.

- b. Explaining rules and guidelines for the action under consideration.
- c. Soliciting information from the candidate.
- d. Informing candidates that they may provide names of persons who, in their view, and for reasons noted, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications or performance and hence should not be invited by the Vice Provost--Academic Affairs to serve on their ad hoc committee (see APM UCD 220 V. B. 1. e.). This request must be in writing and must indicate the basis for the candidate's view. The candidate shall be informed that any such information must be forwarded with the personnel review file (refer to APM 220-8 c.).
- e. Ad hoc committees can be appointed for the following actions:
  - 1) Promotion to Associate Professor
  - 2) Promotion to Professor
  - 3) Advancement to Professor, Step 6 or 6.5
  - 4) Initial advancement to Professor at an above-scale salary

2. Candidate's statement (optional)

Candidates are strongly encouraged to include a brief statement in the review file (no more than five pages) describing, and putting into perspective, their teaching and mentoring, scholarly and creative achievements, professional activity, and University and public service. The candidate's statement may:

- a. Discuss specific scholarly and professional accomplishments.
- b. Focus on particular areas of achievement, including honors and awards.
- c. Discuss the unique aspects or special significance of accomplishments during the review period.
- d. Discuss professional service provided to the department(s), graduate groups, campus, University, profession, and public.
- e. Discuss teaching, which may include some or all of the following:
  - 1) Philosophy of teaching
  - 2) Aims of specific courses developed or changes in course design
  - 3) Choice of teaching strategies, and reasons for those choices
  - 4) Efforts to enhance learning outcomes for diverse student populations
  - 5) Reasons for problems that may have arisen in the candidate's teaching and actions taken to improve
  - 6) Efforts to assess learning outcomes
  - 7) Criteria for selecting reading materials and homework assignments
  - 8) Explanation of how student performance is assessed
- f. Discuss mentorship of graduate students and postdoctoral scholars, which may include attention to the following:
  - 1) Reflections on mentoring philosophy
  - 2) Instances of outstanding or creative mentorship
  - 3) Efforts to adapt mentorship to the unique needs of mentees
  - 4) Participation in campus or professional programs focused on mentoring
  - 5) Success of mentees in their chosen fields
- g. Do not include attachments or letters of support not solicited by the department.

3. Statement of Contributions to Diversity (optional) (APM 210-1 d)

The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity are an integral component of faculty excellence. Accordingly, it is very helpful to reviewers to direct their attention to contributions in teaching, research and service that promote the University's commitment to serving the needs of our increasingly diverse state. This is an opportunity to provide context and evidence of impact or effectiveness towards a fuller understanding of those contributions.

4. Letters of evaluation

a. Extramural evaluators are required for:

- 1) Promotions
- 2) Initial advancement to Professor at an above-scale salary
- 3) Some appointments

b. Solicitation of extramural letters (see APM UCD 220 Exhibit B for sample formats).

Basic principles: To the extent possible, extramural referees should be individuals who are eminent in their field and are able to provide an objective "arm's-length" assessment of the candidate's work. Reviewers should be: (1) selected from academic or research institutions with standards comparable to the University of California; and (2) of a rank equal to or above the rank sought by the faculty member.

Definitions: The following definitions are provided to assist in determining which extramural letters should be considered "arm's-length."

"Arm's-length" - Arm's-length means extramural referees who are qualified to evaluate the work, but have no close connection with the candidate, e.g., they are not a recent mentor, collaborator, or advisor. This assures that extramural referees do not have a conflict of interest.

There is a wide range of professional relationships that can fall into this category, ranging from virtually no professional association to having moderate association with the candidate. Referees may still qualify as "arm's-length" even though they have had a significant professional or personal association with the candidate, if the reviewers determine that the relationship is sufficiently distant or occurred far enough in the past that it is unlikely to compromise the impartiality of the evaluation. Examples may include colleagues who collaborated or co-authored publications with the candidate; former members of the same department or laboratory group; and colleagues who have shared extensive service on the same boards, committees or work groups.

"Not Arm's-length" - Some potential referees are close associates of a candidate and clearly cannot be considered "arm's-length" reviewers. Close associates of a candidate include graduate or post-doctoral supervisors, graduate or postdoctoral students, thesis supervisors, teachers, current members of the same academic department or laboratory group, close personal friends, business partners, family members and recent collaborators and co-authors.

c. Selecting the list of extramural referees.

- 1) Normally, six to eight letters are adequate for the review file. At least three of the letters should be "arm's-length".
- 2) The chair and the candidate develop separate lists of potential referees. The chair's list should be developed in consultation with the department faculty members and joint department(s), when applicable, but must be completed

without consultation with the candidate or referral to the candidate's list. Candidates should not review their list with other faculty members in the department.

- 3) After the lists are completed, if the chair finds that some of the names are the same on both lists, the chair can claim those names for the department list.
- 4) Letters are to be obtained both from extramural referees recommended by the candidate and the department, with at least half from the department list. Typically, referees on the chair's list should be arm's-length reviewers. Referees on the candidate's list may also be arm's-length, although the list may also include closer professional associates.

d. List of reviewer information must include:

- 1) Names of extramural reviewers to whom the solicitation letter was sent.
- 2) Academic title and expertise of reviewers. This should be a brief paragraph. Do not forward curriculum vitae of the reviewers.
- 3) Identification of reviewers that were suggested by candidate versus those suggested by the chair.

**Note:** The list of reviewers is never shared with the candidate.

e. The sample solicitation letter included in the dossier should not include the name and address of anyone from whom letters were solicited.

f. Management of letters from reviewers:

- 1) All solicited letters received must be included in the file.
- 2) Each extramural letter must be marked "confidential" and indicate whether it is "arm's-length" or "not arm's-length."
- 3) Each extramural letter must be marked "department list" or "candidate list."
- 4) Each letter should be identified separately by a letter or number to ensure confidentiality of reviewers (refer to APM 160). References may be made to the extramural letters (Letter A, Letter B, etc.), but the department letter and ballot comments must not identify the individual writing the letter or their institution. Extensive quotations in the department letter from the extramural letters are inappropriate and unnecessary since the letters are included in the dossier.
- 5) If the identity of the reviewers has been revealed, the department must write to each of the named reviewers and explain that there has been a breach of confidentiality and that the candidate not only knows that they served as a reviewer, but also has a sense of their letter. The reviewer should be informed that they have the option of declining any future request from UC Davis with the explanation that their confidentiality had previously been compromised.

g. Intramural letters

The only intramural letters accepted are those solicited by the department chair for providing the following:

- 1) Peer evaluation of teaching performance.
- 2) Peer evaluation of mentoring performance.
- 3) Evaluation of clinical activities, if applicable.
- 4) Input on the specific role of the candidate in collaborative research. This may include letters from the Vice Chancellor for Research or appropriate unit director evaluating service to an Organized Research Unit or other research center.
- 5) Evaluation of graduate group chair service.
- 6) Evaluation of Academic Senate committee service, if requested by candidate.

Letters from departmental colleagues or from colleagues in other

departments on campus (other than those above) should not be included in the candidate's file.

h. Unsolicited letters

Letters not officially solicited as part of the normal review process will not be considered in the review nor included for consideration. Respond to the writers of the unsolicited letters using the “model language for unsolicited letters” in UCD APM 220, Exhibit B.

5. Voting requirements and consultation with department faculty

a. Academic Senate [Bylaw 55](#)

- 1) Defines the rights of Academic Senate members to vote or consult on Senate personnel actions within the department.
- 2) Mandates that only Academic Senate members can vote on Academic Senate faculty actions.
- 3) Requires each department to develop its own voting procedures that must be reviewed and found acceptable by CAP prior to implementation.
- 4) Requires that any changes be submitted to CAP for approval prior to implementation.
- 5) Does not allow constraints to be placed on those eligible to vote (e.g., attendance at meetings).
- 6) Provides that no voter may be denied the option to require a secret ballot.
- 7) Does not require blind ballots during in-person “straw votes”, but we strongly encourage using this process, as it enables faculty members greater freedom to express a minority recommendation. In-person voting by verbal assent or raising hands is strongly discouraged.
- 8) The deliberation and voting process is confidential. Deliberations should not be discussed among the faculty outside of the meeting or with the candidate.

b. Reporting department consultation and views in the department letter.

The department letter should reflect, to the best of the chair’s ability, the outcome of faculty consultation and the mode and range of department faculty’s view on the advancement action. APM 220 80 e. also requires that the department chair describe the consultation process used.

- 1) A near-final draft of the department letter of evaluation, including the department vote, must be made available to all members of the department eligible to vote prior to sharing the draft with the candidate, so that faculty members can identify any factual corrections needed to accurately reflect faculty consultation and views on the advancement action. (APM 220 80 e.) However, these factual corrections should not be the subject of negotiation, as department chairs have authority to determine the content of the department letter.
- 2) Unsolicited letters from other department colleagues should not be considered by the department and cannot be forwarded to review committees.
- 3) Chairs should recuse themselves from writing the department letter if the candidate for advancement works especially closely with the chair (e.g., is a member of a research team led by the chair).
- 4) The department letter must include the results of all votes taken.
- 5) Actual vote totals should be reported, even if the vote is unanimous, including numbers that were positive, negative, abstentions, and failures to vote. Votes should not be reported by rank or in any way that would allow individual voters to be identified. Abstentions due to conflict of interest of administrative roles should be noted.
- 6) A balanced letter should discuss significant evidence and differences of

- opinion that support a minority recommendation.
- 7) It is strongly recommended that all comments from the ballots be appended to the department letter, although ballot comments that are unprofessional may be summarized or provided separately in a confidential chair's letter.

6. Structure of the department letter

The department letter should be a concise analytical evaluation of the candidate's performance in teaching, research, and service. The department recommendation should be unbiased and evidence-based, and should not reflect the chair's personal opinion. The letter must be structured to include the following:

- a. Summary. The letter should begin with a brief paragraph that provides:
  - 1) Candidate's current rank and step.
  - 2) Candidate's current title.
  - 3) Candidate's department.
  - 4) Details of recommended action, including:
    - a) Rank and step recommended by the majority of department voters (indicate if the action is a promotion that is accelerated in time).
    - b) Effective date.
    - c) Department vote on recommendation. Include the results of all votes taken, reasons for negative notes, and any significant evidence and differences of opinion that would support a contrary recommendation.
    - d) Retention as a justification for advancement is inappropriate and should not be included in the department letter.
- b. Teaching. The teaching/mentoring section should comprehensively summarize the candidate's teaching, mentoring and advising activities during the review period. The letter should then remark on the quality of teaching/mentoring, referring to formal evaluations (all of which should be included in the review file) and other available evidence as appropriate. As there are no formal evaluations provided by graduate or undergraduate mentees in scholarly activities, particular attention should be given to indications of the quality of candidate's mentoring activities.

For promotions, substantive peer evaluation of teaching is required. The peer teaching evaluation by department or other campus colleagues should assess the course's scholarly content and the apparent effectiveness of classroom instruction, and should also evaluate teaching materials such as course syllabi, websites, other online resources, exams, lecture notes, study guides and assigned readings. Peer reviewers must be members of the Academic Senate and write an individual letter that is not anonymous nor considered confidential.

Peer evaluation of teaching is analogous to peer evaluation of research and other creative work. To enhance reliability, validity, and an integrated understanding of the candidate's entire record, intramural peer evaluation of teaching should be undertaken by the same colleagues who evaluate the candidate's other academic achievements. When there is an insufficient number of peers within the department with the credentials or specific knowledge necessary for properly evaluating a candidate's teaching, the department should solicit peer evaluation from colleagues outside of the department in a related discipline.

It is the chair's responsibility to make sure that the processes and outcomes of peer evaluation do not infringe on the academic freedom of the candidate being evaluated. Department chairs should plan for such evaluations at least a year in advance of an anticipated promotion. The procedures used and the extent to which the candidate participated in the process should be described in the department letter.

All promotion cases that do not include peer evaluation of teaching will be returned.

- c. Research. The research section should concisely describe the subject matter or sub-disciplinary area of the candidate's main line(s) of research. It should:
  - 1) Explain how the candidate's scholarship has progressed during the review period.
  - 2) Discuss specific work published and in-press accepted for publication (unconditionally accepted without further review) during the review period.
  - 3) Contain a thorough analysis and evaluation of the work, emphasizing its impact.

If the department uses a Criteria for Scholarship document, then the Criteria of Scholarship document should be appended to the department letter. Departments can provide new or revised Criteria for Scholarship, as deemed appropriate, for CAP review.

- d. Professional (clinical) Competence. A clinician in the health sciences must demonstrate clinical competence and be recognized for accomplishments in a focused area of clinical practice. This should be documented by evaluations from peers, by evaluations from house staff, and by reputation for clinical excellence locally for Assistant Professors, regionally for Associate Professors, and nationally for Full Professors, as measured by patient referrals, extramural letters, and invitations to speak on clinical topics.
- e. Professional activity and University and public service. This section should begin with a statement of the precise nature of such activities carried out during the review period. This should be followed by an evaluation of the quality of the contributions in these areas.
- f. For those in the Adjunct Professor series, the department letter should clearly describe the balance of research versus teaching expected of the candidate.

7. Chair's confidential letter (optional)

Department chairs are permitted to write a separate letter to make an independent evaluation, interpretation and/or recommendation that may differ from the department recommendation. Ballot comments that are unprofessional may be summarized or provided separately in the confidential chair's letter. A letter from the chairperson (or equivalent officer) setting forth a personal recommendation in connection with any academic personnel action is classified as a "confidential academic review record" and shall be provided to the candidate in redacted form after completion of the review process (See APM 160 20 (b) and APM 160 20 c. (1)).

8. Candidate's access to file prior to department vote

Procedures for communicating with the candidate before the department vote are outlined in APM 220 80 d. and e. Prior to the faculty vote, the chair shall provide the candidate with an opportunity to inspect all non-confidential documents in the personnel review file (APM 160 20 b. (2)) and shall provide a redacted copy of the confidential records. This is to allow the candidate the opportunity to correct any errors of fact and refute the contents of the letters by submitting a rebuttal letter within 10 calendar days of receipt of the records.

9. Candidate's access to file after department review

- a. A department chair may not negotiate the contents of the department letter with the candidate, but should correct any errors of fact pointed out by the candidate.
- b. The candidate may comment on or refute the department recommendation as established by APM 220 80 e. The candidate's comments will be included in the personnel file as a rejoinder letter. The time limit for such comment is 10 calendar days from the date that the candidate receives a copy of the department letter. The



rejoinder letter is not confidential and all reviewing bodies may have access to the rejoinder letter.

- c. Since candidates have an opportunity to participate in the original selection of extramural referees, candidates do not have the privilege of requesting additional extramural letters after the entire review file has been compiled and the department letter has been written.

10. Assembly of the dossier

- a. The order of assembly should adhere strictly to the order of the checklist for the appropriate action.
- b. Departments are responsible for ensuring that all appropriate supporting documents are listed correctly and forwarded with each candidate's review file.

11. Late submission of material and department responsibility for review

- a. Submission of additional materials after the review file has been forwarded to the Vice Provost--Academic Affairs is discouraged. In order to keep late submission of additional materials to a minimum, a deadline date of September 30 has been established for submitting additional materials for the review file. Materials will not be accepted after that date unless the person undergoing review is an Assistant Professor in the seventh year of service, and the information is critical to the review.

Faculty undergoing review in their seventh year can add information to the review file until the Chancellor's final decision on the action is made. If the seventh-year case is appealed, the faculty member can add new information to the dossier until the appeal is submitted. If after the appeal is submitted and new scholarly work is completed, the work may be submitted directly to the Vice Provost--Academic Affairs. Note: If the seventh-year promotion case was denied and appealed, the termination date is based on the first final decision and cannot be modified.

- b. All late submissions should show that the candidate knows about the forwarding of the material by signing another Disclosure Certificate.
- c. If, during Academic Senate or administrative review of a department recommendation, the review file is found to be incomplete or inadequate, additional information shall be solicited through the Vice Provost--Academic Affairs. APM 220 80 h. outlines the department role in adding information to the original recommendation.
  - 1) Such new material shall be added to the review file, and the department shall be invited to comment on the new material.
  - 2) The candidate shall be informed by the chair of the substance of the new material that has been added to the review file (without disclosing the identities of sources of confidential documents), and shall be provided the opportunity to make a written statement of inclusion in the review file. A Candidate's Disclosure Certificate should be signed by the candidate at this time.
  - 3) The review shall then be based upon the review file as augmented.

12. Preliminary assessment (promotion to Associate rank only)

A preliminary assessment is required if the Chancellor intends, after review of all recommendations in the dossier, to make a negative decision on promotion to tenure. The preliminary assessment is designed to provide an opportunity for the candidate and reviewers to determine if dossier materials might have been inadvertently omitted from the file, if there are any new materials to be added, or to identify points that reviewers appeared to have overlooked or misunderstood.

- a. Candidates are provided with comments from reviewing bodies (APM 160 20 b. and c.).
- b. Intramural letters (excluding those defined in APM UCD V. B. 4. g.) are not appropriate documents to be submitted and will not be considered in response to preliminary assessments.
- c. Unsolicited letters are not appropriate documents to be submitted and will not be considered in response to preliminary assessments.

See the procedure for preliminary assessment.

## **VI. Approval Authority**

The authority to make recommendations and decisions on academic reviews is outlined in the UC Davis delegations of authority <http://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/dofa.cfm>.

## **VII. Procedures, Checklists, Exhibits, and Forms**

### **A. Procedures:**

1. Appointment
2. Merit, Appraisal, Promotion, Career Equity Review, and Preliminary Assessment
3. Deferral and Postponement
4. Five-Year Review
5. Appeal

### **B. Exhibits:**

- A. Consultation and Voting Procedures on Academic Senate Personnel Actions
- B. Language Required When Letters of Evaluation Are Solicited or Received
- C. Guidelines for Preparation of Publication and Other Creative Efforts List
- D. Guidelines for Academic Advancement Review of Department Chairs (instructions to the deans)

### **C. Forms and Checklists:**

All forms and checklists are available at [http://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/resources/forms\\_checklists/index.html](http://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/resources/forms_checklists/index.html)