


DOSSIER PREPARATION FOR MERIT AND PROMOTION ACTIONS

MAY 20, 2025

Philip Kass
Office of Academic Affairs





Each *line* represents a *rank* of Professor: A = Assistant; S = Associate; F= Full; AS = Above Scale

Each *digit* represents a *step* at that rank: for example, A3 = Assistant Professor step 3

Each *small tick* represents a year and each *large tick* represents a merit review, while moving from one rank to the next is a promotion. For Assistant and Associate Professors (up to Associate step 4), reviews normally occur every two years; for Associate step 4 through Full step 8, reviews normally occur every three years; for advancement from Full step 9 to Above Scale and Further Above Scale steps, reviews occur at four-year intervals at the earliest.

A candidate may defer or postpone a merit or promotion review, and actions not deferred can receive an approved advancement of 1.0, 1.5 or 2.0 steps under the UC Davis Step Plus system. At Professor step 5 and above an individual may choose to remain at step without deferrals, but all individuals without any merit or promotion review after five years will undergo a 5-year review. RTG0

The shaded areas in the diagram represent *overlapping steps*: Assistant steps 5 and 6 (A5, A6) overlap with Associate steps 1 and 2 (S1, S2), and Associate steps 4 and 5 (S4, S5) overlap with Full steps 1 and 2 (F1, F2). Overlapping steps at a lower rank earn \$100 less than the equivalent step at a higher rank, and they allow for extra time if needed and if permitted at the lower rank while a candidate prepares for promotion to the higher rank.


Slide 2

RTG0

Does this 0.0 advancement refer to lateral promotions? Consider, "actions not deferred can receive an advancement of 1.0, 1.5 or 2.0 steps or a lateral promotion under the UC Davis Step Plus system."

Rachel T Geier, 2023-05-19T20:40:22.481


The *simplest* progression up the UC Academic Ladder (not accounting for Step Plus)



Professors

Further
above Scale

Above Scale



➡ 3-year step

➡ 3-year barrier step

↑ 4-year barrier step

↑ 4-year step

UC RANKS & STEPS WITHIN RANKS:
“NORMATIVE TIME” AT EACH STEP FOR LADDER RANK
PROFESSOR AND PROFESSOR OF TEACHING FACULTY

Assistant Professor

Step 1	2 yrs
Step 2	2 yrs
Step 3	2 yrs
Step 4	2 yrs
(Step 5)	2 yrs
(Step 6)	2 yrs

Associate Professor/Tenure

Step 1	2 yrs
Step 2	2 yrs
Step 3	2 yrs
(Step 4)	3 yrs
(Step 5)	3 yrs

Professor

Step 1	3 yrs
Step 2	3 yrs
Step 3	3 yrs
Step 4	3 yrs
Step 5	3 yrs/indefinite

Professor (senior levels)

Step 6	3 yrs/indefinite
Step 7	3 yrs/indefinite
Step 8	3 yrs/indefinite
Step 9	4 yrs/indefinite

Professor Above Scale

4 yrs/indefinite

UC RANKS & STEPS WITHIN RANKS: “NORMATIVE TIME” AT EACH STEP FOR LADDER RANK PROFESSOR AND PROFESSOR OF TEACHING FACULTY

Important!

All Academic Senate faculty are required to advance in rank and step until they reach Professor, Step 5.

Faculty may not remain as Associate Professors indefinitely.

Professor

Step 5 3 yrs/indefinite

Professor (senior levels)

Step 6 3 yrs/indefinite

Step 7 3 yrs/indefinite

Step 8 3 yrs/indefinite

Step 9 4 yrs/indefinite

Professor Above Scale

4 yrs/indefinite


STEP PLUS ADVANCEMENTS!




“Clear? Huh! Why a four-year-old child could understand this report!

Run out and find me a four-year-old child, I can't make head or tail of it.”


The UC Davis **Step Plus system** allows faculty to move faster (1.5 or 2.0 steps) based on greater-than-expected performance



The UC Davis **Step Plus system also** allows faculty at overlapping steps to laterally promote without loss of time at both ranks/steps (applies to whole and half steps) counting toward next merit action



The UC Davis **Step Plus system** also allows faculty to **accelerate in time** when promoting to Associate or full Professor, but only 1.0 step is allowed. No accelerations in time are allowed for high-level merits to Step 6 or Above Scale.



A Primer on the UC Davis Step Plus system

- A faculty member is eligible for merit advancement after *normative time* at their current step (2, 3, or 4 years)
 - After deferral, candidate is eligible for advancement the following year
 - After denial or a 5-year review without advancement, candidate is eligible for advancement the following year; period of review continues to begin with last successful advancement.
- **Promotion** (to Associate Professor/Professor of Teaching and full Professor/Professor of Teaching) can occur before normative time has elapsed, but promotions requested before normative time has elapsed are eligible for a maximum of one (1.0) step.
- Each merit/promotion dossier will be considered for Step Plus advancement
 - “normative advancement” is 1.0 step
 - Step Plus actions may be 1.5, 2.0, or (**EXTRAORDINARILY** rarely) > 2.0 steps



The three legs of the academic chair:

foundations for performance evaluation (APM 210)


Ladder-rank faculty
(APM 210/220)*

Professors of Teaching
(APM 210/285)



The four legs of the Specialists in Cooperative Extension chair

foundations for performance evaluation (APM 334)



Got DATA??? Words to the wise

- Keep track of all professional activities (committees, talks, invitations, etc.)
 - ✓ Set up file folders/spreadsheet for research, teaching, service, professional competence (whatever works for you)
 - ✓ **Summarize regularly (quarterly or at least annually) and/or enter data directly into MIV! DO NOT WAIT until you come up for advancement to avoid recall errors**
- Keep your CV updated (publications, exhibits, invited seminars, grants, etc.) – *MIV can generate this automatically for you!*
- Consult with department colleagues, chair, and unit academic personnel analyst for advice on how to enter activities into MIV for YOUR discipline



Responses you can make during review

- Check dossier for accuracy/completeness before chair releases it for department review
 - You can write a rebuttal letter of redacted extramural letters with which you disagree – due within 10 calendar days from date of receiving copies of redacted extramural letters
- Check penultimate draft of department letter
 - ✓ Factual errors should be corrected
 - ✓ Content should reflect faculty views, and is not negotiable
- If you disagree with statements in the department letter, you can write a rejoinder letter (due within 10 calendar days from date of receipt of department letter)
- You can go forward for advancement even if the department vote is negative ... but is this a good idea?
- Fourth-year Appraisals provide Assistant Professors with input from peers about progress toward tenure promotion

Where does your dossier go after it leaves your digital hands?

- This depends on whether the action is “redelegated” or “non-redelegated”
- If redelegated, your Dean makes the final decision
- If *not* redelegated, the Vice Provost – Academic Affairs makes the final decision (except for tenure decisions... these are made by the Provost or Chancellor)
- Non-barrier merits recommended for < 2.0 steps are redelegated
- URL for professorial (and other) series delegation of authority:
<http://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/dofa.cfm>

REDELEGATED ACTIONS

- Candidate (that's you) must sign off on the digital dossier before it leaves the department – this affirms that you have inspected the dossier and have been given the opportunity to provide all your materials
- Dossier goes from department to Dean's Office
- Most actions: Dean's Office sends dossier to college/school Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC – a subcommittee of CAP – Oversight Committee)
- FPC makes a recommendation to the Dean
- Dean makes final decision
- Appeals go to CAP-Appellate Subcommittee (CAPAC), and back to Dean for final action



NON-REDELEGATED ACTIONS: promotions, 2.0-step merit recommendations and merits to barrier steps

- Candidate signs off on dossier
- Department sends dossier to Dean's Office
- Dean makes recommendation to Vice Provost – AA
- Vice Provost sends to CAP–Oversight Committee (CAP), which theoretically may recommend Ad Hoc review (note: this has not been done in many years)
- CAP recommendations go to Vice Provost for final action (except for tenure)
- If tenure case, Chancellor/Provost decide after consultation with Vice Provost
- Appeals go to CAPAC; then to Vice Provost or Dean (if redelegated) for final decision/recommendation (tenure cases go to the Chancellor/Provost)



The background is a solid blue gradient. It is decorated with several flowing, ribbon-like shapes. A prominent ribbon at the top left transitions from yellow to orange to red. Another ribbon at the bottom left is a vibrant red. A third ribbon at the bottom right transitions from green to cyan to blue. These ribbons have a glossy, 3D appearance with highlights and shadows.

DISCUSSION (MORE DETAILED INFORMATION TO FOLLOW)

Dean:
decides on most 1.0-
and 1.5-step merits

**VP-AA,
Provost, or Chancellor:**
all other decisions

Recommendations on:
2.0-step merits
promotions, high-level merits
4th-year appraisal

Faculty Personnel
Committee (FPC)
recommendation

2.0-step merit recommendation
***promotions (rank change)**
merit to Professor Step 6
***merit to Professor Above Scale**

Committee on
Academic Personnel (CAP)
recommendation

1.0-step or 1.5-step merit
recommendations**
4th-year appraisal



**Your MIV
dossier**

Department review,
recommendation

**Extramural letters
required
** first review after
appointment/promotion
does not go to FPC*



Guidelines for advancement under Step Plus: Professor series

- Regular, 1.0-step advancement
 - Requires a **balanced record**, appropriate for rank and step, with evidence of **meritorious accomplishments in all areas of review**. Academic Senate faculty can expect to advance at normal rates, unless a major flaw in their performance is evident. Service duties are expected to increase as faculty advance in rank and step.
- 1.5-step advancement
 - Requires a **strong record with outstanding achievement in at least one area of review across research or creative work, teaching, and service**. However, outstanding achievement in one area may not qualify the candidate for 1.5-step advancement if performance in another area does not meet UC Davis standards.



Guidelines for advancement under Step Plus: Professor series

- 2.0-step advancement
 - Requires a **strong record in all three areas of review, with outstanding performance in at least two areas**. In *most* cases, one of those areas will be scholarly and creative activity, however, exceptional performance in two other areas (teaching, University and public service, professional competence and activities) might warrant such unusual advancement.
- > 2.0-step advancement
 - Expected to be extremely rare; requires an exceptionally strong and balanced record, highlighted by extraordinary levels of achievement in two areas (including research and creative activity), and excellent contributions in the third area.
- At Above Scale, criteria for acceleration are very stringent





Guidelines for advancement under Step Plus: Professors of Teaching Senate faculty

- Regular, 1.0-step advancement
 - Requires a **balanced record**, with evidence of **meritorious accomplishments in all areas of review**. Academic Senate faculty can expect to advance at normal rates, unless a major flaw in their performance is evident. Service duties are expected to increase as faculty advance in rank and step.
- 1.5-step advancement
 - In addition to excellent teaching, requires a **strong record** with **outstanding achievement in at least one area of review across teaching excellence and educational innovation, professional [and/or scholarly] achievement and activity, and university and public service**.



Guidelines for advancement under Step Plus: Professors of Teaching Senate faculty

- 2.0-step advancement
 - In addition to excellent teaching, requires a **strong record in all three areas of review, with outstanding performance** in at least two areas.
- > 2.0-step advancement
 - Expected to be extremely rare; requires an exceptionally strong and balanced record, highlighted by extraordinary levels of achievement in two areas (including teaching excellence and educational innovation).
- At Above Scale (available for Professors of Teaching only), the criteria for acceleration are very stringent

How do you find out what expectations for normative advancement are?



- Talk to your senior colleagues, your department chair, and to current or former Senate review committee members (CAP, FPC)
- Consider developing a “Plan for Progress” with your Chair
- Criteria and expectations, especially for promotion, vary among disciplines!
 - E.g. the “book disciplines”
 - The arts
 - STEM disciplines
 - Co-authorship, and intellectual/conceptual leadership
- Teaching expectations (and teaching loads) vary among disciplines
- Encourage your department to prepare written guidelines



Your dossier establishes the case for a particular advancement outcome



- ✓ Good, strong contributions that meet expectations for normal advancement
- ✗ Substantial weaknesses, contributions well below expectations
- ★ Outstanding performance, contributions *well above* expectations



Possibly no promotion or no merit



1.0 step



1.5 steps



2.0 steps

Which department members vote on your merit or promotion dossier?

- Only **Senate faculty** can vote on **Senate** personnel actions.
 - Most common series: Professor (also called “ladder-rank faculty”), Professor of Teaching, Professor of Clinical ____, Professor in Residence
- Each department has specific voting rules that determine:
 - Whether junior faculty vote on appointments or advancements at higher ranks
 - Whether **non-ladder rank Senate** faculty (e.g. Professor of Teaching series, Professor of Clinical ____, etc. can vote on **ladder rank Senate** personnel actions
 - Whether emeriti can vote (uncommon)
- Review your department’s voting rules with your Chair
- **Your dossier communicates your record to your voters!!!**

MERIT ACTIONS:

MAJOR COMPONENTS OF SUBMITTED DOSSIER

- Candidate's statement (teaching, mentoring, research, service)
- Statement of Achievements Relative to Opportunities
- Statement of Public and Global Impacts
- Courses taught, student evaluation scores and comments
- Teaching, advising and curriculum development
- Mentoring record
- Service activities (department, college, professional, public)
- Publications or creative works of various types
- **Contributions to jointly authored works!!!**
- Honors and Awards
- Extramural support



PROMOTIONS: ADDITIONAL COMPONENTS OF DOSSIER

- Letters from external referees
- Peer teaching evaluation
- Summary of record since terminal degree (for tenure promotion) or since last promotion, with achievements since last review identified
 - Dossier review by the Committee on Academic Personnel – Oversight Subcommittee (CAP) and the VPAA will emphasize activities/achievements since the most recent review, while also considering the longer review period
 - If more than one step is being requested for outstanding work in one or more areas, *reviewers will consider whether that work has previously been awarded*




STEP PLUS HAS COMPLICATED REVIEWS WITHIN 2 STEPS OF A PROMOTION OF HIGH-LEVEL MERIT BARRIER STEP

- A dossier submitted for promotion may instead be considered for merit advancement to an overlapping step if a key criterion for promotion has not been met
- A dossier submitted for a merit may gain support from the department, dean or FPC for promotion or for advancement past a high-level barrier step (Professor Step 6 or Professor Above Scale); if so, the dossier will need to be updated and a new review conducted
- If >1.0 step is being requested for outstanding work in one or more areas, reviewers will consider whether that work has previously been awarded



MyInfoVault (MIV): UCD's digital dossier management system



- <http://myinfovault.ucdavis.edu/>



Candidate



Department



Narrative statements
Graduate advisees
Service activities
Curriculum development
Publications
Contributions to joint works
Extramural support
Awards, honors
Contributions to diversity

Department letter
Other allowable letters
Undergrad advisee count*
Course schedule
Plus, for promotions only:
External letters
Peer review(s) of teaching

*** check with your department to
see if it tracks this data**

**MyInfoVault
(MIV)**



KEY COMPONENTS OF DEPARTMENT LETTER



- Nature & extent of consultation with department faculty & faculty vote
- *Evaluation* of teaching effectiveness, comments on student/peer evaluations
- *Analysis* of quality, productivity and impact of research/creative activities
- *Evaluation* of service contributions
- *Evaluation* of professional competence
- *Evaluation* of contributions to diversity



DEPARTMENT: DOCUMENTATION OF TEACHING



- Official list of all courses taught
- *Remember to report guest lectures!*
- Student evaluations:
 - ✓ Complete set of original evaluations from 2 courses (preferably recent courses and one with high enrollment).
 - ✓ Numerical summaries for all courses (department letter discusses all courses)
- Peer evaluation letter (promotions and optional for other advancements)
- Numbers of undergraduate student advisees, special advising and mentoring



For Promotions or high-level merits:

EXTRAMURAL LETTERS

- The department chair will request extramural evaluations of your record. **Some names will come from a list suggested by the candidate (you). Some will come from an *independently selected* list generated by the department.**
 - Most letters should be “arm’s length”—not from mentees, mentors, collaborators or other close associates.
 - Letters should be requested in Spring quarter, so get your materials together early, including a draft candidate statement.
- Before your dossier goes to the department for a vote, you have the right to see a redacted version of the extramural letters and write a rebuttal letter





CANDIDATE: DESCRIPTION OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES

- Statement of teaching philosophy (part of Candidate's Statement)
- Description of curriculum and pedagogical development activities
 - New courses developed
 - New assignments, e.g. to build teamwork, critical thinking skills
 - Active learning innovation and pedagogical tools
 - Application of new technology
 - Advances in assessing learning
- Special advising activities
- Teaching activities that make contributions to diversity, principles of community
- Possible links to syllabi, lecture slides/handouts, homework assignments, etc.





CANDIDATE: DESCRIPTION OF MENTORING ACTIVITIES

- Summary of graduate / undergraduate mentoring
 - ✓ Students advised
 - ✓ Your advising capacity (committee chair, member)
 - ✓ Current status of former graduate students
 - ✓ In Candidate's Statement – describe special achievements, unusual advising methods or activities
- In Candidate's Statement and in MIV, describe other special advising, training and mentorship, e.g. of rotation students, post-doctoral or international scholars
- Report advising and mentorship activities that contribute to diversity and principles of community





CANDIDATE: SERVICE ACTIVITIES

- University service
 - ✓ List by level – i.e., department, college, graduate group/ program, Academic Senate, Administrative, etc.
 - ✓ Indicate role (member, chair) ***and describe your special contributions in the Candidate's Statement***
 - ✓ ***Note: membership in a graduate group/program and professional society is not service – please do not list it as such***
 - ✓ Briefly state outcome/impact of committee in Candidate's statement
- Other professional service that “counts” and indicates professional reputation and competence
 - ✓ Reviewing grants and manuscripts
 - ✓ Professional society committees, officer positions, editorial board memberships (include web links)
 - ✓ Service to government agencies
- Public service and outreach



CANDIDATE: DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES – Part 1

- Narrative in Candidate's Statement
 - ✓ Be concise
 - ✓ Summarize major published findings and refer to published or in-press works by number (in MIV record)
 - ✓ Briefly recap promising new findings
 - ✓ Indicate new directions, challenges and goals
 - ✓ Remember – your statement should be understandable to non-specialists
 - ✓ Consider including citation statistics; e.g. from Google Scholar Citations





CANDIDATE: DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES – Part 2

- Indicate all publications & created works that occurred during the review period
 - ✓ Peer-reviewed publications of broad distribution are most critical
 - ✓ Use MyInfoVault annotations to indicate if refereed, especially important, etc.
 - ✓ Publications of other types – books, book chapters, limited distribution, technical reports, reviews, etc.
 - ✓ Other created works include: patents, exhibits, performances, etc.
- In-press publications *may* be included *with an acceptance letter or galley proof dated no later than September 30 of the year of review.*
- Submitted papers, chapters or book contracts do *not* count as evidence of publication
- Work in progress, especially on books and other major works, may be given some weight in merit actions, but are **not** generally considered for promotion





CANDIDATE: DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES – Part 3

- Describe contributions to jointly authored works in MIV
 - ✓ This is extremely important to do well
 - ✓ Describe your own role in substantive detail, being especially careful to indicate intellectual/conceptual leadership role, if any
 - ✓ Also, briefly describe the significance of the jointly authored paper in this section
 - ✓ Do not assign a percentage to your contribution





CANDIDATE: EVIDENCE OF PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

- Invitations to review manuscripts/grants
- Invitations to present at national/international meetings, to organize symposia/sessions/meetings, to chair sessions
- Invitations to write scholarly articles/reviews– *but beware of putting too much time into chapters in edited books!*
- Invitations to write book reviews
- Awards, honors, competitive fellowships
- Election to professional society leadership positions
- Serving in expert capacity for government agencies

EFFORTS TO ENHANCE INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE AT THE UC ARE CONSIDERED POSITIVELY FOR MERITS AND PROMOTIONS

UC APM 210-1.d:

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. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of California's diverse population, or research in a scholar's area of expertise that highlights inequalities. Mentoring and advising of students or new faculty members are to be encouraged and given recognition in the teaching or service categories of academic personnel actions.





CANDIDATE: Efforts to support diversity and equal opportunity (optional statement in MLV)

1. Teaching

- Modules/exercises to engage under-represented students with the topic
- Methods/practices to foster an inclusive classroom environment
- Curricula that include contributions from different ethnicities/genders
- Writing grants targeting teaching of diverse groups
- Learning activities centered in under-served communities





CANDIDATE: Efforts to support diversity and equal opportunity (optional statement in MIV)

2. Service

- Mentoring students from diverse backgrounds
- Calling/encouraging admitted students from diverse backgrounds to attend UC Davis, go on to higher degrees
- Participating in outreach programs focused on under-served or under-represented groups
- Developing grant proposals to enhance diversity-building efforts





CANDIDATE: Efforts to support diversity and equal opportunity (optional statement in MIV)

3. Research

- Studies of gender/ethnic differences in _____ (e.g., learning methodology effectiveness, pipeline issues), with efforts to disseminate useful findings
- Research on how to reduce impacts of unconscious bias in reducing diversity
- Research requiring engagement of under-served communities





CANDIDATE: EXTRAMURAL GRANT ACTIVITY

- List grants completed, active and submitted during this review period
- Include names of PIs and co-PIs
- In Candidate's Statement, indicate your role in multi-investigator grants



Merit advancement expectations

- Although reviewers are expected to exercise reasonable flexibility in assessing any one review period, continued advancement requires meritorious contributions in all areas! Expectations for service increase dramatically after promotion to Full Professor, especially at the high steps.
- The Step Plus merit criteria are applied by reviewers to determine whether they recommend > 1.0-step advancement in recognition of **outstanding** achievement in one or more areas of review over the period of review.
 - Find merit advancement criteria for all Senate titles at the Step Plus website: <http://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/policies/step-plus/index.html>
 - For Step Plus promotions or merit advancements to barrier steps, attention is paid to achievements since the previous merit review and the degree to which achievements over the longer review period have already been recognized and rewarded

Promotion expectations

- Promotions and merits to barrier steps (Professor Step 6 and Professor Above Scale) are based on your cumulative record since your terminal degree (for promotion to tenure) or since your last promotion (to Associate or full Professor rank)
- Criteria for promotion involve the achievement of **benchmarks** in scholarship/creative work, teaching and service, and are separate from those for merit advancement.
 - Have you established your own unique voice as a scholar?
 - Is your work having a demonstrable impact at regional, national or international scales?
- Review UC and UCD APM 210, 220 and 285 (Professor of Teaching series)
 - Discuss discipline-specific expectations with your chair and colleagues!

Research and scholarly creative activity

- Evidence of a creative, innovative and thematic *program*
 - ✓ Sole, first or corresponding/senior author
 - ✓ Grant applications/funding for projects (PI, co-PI status)
 - ✓ Evidence of growth and leadership beyond doctoral, post-doctoral programs
- Quality/impact of scholarship
 - ✓ Quality of peer-reviewed journals/presses
 - ✓ External peer reviews/letters; citation impact
 - ✓ Reviews and references to exhibits and performances
- Productivity, contributions to jointly authored work
- Indications that productivity can be sustained



Teaching excellence and educational innovation... especially (but not exclusively) for Professors of Teaching

- Stress your efforts to make evidence-based improvements in teaching and to assess impacts on student learning
 - Provide evidentiary basis for the changes and “experiments” you’ve initiated
 - Begin with your own courses
 - For promotion-- extend your work, via collaboration, to other courses, curriculum within your unit or community
- For Assistant Professor of Teaching promotion to Associate Professor of Teaching, document how your work is moving us towards better teaching and learning, but published research in pedagogy is not yet required at UC Davis
- For Associate Professor of Teaching promotion to Professor of Teaching, provide evidence for national leadership and recognition for work on pedagogy



Professors of Teaching: Professional achievement and scholarship

- For Assistant Professor of Teaching, publishing on pedagogy is a plus, *but is not required*; “in-house” studies and innovative trials can suffice
- Professional activity should demonstrate growth as a scholar of teaching and learning
 - Presentations at national meetings focused on pedagogy
 - Textbook writing, manuals for better instruction
 - Consultations with other departments, institutions
 - Participation in learning communities focused on pedagogy
- Grant proposals submitted and funded for teaching innovation, inclusion and other critical goals



Academic Affairs

People > Resources > Policies > Programs > Tools > Workshops > Honors > Diversity >



Quick Links <

Academic Affairs > Policies > Academic Personnel Manual

Table of Contents

Universitywide policies listed below begin with "APM." UC Davis policies and procedures begin with "UCD" and are highlighted below. Not all Universitywide policies have UCD procedures. Universitywide policies are issued by the Office of the President and apply to all campuses and laboratories. UCD procedures are developed by Academic Affairs and issued by the Offices of the Chancellor and Provost and apply only to UCD, which includes all units under the jurisdiction of UC Davis, located in Davis, Sacramento, and all off-site locations.

Throughout these policies, the term "Chancellor" refers to the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee. Responsibilities that cannot be redelegated by the Chancellor are stated explicitly within the policy.

Select a link to view the specific section:

[I. General University Policy Regarding Academic Appointees](#)

[II. Appointment and Promotion](#)

[III. Recruitment](#)

[IV. Salary Administration](#)

[V. Benefits and Privileges](#)

I. General University Policy Regarding Academic Appointees

[APM 005](#) Privileges and Duties of Members of the Faculty

[APM 010](#) Academic Freedom

[APM 011](#) Academic Freedom, Protection of Professional Standards, and Responsibilities of Non-Faculty Academic Appointees

[Grievance Alleging Professional Standards Violation Form](#)

[APM 011 Frequently Asked Questions](#)

[Academic Titles and Academic Freedom Related Protections](#)

Policies

[Academic Enrichment Fund \(AEF\) Accounts](#)

[Academic Advisories](#)

[Academic Personnel Manual](#)

[Access To Records](#)

[Accommodations](#)

[Ad Hoc Committees](#)

[Annual Call](#)



[Appointment And Advancement](#)

[Compensation](#)



[Leaves](#)

[Recruitments And Removals](#)



[Retirements And Recalls](#)



[Step Plus System](#)

II. Appointment and Promotion

[APM 200](#)

General

[APM 205](#)

Recall for Academic Appointees

[APM 210](#)

Review and Appraisal Committees

[APM 220](#)

Professor Series

[UCD-220, Table of Contents](#)

[UCD-220, Academic Senate Review and Advancement](#)

[Procedure 1, Appointment](#)

[Procedure 2, Merit, Appraisal, Promotion, Career Equity Review, and Preliminary Assessment](#)

[Procedure 3, Postponement and Deferral](#)

[Procedure 4, Five-Year Review](#)

[Procedure 5, Appeal](#)

[Exhibit A, Consultation and Voting Procedures on Academic Senate Personnel](#)

[Exhibit B, Language Required When Letters of Evaluation are Solicited or Received](#)

[Exhibit C, Guidelines for Preparation of Publication and Other Creative Efforts List](#)

[Exhibit D, Guidelines for Evaluation of Department Chairs \(instructions to the deans\)](#)

[UCD-220AF, Academic Federation Review and Advancement](#)

[Exhibit A, Criteria Used for Evaluating Performance When Soliciting Extramural Evaluations](#)

[APM 280](#)

Adjunct Professor Series

[UCD-280, Adjunct Professor Series](#)

[APM 283](#)

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer

[APM 285](#)

Lecturer with Security of Employment Series

[APM 289](#)

Guest Lecturers

[APM 290](#)

Regents' Professors and Regents' Lecturers

[APM 300](#)

Supervisor of Physical Education Series

[APM 310](#)

Professional Research Series

[APM 311](#)

Project (e.g., Scientist) Series

Discussion

