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Part 1: Resources and Tools
Advancement Policies and Practices: Resources

- APM 210 lists the review criteria for Academic Senate Series
- APM 220 describes system-wide policy for merits/promotions in the Professor series
- APM 285 describes system-wide policy for the Lecturer SOE series
- APM UCD 220 and APM UCD 285 describe campus implementation of APM 220 and APM 285 plus our procedures, checklists, and sample letters
- See the Step Plus Toolkit on the Academic Affairs website for information and guidance
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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
Chair’s Roles in the Academic Personnel Process:

See APM 245, APM UCD 245, Exhibit A: Duties of Clinical Department Chairpersons

- Liaison between faculty member & Dean/Administration
- Proactive mentor in career advancement of faculty
  - Meet at least annually with each faculty member (more frequently with junior faculty)
- Ensures department and university policies are followed in all personnel actions
- Agent for change in making personnel processes fairer and more efficient
- Sets the standard for department climate and modes of interaction
Part 2: Important changes for 2019-2020 and beyond
The Annual Call

- Issued in summer (e.g., September 2019)
- Reminders about process steps and best practices
- Summarizes and links to recent Academic Affairs’ advisories
- Due dates for academic personnel actions to department, Dean’s office, and Vice Provost’s office
- Identifies what has changed since last year, and offers reminders and clarifications about things to do or to avoid
- Make sure to read the Annual Call and discuss it with your academic personnel staff member!!!
- Discuss the important changes with your faculty, as well
Recommendation: Also check “Historical Annual Calls” for last 2-3 years
ANNUAL CALL

- **New 2019-2020 deadlines for academic personnel actions**

  - **Administrative Deferrals will again be optional in 2019-2020.** Deadlines for actions due to the Vice Provost’s Office are published in the Annual Call and Deans’ Offices set additional deadlines to allow for timely review at their level.
  
  - Deans have discretion to impose administrative deferrals for redelegated actions.
  
  - If any non-redelegated 2019-2020 action is late **without obtaining prior approval of an extension from Academic Affairs**, the action will automatically be designated as an “Administrative Deferral”, and the candidate will be eligible in 2020-2021. The advancement will not be made retroactive to the previous year. Note: Five-year reviews and 7th-year tenure cases cannot be designated as Administrative Deferrals.
ANNUAL CALL

• New 2019-2020 deadlines for academic personnel actions

Reminder: Deadline for Submitting Materials to Review Files in 2019-2020 – Please notify your faculty!

In the past, UC Davis allowed candidates to submit additional materials to a review file until December 31. Effective with the 2017-2018 review cycle, this date was changed to September 30. Materials will not be accepted after September 30 unless the person undergoing review is an Assistant Professor in his/her “seventh year” of service. For example: a journal article accepted as in-press on October 12, 2019 cannot be included in the 2019-2020 review file. Please be sure to communicate this information to all academic members of your unit(s).

Please do not request exceptions to this – they will not be granted.
Part 3: Step Plus Update and Reminders
The Academic Senate and Academic Federation transitions are now over.

The following Academic Federation (AF) titles are now on the Step Plus System (click each title for a link to their Step Plus advancement guidelines):

- Academic Administrator Series
- Academic Coordinator Series
- Adjunct Professor Series
- Assistant/Associate University Librarian/Law Librarian Series
- Continuing Educator Series
- Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series
- Professional Researcher Series
- Project Scientist Series
- Specialist in Cooperative Extension Series
- Specialist Series
- University Extension Teacher Series
Reminder: Step Plus Advancement Dossiers

Step Plus is rewarding outstanding teaching and service more than we did previously, so accuracy and detail in dossiers is essential!

- Provide complete description of teaching responsibilities (% responsibility, average loads), etc.
- Conduct substantive peer review of teaching for promotions and marginal cases
- Assess impact of candidate’s contributions to diversity
- Update all activities (candidate signs off on dossier for accuracy!)
  - Include mentees only from review period
  - Include post-degree positions of PhD mentees
  - Include only service activities during the current review period
  - Add web links documenting editorial board service

Reminder: although candidate can state a preferred action in the Candidate’s Statement, routing of subsequent review and decision is determined by the majority department, FPC, or dean recommendation.
  - If any of these reviewing bodies supports a non-redelegated action (e.g., 2.0 steps), it becomes non-redelegated and is reviewed by CAP and the VP-AA.
Writing effective department letters for Step Plus actions

• If >1.0 step advancement is being recommended by the majority of the department:
  ▪ Clearly identify which areas of performance are outstanding
  ▪ Explain ways in which performance greatly exceeds expectations and is outstanding for regular advancement

• Report the full vote and all the rating scores (if these were done)

• Address potential weaknesses in the record, as well as strengths

• Recommended: append all ballot comments to the letter.
  ▪ “NO” voters are expected to provide explanation (but votes still count even if they decline to)
  ▪ Encourage comments on positive ballots, as well!

• Indicate rationale for recommendation within Step Plus framework—which, if any, areas are deemed “outstanding”, and why?

• Provide a clear description of the department vote
Please report Step Plus votes unambiguously!

Example: “Of the 25 faculty eligible to vote on this action, 20 voted and 1 abstained. 20 voters supported at least 1.0-step advancement. Of these, 8 supported at least 1.5-step advancement based on outstanding research, and 3 of those also supported 2.0-step advancement for outstanding teaching.”
Examples of good voting templates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Check box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support 1.0 (normal advancement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support 1.5 step</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support 2.0 step</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support advancement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>1.0 step</th>
<th>1.5 steps</th>
<th>2.0 steps</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division/section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of good voting templates

C. Which of the following options do you feel is most appropriate for merit advancement? Please vote for only one option.
(Note: a vote for a higher step implies support for all lower steps.)
- I vote in favor of a 2.0 step increase
- I vote in favor of a 1.5 step increase
- I vote in favor of a 1.0 step increase
- I do not support merit advancement
- Abstain

D. For appraisals:

| Voting action | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Positive      | Guarded       | Negative      | Abstain       |
Making Step Plus Fairer

• Implicit biases based on gender, race, and family status are particularly common
• Implicit biases reduce our ability to fairly evaluate non-majority candidates
  ▪ Extramural referees
  ▪ Student evaluators
  ▪ Department peers
  ▪ Review committees and administrators
• Implicit biases are known to affect self-review and self-promotion
  ▪ Which action will a given candidate think is deserved?
  ▪ Stereotype threat; the Imposter Syndrome
• Impacts of implicit biases can be reduced if they are recognized and called out
UC Davis: Accelerations-in-time Showed Signs of Gender Bias

2008-13 data from UC Davis ADVANCE:

Women were 36% less likely to seek accelerated tenure than men (25.5% vs. 39.7% of dossiers put up for acceleration), but overall were as likely as men to succeed.

In STEM, women were 29% less likely to pursue accelerated tenure, but were more likely to succeed.
Best practices to reduce the impacts of implicit bias

- Recognize that implicit biases exist and challenge fair evaluation
  - Raise awareness of patterns of implicit bias
  - Learn to recognize and call out biases when apparent

- Create and use more specific, structured evaluation criteria

- When voting on merits or promotions, consider rating a faculty candidate’s performance in each of the critical academic spheres

- Use processes that increase careful evaluation at the department level and decrease the role of variation in the personalities of candidates
The Role of the Candidate’s Preferred Action

It is the candidate’s right to pursue advancement, even if the department vote is negative or the dean is not supportive.

However, at the urging of the Senate, we are no longer requiring, or even recommending, that the candidate make a specific advancement request.

It is our hope that this change will:

• encourage more thorough analysis of the dossier by department peers

• reduce the need for peers to vote “against” a specific candidate request

• allow the candidate to present their case and simply rely on department evaluation.
Part 4: Updates on the “new” Senate LSOE series: LPSOE/SLPSOE/LSOE/SLSOE

Working title change is:
“Professor of Teaching _______”
SOE faculty vs. Unit 18 Lecturers: Why hire into these two series?

L(P)SOE series faculty – these are Academic Senate members

- Need for excellence and innovation in classroom teaching
- Curriculum, course development
- Transform and update teaching approaches in the discipline based on research, learning assessment, etc.
- Research in the underlying discipline and/or in pedagogy counts for advancement

Unit 18 Lecturers – these are not Academic Senate members, but are members of the Academic Federation and are union-represented

- Manage teaching loads too high for available Senate faculty
- Requirement for consistent, excellent classroom teaching
- Temporary teaching needs, e.g. replacing retirees or those on leave
- Fill teaching needs in specialty “gaps”
- Must show evidence of no less than excellent teaching for advancement to Continuing Lecturer
LSOE Series Advancement

Materials submitted in support of an appointment or advancement action should provide a comprehensive assessment of the candidate's qualifications and performance in the areas specified below:

A. Teaching and Learning
B. Professional Achievement and Activities
C. University and Public Service

Although LPSOEs are expected to build significant expertise in the scholarship of teaching and learning, our campus does not require peer-reviewed publications in pedagogy for promotion from LPSOE to LSOE.

Policy References – APM 210, APM 285 and APM UCD 285
LPSOE → LSOE Promotion

Teaching excellence
• Assigned classroom teaching should allow sufficient time to participate in pedagogical innovation and professional development as educators

Professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, including creative activity
• Includes scholarly professional activities and research in both the underlying discipline and in pedagogy

University and public service
• As for Assistant Professors, Department Chairs should avoid assigning heavy service responsibilities to LPSOE faculty members
The “new” SOE series: Advice for Chairs

• Review your department voting rules (refer to Senate Bylaw 55)

• SOE faculty are members of the Academic Senate, and should have considerable latitude in choosing their own activities for professional growth and scholarship

• Duties or assignments negotiated with the Chair, especially if demanding, should have a strong creative and scholarly element with a focus on teaching and learning

• Consider developing a Plan for Progress with new SOE faculty members

• Consider consulting with the Center for Excellence in Education on peer review
Part 5: Review of the merit and promotion process
To Above Scale or (if deemed essential) to Professor 6:

Develop referee lists
Send materials to referees

Chair:
possible P6 or A/S action?

Promotion candidates: ready to advance?

Chair:

Yes
No

Step-Plus merits

Department chair shares extramural letters (if any) with candidate; candidate can write rebuttal prior to department vote; set department meeting dates, as needed

Chair: monitor letter status

Early Fall

Department votes; draft dept letter is shared with faculty and then candidate; candidate can write rejoinder letter

By Fall deadline

Dossier submitted to dean; department letter presents vote(s) and basis for recommendation

Mid-Spring

Summer

Early-mid Fall

Extramural Referees

• Which referees are NOT arm’s-length?
  • Former mentors, mentees; collaborators; close friends or professional associates; relatives
  • Encourage referees to describe their relationship to / knowledge of the candidate below the signature block

• Developing lists of extramural referees
  • Ask candidate to generate a list of colleagues/experts who can evaluate the work (this list may include arm’s-length referees). These cannot be from UC Davis.
  • Chair generates a completely independent department list of arm’s-length referees only
  • Any referee on both lists can legitimately be “claimed” for the department list
  • The Chair identifies each extramural letter as “arm’s-length” or “not arm’s-length” and as being from department’s or candidate’s list
Extramural Referees

- The Chair identifies each extramural letter as “arm’s-length” or “not arm’s-length” and as being from department’s or candidate’s list
- Arm’s length letters carry more weight and credibility than non-arm’s length letters
- Also consider the quality of the academic institution where the letters writers are. It is preferable to have letter writers from institutions that are considered our “peers,” particularly with respect to research and scholarship
Communication with Extramural Referees

• Contact potential reviewers by early Spring Quarter
  ▪ At least half should be from the department list
  ▪ When the department vote favors a Step Plus action that requires letters, request extension from VP-AA and expedite letter requests in fall!

• Provide reviewers a time frame for response & information about campus work-life policies (see links to template letters on AA website)

• Send CV, draft of candidate’s statement, publications; book chapters or manuscript (only if book is very near acceptance), and other teaching-related material for LSOEs
  ▪ Send publications only from the period under review
  ▪ For merits to Above Scale, even though the whole career provides context, encourage referees to discuss recent work
  ▪ Keep sending reminders, as needed!!!!!

NOTE: Solicit intramural letters from Grad Dean (if candidate is a grad group chair), Center Directors, Clinic Directors, peer reviewers of teaching (for promotions and all merits for LSOE series faculty)
Letters are Not Required for Merit to Prof 6: Implications

• APM 220-18b: Merit to P6 requires evidence of “great academic distinction, recognized nationally, ... in scholarly or creative achievement or teaching”
• Letters may be especially helpful if > 1.0 step is anticipated for faculty at Step 4.0 or 4.5
• *Without letters from national authorities, such impact may be harder to demonstrate for some candidates. Use your judgement!*
• The dossier should thoroughly document:
  - National scholarly impact of publications (citations, etc.)
  - Invitations to speak/exhibit/perform, especially plenary addresses
  - National/international service based on scholarly/creative work
• At their discretion, the Dean, CAP or VPAA may request extramural letters in some cases
Extramural Letters for Merit to Above Scale

- Explain criteria for advancement in solicitation letter.
- APM 220-18b 4) describes the criteria for advancement to Above Scale:
  
  “Advancement ... involves an overall career review and is reserved only 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...”

- Ensure that some letters are from international authorities
- Include letters, if possible, from high-level faculty in the UC system
  - Note: Not all UC campuses use the title “Distinguished Professor” for the Above-Scale rank
Work-life Language

Language that should be used in ALL requests for extramural review of UC Davis faculty:

“UC Davis encourages its faculty members to consider extensions of the (pre-tenure/review) period under circumstances that could interfere significantly with development of the qualifications necessary for (tenure/advancement). Examples of such circumstances may include birth or adoption of a child, extended illness, care of an ill family member, or significant alterations in appointment.

Please note that under this policy the overall record of productivity and scholarly attainment forms the basis of your evaluation. Time since [appointment/promotion] is not a factor in this review.”
The Candidate’s Statement

• Restrict to 1-5 pages (slightly longer statements may be appropriate for P6 and Above Scale) – please send back longer letters for shortening

• Should present candidate’s perspective in all areas under review in language accessible to non-specialists

• Should include an analysis of impact of work, stressing intellectual leadership, creativity and uniqueness of work, and identifying technical contributions

• Do not recapitulate what is already in the dossier

• Should focus only on the period under review!

• Can discuss challenges encountered, future plans
First Dossier Review by Candidate

- **Before** department faculty review, candidate checks dossier, *including redacted extramural letters*
- Candidate must correct errors in his or her MIV entries
  - It is the candidate’s responsibility to check for accuracy of MIV information (e.g. service periods on editorial boards, committees or review committees, dates of grants)
- Candidate may write rebuttal letter within 10 calendar days to respond to issues raised in redacted extramural letters. This letter will be included for voting faculty review.
Departmental Vote

- Votes are totally confidential
- Negative votes *must* indicate reasons on ballot
- Under Step Plus, positive comments are also extremely important, and encourage your faculty to provide them
- Consider an online voting system, e.g. ASIS from the Senate

**Before your first action of the 2018-19 merit cycle:**

- Review your current voting procedures and Senate Bylaw 55, if you have not done so in the past 1-2 years
  - Many departments have recently hired LSOE series faculty
  - Consider the role that more junior faculty can play in the process—many do not fully understand the benchmarks ahead of them
Scholarly independence is no longer a key criterion for Senate faculty, given that many research areas are highly collaborative. Evidence for intellectual/conceptual leadership, uniqueness and creativity should be stressed for the Professor series.

- Candidate: Care should be taken in describing Contributions to Jointly Authored Works.
- Reviewers: Leadership should not be assumed just from authorship position.

Candidate and department letter should describe how contributions originated or changed the course of the project.
Public Scholarship and Engagement @ UC Davis

Michael Rios
Vice Provost, Public Scholarship and Engagement
Office of the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
Public Scholarship Defined

Public Scholarship exemplifies **excellence** in research, teaching, and creative practice that focuses on **issues of public concern**. It is useful to, and often developed in concert with, **diverse audiences beyond the university**.

“Public Scholarship refers to diverse modes of creating and circulating knowledge for and with publics and communities.”

*Imagining America*

“Where we work, we're listeners. We have to understand what the needs are of our community partners. I think an important piece for me in engagement is being invited. I think that sometimes we as academicians can be a bit arrogant: that we know what's wrong with the world and how to fix it.”

*Professor, School of Veterinary Medicine*
A Recent History of Engagement at UC Davis

1990s
Kellogg Commission of State and Land-Grant Universities

2013
Communities and Scholars Engaged (CASE)

2015
“Community-Engaged Scholarship at UC Davis: A Strategic Vision”

Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Classification

2017
Imagining America

2018
Office of Public Scholarship and Engagement

“I think part of this process is going to require communicating the value of engaged scholarship. The truth of it is UC Davis is a land-grant institution, so service is so key to what makes us a land-grant and yet, I don’t think engaged scholarship has been recognized as exemplary of the service we’re mandated as a land-grant public institution. So we need to re-embrace what land-grant means.”

Associate Professor,
College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences
What is the Office of Public Scholarship and Engagement?

The four primary roles of PSE are to:

- **Communicate** the value, importance, and impact of engaged scholarship and engaged learning.
- **Convene** individuals and groups to build collaborative relationships, partnerships, and networks.
- **Collaborate** on university and community partnerships, training, workshops, and events.
- **Champion** engaged scholarship and engaged learning to increase resource support and begin implementing changes that advance the ways the university works to support publicly-engaged research, teaching, and learning for faculty, staff, and students.
A VISION FOR PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP AND ENGAGEMENT AT UC DAVIS

Cultivate and foster a culture of engagement that rewards and recognizes public scholarship in research, teaching, and service; builds the collective capacity and scholarly excellence of the UC Davis community; and increases the university’s impact and visibility through mutually-beneficial relationships that have local, regional, statewide, and global reach.
Goals And Objectives

Goal 1: Reward and recognize public scholarship in research, teaching, and creative practice

1. Increase awareness, understanding, and acceptance of public scholarship and engagement among the university community and general public
2. Provide incentives to faculty for incorporating public engagement into research and teaching
3. Integrate public scholarship with UC Davis' colleges, schools, and other academic units to support activities and increases outputs
4. Introduce ways to recognize public scholarship in university policies, program reviews, and faculty recruitment, merit, advancement and promotion reviews

Goal 2: Develop and improve community-based learning experiences

1. Promote and support coordinated university-wide engaged learning experiences
2. Provide tools and resources to support student learning in community settings on our campuses, in our region, and throughout the world
3. Increase opportunities for students to participate in community engagement domestically and internationally through research, coursework, internships, and independent studies
4. Promote student learning that incorporates collaborative leadership, creative problem-solving activities, and intercultural engagement

Goal 3: Increase Mutually Beneficial Community Engagement and Public Impact

1. Enhance communication channels to increase public access to university expertise, resources, and data
2. Promote diversity, equity, and inclusion in public scholarship, community engagement, and in recruiting and retaining engaged scholars
3. Facilitate the creation of new, and support for existing, community-university partnerships, and statewide, regional, and global multi-sector consortia that will address community-based and policy-relevant issues
4. Enhance visibility and presence of UC Davis to facilitate engagement between the larger Sacramento region and the university's Davis and Sacramento campuses utilizing research, technical assistance, and community-based learning experiences
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Unit Consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Forum/Symposium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards and Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Commons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Fellowships and Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Program Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Fellowships and Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Workshops and Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Fellowships and Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Communities and Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures and Roundtables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit, Advancement, and Promotion Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Education and Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal, Grant, and Contract Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Workshops and Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Metrics and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Workshops and Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Co-operative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Collaboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Fellowships and Grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact Activities
- Academic Unit Consultations
- Faculty Fellowships and Grants
- Staff Workshops and Mentoring

Imagining Engagement
OPSE could work with college and school deans to incorporate public scholarship into unit-wide initiatives, grant programs, and other faculty incentives. Possibilities might include engagement action plans, coordination mechanisms to support curriculum-based projects with non-university groups, and document templates for memoranda of agreements, community IRBs, technical assistance contracts, among others.

Potential Collaborators
- Academic Unit Consultations
  - Colleges and Schools
  - Academic Affairs
  - Colleges and Schools
  - Development and Alumni Relations
  - Global Affairs
  - Office of Research
- Staff Workshops and Mentoring
  - Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
  - Staff Assembly

Impact Activities
- Annual Forum/Symposium
- Regional Consortium
- The Co-operative

Imagining Engagement
UC Davis could develop the Co-operative as a physical co-working space for university faculty, students, and non-university groups. This Sacramento-based center for experiential learning, action research, creative cultural production, and leadership development would enhance student experiences through real-world and project-based programs, coursework, and internships in local settings. One of its central aims would be to facilitate community-benefiting research and practice on key issues, such as housing, education, health, poverty, inequality, and the environment.

Potential Collaborators
- Annual Forum/Symposium
  - Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
  - Office of Research
- Regional Consortium
  - Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
  - Office of Research and Policy for Equity
  - Office of the Vice Chancellor of Human Health Sciences
  - Policy Institute for Energy, Environment, and the Economy
  - UC Center Sacramento
- The Co-operative
  - Academic Support
  - Arboretum and Public Garden
  - Center for Community and Global Health
  - Center for Educational Effectiveness
  - Center for Healthcare Policy and Research
  - Center for Poverty Research
  - Center for Reducing Health Disparities
  - Center for Regional Change
  - Development and Alumni Relations
  - Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
  - Feminist Research Institute
  - Global Affairs
  - Graduate Studies
  - Imagining America
  - Internship and Career Center
  - Office of Research and Policy for Equity
  - Office of the Vice Chancellor of Human Health Sciences
  - Undergraduates Education

Next Steps: 10 Actions in 365 Days

1. Establish Advisory Committees related to: 1) Faculty Development and Recognition, 2) Student Learning, and 3) Community Engagement. These advisory groups will provide guidance and feedback to OPSE as specific activities are implemented.

2. Create a web-based portal for engaged scholarship and engaged learning. This will include resources, opportunities, a searchable directory, a calendar of events, and stories of engagement.

3. Collaborate in the creation and launch of a UC Davis facility in Sacramento that will serve as a physical hub to support engagement initiatives and projects with non-university partners. The facility would include shared co-working space, a conference/classroom, an open area for public events, and a range of small meeting spaces.

4. Establish an Engaged Scholarship Faculty Fellows program to advance significant contributions to, and exploration of, theories and practices that will cultivate and foster a culture of engagement at UC Davis. This cohort-based program will be organized around monthly meetings, mentorship, and the development of a major publication.

5. Establish an Engaged Learning Faculty Fellows program to create and improve community-based student learning experiences that will cultivate and foster a culture of engagement at UC Davis. This cohort based program will be organized around monthly meetings, mentorship, and the development or improvement of a course.

6. Develop 10 pilot projects with UC Davis colleges, schools, and other academic units. Possibilities might include engagement action plans, coordination mechanisms to support curriculum-based projects with non-university groups, and document templates for memoranda of agreements, community IRBs, scopes of work, among others.

7. Co-sponsor 10 trainings or workshops with faculty, staff, students, and community stakeholders. Specific topics may include community engagement theory and practice, translational and action research, communicating research to public audiences, and intercultural communication, among others.

8. Expand community internship and clinical programs to serve urban and rural communities in the Sacramento region. The goal is to improve coordination and expand upon existing opportunities at UC Davis’ professional schools, Internship and Career Center, Global Affairs Office, Arboretum and Public Garden, and other centers that are focused on student career and leadership development.

9. Organize an annual Community Engagement Forum to solicit ideas and suggestions from community partners. The event would showcase model collaborations, identify ways to access university resources, and offer consultative services to help community groups develop research and curriculum-based projects, and respond to technical assistance requests.

10. Support a university-wide taskforce that will explore ways to achieve greater recognition of public scholarship within university policies, program reviews, and faculty recruitment, merit, advancement, and promotion reviews.
"Staying in this field is more than a career, it is a passion." - Stephanie Sanchez

It was in medical school that Stephanie Sanchez decided she wanted to be a doctor. Her work at the Sacramento County Chico Clinic led her to develop a passion for treating underserved communities. "I don't think you can be a doctor without having a passion for helping others," she says. "And I have that passion." She now serves as the medical director of the Sacramento County Chico Clinic, where she works to improve the health of underserved populations.

"RJ Taggueg"

"If you have a community behind you, you'll be driven by genuine passion." - RJ Taggueg

RJ Taggueg, a PhD student in public health, is researching the health impacts of climate change on communities in the Philippines. His work has led him to advocate for policy changes to address climate change and its effects on public health. "If you have a community behind you, you'll be driven by genuine passion," he says. "And that's what I feel." He now serves as the director of the Climate Change and Health Policy Initiative at UC Davis, where he works to improve the health of communities affected by climate change.

"Keith David Wattenpaugh"

"Education must be a human right and the university must be a public good if we are to achieve just, equitable and peaceful societies." - Keith David Wattenpaugh

Keith David Wattenpaugh, professor of human rights, is working to improve the lives of refugees around the world. He is conducting research on the impact of climate change on refugees and their host communities. "Education must be a human right and the university must be a public good if we are to achieve just, equitable and peaceful societies," he says. He now serves as the director of the Human Rights Center at UC Davis, where he works to improve the lives of refugees around the world.

"Tessa Hill"

"Complex problems require collaborative problem solving, which is why partnerships are so important." - Tessa Hill

Tessa Hill, a public health student, is working with a team of UC Davis students and faculty to address the challenges facing refugees around the world. "Complex problems require collaborative problem solving, which is why partnerships are so important," she says. She now serves as the director of the Human Rights Center at UC Davis, where she works to improve the lives of refugees around the world.

"RJ Taggueg, Ph.D. "Taggueg is a public health scholar." - RJ Taggueg

RJ Taggueg, a PhD student in public health, is researching the health impacts of climate change on communities in the Philippines. His work has led him to advocate for policy changes to address climate change and its effects on public health. "If you have a community behind you, you'll be driven by genuine passion," he says. He now serves as the director of the Climate Change and Health Policy Initiative at UC Davis, where he works to improve the health of communities affected by climate change.

"Keith David Wattenpaugh, Ph.D. "Wattenpaugh is a human rights scholar." - Keith David Wattenpaugh

Keith David Wattenpaugh, professor of human rights, is working to improve the lives of refugees around the world. He is conducting research on the impact of climate change on refugees and their host communities. "Education must be a human right and the university must be a public good if we are to achieve just, equitable and peaceful societies," he says. He now serves as the director of the Human Rights Center at UC Davis, where he works to improve the lives of refugees around the world.

"Tessa Hill, Ph.D. "Hill is a public health student." - Tessa Hill

Tessa Hill, a public health student, is working with a team of UC Davis students and faculty to address the challenges facing refugees around the world. "Complex problems require collaborative problem solving, which is why partnerships are so important," she says. She now serves as the director of the Human Rights Center at UC Davis, where she works to improve the lives of refugees around the world.
Other activities in the works

- Organize trainings and workshops in public engagement and broader impacts
- Establish Faculty Fellows program
- Develop templates for community MOUs and IRBs.
- Identify community partners for research and curriculum-based projects
- Provide consultations with department chairs and faculty
Creating A Culture of Engagement
Department Letter

- Two pages maximum for merits
- Up to five pages for promotions, merits to barrier step
  - Appended comments from department ballots do not count towards the page limit
- Reflects department view (not Chair’s view)
- Should not duplicate candidate’s statement
- Discusses impact of scholarly activities, innovative teaching, outreach, contributions to diversity & any extenuating circumstances
- Includes language for Work-Life Program participation if appropriate.
Department Letter (continued)

- Department letter should not be in final or near-final form prior to the department vote
- Don’t include comments about off-scales or retentions (salary should not be discussed as part of the department evaluation)
- Draft can be prepared by a department ad hoc committee, designated faculty member, Vice Chair, or Chair
- CAP and I strongly recommend appending all written faculty comments to the department letter; however the chair may have to exercise discretion
- Voting faculty should have opportunity to review draft letter, including faculty votes, and suggest changes to Chair
Contributions to Diversity as Criteria for Advancement

PROMOTING DIVERSITY EFFORTS RECOGNIZED IN MERITS AND PROMOTIONS, PER 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. (1/1/06)
The Department Letter Should Address the Candidate’s Contributions to Diversity

• Strongly encourage your faculty members to provide information in the “Contributions to Diversity” sections in MIV
  ➢ Teaching
  ➢ Service
  ➢ Research

• Discuss these contributions in faculty meetings

• Consider rating these contributions (e.g. 1-5), along with other critical areas of faculty performance, using rubrics
Faculty Equity and Inclusion

Resources:

- Why Does UC Davis Seek Statements of Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion From Applicants?
- Guidelines for Writing Statements of Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
- Advertising Suggestions
- How and Why We Built a Majority-Minority Faculty by Kevin R. Johnson, Dean, UC Davis School of Law

› ADVANCE

› Advancing Faculty Diversity Hiring Grant

› Faculty Equity and Inclusion

Guidelines for Writing Statements of Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
Candidate Reviews the Department Letter and Dossier Before it Leaves the Department

- Department letter content is not negotiable, but candidate can ask that inaccuracies be corrected
- If candidate disagrees with statements in final version of department letter, he/she may write rejoinder letter; has 10 calendar days to do so
- Do *not* reveal names of extramural letter writers (or describe them in the letter)
- Candidate can request advancement even if faculty vote is negative
- Final step: Candidate signs disclosure statement verifying that packet is complete & factually accurate
Confidential Chair’s Letter (optional)

- Letter is kept confidential from department faculty and accompanies the MIV file in paper form.
- Letter is kept confidential from candidate until after the action is completed.
- Candidate receives a redacted copy of the Chair’s Confidential Letter when the merit decision is finalized and shared with the dean’s office to then share with the department.
- Letter continues to remain confidential with respect to department faculty.
- Collegiality is a legitimate factor for evaluation, but only to the extent that it demonstrably affects research, teaching or service.
- Why include a Chair’s letter?
What Happens to the Dossier Next?
Redelegated vs. Non-redelegated Merits

- If **redelegated**, your Dean makes the final decision (advised by the FPC)
  - Step Plus 1.0- and 1.5-step merits, except those to or beyond a barrier step

- If **not redelegated**, the Vice Provost – Academic Affairs makes final decision (except for tenure decisions, which may be decided by the Provost or Chancellor), advised by CAP
  - Promotions, merit to Prof 6, merit to Professor Above Scale, merits to Further Above Scale
  - Recommendation from department, FPC or dean for >2.0 steps

- See “Delegations of Authority” link on Academic Affairs’ website quick links
Pathway for redelegated actions

- Dossier goes from department to Dean’s Office
- Dean’s Office to Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC – a subcommittee of CAP – Oversight Committee)
- From FPC to Dean for final action
- Appeals go to CAP-Appellate Committee, and back to Dean for final action
Appeals

- Appeals occur when the candidate provides explanatory/clarifying information pertinent to the original dossier, after the final decision is made.
  - No additional scholarly activities, awards, teaching evaluations, etc. are provided
  - Procedural errors / oversights may be addressed
  - Incorrect application of standards may be addressed
- Basic concept: CAP-Appellate does not review a dossier that differs substantially from the dossier that CAP-OC reviewed.
- Final decision on appeal is based on the delegation of authority
Deferrals

- Below Professor Step 5, deferral is required if a candidate chooses not to go forward for advancement when eligible.
  - A candidate is eligible after normative time at the current step, or in the year following a denial, prior deferral, or five-year review

- Deferral requests are due at the same time that the corresponding merit or promotion action is due.

- ALL academics must be reviewed at intervals no longer than five years. Accordingly, five-year reviews cannot be deferred.

- For further information, work with your college’s academic personnel analyst.
Five-year Reviews

• All faculty are required to be reviewed at least once every five years (starts during their 4\textsuperscript{th} year since last review)

• Department letter reviews activities in teaching, research, service, and contributions to diversity.

• Department vote is currently optional. Voting options:
  • NAPS— “No advancement, performance satisfactory”
  • NAPU— “No advancement, performance unsatisfactory”
  • Recommend “Advancement” -- CAP can recommend advancement, which will require a full review, starting with a new department vote.

• Unsatisfactory performance requires a plan for progress

• Continued under-performance should lead to a shift in duties (e.g. additional teaching), and can lead to a termination process (APM 075)
Discussion