

**CHECKLIST FOR REAPPOINTMENT**  
**OR REVIEW OF AN EXISTING ENDOWED CHAIR APPOINTMENT**

**1. Dean:**

\_\_\_\_\_ Submits nominations for ad hoc committee members and an ad hoc committee chair to the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs (slate of at least three names), including the department and rank/step of each person. This committee will review the performance of the endowed chair holder and provide a recommendation to the dean.

**2. Vice Provost:**

\_\_\_\_\_ Approves ad hoc committee chair and members, notifying dean of approved membership.

**3. Dean:**

\_\_\_\_\_ Appoints ad hoc committee members and chair.

**4. Department responsibility in assembling dossier:**

Submit dossier in MyInfoVault (MIV).

\_\_\_\_\_ Action Form

\_\_\_\_\_ Departmental letter from the department chair/unit head containing:

a) Departmental consultation and Senate vote, according to departmental voting procedures for new faculty hires.

Note: If the endowment is for a Specialist in Cooperative Extension, the vote should also include other department members in that title series.

b) Evaluation of candidate's fulfillment of activities specific to the endowed chair.

c) Evaluation of candidate's intellectual leadership to the department.

d) Evaluation of candidate's enhancement of the academic life on campus.

e) Evaluation of candidate's progress in scholarly activities, teaching, and University and public service.

f) Enhancement of academic mission of the department.

\_\_\_\_\_ Position description

\_\_\_\_\_ Signed Candidate's Disclosure Statement

\_\_\_\_\_ Candidate's Statement (accomplishments and goals as endowed chair, 1-5 pages)

\_\_\_\_\_ Extramural letters are optional\* (see note below)

a) If submitted with dossier, stamp "CONFIDENTIAL".

b) Submit an example of the solicitation letter.

- c) List of all referees, including academic title and expertise of each referee. This list should identify those nominated by the candidate and by the department.
- d) Each letter should be identified as being “arm’s length” or “**not** arm’s length,” according to the opinion of the department chair. \*\* (see note below)

\_\_\_\_\_ List of all student evaluations submitted.

\_\_\_\_\_ Teaching, Advising, and Curricular Development Record

\_\_\_\_\_ List of service activities

\_\_\_\_\_ Complete list of publications and/or creative activities (APM UCD-220-Exhibit C):

- a) Indicate those materials that have been added since last approved action (draw a line).
- b) Indicate with an asterisk (\*) those publications included in the review period. (Note: these may appear above or below the line; e.g. delay in publication.)
- c) Indicate with a (X) the most significant publications.
- d) Indicate with a (+) major mentoring role publications.
- e) Indicate with a (@) refereed publications.
- f) In press items must have dated letters or emails indicating that items have been accepted for publication, unless the items are galley proofs. Attach the acceptance letters or emails to the manuscript in the supporting documents.

NOTE: The term "in press" designates works that have been accepted for publication without revision. Book contracts are not considered an "in press" item.

NOTE: If there is a link directly to the full publication (not an abstract), reprints do not need to be provided. Add the link into the article into the publication list(s) in MIV. Ensure all links are active or the dossier will be returned. If no such link can be provided, please provide a paper copy of the publication.

\_\_\_\_\_ List of contributions to jointly authored works (numbering corresponds with numbering on publications list). Identify the leadership role and contribution of the faculty member. Examples of leadership include activities such as developing the concept, inventing or applying novel analytic techniques, making key discoveries, changing the interpretation of findings, and writing substantial sections of the paper. Do not describe the role of all authors. Percent of effort should not be included.

\_\_\_\_\_ List of honors and awards, if any

\_\_\_\_\_ List of grants, if any.

## **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION (will be returned to the department)**

Note: If there are no physical supporting documents, the department should send an email to notify the Dean's Office that the dossier is ready for review in MIV and there are no supporting documents. The same courtesy should be provided to the Senate Office and Academic Affairs when routing dossiers.

\_\_\_\_\_ Items published or in-press during the review period. Copies of submitted manuscripts may be included at the option of the candidate.

\_\_\_\_\_ Student evaluations, if applicable: one complete set of original evaluations from two courses, preferably courses with the highest enrollment and preferably representing a range of courses taught (e.g. upper division and lower division). Numerical summaries or percentages in each rating category should be included with student evaluations for all courses taught during the review period or the last three years, whichever is longer. Department should retain student evaluations for other courses taught and have them available if requested by reviewers.

### **5. Dean's Office will upload in MIV the following for inclusion in the dossier and forward to the Academic Affairs.**

\_\_\_\_\_ Dean's Recommendation Letter

\_\_\_\_\_ Ad Hoc Committee Report

### **6. CAP reviews and makes a recommendation.**

### **7. Vice Provost – Academic Affairs reviews and makes a recommendation.**

### **8. Chancellor holds final decision authority.**

\*Extramural letters will be optional for five year review/reappointment of endowed chairs/professorships. However, the department chair, dean, review committee, and/or the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs **may require extramural letters** for a more substantive, arm's-length assessment of the candidate's record.

\*\*"Arms-length" letters are from external referees who are independent of the appointee, who are known scholars in the field, and who are able to provide an objective evaluation of the work. Use of external referees whom the reviewers may not regard as objective or independent, either because they are too close to the appointee professionally (collaborators, thesis/dissertation supervisors, teachers, etc.) or because they have a personal relationship with the appointee, may be included if they shed light on collaborations. An effort should be made to contact individuals who have not contributed letters for prior reviews for the same candidate. It is also desirable to have some referees who are familiar with the UC rank and step system because referees from within the University (outside UC Davis) can speak to the issue of the appropriateness of the step.