

CHECKLIST FOR CAREER EQUITY REVIEW (CER)

The following Senate titles are eligible for a CER:

Associate Professor
Professor, Steps 1 through 8
Associate Professor of Clinical ____
Professor of Clinical ____, Step 1 through 8
Associate Professor in Residence
Professor in Residence, Steps 1 through 8
Associate Professor of Teaching
Professor of Teaching, Step 1 through 8

Restrictions:

1. Career Equity Reviews may not be requested more frequently than once every six years.
2. Faculty who have previously requested a CER may not resubmit the same arguments in any new request.
3. Only faculty who have held an eligible title (see list above) for at least four years and have not been reviewed by CAP during the last four years can be considered for a CER.

Request must be coincident with a merit or promotion action. The faculty member submits their merit or promotion materials through the usual process in their department/dean's office, in MyInfoVault (MIV). The merit/promotion packet and the CER request must be submitted to the Dean by the established due date for the merit/promotion.

If the department Chair, Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC), Dean, CAP or the Vice Provost identify a faculty member that they think should seek a CER and if the faculty member agrees to be considered for such a review, the required materials above shall apply.

Appeals:

Career Equity Review decisions may be appealed through the standard appeal process for merits and promotions (see APM 220.Proc.5).

Department will submit to the dean's office the information listed below through MyInfoVault (MIV) concurrent with a merit as a linked action:

____ Letter from faculty member which identifies:

- a. Area(s) of the record that the faculty member believes were not properly evaluated in past reviews.
- b. Area(s) of the record that indicate they were not hired at the rank/step commensurate with their accomplishments at the time of hire.

____ Department recommendation, a well-documented letter containing:

- a. Concise evaluation of candidate's achievements in teaching, research, and service, as applicable.
- b. Statement delineating the academic responsibilities of the position.
- c. Report of the nature and extent of consultation and the vote of faculty members in the department (see [sample ballot](#)). Reasons for negative votes should be addressed in the department letter. Strongly recommend that all written comments be appended to the department letter.

____ Signed Candidate's Disclosure Certificate

____ **IF CER INVOLVES PROMOTION OR MERIT TO ABOVE SCALE** – Extramural Letters (6-8 letters are normally adequate. At least three should be “arm’s-length.”). Include the following:

- a. List of all referees, including academic/professional title and expertise of each referee. Upload into MIV as a Non-Redacted letter.
 - i. This list must identify those nominated by candidate and those nominated by department. If the same name appears on both lists, they will be included on the department list.
 - ii. Indicate which referees are “arm’s-length.”
- b. Example of the solicitation letter. Do not include the name and address of a referee in the example. Upload into MIV as a Non-Redacted letter.
- c. Extramural letters. Both redacted and non-redacted versions should be uploaded into MIV. The following information should be marked on each of the extramural letters.

- i. Stamp all letters "CONFIDENTIAL"
- ii. Each letter must be identified separately by a letter or number that corresponds to the letter or number used in a. above, to ensure confidentiality of reviewers (APM 160).
- iii. Each letter should be identified as being from either the "candidate list" or the "department list."
- iv. Indicate whether the letter is "arm's-length" or "not arm's-length", according to the opinion of the department chair.

(See APM 210; APM 220-80-c. and UCD 220 Exhibit B for additional details.)

NOTE: "Arm's-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 supervisors, personal friends, 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 since referees from within the University (outside UC Davis) can speak to the issue of the appropriateness of the step. Review UCD 220 IV.F.3. for further information on determining "arm's-length".

___ Supporting documentation that is required for merit/promotion

Dean's office will provide:

___ Dean's recommendation letter