

## CHECKLIST FOR FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

For the following Academic Senate and Academic Federation series:

Professor  
Professor In Residence  
Professor of Clinical \_\_\_\_  
Acting Professor of Law  
Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE)  
\_\_\_\_ in the AES  
Adjunct Professor  
Health Sciences Clinical Professor  
Professional Researcher  
Project Scientist  
Specialist  
Specialist in Cooperative Extension

**Department** will submit to the dean's office the information listed below through MyInfoVault (MIV):

\_\_\_\_ Action Form

\_\_\_\_ 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. One of the following:
  - i. Report of the nature and extent of consultation and the vote of faculty members in the department.  
**Voting options include: advancement; no advancement, performance satisfactory; no advancement, performance unsatisfactory.** Reasons for negative votes should be addressed in the department letter. Strongly recommend that all written comments be appended to the department letter.
  - ii. Report of the recommendation of the department chair, after meeting with the faculty member.  
**Recommendation options include advancement; no advancement, performance satisfactory; or no advancement, performance unsatisfactory.**
- d. Plan for progress, if recommendation is no advancement, performance unsatisfactory.

**NOTE:** OPTIONAL – The Criteria of Scholarship should be appended to the Department letter or referred to in the Department letter.

**NOTE:** If the result of the department vote or department chair recommendation is advancement, the department should prepare a full merit or promotion packet instead of a five-year review. Please consult the appropriate merit or promotion checklist. If the candidate still wants to proceed with the five-year review in lieu of a merit or promotion, this must be indicated in the department letter with an acknowledgement that if the final decision is advancement, the candidate understands they will not be eligible for advancement until the following review cycle.

\_\_\_\_ For Adjunct Professor, Professional Researcher, Project Scientist, and Specialist only: Include current and all past forms for *Notification of advancement eligibility for an Academic Federation member*, appended to the department letter in MIV.

\_\_\_\_ Signed Candidate's Disclosure Certificate

\_\_\_\_ Previous Plans for Progress, if the candidate has not achieved Step 5 of the full rank. Upload all previous Plans for Progress since last positive advancement as a Candidate's Statement in MIV, if applicable.

\_\_\_\_ OPTIONAL – Candidate's statement (1-5 pages only)

\_\_\_\_ OPTIONAL – Candidate's diversity statement

\_\_\_\_ For Professional Researcher, Project Scientists, Specialist and Specialist in Cooperative Extension only: Position Description, with a listing of percentage effort expected for each activity, signed by the department chair and candidate.

\_\_\_ List of all student evaluations submitted for the review period, if any

\_\_\_ Teaching, Advising, and Curricular Development form, if applicable  
\_\_\_ DESII Report

\_\_\_ List of Extending Knowledge activities, if applicable

\_\_\_ List of any Extension Teaching Evaluations submitted, if applicable

\_\_\_ List of service activity, if applicable

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

- a. Indicate those materials that have been added since last approved action, if applicable (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 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 to 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). Candidates can list all authors, but should only describe their own contributions and leadership role to the work. 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. An estimate of the candidate's percent contribution to the work should not be included.

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

\_\_\_ List of grants, if applicable

**NOTE:** The review period is since the last approved advancement action, or if at full rank, step 5 can be since the last satisfactory 5-year review.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION** (will be returned to department).

\_\_\_ Items published or in press during the review period. Acceptance letters or emails should be attached to the in press manuscript. Copies of submitted manuscripts may be included at the option of the candidate.

\_\_\_ Student evaluations (one complete set of original evaluations from two courses, preferably courses with the highest enrollment and represent a range of courses taught, e.g., upper division and lower division).

- a. Numerical summaries or percentages in each rating category for all courses taught during the review period should be included with student evaluations.
- b. Department should retain student evaluations for other courses taught during review period and have them available if requested by review committees.
- c. For Lecturer SOE series, submit complete teaching evaluations from all courses taught during the review period.

**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 that there are no physical supporting documents. The

same courtesy should be provided to the Senate Office and Academic Affairs when dean's offices route actions in MIV.

**Dean's office will provide:**

\_\_\_\_ Dean's recommendation letter. If the dean concurs with the department recommendation, the reviewing dean may opt to write a statement indicating that they have reviewed the dossier and agree with the recommendation of the department in lieu of writing a detailed letter.