

## CHECKLIST FOR PROMOTION

For the following Academic Senate and Academic Federation series:

Professor  
Acting Professor of Law  
Professor In Residence  
Professor of Clinical \_\_\_\_  
Acting Professor  
Adjunct Professor  
Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer with Security of Employment (SOE)  
Health Sciences Clinical Professor

**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. Report of the nature and extent of consultation and the vote of faculty members in the department. A separate department letter is required containing the vote and comments from eligible non-senate faculty for the Adjunct Professor and Health Sciences Clinical Professor series. Reasons for negative votes should be addressed in the department letter. Strongly recommend that all written comments be appended to the department letter.
- d. For LSOE series faculty the letter must clearly state which APM 285 criteria the LSOE series faculty member is to be evaluated under for advancement review:
  - i. prior criteria in effect until June 30, 2023 **or**
  - ii. revised criteria effective October 1, 2018Departments can obtain this information from their dean's office as each school/college dean's office received confirmation of the criteria choice for their LSOE series faculty.
- e. For Adjunct Professors the letter must include the percent distribution of research and teaching.

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

\_\_\_\_ For Adjunct Professor only: Include *Notification of advancement eligibility for an Academic Federation member*, appended to the department letter in MIV.

\_\_\_\_ Peer Evaluation of Teaching Letter. A substantive peer evaluation by one or more department or other campus colleagues should involve an analysis of classroom teaching, as well as an assessment of teaching materials, assignments, and examinations.

**NOTE:** For faculty in the health sciences, peer evaluation may include analysis of direct clinical patient care, operating room procedures, hospital rounds, research mentorship, and residency program teaching sessions.

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

\_\_\_\_ Extramural Letters. Normally 6-8 letters are adequate. At least half of the letters should be "arm's-length," with the exception of the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series. 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".

\_\_\_ Graduate group chair evaluation from Dean – Graduate Studies, if applicable

\_\_\_ For promotions following a third- or fourth-year deferral or five-year review: Plan for progress developed by the candidate and department chair. Upload as Candidate's Statement in MIV. Include all plans for progress since last positive advancement.

\_\_\_ For Adjunct Professor only: Include all forms for *Notification of advancement eligibility for an Academic Federation member* since last positive advancement. Upload as Candidate's Statement in MIV.

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

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

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

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

\_\_\_ 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 any

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

\_\_\_ Agricultural experiment station reports, if applicable

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION** (will be returned to department after the review and decision is finalized):

\_\_\_ 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. For promotions to full rank, provide summaries of all courses taught since CAP's last review.
- 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/Sr. Lecturer SOE, submit all teaching evaluations from all course 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:**

\_\_\_ College/school faculty personnel committee (FPC) recommendation letter, if applicable

\_\_\_ Dean's final decision (redelegated promotions) or dean's recommendation letter (non-redelegated promotions). 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.