

April 21, 2015

To: Department Chairs, Directors, Business Officers and all faculty

From: Cindy Doherty, Director  
Academic Personnel

Re: Red Binder updates

A number of revisions to the Red Binder (UCSB campus academic personnel policies and procedures) have been posted at the Academic Personnel web site. Major changes include:

- Routine and Non-Routine merit reviews are now referred to as *Dean's Authority Reviews* and *Expanded Reviews*.
- The Academic Personnel online case processing system and other related functions have been rebranded as *AP Folio*.
- Optional wording for tenure case solicitation letters in cases where extensions to the tenure clock have occurred has been (RB I-50)

A summary of all changes is listed below for your convenience.

The complete Red Binder, as well as the annotated changes may be viewed on the Academic Personnel website at: <https://ap.ucsb.edu/policies.and.procedures/red.binder/>

### **Summary of changes**

**I-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 1-6, 1-15, 1-22, I-25, 1-26,1-30, 1-31, 1-34, 1-38, 1-56, 3-5, 3-12, 3-14, 5-1, 5-2, 5-10, IX-18:** These sections contain changes in terminology as follows: 1) change of advancement types from "Routine" to "Dean's Approval" and "Non-Routine" to "Expanded Review" intended to reflect the review process for cases vs. the type of case. 2) New name of "AP Folio" for the Academic Personnel online case process system and other related functions.

**I-14** Clarification of affiliated vs. without salary faculty appointments. Additional information will be provided to department regarding affiliated appointments in PPS.

**I-27** Modification of wording to clarify bio-bibs are used by academic research appointees

**I-29** No exceptions for more than 39 days of outside professional activity are allowed. Naming of AP Folio

**I-35** No direct quotes from ballots or departmental discussion should be used in departmental letters

**I-50** Optional wording for tenure case solicitation letters regarding extensions of the tenure clock

**I-51** Consistency of materials sent to reviewers

**II-1** Correction of title code for recall of non-senate faculty for teaching

**II-24** Change in delegation of authority for Continuing Educators

**II-31** Clarification of process for payment of Guest Lecturers

**III-7** Clarification of vote and salary information requirements. Naming of AP folio.

**III-9** Reference corrections

**III-16** Wording clarification and naming of AP Folio

**III-17** Postdoctoral Scholar reference materials are now on the Academic Personnel web site

**III-23** Addition of parenthesis to clarify “Visiting” applies to Researchers and Project Scientists

**IV-2, VI-9, VI-10** Update of annual service period charts

**V-6** Academic appointees other than faculty may hold the working title of Curator

**V-20** Clarification of process for Visiting Professor of Practice and Professor of Practice

**V-25** Approval process for faculty administrators

**V-34** Approval process for other administrative positions

**VI-1** Application of policy to non-faculty academics

**VI-15** Process for intercampus payment forms

**VI-22** Alien salary advances are available to non-faculty academics

**VII-7** Revised advertisement tag-line wording per OFCCP guidelines.

**VIII-1** Clarification of procedures for Career Development Awards

**VIII-3 (New)** Summary of the Hellman Fellows Program

**IX-3 (Deleted)** references to other campus policies

I-1  
**APPROVAL AUTHORITY FOR  
LADDER RANK FACULTY**  
(Revised 04/13/15)

**Action**

**Authority**

**Appointments**

Assistant Professor II, III, including Acting titles	Dean
Assistant Professor IV and V	Associate Vice Chancellor
Associate Professor, Professor	Chancellor
Affiliated Appointments (0% or without salary)	Associate Vice Chancellor
Lecturer PSOE	Dean
Lecturer SOE, Sr. Lecturer SOE	Chancellor

**Merits**

On-Schedule Merit Cases (including decelerated in time)	Dean
Merit to Professor VI, to and within Above Scale	Chancellor
Other Merits	Associate Vice Chancellor
Formal Appraisal	Associate Vice Chancellor
Asst Prof deferrals	Dean

**Promotions**

Associate Professor, Professor	Chancellor
Lecturer SOE, Sr. Lecturer SOE	Chancellor
Deferral of tenure review	Dean

**Leaves**

Sabbatical <del>routine</del> <i>within policy</i>	Dean
Sabbatical - exceptions, any negative rec., no merit in past 5 years	Associate Vice Chancellor
Medical leaves within APM policy	Dean
All other <del>routine</del> leaves for up to one year, <i>Within policy</i>	Dean
Active service/modified duties	Dean
Exceptions to policy	Associate Vice Chancellor
Leaves beyond one year	Associate Vice Chancellor

I-2  
**DEADLINE DATES**  
(Revised ~~11/14~~04/15)

The following deadlines have been established for submission of ladder faculty advancement cases from the Department to the College:

~~Routine Reviews:~~ *Dean's Authority cases:* 2<sup>nd</sup> Monday in November  
Assistant Professor Deferral Requests:

~~Non-Routine Reviews:~~ *Expanded Review cases:* 2<sup>nd</sup> Monday in December  
(See Red Binder I-33 for definition  
of ~~non-routine~~ Expanded Reviews)

Completed cases must be submitted to the office of the appropriate Dean by the appropriate deadline date. Cases received after the due date will be returned to the Department and will not be processed. A missed deadline may not be used as justification for retroactivity in a future review. Recommendations must be based on materials available before September 15 except for extramural letters delayed by circumstances beyond the department's control. Departments may institute earlier cut-off dates. Both the Dean and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel must be notified if the department plans to change its existing cut-off date. It may also be appropriate in some promotion to tenure cases to add materials available after September 15.

In situations where a reviewing agency requests additional information in the case, a deadline for submission of those materials will be included in the request. If the materials are not received by the stated deadline the case will proceed through the review process without the materials. Failure to submit requested materials may have an effect on the outcome of the review. Failure to submit the requested materials may not be used as the basis for a reconsideration request.

**PRIORITY DESIGNATIONS**

(Revised ~~11/10~~04/15)

Personnel cases shall be reviewed in priority order based on the date received and the following designations:

- Priority 0: Retentions
- Priority 1: Appointments
- Priority 2: Tenure Review
- Priority 3: Career Review (Promotion to Professor, merit to Professor VI or Above Scale)
- Priority 4: Accelerations, Appraisals and all other ~~non-routine~~ *Expanded Review* actions
- Priority 5: ~~Routine~~ *Dean's Authority* merits

**ELIGIBILITY, DEFERRAL AND MANDATORY REVIEW**

(Revised 05/14)04/15)

**I. Service Credit**

Six months or more of service at one-half time or more in any one fiscal year normally count as one full year of service for merit eligibility. Less than six months of service at one-half time or more in any one fiscal year does not count. The normal period of service prescribed for each salary level does not preclude more rapid advance in cases of exceptional merit nor does it preclude less rapid advance. Service as an Assistant Professor (including time as an Acting or Visiting Assistant Professor) is limited to 8 years. Service at the Associate Professor and Professor levels is unlimited.

Assistant Professors or Lecturers with Potential Security of Employment who have been approved for an extension of the tenure clock should not be expected to have produced more or performed at a higher level than faculty who have not extended the tenure clock. The file is to be evaluated without prejudice as if the work were done in the normal period of service.

**II. Regular Ranks, Steps, Normal Periods Of Service**

The Assistant Professor Rank contains steps I-VI, although steps I and VI are not used at UCSB. The Associate Professor Rank contains steps I-V, although step V is not used at UCSB. The normal time of service at each step within the Assistant and Associate rank is 2 years, except for service at the special steps of Assistant Professor V and Associate Professor IV (Red Binder I-37). The Professor rank contains steps I- IX as well as Above Scale. Normal service at steps I-IV is 3 years. Service at step V and above may be for an indefinite time; however, normal service is 3 years at steps V through VIII and 4 years at step IX or Above Scale. Eligibility for normal advancement occurs after the normal time of service at each step. If not advanced in step at that time, the candidate will continue to be eligible each year until advancement in step occurs.

**III. Advancement Effective Dates**

The Office of Academic Personnel annually publishes promotion and merit eligibility lists for each department.

All merits and promotions will be effective July 1. It is possible, based on availability of funding, that payment for merits and promotions may be delayed. If this occurs, payment will be made retroactively at the time funds become available.

**IV. Mandatory Five-Year Reviews**

Ladder-rank faculty must undergo a performance review at least once every five years, including an evaluation of the faculty member's record in all review areas. This review may not be deferred. Most UCSB faculty are reviewed for merit advance every two to four years, depending on rank and step. Faculty eligible for merit advancement or promotion may request deferral of review, so long as the time period since their last review is not more than four years. Non-submission of materials by a faculty member will not constitute automatic deferral. If a faculty member does not turn in materials by the departmental due date, the department will conduct the mandatory review based on the materials available in the department as of the due date.

Faculty holding 100% administrative positions in the SMG program or covered by APM 240 or APM 246 are exempt from mandatory five-year reviews since they face a separate review policy.

**V. Deferral Of Review**

Deferral of non-mandatory reviews will be automatic if a tenured faculty member does not submit materials by the departmental due date, and no case is forwarded by the department by the established submission deadline.

Deferral requests made by Assistant Professors must be accompanied by a letter of recommendation from the Chairperson that explains the reasons for the deferral and describes the progress that will be expected prior to the next review. Review for promotion to tenure will normally take place by the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> year of service but may be deferred until the 7<sup>th</sup> year. The faculty member's deferral request along with the Chairperson's letter of

recommendation must be submitted via ~~the on line case processing system~~, *AP Folio*.

Deferral beyond the 7<sup>th</sup> year will not be considered. The Formal Appraisal review may not be deferred.

I-6  
**CAREER EQUITY REVIEW**  
(Revised 08/12)04/15)

A Career Equity Review (CER) may be initiated by or on behalf of tenured ladder faculty, and Lecturers SOE and Senior Lecturers SOE who are members of the Academic Senate. The CER is designed to examine cases in which normal personnel actions from the initial hiring onward may have resulted in an inappropriate rank and/or step; i.e., a faculty member's rank and/or step is not commensurate with the candidate's merit as assessed in the areas of research, teaching, professional activity, and service and in terms of the standards appropriate to the candidate's field, specialization, and cohort. A CER provides the opportunity to pay special attention to equity in relation to the standards in the discipline and to determine if current placement on the academic ladder is consistent with the application of those standards as they relate to rank and step. Recommendations and decisions will be based on the criteria used for normal promotion and merit reviews; but CERs will consider the entire career record of the individual, as well as recent activity.

A CER is not an alternative to the reconsideration procedures that apply to particular reviews (Red Binder I-10) nor is it an alternative to cases that should be brought before the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. A CER is not intended to address salary compression or other salary issues related to market, therefore, requests for adjustment of off-scale supplement will not be considered. Final decisions of CERs will not be subject to reconsideration or appeal. Reports generated during the CER process will be subject to the same policies and procedures as reports generated during the regular review process. A CER is considered a ~~non-routine~~ **Expanded Review** case and will be subject to review by CAP. CERs may be requested or conducted no more frequently than once every six years. Only faculty who have held an eligible title (see above) for at least four years can be considered for a CER.

**Procedure:**

A CER may be initiated by the candidate through his or her department in parallel with an advancement case submitted for the faculty member through the regular advancement process, or through the appropriate Dean as a separate personnel action during the same review cycle as an advancement case. A CER may also be recommended to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel by any reviewing agency in the course of a personnel review. The reviewing agency will inform the Associate Vice Chancellor that it believes a CER should be considered and the Associate Vice Chancellor will report this recommendation to the faculty member. The candidate will then decide whether to initiate a CER and, if so, whether to initiate it in the department or with the Dean. Once initiated, it will follow one of the paths outlined below.

Possible justification for a CER may include, but is not limited to, the following: 1) the rank/step was inappropriately low at the time of initial hiring and in consequence the faculty member is currently placed too low on the ladder; 2) the outcome of one or more prior personnel actions has had a negative effect on subsequent personnel reviews, and in consequence the faculty member is currently placed too low on the ladder; 3) specific works and contributions have been overlooked or undervalued by the department or other reviewing agencies and in consequence the faculty member is currently placed too low on the ladder; 4) the faculty member's cumulative record warrants placement higher on the academic ladder.

**A CER may be initiated in the following ways:**

1. During consideration of a normal advancement, either the candidate or the department may initiate a CER by including a letter with the review file that identifies the area of the record that the candidate or department believes was not previously properly evaluated and/or the area of the record that indicates the candidate was not hired at the rank/step commensurate with the accomplishments at the time of hire. The department must consider, analyze, vote, and make a recommendation on both the CER and the proposed merit/promotion action. The candidate's letter will be included in the merit/promotion case that is sent forward by the department.
2. At the time a merit or promotion case is being prepared in the department, a CER may be requested by an individual faculty member through the Dean. The request in such cases will be treated as confidential. The Dean will inform the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel of the request for review. The Dean will then form a confidential ad hoc committee to oversee the assembly of materials for a career review. The



Dean will also assure that all appropriate procedures concerning safeguards and access occur as outlined in the Red Binder. The committee will include members of the School or Division, and at the Dean's discretion may contain members of the Department and/or representatives from outside the School or from other UC campuses. The committee will provide an analysis equivalent in depth to that of a Department letter. The ad hoc committee's dossier, and their letter analyzing the case, will be forwarded to the department for consideration, analysis, and vote. The CER case will then be forwarded along with the merit or promotion case to the Dean and continue through the normal review process for a ~~non-routine~~ *Expanded Review* case.

3. During the course of a normal personnel review, a Dean, CAP or the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic personnel may recommend a CER. A letter will be sent from the Associate Vice Chancellor to the faculty member informing the faculty member that a reviewing agency has recommended a CER as part of the advancement review. If the faculty member wishes to be considered for a CER, the review may be initiated via either of the two procedures listed above. Reviewing agencies are encouraged to review the files of every academic appointee for appropriate inclusion in the CER program coincident with the normal review cycle. Input from the department chair may be requested via the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel if warranted.

Any CER that is initiated by a reviewing agency and that requires review for promotion, merit to Professor VI or to Professor Above Scale must contain extramural letters. In the event that the original case does not contain extramural letters, the agency preparing the CER will be responsible for solicitation of such letters.

Because the CER is processed in conjunction with a merit/promotion case, two decisions will be made at the conclusion of the review; one based on the request for CER and one based on activity during the current review cycle. If the CER decision leads to an adjustment of rank and step, the candidate's salary at the new rank and step will include the same off-scale supplement as the salary prior to the review. A final decision for an adjustment in rank and/or step will occur effective the next July 1. No retroactive action will be approved.

**SENATE FACULTY APPOINTMENTS**(Revised ~~10/10~~ 04/15)

**Senate** faculty appointments may be made in academic departments or in programs. At UCSB, the term "program" is used not only in reference to those sequences of courses leading to degrees but also to those academic/administrative units that have not yet attained departmental status but "from which academic appointments and promotions are recommended to administrative officers" (Bylaw 55 of the Academic Senate). As such, the provisions of Bylaw 55 shall apply: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/manual/blpart1.html#bl55>

A faculty member's rights are vested in any department or program in which he/she holds a salaried appointment carrying Senate membership. Non-salaried ~~appointments or~~ affiliations in departments or programs do not carry with them voting privileges or other rights not explicitly made part of such appointment agreements. A brief description of types of appointments and rights follows.

A faculty member accepting transfer from one department or program to another relinquishes thereby his/her rights in the original department or program.

**I. Types Of Appointments**

1. Salaried appointments in a single department or program.
  - a. The appointment is in one department or program
  - b. The faculty member's voting rights are vested in the department or program.
2. Joint salaried appointments in departments or programs.
  - a. Each appointment carries with it a percent of full time and salary in each department or program.
  - b. The faculty member maintains voting rights in each department or program.
  - c. When a faculty member is being considered for a merit or promotion, each department or program must provide a recommendation.

A request for joint appointment, either at the time of initial appointment or related to a temporary or permanent transfer of FTE at a later date, should be discussed and voted upon by the faculty in both departments/programs. The request from both Chairs/Directors, should be sent via the Dean, to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel indicating the vote of the faculty, effective begin date, end date (if any), and percentage of time in each department. Each department is responsible for assuring that a partial FTE has been approved for use.

3. *Without salary appointments.*  
*Faculty who take on full time administrative positions or who are released to specific programs (KITP, Station Q) retain a without salary faculty appointment in their home department. Full voting rights are maintained in the department.*

**3.4. Affiliated ~~faculty~~ status**

A ~~ladder rank~~ **Senate** faculty member who participates in instructional activities in a department or program in which he/she does not hold a salaried appointment may receive "affiliated" (~~i.e. zero percent~~) status in the "host" department or program.

- a. The faculty member has no voting rights in the host department or program.
- b. The host department or program is not required to vote on the affiliated faculty member's personnel case, but may be asked to provide a statement of departmental activities carried out under the affiliated status.
- c. An affiliated appointment with an indefinite end date may be terminated on the recommendation of a majority of the voting members of the department or program.

A request for affiliated appointment should be approved by the voting members of the host department/program with the endorsement of the home department. The request from both Chairs should indicate an effective begin date and end date (if any) and should be submitted to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, via the Dean.

**Senate** faculty from another UC campus may be given an affiliated **(zero percent)** appointment at UCSB. A request from the host department indicating the begin and end date of the appointment as well as the reason for the affiliation should be submitted to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, via the Dean. **An appointment letter will be generated but no PPS input will be done.**

***Affiliated appointments are not entered into the payroll system.***

#### 4. Other "Professor" titles

For appointments of Adjunct or Visiting Professors refer to Red Binder III-21 and II-28. For Emeriti appointments refer to Red Binder I-70.

## II. Appointment Criteria

All new appointments should be consistent with affirmative action guidelines (see Red Binder Section VII).

Non-tenured appointments are made in the expectation that the appointee will meet standards for a tenure appointment by the time that a promotion decision is due. Recommendations for non-tenure level faculty appointments must provide: a) clear evidence of potential excellence in both teaching and research; and b) clear evidence that the proposed appointment relates in a significant manner to established or projected programmatic needs of a department or unit.

Recommendations for tenure-level faculty appointments must provide: a) clear evidence of nationally recognized excellence in published research (or other creative work) as well as evidence of excellence in teaching; b) clear evidence that the proposed appointment is essential to an academic program of high quality and stature; and c) clear evidence of continuing scholarly productivity. For the level of excellence required for specific ranks and steps, consult APM 210-1 d. These criteria are also summarized in Red Binder I-40 through I-43. The difficulties of recruiting at this level of excellence require a considerable investment of time and energy in the recruitment process.

Departments should be prepared to engage in multiple-year searches in order to make the best possible appointments. The open provision for the recruitment will normally be available to the department for the duration of the search process, as long as funding continues to be available.

A recommendation for appointment must fully conform to the highest level of academic excellence and programmatic need. If, after rigorous review, significant and credible doubts exist about a candidate's academic qualifications, the appointment will not be approved.

Furthermore, it is strongly recommended that the Chair discuss the proposed rank, step, salary level, and start-up expenses of a new appointment with the Dean prior to submitting a recommendation for the appointment.

## III. Letter To Prospective Ladder Appointees

After discussion with the Dean as described in the preceding paragraph, the department may communicate to the candidate its intention to recommend an appointment.

The recommended wording for department letters to prospective ladder appointees is as follows:

I am happy to inform you that our Department of \_\_\_\_\_ intends to recommend you for appointment as \_\_\_\_\_ at a salary of \_\_\_\_\_, effective July 1, \_\_\_\_\_. As you know, appointments in the University of California are only made by the Chancellor of the campus after careful review of the departmental recommendation by the Chancellor, in consultation with reviewing agencies, including the dean of the College and the campus Committee on Academic Personnel, as necessary. Approval of departmental recommendations is not automatic, and departmental recommendations do not constitute actual offers. Following the review process, actual offers of appointment are extended by the Executive Vice Chancellor, Chancellor or Regents as appropriate.

#### **IV. AAU Deadlines**

Department should be mindful of the AAU recruitment deadline of April 30 and the Intercampus deadline of April 1. Please refer to APM 500-16.

#### **V. Offer Deadlines**

The department will be contacted by the College or Academic Personnel concerning the response deadline the department wishes to give to the candidate. It is the department's responsibility to notify the College and the Office of Academic Personnel when an offer has been either accepted or declined.

#### **VI. Other Deadlines**

Departments should also take into consideration other guidelines established by organizations specific to their field (i.e., Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences).

When making an offer to a non-resident alien (i.e. not currently a US Citizen or a Permanent Resident), the department is strongly encouraged to consult with the Office of International Students and Scholars at the time the offer is being considered to be assured that labor certificate processing deadlines are met.

I-15  
**DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR**  
**APPOINTMENTS**  
(Revised ~~11/14~~04/15)

All appointment cases are submitted via ~~the on-line case processing system~~ AP Folio.

**I. Departmental letter of recommendation**

Accurate and analytical letters of recommendation from the department are essential in the review process. See Red Binder I-35 for further detail of content of departmental recommendations

- Are the start date, rank and step all clearly stated?
- Is the recommended salary on the published salary scale?
- Is the off-scale supplement correct (if applicable), per off-scale general policies (RB I-8)?
- Is the actual vote included (e.g. 10(yes)-0(no)-0(abstentions)-3(not voting))? Is there an indication of how many were eligible to vote?
- Is the letter an accurate, extensive, and **analytical** representation of the case?
- If the case contains extramural letters, are letter writers identified **only** by coded list, with no identifying statements?
- Are the candidate's qualifications, educational background, and area(s) of specialization all discussed?
- Are all four areas of review covered: teaching, research, professional activity and university and public service?

**II. Extramural letters of evaluation and list of evaluators (Red Binder I-49)**

**Extramural Letters**

- For tenured appointments, are there at least 6 letters, including letters from UC familiar referees?
- For tenured appointments, are at least half of the letters from references chosen by the Chair/Dept independent of the candidate?
- Have all letters been coded, on all copies?
- If the letters were sent via email, is a copy of the email and any attachment included?

**Sample Solicitation Letter(s) and/or Thank you letter(s) for unsolicited letters**

- Was the proper wording used in the letter (RB I-49 to I-50)?
- Is a list of all informational items sent to referees (e.g. CV, Bio-Bib, publications sent, etc, per RB I-46-VI) included? Is a copy of each item included as either part of the case or a one-of-a-kind item?
- If different versions of either the letter or the materials went out, is a sample of each included?

**List of Referees, including brief Biography and indicating who selected referees**

- Do the codes on the letters match the codes on the list and the codes used in the departmental letter?
- Does the list clearly indicate if the referees were candidate, department or jointly selected?
- Are the names of everyone who was asked to write included? For those who did not respond is a reason for no response listed?

**III. Complete CV and Academic biography form.**

- Is the CV up to date?
- Is the Academic biography form complete, signed and dated?

*The following items are submitted as hard-copy:*

**IV. Copies of publications**

- Has a representative sampling of publications been submitted?

**V. Start-up request information. (see RB I-18)**

- Have all start-up issues been addressed?

**VI. Recruitment Packet**

- Has the Academic Recruitment Packet (Red Binder VII-9) been completed and signed?

**Note:** The Procedural Safeguard Statement is not used for new appointments. However, candidates for appointment, once appointed, do have the right to inspect non-confidential documents in their files and to have a redacted copy of the confidential academic review records contained in the personnel review file received pursuant

to APM 220-80-i.

**Note:** When putting forward a case for a non-resident alien (i.e. not currently a US Citizen or a Permanent Resident), the department is strongly encouraged to consult with the Office of International Students and Scholars at the time the offer is being considered to be assured that labor certificate processing deadlines are met.

**DEPARTMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR ACADEMIC ADVANCEMENT**

(Revised 04/13/15)

This checklist is for the use of the Department Chair, and should not be submitted with the case.

The Department Chair has the responsibility to see that each of the following steps is completed at the appropriate time during any personnel review. **A copy of this checklist must be given to the candidate at the beginning of his or her review.**

All documents included in the case must be relevant to the action under consideration (APM 200-30) and must be in compliance with University and Campus policy and practice relating to confidentiality.

**I. Notifying The Candidate**

Note: These steps should be taken as soon as possible after receipt of the eligibility list in which the candidate's name first appears.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1) **Inform the candidate of his or her eligibility for advancement or appraisal.**
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2) **Inform the candidate of the UC criteria for advancement** as set forth in Section 210-1d and 220 of the APM. Include a full clarification of the concrete nature of materials relevant to those criteria, as commonly used in the candidate's department.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3) **Inform the candidate of the UC review process** as set forth in APM 210-1d and 220. Include in your description both the role and character of higher reviewing agencies and the department's own customary modes of proceeding. Provide candidate with a copy of the Procedural Safeguard Statement.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4) **Inform the candidate of UC policy regarding academic personnel records** as set forth in APM 160.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5) **Inform the candidate of any other issues relevant to his/her personnel case.** Be sure to provide an opportunity for the candidate to ask questions regarding any aspect of the review procedures and of his/her case in particular.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6) **Inform the candidate of the due date** for all pertinent information and material relevant to the criteria for advancement. Be sure to advise the candidate of the consequences of late submission of materials.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7) **Inform the candidate if letters of evaluation are to be sought in his/her case and provide an opportunity for the candidate a) to suggest names of persons who might be solicited for such letters and b) to indicate in writing the names of persons who, for reasons set forth by the candidate (which may include personal reasons), might not be objective in their evaluation.** Also inform the candidate that the names of scholars writing outside letters who were originally suggested by the candidate, together with any requests not to select a potential evaluator, will be made part of the review file, and that a reasonable request for exclusion of outside evaluators will in no way jeopardize the candidate's case. The candidate should also understand that though such requests are made and honored regularly, there may be occasions when proper evaluation requires that they not be honored. Finally, the candidate should know that both the evaluator's academic stature and the extent, if any, of his/her association with the candidate (personal or professional) will affect how the evaluation is weighted.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8) **In compiling the list of outside reviewers,** include a "reasonable number" (APM 220-80c) of the candidate's nominees, together with a "reasonable number" of letters from scholars who are not nominated by the candidate and who have not been closely associated with him/her either as colleagues, friends, or collaborators in research. At UCSB, a "reasonable number" is interpreted to mean "half of the letters". There should be adequate representation among the evaluators of University of California faculty members.

## II. Developing The Recommendation

- \_\_\_\_\_ 9) **Solicit confidential extramural letters of evaluation** in cases of promotion to tenure, promotion to professor, merit from Professor V to VI, merit from Professor IX to Above Scale, advancement to Supervisor V and advancement to Lecturer SOE or Sr. Lecturer SOE.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10) **Include with the case a sample copy of the letter used to solicit extramural letters** , a list of the materials sent to the letter writers, and a copy of all items that were sent to the referees (e.g., C.V., bibliography, reprints, manuscripts, and so forth) if they are not already included with the case of one-of-a-kind materials.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11) **Assemble all pertinent information** (publications, teaching evaluations, solicited letters, etc.) in accordance with instructions set forth in the Red Binder sections related to specific actions. Be sure to include the total record of accomplishments appropriate to the review period.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12) **Provide the candidate with an opportunity to inspect all non-confidential documents included in the review file.** Candidates should be told that they have access to non-confidential material.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13) **Provide the candidate with the opportunity to request a redacted copy of all confidential letters and documents included in the file without revealing the identity of the sources.** One set of the redacted material must also be included in the file.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14) **Provide the candidate with an opportunity to include a written statement responding to or commenting upon material in the file.** This should be done in sufficient time to allow the candidate's response to be taken into account in the departmental letter.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 15) **Inform the candidate that, if at any later point new information is added to the file, he/she will be informed and given an opportunity to comment.**
- \_\_\_\_\_ 16) If an ad hoc review committee will be employed, explain the role and selection of this committee and the candidate's three options (Red Binder I-60).
- \_\_\_\_\_ 17) **Inform the candidate of his/her right to request a redaction of the ad hoc committee's letter and a copy of other reviewing agencies' reports** from the office of Academic Personnel at the conclusion of the review process.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 18) **Consult colleagues in accordance with departmental practice and the rules of voting rights and eligibility established in By-Law 55.**  
(<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/manual/blpart1.html#b155>)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 19) **Write a letter of recommendation** in accordance with APM 220-80-e. Note in particular the requirement to present both supporting and opposing views. Be sure the letter is dated and signed.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 20) **Make the letter available for inspection by all departmental members eligible to vote on the case** or by a departmental committee or group established in accordance with APM 220-80-e. At this point any eligible faculty member who voted with the minority may include a "minority opinion" letter if they feel that the Departmental letter does not adequately address the opinion of the minority vote. A minority opinion letter must be submitted by the end of the inspection period to assure its consideration in the review process. All eligible faculty must be provided full access to this document. Any unresolved issues between the minority and majority opinions should be addressed in a Chair's confidential letter (Red Binder I-35)

## III. Forwarding The Case

NOTE: These steps should be taken after the Departmental review of the case.



- \_\_\_\_\_ 21) **Inform the candidate orally or, if requested, in writing of the departmental recommendation, the departmental vote, and of the substance of the evaluations under each of the applicable review criteria.** Bear in mind that it is especially helpful for junior faculty to understand concerns regarding some particular aspect of their performance even if there was a strong vote of approval
- \_\_\_\_\_ 22) **Inform the candidate of his/her right to request a copy of the letter setting forth the departmental recommendation, including any minority opinions.** Identities of persons who were the sources of confidential documents are not to be disclosed and minority opinion letters should be provided in redacted format.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 23) **Inform the candidate of his/her right to make written comments, within 5 working days,** to the Chair or directly to the Dean regarding the departmental recommendation. A copy of these comments will be included in the file. If the comments are directed to the Chair, they will be made available for review by the voting faculty. Any unresolved issues between the candidate and the department evaluation should be addressed in a Chair's confidential letter (Red Binder I-35). If the comments are directed to the Dean, they will be included in the file at the time of the Dean's review and will be made available to other reviewing agencies but not to the department.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 24) **Check that the case, as packaged, is complete and properly formatted** (Red Binder I-31 for **routine Dean's Authority** merits, Red Binder I-35 for **non-routine Expanded Review** advancements).
- \_\_\_\_\_ 25) **Have the candidate fill out and sign the Procedural Safeguard Statement on-line through the case processing system AP Folio.** Forward the case to the appropriate Dean's office.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 26) For promotions to tenure, a Chair's Recommendation for Department Representative memo suggesting up to three faculty members who are eligible to serve as departmental representative. The nominated faculty should: (1) have participated in the departmental review and voted on the case; (2) have familiarity with the research area of the candidate; and (3) be in residence during the quarter the case is likely to be considered. This memo is to be forwarded directly to the Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Personnel and marked "Confidential." See Red Binder I-60 for sample memo format.

**PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARD STATEMENT  
INSTRUCTIONS TO THE CHAIR**

(Revised 02/10/15)

The Procedural Safeguard Statement has been designed to follow the actual steps taken when a candidate is being considered for a personnel action. It is important for the Department Chairperson, as well as for the candidate, to note how each step leads to the forwarding of a recommendation to the administration. For example, the difference between Number 9 and Number 12 on the Safeguard Statement is a matter of timing. Number 9 occurs before the department meets and votes on the case. Therefore, written comments by the candidate under Number 9 would refer to materials on which the case is based and would be routinely considered by the department before the vote is taken. Written comments submitted by the candidate under Number 12 would refer to the recommendation after the department review and could be supplied to the Chair or sent directly to the Dean, who normally will ask the Department for comment.

It is advisable for the Chair to provide a copy of the Procedural Safeguard Statement to a faculty member prior to the initiation of a personnel review, so that the faculty member is apprised of the steps and safeguards built into the process. The sample Safeguard Statement (Red Binder I-26) may be used for this purpose. The candidate should also be informed that signing the Safeguard Statement does not imply concurrence with the departmental recommendation. It only provides a record of the procedures that were followed in the review of the case. There is a place for candidates to record any exceptions or comments.

For individuals holding joint appointments, a separate Safeguard must be completed for each department. In the rare case that a department, based on their stated voting procedures, defers to the majority percentage department, a Safeguard Statement will be required for the majority percentage department.

The Procedural Safeguard Statement is to be completed by the faculty member on-line, via the Academic Personnel web site via AP Folio and, must be forwarded as part of the departmental personnel case per Section 220-80-c of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM). If in the case of a mandatory review it is impossible to obtain this document, the chairperson should explain the situation and indicate in what manner he/she has attempted to meet the requirements outlined in the form.

In addition, if any of the following documents have been supplied to the candidate or by the candidate, they must be included in the personnel case when forwarded to the administration:

1. Redaction of confidential documents in the file (7A).
2. Candidate's written statement commenting on material in the file (9).
3. Candidate's written comments regarding the departmental recommendation (12).

**LADDER RANK FACULTY ADVANCEMENT: PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARD STATEMENT**

Informational only: all safeguards are to be completed **on-line via AP Folio**

(Revised **10/1004/15**)

**PRIOR TO DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW:**

1. I was informed that I was to be reviewed for this personnel action and of the process as described in APM 160, 210-1 and 220, and was informed of relevant deadlines for submission of materials.
2. I had the opportunity to ask questions, supply information and evidence, and add material to my file in preparation for the review.
3. I was informed whether or not letters of evaluation were to be sought as part of this personnel action.
4. If letters were sought (e.g., for promotion, review for advancement to Professor VI or Professor Above Scale)
  - A. I had an opportunity to suggest names of evaluators; and
  - B. I had the opportunity to submit, in writing, names of persons who, for reasons set forth by me, might not provide objective evaluations.
5. If an Academic Senate ad hoc committee is to be appointed, I was advised of my right to utilize any of the three options listed in Red Binder I-60. NOTE: If these options are utilized, they must be put in writing by the candidate and forwarded directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel.
6. I was informed whether or not there were confidential documents (i.e. external letters, minority opinion reports) in my department review file and of my right to review a summary of any such documents.  
 Yes, there are confidential documents in my file (proceed to #7)  
 No, there are not any confidential documents in my file (proceed to #8)
7. If yes to #6, I was provided the contents of the confidential documents (i.e. external letters, minority opinion reports) in my file by means of:  
 A. Redacted copy                       C. Chose not to receive contents  
 B. Oral Summary
8. I had the opportunity to inspect all non-confidential documents in the review file.
9. I had the opportunity to provide a written statement in response to or comment upon all materials in the file.

**FOLLOWING THE DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS:**

10. I was informed of the departmental recommendation and the substance of the evaluation under each of the applicable review criteria.

A. Copy of Departmental Recommendation

B. Oral Summary

C. Chose not to be informed

11. I was informed whether or not the department vote for the recommendation was unanimous or by a strong or a narrow majority.
12. I was informed of my right to make written comments, within 5 working days, to the Chair (or appropriate person) regarding the departmental recommendation. I was aware that these comments would be included in the file and made available to other voting faculty in the department.
13. I was informed of my right to make written comments regarding the departmental recommendation to the Dean and that these comments would be included in the file and available to other reviewing agencies outside of the Department.

**I HAVE SUBMITTED THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL MATERIALS:**

Suggested names of evaluators (in accordance with 4A above).

Names of persons who might not provide objective evaluations (in accordance with 4B above).

A written request concerning formation of a Senate ad hoc committee to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel (in accordance with 5 above).

A written statement in response to materials in the file (in accordance with 9 above).

A written statement about the departmental recommendation to the chair (in accordance with 12 above).

A written statement about the recommendation to the dean in accordance with 13 above.

**REVIEWING AGENCY REPORTS**

I request that copies of reviewing agency reports (Dean, CAP, ad hoc committee and any correspondence between them) be provided to me after the conclusion of my review.

I do not wish to receive copies of reviewing agency reports (Dean, CAP, ad hoc committee and any correspondence between them) at the conclusion of my review, but understand that I may request them at any time in the future.

SIGNED \_\_\_\_\_ DATED \_\_\_\_\_

PRINT NAME \_\_\_\_\_ DEPARTMENT \_\_\_\_\_

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF THE

BIO-BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Revised 09/13/04/15)

It is the responsibility of each faculty member *and academic employees in research titles* to maintain an up to date bio-bibliography (bio-bib). *For Senate faculty* the bio-bib should contain information ending at the campus cut-off date of September 15, or the date established by the candidate's department if an earlier date has been established. Information that falls beyond that date will not be considered in the review. Departments may require that the bio-bib be updated and submitted on an annual basis to assist the chair in the annual review of all *Senate* faculty (APM 220-80 b.)

*For appointees in academic research titles, the bio-bib should contain information ending at the date established by the candidate's department.*

Bio-bibs may be maintained in any format (word document, excel document, etc) but must conform the format described below. A bio-bib template is available via the Forms section of the Academic Personnel web site.

Short Curriculum Vitae

The first page of the bio-bib should contain an abbreviated curriculum vitae. The following categories should be included: Education, Area(s) of Specialization, Professional Experience, and Professional Organizations.

Research

The bio-bib must contain a comprehensive and complete itemized list of publications (or other creative activity) for the entire career. Items should be identified as published, in press, submitted, and in progress according to the following format:

[A] Published work; work that has appeared in final, published format

[B] Work in press; work that has been formally accepted, completed, and is in the process of being published. In-Press work is counted toward advancement and evidence should be supplied documenting the In Press status

[C] Work submitted; work that has been submitted but not yet accepted. Such work is required to be included in the case. It is not usually counted for the advancement, but it is used as evidence of continuing scholarly productivity.

[D] Work in progress; work that has not been completed and is available for review. Such work is not counted for the advancement, but it can be used as evidence of continuing research activity. Departmental practice will dictate if work in progress is included in the case

A line should be drawn separating all new items from ones which in one form or another were part of the review file underlying the last successful advancement and should be clearly identified with an explicit indication of their subsequent change in status using the following notation system:

\* for items previously listed as Work In Press

\*\* for items previously listed as Work Submitted

\*\*\*for items previously listed as Work In Progress

Footnotes should indicate the number of the publication from the prior review (i.e. previously item B-1). If a change in title has occurred since the last bio-bib, the footnote should also indicate the previous title.

If publications are being submitted via an electronic link, the link must be listed at the end of the "Title and Author" information. The link must go directly to the specific item. Electronic links may only be used for documents that are considered to be the final version. In general, work in press and published may be

provided electronically while work submitted or in process should be submitted in hard copy format. All links should be verified prior to submission of the case.

If the previous action resulted in an increase in off-scale supplement only or a no-change decision, two sets of lines may be used to differentiate between what was included in the previous case vs. what took place during the review period. The departmental letter should explain the use of two sets of lines.

#### Teaching *(For Senate Faculty only)*

The bio-bib must contain an itemized, chronological (by quarter) list of workload since the last successful review. This list should include: quarter and academic year, course number, course title, course format, unit value, enrollment, share of teaching assignment, and indicate if evaluations are available. If the Budget and Planning print out is used information concerning the availability of evaluations must be added. A line may be drawn or footnotes added to indicate the transition from hard-copy to on-line course evaluations.

The bio-bib should also contain a statement of normal teaching workload for the department overall (e.g., 2-2-1) and a brief explanation of any deviations from this workload (e.g., sabbatical, administrative assignment).

A listing of graduate committee (MA and Ph.D.) service and related information since the last successful review must also be included. It should be clearly stated if service was as Chair or a member of the committee. The bio-bib should also indicate if the degree was completed during the current review period.

If a cumulative list is maintained for any of the teaching categories, a line must be drawn to show which activity is new since the last review.

#### Professional Activity

The bio-bib must contain an itemized list of professional activities in appropriate categories (e.g., seminars, workshops, book reviews, professional memberships, extramural grants, refereeing for journals, consulting, and so forth) that have occurred since the last successful review. If a cumulative list is maintained, a line must be drawn to show which activity is new since the last review.

#### University and Public Service

The bio-bib must include an itemized list of various activities by categories or level (e.g., department, Senate, administration, community, governmental, and so forth) that have occurred since the last successful review. If a cumulative list is maintained, a line must be drawn to show which activity is new since the last review.

**CONFLICT OF COMMITMENT AND OUTSIDE PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES**(Revised ~~11/14~~ 04/15)**General information**

APM 025 provides specific guidelines concerning potential conflicts of commitment that may arise when faculty participate in outside professional activity, both compensated and uncompensated. While there is great value in activities outside the University that advance and communicate knowledge, it is important that these activities not conflict with the faculty member's primary responsibility to the University.

Faculty members holding the following titles at 50% time or more are subject to APM 025 and are required to submit an annual report:

- Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor
- The above titles when used with an Acting or Adjunct pre-fix
- Lecturer PSOE, Lecturer SOE, Senior Lecturer SOE

In addition, administrative officers who hold appointments in any of the above titles are subject to APM-025, regardless of the current percent of time in the academic appointment.

A full-time faculty member on a nine-month appointment **normally** may not engage in compensated outside professional activity for more than 39 days during the academic year. ~~Outside employment in excess of this time limit may be approved when in the Chancellor's (or Chancellor's designee's) opinion the activity benefits the University.~~ The 39 day limitation does not apply during periods of leave without pay, however reporting of category I and II activity is still required. Faculty receiving compensation from the University during the summer period (i.e. Summer Session teaching or research compensation) may engage in a maximum of one day per week of outside professional activity.

**Categories Of Outside Professional Activity**

Three categories of compensated outside activity have been defined, in terms of the extent to which they may raise a conflict of commitment. See APM-025 for a complete explanation of activity

Category I activities are likely on their face to raise issues of conflict of commitment. Such activities are **not allowed without prior approval** from the Chancellor or designee, and when approved are subject to the 39-day limit, and must be reported on an annual basis. Prior approval is required even if the activity will take place during a period of leave without pay. Category I activities include:

- Assuming an executive or managerial position in a for-profit or not-for-profit business.
- Assuming a founding or a co-founding role of a company.
- Administering a grant outside the University that would ordinarily be conducted under the auspices of the University.
- Establishing a relationship as a salaried employee outside the University, including teaching or research at another institution.
- Other compensated professional activity that common sense and good judgment would indicate are likely to raise issues of conflict of commitment.

Category II activities are unlikely to raise issues of conflict of commitment. They are allowed without prior approval up to the 39-day limit and must be reported on an annual basis. Such activities include:

- Teaching for University Extension
- Testifying as an expert in administrative, legislative, or judicial hearings;
- Providing consulting services or engaging in professional practice as an individual, single- member professional corporation or sole proprietorship.

- Serving on the board of directors of an outside entity
- Providing workshops for industry
- Other compensated outside professional activity not mentioned in Category I or III that common sense and good judgment indicate are not likely to raise issues of conflict of commitment.

Category III activities are accepted as part of a faculty member's scholarly and creative work. Even if compensated they are allowed, and do not count towards the 39-day limit. Category III activities include:

- Serving on a committee, panel, or commission established by a governmental agency;
- Acting as a reviewer or editor for journal or book manuscripts.
- Serving as a committee member or an officer of a professional or scholarly society, or providing professional services to such societies.
- Participating in or accepting a commission for an artistic performance or event not sponsored by the University.
- Presenting an invited lecture or paper at a meeting.
- Developing scholarly communications, even when such activities result in financial gain.
- Accepting honoraria (other than those received for Category II activities) and prizes.

### **Prior approval requirements**

Request for approval to: (1) engage in Category I activities, (2) exceed the 39 day limit, or (3) involve a graduate student in outside professional activity must be submitted to the Department Chair by **June 30** for the upcoming academic year. Prior approval requests are submitted using the Prior Approval For Compensated Outside Activities form, (APM-025, appendix B) via the Academic Personnel web site. The report request form is accessed by signing on to the Academic Personnel web site *AP Folio*, selecting the Outside Professional Activities link, and then the Prior Approval tab. The Department Chair will review the request within the context of departmental teaching demands, sabbatical leaves, other leaves, etc., and endorse or deny each request. The request will then be forwarded to the appropriate Dean for approval. If the faculty member, Department Chair and Dean agree, the Dean's decision will be final. In cases of disagreement, the Dean will consult with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel to reach a decision. A copy of the signed form is to be forwarded to the Academic Personnel office.

### **Category I exceptions**

Exceptions to engage in compensated teaching (with the exception of occasional lectures) or research at another institution while employed as a full time faculty member are not permitted without prior approval of the Executive Vice Chancellor. This restriction applies both during periods of paid service and periods of leave without pay.

### **Graduate Student involvement**

Before involving a student in an outside professional activity in which a faculty member has a financial interest, the faculty member must obtain prior written approval as described above. Involvement means any substantive activity, whether paid or unpaid. The campus Policy on Conflict of Interest Graduate Students Working with Industry (Red Binder VII-13) provides guidelines for such activity.

### **Reporting requirements**

All activity that is subject to the 39-day limit as described above must be reported on an annual basis. The annual report period is from July 1st to June 30th of each year. The Report of Category I and II Compensated Outside Professional Activities form (APM-025, appendix C) is to be used for reporting purposes. This report must be completed online annually by each faculty member by September 15 of the calendar year. Faculty are to sign on to the Academic Personnel web site *AP Folio* and use the Outside Activities Reporting link, My APM-025 tab to complete the report. The Chair must review and approve each report. The Dean will review and approve the report



of the Chair. ~~Reports are to be maintained in the department until the next personnel action at which time they will be included with the merit or promotion case.~~ The reports are considered to be non-confidential in nature and are subject to public inspection.

**ROUTINE DEAN'S AUTHORITY MERIT REVIEWS**

(Revised 04/13/15)

*Deans have the approval authority for the following actions.* ~~The following merit actions are considered "routine"~~ when the departmental recommendation is for an on-schedule (one-step) merit advance with no increase or decrease the off-scale salary supplement, regardless of the number of years since last review:

Assistant Professor Series:

Advances from Step II to III, and III to IV

Associate Professor Series:

Advances from Step I to II and II to III

Professor Series:

Advances from Step I to II, II to III, III to IV, IV to V, VI to VII, VII to VIII, VIII to IX

~~Deans have approval authority for routine merits.~~ Should a Dean ~~not approve a routine merit,~~ *disagree with the departmental recommendation* the case will be forwarded to Academic Personnel for review by the Committee on Academic Personnel and decision by the Associate Vice Chancellor.

The Office of Academic Personnel is the office of record for maintenance of personnel files and is responsible for the announcement of merit decisions.

At the end of each review cycle, the CAP will conduct a post-audit of each Dean's merit decisions. The CAP reserves the right to request to review any individual faculty case at a subsequent merit review point, regardless of the type of proposed action.

**DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR****ROUTINE DEAN'S AUTHORITY MERITS**

(Revised 09/13/04/15)

All personnel review cases are submitted via ~~the on-line case processing system.~~ **AP Folio**

**I. Departmental Letter**

The Chair should provide a **concise** description of the most significant developments since the last review in each of the review areas. Any criticisms or reservations should also be noted. The letter should be brief; normally one to two pages long. See Red Binder I-75 for further discussion of evaluation of four areas of review.

- Is the letter an accurate, concise and **analytical** representation of the case?
- Is the actual vote included (e.g. 10(yes)-0(no)-0(abstentions)-3(not voting))? Is there an indication of how many were eligible to vote?
- Are all four areas of review covered: teaching, research, professional activity and university and public service?
- Are contributions to diversity and equal opportunity given recognition?
- Is all relevant information from the Departmental letter accurately entered on the case up-load screen?

**II. Chair's Separate Confidential Letter**

See Red Binder I-35 for further information.

- Is the letter clearly marked "Chair's Separate Confidential"?

**III. Safeguard Statement.**

The candidate must sign an on-line safeguard for each departmental recommendation. If it is difficult or impossible to obtain the required signature, the Chairperson should explain the situation and indicate in what manner he/she has attempted to meet the requirements outlined in the form.

- Has the candidate signed the safeguard statements? The case may not be forwarded until the candidate has signed.
- If there are no confidential documents (e.g. external letters, minority opinion letter) the appropriate box under #6 should be checked.
- Are copies of everything the candidate has provided, or been provided, included with the case?

**IV. Bio-bibliographical Update**

- Is it in the proper format?
- Is the Research section a **cumulative** list of publications (or creative activities) with a line drawn separating all new items from where the bio-bib from the last review case had ended?
- Are the numbers the same as in the previously submitted bio-bib, and have items previously listed as "In Press", "Submitted" been accounted for?
- Are all items, including "In Press", "Submitted", and "In Progress" properly numbered?
- Are all teaching evaluations listed as available in the Teaching section of the bio-bib included with the case?
- If sections other than Research are cumulative, are lines drawn showing what is new since the last successful review?

**V. Evaluation of the teaching record**

At a minimum, two sources must be included in the case. ESCI summary sheets and scores for questions A and B are mandatory

- If the B&P printout is used, is it noted which classes have ESCI's?
- Does the file accurately indicate which course evaluations were done via hard-copy and which were done on-line?
- Has the second source of teaching been clearly identified on the coversheet?
- If a self-assessment of teaching was submitted, is it included with the case?

**VI. Self-assessment of other accomplishments and activity (optional).**

- If a self-assessment of activity and accomplishments other than teaching (V. above) was submitted, is it included in the case? Self-statements may address research, professional activity, service, or contributions to diversity and equal opportunity.

VII. **Sabbatical leave reports.**

- If any sabbatical leaves were taken during the review period are copies of the reports included with the case?

VIII. **Outside Activity Reports (APM 025 Appendix C)**

- Has a report been completed for each academic year within the current review period included?  
 Is the form approved by the Department Chair(s)?

IX. **Copies of publications.**

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to maintain copies of published research or other creative work and reviews. One set of publications for the review period should be forwarded with the case. Publications submitted with the case, along with teaching evaluations and other single copy items, will be returned to the department upon completion of the review.

- Have all items included in Part I of the bio-bib for the current review period been submitted, including In Press and Submitted items?  
 Do all of the titles on the actual publications match those listed on the bio-bib?  
 If publications are being included via a link in the bio-bib, has the link been verified?  
 If any publications are missing from the file, is a note included noting which are missing and explaining why?

**NON-ROUTINE-EXPANDED REVIEWS**

(Revised 02/10/15)

The following actions ~~are considered non-routine~~ *require expanded review beyond the Dean:*

Formal Appraisal

Terminal Appointments

Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to Professor

Merit to a special step

Merit to Professor Step VI

Merit to or within Professor Above Scale

All accelerated actions (including an increase in the off-scale supplement)

Reduction in off-scale supplement

All ~~non-routine~~ *Expanded Review* cases will be subject to review by the Committee on Academic Personnel. The Chancellor will have final approval authority for all promotions, advancement to Professor VI and advancement to or within Above Scale. The Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel will have final approval authority for all other ~~non-routine~~ *Expanded Review* cases.

Senate members serving on the Committee on Academic Personnel will have ~~non-routine personnel~~ *Expanded Review* actions reviewed by a shadow CAP instead of the current membership of CAP.

**DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR****NON-ROUTINE EXPANDED REVIEW CASES**

(Revised 11/14/04/15)

All personnel review cases are submitted via ~~the on-line case processing system.~~ **AP Folio**

**I. Departmental letter of recommendation**

Accurate and analytical letters of recommendation from the department are essential in the review process. See Red Binder I-35 for further detail of content of departmental recommendations

- Is the letter an accurate, extensive, and **analytical** representation of the case?
- Is the actual vote included (e.g. 10(yes)-0(no)-0(abstentions)-3(not voting))? Is there an indication of how many were eligible to vote?
- If there is a recommendation for an acceleration, are the reasons for the acceleration specifically stated?
- In the case of a negative or mixed departmental recommendation, is the basis of the recommendation clearly documented?
- If the case contains extramural letters, are letter writers identified **only** by coded list, with no identifying statements?
- If the case is for a career review, does the letter provide an overview of the career accomplishments as well as analysis of the achievements within the most recent review period?
- Are all four areas of review covered: teaching, research, professional activity and university and public service?
- Are contributions to diversity and equal opportunity given recognition?
- Is all relevant information from the Departmental letter accurately entered on the case up-load screen?

**II. Chair's Separate Confidential Letter**

See Red Binder I-35 for further information.

- Is the letter clearly marked "Chair's Separate Confidential"?

**III. Safeguard Statement.**

The candidate must sign an on-line safeguard for each departmental recommendation. If it is difficult or impossible to obtain the required signature, the Chairperson should explain the situation and indicate in what manner he/she has attempted to meet the requirements outlined in the form.

- Has the candidate signed the safeguard statements? The case may not be forwarded until the candidate has signed.
- If there are no confidential documents (e.g. external letters, minority opinion report) the appropriate box under #6 should be checked.
- Are copies of everything the candidate has provided, or been provided, included with the case (e.g. redacted letters, list of potential evaluators)?

**IV. Bio-bibliographical Update**

- Is it in the proper format?
- Is the Research section a **cumulative** list of publications (or creative activities) with a line drawn separating all new items from where the bio-bib from the last review case had ended?
- Are the numbers the same as in the previously submitted bio-bib, and have items previously listed as "In Press", "Submitted" been accounted for?
- Are all items, including "In Press", "Submitted", and "In Progress" properly numbered?
- Are all teaching evaluations listed as available in the Teaching section of the bio-bib included with the case?
- If sections other than Research are cumulative, are lines drawn showing what is new since the last successful review?

**V. Extramural letters of evaluation** and list of evaluators in cases where extramural letters are required; promotion, merit to Professor Step VI, merit to Professor Above Scale. (Red Binder I-49)**Extramural Letters**

- Are there at least 6 letters, including letters from UC or UC familiar referees?
- Are at least half of the letters from references chosen by the Chair/Dept independent of the candidate?
- Have all letters been coded? Are the codes also on the copies and the redacted versions?

- If the letters were sent via email, is a copy of the email and any attachment included?
- If redacted copies of the letters were provided to the candidate, is a copy included (one copy only), and did he/she check box 7A on the Procedural Safeguards Statement?

**Sample Solicitation Letter(s) and/or Thank you letter(s) for unsolicited letters**

- Was the proper wording used in the letter (RB I-49 to I-50)?
- Is a list of all informational items sent to referees (e.g. CV, bio-bib, publications sent, etc, per RB I-46-VI) included? Is a copy of each item included as either part of the case or a one-of-a-kind item?
- If different versions of the letters or materials went out, is a sample of each included?

**List of Referees, including brief Biography and indicating who selected referees**

- Do the codes on the letters match the codes on the list and the codes used in the departmental letter?
- Does the list clearly indicate if the referees were candidate, department or jointly selected?
- Are the names of everyone who was asked to write included? For those who did not respond is a reason for no response listed?

**VI. Evaluation of the teaching record.**

At a minimum, two sources must be included in the case. ESCI summary sheets and scores for questions A and B are mandatory

- If the B&P printout is used, is it noted which classes have ESCI's?
- Does the file accurately indicate which course evaluations were done via hard-copy and which were done on-line?
- Has the second source of teaching been clearly identified on the coversheet?
- If a self-assessment of teaching was submitted, is it included with the case?

**VII. Self-assessment of other accomplishments and activity (optional).**

- If a self-assessment of activity and accomplishments other than teaching (VI. above) was submitted, is it included in the case? Self-statements may address research, professional activity, service, or contributions to diversity and equal opportunity.

**VIII. Sabbatical leave reports.**

- If any sabbatical leaves were taken during the review period are copies of the reports included with the case?

**IX. Outside Activity Reports (APM 025 Appendix C)**

- Has a report been completed for each academic year within the current review period included?
- Is the form approved by the Department Chair(s)?

**X. Copies of publications.**

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to maintain copies of published research or other creative work and reviews. One set of publications for the review period should be forwarded with the case. Publications submitted with the case, along with teaching evaluations and other single copy items, will be returned to the department upon completion of the review.

- Have all items included in Part I of the bio-bib for the current review period been submitted, including In Press and Submitted items?
- Do all of the titles on the actual publications match those listed on the bio-bib?
- For tenure cases, have you included all publications?
- If publications are being included via a link in the bio-bib, has the link been verified?
- If any publications are missing from the file, is a note included noting which are missing and explaining why?
- For other career reviews (promotion to Professor, to Step VI, to Above Scale), are all publications since last review, and all or a representative sample of publications from the prior record included?

**HOW TO WRITE A DEPARTMENTAL LETTER****Appointments and Advancements**

(Revised 05/14/04/15)

Accurate and analytical letters of recommendation from the department are essential in the review process. The candidate and his/her department must make the case; other reviewing agencies cannot do so. The analysis should be extensive, and for promotions, merits to Professor *step* VI and to Above Scale the analysis should cover the cumulative record of the candidate. In cases where acceleration is recommended, explicit justification must be given for the recommendation. In any case, the letter should clarify which of the candidate's accomplishments precede the last review and which follow.

Personnel reviews that have been deferred due to a family accommodation (i.e. childbearing or parental leave, extension of the tenure clock) should be evaluated without prejudice as if the work were done in the normal period of service. The departmental letter should clearly state that the standard expectations are being applied.

*The departmental letter should provide a summary of both the positive and negative aspects of the case. Direct quotes from faculty ballots or from the departmental discussion should be avoided.* The analysis overall should strive for balance. It should identify criticisms and reservations, especially when there is significant opposition to the recommendation. It should, if indicated, include an assessment of the significance of particular extramural views or judgments. In the case of a negative departmental recommendation, the basis of the recommendation should be documented as well.

Individuals who have provided confidential letters of evaluation should not be identified, except by means of a coded list (e.g., "Reviewer A"). Note that in career reviews (promotions and advancement to Professor *step* VI or Above Scale), the department letter should provide an overview of career accomplishment as well as the achievements of the most recent review period.

The letter should provide a comprehensive assessment of the candidate's qualifications together with detailed evidence to support this evaluation. The letter should be a complete professional evaluation (accurate and analytic), including both supportive and contrary evidence. At the same time the letter should be succinct. Extended quotations from supporting documents (e.g. external letters, bio-bib) and rhetorical statements are to be avoided, since overly long letters are a burden to all reviewing agencies. The Chair should make clear which portions of his/her letter refer to the candidate's past accomplishments and which refer to accomplishments falling within the current **review period**.

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 record. *Letters for appointees in other academic series (i.e. Researcher, Academic Coordinator, etc.) should cover the review areas appropriate to that series.*

Suggested format for letters of recommendation

1. Brief outline of the mechanisms used for soliciting information and evaluating the academic performance of colleagues in cases of merits, promotions, and so forth (e.g., departmental use of ad hoc committees, teaching evaluation committees, departmental meetings to assess candidates, etc.). Explanation of any apparent anomalies in the voting, e.g., a disproportionately small number of votes relative to departmental size, or excessive abstentions should also be explained.
2. The basis for the departmental recommendation, including analytical evaluation of the performance in each of the four review areas.

A) Research

Present a full evaluation of candidate's research record, indicating the significance of the research accomplishments.



The departmental letter should present the publication record for the current review period according to the following format: [A] Published work; [B] Work in press; [C] Work submitted.

In certain fields such as art, architecture, dance, music, literature, and drama, distinguished creativity should receive consideration equivalent to that accorded to distinction attained in research. In evaluating artistic creativity, an attempt should be made to define the candidate's merit in the light of such criteria as originality, scope, richness, and depth of creative expression. An important element of distinction is the extent of regional, national, or international recognition.

The departmental letter must assess the degree and quality of the candidate's role in any collaborative work, or explain why such assessment is impracticable.

#### B) Teaching

The department letter should assess the overall contributions of the candidate to the departmental curriculum on lower-division, upper-division, and graduate instruction. The department assessment might also evaluate the candidate's contribution to academic advising, thesis and dissertation directorship, committee work relating to the curriculum, "mentoring" colleagues, or frequency of invited lectures given by the candidate.

The letter should include an evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance, including an analytical evaluation of the ESCI scores and indicating the significance of the record. The letter should clearly indicate which courses were evaluated on-line and should take into consideration the possible impact of the change in methodology from paper to on-line evaluation. The analysis should include information on the number of graduate committees (MA and Ph.D. as reflected in the bio-bibliography).

#### C. Professional Activity

The departmental letter should include a full analysis of the candidate's performance, indicating the most prominent features of the record. The significance of honors, awards and extramural grants should be described.

#### D. University and Public Service

The letter should include a full analysis of candidate's involvement, indicating the significance of the record and the quality of the service.

### 3. Summary

This section is optional, and may be used to summarize the most significant accomplishment of the review period, and to provide an explicit justification for acceleration or other special action.

In cases of appraisal, departments may make one of the following three recommendations: a) Continued Candidacy: indicating an assessment that the candidate is likely to eventually qualify for promotion to tenure rank. B) Continued Candidacy with Reservations: indicating an assessment that there is an identified weakness in the record that appears to require correction in order for the individual to eventually qualify for promotion to tenure rank. C) Terminal appointment. In addition, the letter must also include an evaluation of the performance as progress toward eventual tenure.

#### Chair's Separate Confidential Letter

While this option is not often used, the Chair may, in accordance with APM 220-80e, submit a separate letter indicating his/her own analysis and recommendation. This letter is not made available to other members of the faculty in the department. It should be noted that a Chair's separate letter is designed to be evaluative of the evidence available to the department; new evidence can be considered on the rare occasions when it could not be appropriately shared with the department. A Chair's confidential letter may also be used to address unresolved issues between majority and minority opinions related to a case, or to address a candidate's comments in response to the departmental review. When a Chair submits a confidential "Chair's separate letter", it should be clearly identified as such, and will become part of the personnel review file. The status of such a letter is considered to be non-departmental (as is a letter from a

dean). It is not submitted to an ad hoc review committee when one is convened. As a "confidential academic review record" (as defined in APM 160-20-b), a Chair's letter will be made available to the candidate upon request along with other review agency reports at the end of the review process.

I-38  
**FORMAL APPRAISAL**  
(Revised 05/07/15)

Formal appraisals are made "in order to arrive at preliminary assessments of the prospects of candidates for eventual promotion to tenure rank as well as to identify appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence desired for continued membership in the faculty" (APM 220-83).

A formal appraisal of an Assistant Professor shall normally be made during the fourth year of service in that title, or in combination with this and other titles counted under the Eight Year Rule, as defined in APM 133-0 a and APM 133-0 b. "Individuals appointed at the higher steps of the Assistant Professor rank may be promoted after less than four years of service, in which case an appraisal would not occur". (APM 220-83 a).

Departments may make one of the following three recommendations in an appraisal case:

- a. Continued Candidacy: indicating an assessment that the candidate is likely to eventually qualify for promotion to tenure rank.
- b. Continued Candidacy with Reservations: indicating an assessment that there is an identified weakness in the record that appears to require correction in order for the individual to eventually qualify for promotion to tenure rank.
- c. Terminal appointment.

The departmental vote should be taken providing the above three options rather than a yes-no vote on any one of the possible outcomes.

The departmental letter of recommendation should contain a description and analysis of the candidate's total performance in each of the four areas of evaluation and an evaluation of the performance as progress toward eventual tenure. The procedures for ~~non-routine~~ *Expanded* Reviews (Red Binder I-35) should be followed in preparing the appraisal recommendation. An appraisal done in conjunction with a ~~routine~~ *Dean's Authority* merit increase is still considered a ~~non-routine~~ *Expanded Review* action.

Prior to a formal appraisal the Chair should inform the candidate of the criteria for advancement and the nature of the review process as set forth in APM 210-1 d and APM 220. This step would reasonably include a discussion of the relative value given to books versus journal articles, etc., the importance of research vis-à-vis teaching or University service, and the relative merits of long- and short-term research goals. The structure of the review process, including the responsibilities of various reviewing agencies, should also be explained fully. The candidate should be told that a formal appraisal can not result in a promise of eventual tenure. A final decision for Continued Candidacy, based as it is on an early sample of the record an Assistant Professor will present when later considered for tenure, is only a tentative prognosis. Promotion to tenure rank will require greater accomplishment in all review areas and receives a more extensive review that includes solicitation of extramural letters as well as the convening of an ad hoc review committee.

In all formal appraisal reviews the candidate will receive redacted copies of all reviewing agency reports. A decision for a Terminal Appointment shall be made only in accordance with APM 220-84.

**WORDING FOR SOLICITATION LETTERS BY PROPOSED ACTION**(Revised ~~04/13~~04/15)A. Appointment to Assistant Professor

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for an appointment as an Assistant Professor in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_. Appointment to Assistant Professor within the UC system is made in the expectation that the appointee will meet standards for a tenure appointment by the time a promotion decision is due. Recommendations for faculty appointments at this level must indicate clear evidence of potential excellence in both teaching and research.

B. Appointment or Promotion to Associate Professor

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for (an appointment as/ promotion to) Associate Professor in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_. Appointment (or promotion) to Associate Professor within the UC system includes tenure. The record of performance in (a) teaching, (b) research or other creative work, (c) professional activity, and (d) University and public service is carefully assessed. Reasonable flexibility is used in making personnel judgments, but flexibility does not entail the relaxation of high standards. Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment (promotion) to tenure positions. *[When appropriate in promotion cases add: UCSB encourages its faculty members to consider extensions of the pre-tenure period under circumstances that could interfere significantly with development of the qualifications necessary for tenure. Examples of such circumstances may include birth or adoption of a child, extended illness, or care of an ill family member. In such cases, University of California policy requires that the file be evaluated without prejudice as if the work were done in the normative period of service.]*

C. Appointment to Professor I-V

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for an appointment as Professor in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_. The ranks of Associate Professor and Professor within the UC system are tenured. The record of performance in (a) teaching, (b) research or other creative work, (c) professional activity, and (d) University and public service is carefully assessed. A candidate for the rank of Professor is expected to have an accomplished record of research that is judged to be excellent by his or her peers within the larger discipline or field. Reasonable flexibility is used in making personnel judgments, but flexibility does not entail the relaxation of high standards. Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment to a Professor rank position.

D. Promotion to Professor

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for promotion to Professor in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_. Individuals under consideration for this rank have attained tenure at the Associate Professor rank. The record of performance in (a) teaching, (b) research or other creative work, (c) professional activity, and (d) University and public service is carefully assessed. A candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor is expected to have an accomplished record of research that is judged to be excellent by his or her peers within the larger discipline or field. Reasonable flexibility is used in making personnel judgments, but flexibility does not entail the relaxation of high standards. Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for promotion to a Professor rank position.

E. Appointment at Professor VI- IX

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for an appointment as Professor [specify step] in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_. In the University of California, there are nine steps within the rank of Professor. The normal period of service is three years in each of the first five steps. Service at Professor, Step V, may be of indefinite duration. Appointment to Step VI, or higher, calls for evidence of highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellent University teaching. In addition, great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, in scholarly or creative achievement or in teaching is required for appointment at this step

#### F. Merit to Professor VI

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for advancement to Professor [specify step] in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_. In the University of California, there are nine steps within the rank of Professor. The normal period of service is three years in each of the first five steps. Service at Professor, Step V, may be of indefinite duration. Advancement to Step VI, or higher, involves an evaluation of the candidate's entire career and calls for evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in each of the following categories: (1) scholarship or creative achievement, (2) University teaching, and (3) University and public service and (4) professional activity. In addition, great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, in scholarly or creative achievement or in teaching is required for advancement to this step.

#### G. Appointment or Merit to Professor Above Scale

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for (an appointment as/ advancement to) Professor Above Scale in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_. In the University of California, there are nine steps within the rank of Professor (steps I-IX). Steps VI, VII, VIII, and IX are reserved for highly distinguished scholars. There is one further rank beyond Step IX; Above Scale. Above Scale is the highest rank attainable by a faculty member in the University of California system. (Appointment/advancement) to an Above Scale salary is reserved for the most highly distinguished faculty (1) whose work of sustained and continued excellence has attained national and international recognition, (2) whose teaching performance is excellent, (3) whose University and public service is highly meritorious and (4) whose professional activity is judged to be excellent.

#### H. Sample Thank You Letter for Unsolicited Comments

Use the sample letter, modifying as follows:

[Opening remarks: e.g., Thank you for sending us your letter of recommendation regarding \_\_\_\_\_ who is currently under consideration for an appointment in our department. I would like to inform you that

[Confidentiality paragraph]

I would appreciate if you would inform me whether, in light of our policies, we may proceed with the use of your letter in the personnel file or if you wish it to be destroyed. If you do not respond by \_\_\_\_\_ the materials will be maintained in our files.

#### I. Sample Letter for Restricted Materials (Non-UC Placement Files)

Use the sample letter, modifying as follows:

We have received your letter of evaluation regarding \_\_\_\_\_ who is currently under consideration for an appointment in our department. This letter was received as part of a placement file from \_\_\_\_\_ which states that this material (not be made part of the individual personnel file/be returned to you after we have completed our use of it/be destroyed after we have completed our use of it/etc.) I am writing to inform you that we are unable to accept and use the material you sent with the constraint on its use that you have stated, and to explain why we are unable to do so.

Under University of California policy, evaluatory material about an individual who is (appointed to an academic position/being considered for promotion) becomes part of the individual's permanent personnel record. (In addition, we are required under applicable legal standards to retain in our files for at least two years documentary material that we have considered on all applicants for a position that has been filled.)

[Confidentiality paragraph here]

I would appreciate if you would inform me whether, in light of our policies, we may proceed to use the material from the placement file, or whether you wish us to destroy the materials without using them in the file. If you do not respond by \_\_\_\_\_ the materials will be maintained in our files.

J. Appointment to Lecturer PSOE

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for an appointment as a Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_. Appointment to Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment within the UC System requires clear evidence of potential excellence in teaching and promise of future growth. Research and creative activity, although not required for Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment positions, is also reviewed when available

K. Appointment or promotion to Lecturer SOE

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for (an appointment as/ promotion to) Lecturer with Security of Employment in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_. Appointment (or promotion) to Lecturer with Security of Employment within the UC System requires clear evidence of teaching ability of exceptional quality, and promise of future growth. Research and creative activity, although not required for Lecturer with Security of Employment positions, is also reviewed when available.

L. Appointment or promotion to Sr. Lecturer SOE

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for (an appointment as/ promotion to) Sr. Lecturer with Security of Employment in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_. Appointment/promotion to Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment within the UC System requires teaching ability of exceptional quality and evidence demonstrated, in terms appropriate to this type of appointment, that the candidate has reached the level of professional achievement required of a professor. Research and creative activity, although not required for Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment positions, is also reviewed when available.

M. Continuing Lecturer Excellence review

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for review to be appointed as Lecturer, Continuing Appointment in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_. Appointment beyond six years as a Lecturer within the UC system includes the right to a Continuing Appointment so long as the University determines that the instructional need exists and that the instructional performance of the lecturer is excellent. The record of performance in teaching is carefully assessed and the standard of excellence is an indispensable qualification for appointment beyond six years.

N. Continuing Lecturer promotion to Sr. Lecturer

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for a promotion to Senior Lecturer, Continuing Appointment in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_. Appointment beyond six years as a Lecturer within the UC system includes the right to a Continuing Appointment so long as the University determines that the instructional need exists and that the instructional performance of the lecturer is excellent. The record of performance in teaching is carefully assessed and the standard of excellence is an indispensable qualification for appointment beyond six years. \_\_\_\_\_ completed a review for Lecturer, Continuing Appointment in \_\_\_\_ and is now being considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer, Continuing Appointment. Along with continued excellence in the area of teaching, promotion to the Senior rank requires service of exceptional value to the university. Service activities may include departmental or campus governance or activities that involve the candidate's professional expertise in a context outside the University's environment.

O. To Letter Writers from a Prior Review for Amendment or New Letter

Last year you were kind enough to provide an evaluation of Professor \_\_\_\_\_'s work in consideration of advancement to \_\_\_\_\_. We appreciate your time and attention in preparing that letter. For institutional reasons, [we did not pursue the case at that time] or [further consideration of this proposed action is currently taking place]. Your earlier evaluation is now part of the official record (copy enclosed). I write to inform you that you may, if you wish, at this time add further comments or an update to be included in the record. We certainly encourage you to do so. We are enclosing Professor \_\_\_\_\_'s current vita and publications to assist in your update.

**MATERIALS TO EXTERNAL REVIEWERS**

~~(04/09)~~ (Revised 04/15)

In cases where external letters of recommendation are required (~~promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Professor, advancement to Professor VI or Professor Above Scale~~) materials are traditionally provided to the external evaluators to assist them in their evaluation. While departments maintain a large amount of flexibility concerning what is sent, the following guidelines must be observed:

Reviewers must at a minimum be provided with a copy of the candidates CV or Bio-bibliography and access to copies of publications. While departments may choose to send copies of publications with the letter requesting evaluation, they may also ask that the reviewer inform them if they do not have access to the publications at which time they will be provided. Documents may be provided via on-line links or copied on to CD and sent to the evaluators if appropriate.

Departments may choose to send other materials such as a self statement covering one or more of the review areas to the external reviewers. However, if materials beyond the CV/bio-bib and publications are sent, the ~~same~~ procedures *must be consistent among all employees within any given series undergoing the same type of review. Requirements for letters in each series are included in the corresponding Red Binder sections.* ~~followed for all faculty in the department for similar reviews.~~ Departments should also use caution in providing documents beyond the usual items. Teaching evaluations, correspondence, and materials from past cases are examples of items that should not be sent to evaluators.

A list of the materials provided to the external reviewers must be submitted with the case

Any materials that were provided to the reviewers that are not otherwise included in the case must be submitted with the case.

I-56  
**LECTURER/ SENIOR LECTURER  
SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT**  
(Revised 04/13/15)

Security of Employment

An appointment with Security of Employment or Potential Security of Employment can only be granted in conjunction with the titles Lecturer or Senior Lecturer, Security of Employment is not a reward for length of service but is based upon appraised and recognized merit. It cannot be conferred on an appointee unless there is an appropriately budgeted provision for the appointment. An individual may first be appointed as Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment. This may be viewed as a "security of employment-track" position, in the same way that an Assistant Professor position is a "tenure-track" position. Appointments in this series must be at greater than 50%. Lecturers with Potential Security of Employment and Lecturers or Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment are members of the Academic Senate when appointed at 100%.

Campus Policy on Allocation of FTE

It is campus policy to consider the possible allocation of a provision for a Lecturer or Senior Lecturer SOE or Lecturer PSOE primarily in cases where the curricular duties are so specialized in character that it would be difficult to assure continuance of the presentation of the subject matter with any other type of appointment. A permanent allocation will be made only after an administrative review of a departmental request that must make a persuasive case that such an appointment fits this description and meets long range needs. This request and supporting justification should be submitted to the Executive Vice Chancellor via the Dean; it will also be reviewed by the Council on Planning and Budget. Lecturer and Senior Lecturer provisions will be rarely granted and only after the most rigorous scrutiny. The reason for this is that the university is primarily both a research and teaching institution. Provisions for permanent appointments or reappointments with the possibility of permanence should normally be used for the appointment of regular ladder faculty, that is to say, faculty who engage in both research (or other creative activity) and teaching.

**I. Qualifications**

At least one of the following qualifications is essential for appointment in the Lecturer SOE series:

1. Teaching ability in a subject matter so specialized in character that it would be difficult to assure continuance of the presentation of the subject matter with any other type of appointment, and promise of future growth.
2. Lecturer PSOE: clear evidence of potential excellence in teaching and promise of future growth.  
Lecturer SOE: teaching ability of exceptional quality, and promise of future growth.

Sr. Lecturer SOE: teaching ability of exceptional quality and evidence demonstrate, in terms appropriate to this type of appointment, that the candidate has reached the level of professional achievement required of a professor.

**II. Appointment Criteria**

Teaching:

Excellent teaching is an essential criterion for appointment. Clear documentation of ability and effectiveness in teaching is required. In judging the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching, such points as the following should be considered:

1. The candidate's command of his/her subject.
2. Continuous growth in his/her field.
3. Ability to organize material and to present it with force and logic.
4. Capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of his/her subject to other fields of knowledge.



5. Grasp of general objectives.
6. The spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize his/her learning and teaching.
7. Ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students to creative work.
8. Personal attributes as they affect his/her teaching and students.
9. The extent and skill of his/her participation in the general guidance and advising of students.

### Documentation

Documentation of teaching should include a description of the candidate's teaching load for the review period (at UCSB the normal teaching load for Lecturers in the SOE series is three courses per quarter or an appropriate equivalent). Documentation should also include an enumeration of the MA and Ph.D. candidates supervised or directed to completion of their degrees, and class-by-class summaries of all available teaching evaluations. Other significant types of evidence include:

1. Opinions of colleagues, particularly if based on class visits, observations of lectures, or knowledge or performance in courses prerequisite to those taught by the informant.
2. Opinions of current and former students.
3. Number and caliber of students the candidate has guided in their studies or attracted to the campus by his/her repute.
4. Information about the reception of lectures given by the candidate before professional or learned societies.
5. Information about time spent in teaching extra courses including University Extension, being available to and guiding students outside class, preparing for classes, undertaking courses he/she has not taught before, and improving instructional methods.

Student and peer evaluation of teaching is central to the review process, but evidence will also be sought of significant contributions to university level teaching through development of superior teaching materials, programs for teaching improvement, and other activities related to teaching.

### Professional Competence and Activity

Evidence includes such items as:

1. Election to significant offices of professional or learned societies.
2. Initiations to lecture, present papers, etc.
3. Awards, grants or honors bestowed by organizations or foundations.
4. Requests for consultative service.

### University and Public Service

Evidence should include a list of the candidate's services (with dates) in departmental, Academic Senate and administrative capacities (including committee service), and a list of formal service to the community or to public agencies. Evaluation of service in these areas is helpful. Recognition should be accorded the candidate for able administrative or faculty governance, and for able service to the community, state or nation when such service rests upon professional expertise. Contributions to student welfare should also be recognized.

### Letters of evaluation

At least six letters of evaluation should be submitted with the case for appointment or promotion with Security of Employment, at least half of which come from individuals selected by the Chair in consultation with the department but independent of the candidate. The letters may be of two types:

- 1) Letters from extramural referees with knowledge of the candidate's professional status and teaching record.
- 2) Letters from UCSB Senate faculty, external to the department, who have conducted a peer review of the candidate's teaching. Peer evaluation may include classroom visits or videotaping, commentary on course syllabi, reading assignments, and examinations. Qualitative descriptions and opinions are preferable to quantitative ratings or comparative rankings in peer evaluation of teaching. Such letters are subject to the same redaction and confidentiality policies as extramural letters.

Appointments to Lecturer, Potential Security of Employment may include placement files or restricted letters as outlined in Red Binder I-46, III.

In all cases, the sample letter for solicitation of extramural evaluation (Red Binder I-49) and the sample wording by proposed action (Red Binder I-50) should be used.

### **III. Compensation**

The review cycle for a Lecturer in the SOE series is determined by the years at rank and years since last advancement.

Salaries for Lecturers with Potential Security of Employment will normally begin at a close equivalent to the salaries for Assistant Professors. Academic personnel review will occur every two years. Promotion to Lecturer SOE will normally occur during the sixth year of service as Lecturer PSOE.

Salaries for a Lecturer SOE normally begin at a close equivalent to the salaries for Associate Professors. Academic personnel review will occur every two years. Eligibility for advancement to Senior Lecturer SOE will occur after six years as Lecturer SOE. An individual who is not promoted to Sr. Lecturer SOE may continue to receive further merit increases, however eligibility will be every three years if the individual is being paid at a level equivalent to the salary of a Professor. The salary of a Lecturer SOE will not exceed the level of Professor VI.

Salaries for a Senior Lecturer SOE begin at a close equivalent to the salary for Professor I. Academic personnel review will occur every three years.

### **IV. Restrictions**

1. An Assistant Professor with eight years of service, who is not promoted to Associate Professor may not be appointed to the Lecturer SOE series unless a five year break in service has occurred.
2. Total service at more than half-time as Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment is limited to a maximum of eight years.
3. For a Lecturer PSOE at less than 100% time, promotion to Lecturer SOE automatically removes the individual from Unit 18.
4. Since appointees in the Lecturer series are hired for their teaching skills, they will normally carry significantly higher teaching loads than members of the professorial series. At UCSB the teaching load for the Lecturer SOE series will be determined by the departmental workload policy for titles in Unit 18.
5. Lecturers in the SOE series are not eligible for sabbatical leave. They may however request "educational leave" as described in Red Binder VI-7.

### **V. Advancement**

The academic advancement process for the Lecturer SOE series will be governed by the policies and procedures for ladder faculty reviews (Red Binder I-22). Lecturers in this series will be guaranteed the same rights and will

undergo the same levels of review as ladder faculty. All cases are to be submitted via ~~the on line case processing system~~ *AP Folio* using the checklists for submission by the department chair (Red Binder I-31 and I-34). Teaching is the primary area of review in the SOE series. Written student comments must be included with the case.

### 1. Merit

Merits within a Lecturer PSOE, Lecturer SOE or Senior Lecturer SOE title are ~~considered "routine"~~ *Dean's Authority* if they are on time based on the limitations in III above, the proposed salary increase is for at most two increments on the appropriate salary scale. These actions should be prepared using the guidelines listed in Red Binder I-31, modified appropriately to address the requirements of the SOE series.

### 2. Appraisal

A Lecturer PSOE has a probationary period much like that of an Assistant Professor. A mid-career review and appraisal of progress toward promotion will take place during the fourth year of service and will be conducted according to procedures and with the degree of rigor used in evaluating regular faculty (Red Binder I-38), modified appropriately to address the requirements of the SOE series.

### 3. Promotion

A Lecturer PSOE will become eligible for promotion to Lecturer SOE when the salary is a close equivalent to Assistant Professor IV. Promotion must occur by the end of the eighth year of service. Promotion to Lecturer SOE will require the same level of qualifications as initial appointment to Lecturer SOE.

A Lecturer SOE will become eligible for promotion to Senior Lecturer SOE after six years of service as Lecturer SOE. Promotion to Senior Lecturer SOE will require the same level of qualifications as initial appointment to Senior Lecturer SOE.

Promotions and accelerated actions are ~~considered "non-routine"~~ *Expanded Reviews* and should be prepared using the guidelines listed in Red Binder Section I-34 modified appropriately to address the requirements of the SOE series.

II-1  
**UNIT 18, Non-Senate Faculty**  
**Lecturer and Supervisor of Teacher Education Series**  
(Revised 05/14)

**I. Definition**

These titles are used to designate individuals who are appointed on a temporary or continuing basis to teach courses at any level. This series does not include the titles Lecturer PSOE, Lecturer SOE, Senior Lecturer PSOE and Senior Lecturer SOE. (Red Binder I-56)

Policies and procedures regarding terms and conditions of appointments in these titles which are not included in the Red Binder are contained in APM 283 and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the Non-Senate Instructional Unit (Unit 18).

**II. Ranks and Steps**

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer:

Salaries are found on the Unit 18 Academic Standard Table of Pay in the University Salary Scales.

Individuals who have full or shared responsibility for instruction of assigned courses for a specified period of time may be appointed to the title Lecturer. Promotion or appointment to the Senior Lecturer title should be considered for appointees who qualify for the Lecturer title, who provide service of exceptional value to the University.

Supervisor of Teacher Education:

Salaries are found on the Unit 18 Supervisor of Teacher Education pay scale.

This title is used only in the Graduate School of Education, Teacher Education Program

**III. Appointment Criteria**

Initial appointment to these titles requires demonstrated competence in the individual's field. Initial appointment to the Senior Lecturer title also requires appropriate professional achievement and experience.

**IV. Term of Appointment**

- A. During the first six years of service, appointments and reappointments to these titles are normally made for terms of one year or less. A year of service is defined as 3 quarters of qualifying Unit 18 service. Qualifying service is service in any Unit 18 title at any positive percentage of time in the same department. Without salary appointments and Summer Session appointments do not count as Unit 18 quarters of service.

The employee must be notified in writing of the following: "This is a temporary appointment and any renewal or extension is dependent upon programmatic needs, availability of funding and satisfactory performance. As with any temporary appointment there is no guarantee or obligation on the part of the University for renewal or extension."

The employee must also be informed of the following:

- Title of the position, name of employing department, and name of the individual to whom the appointee will report
- Salary rate and percentage time
- Work and pay period
- The nature of the appointment and the general responsibilities
- The web site addresses for the University and the UC-AFT

- B. A reappointment which commences after six or more years of service within the same department at UCSB will be a Continuing Appointment (See Red Binder II-8 and II-10).
- C. All assignments must conform to the Workload Statement approved for the Department.

## V. Compensation

- A. The source that provides compensation for service under these titles must permit teaching.
- B. During the first 18 quarters of service, individuals appointed as Lecturer or Senior Lecturer are compensated at a rate within the published "Lecturer" range and in accordance with the Unit 18 Academic Standard Table of Pay Rates. Senior Lecturer salaries begin at approximately the rate for Professor, Step I. Determination of rate at initial appointment is based on professional qualifications. Appointees to the Supervisor of Teacher Education title are compensated at a rate from the Supervisor of Teacher Education pay scale.
- C. At the time of appointment to a 10<sup>th</sup> quarter of service within the same department, a pre-six Lecturer or Supervisor of Teacher Education will be given a two- step salary increase if the individual has not received a two-step within range salary increases during the prior 9 quarters of service.
- D. An appointee who is reviewed for a Continuing Appointment (an Excellence Review) shall be reviewed for a merit increase in accordance with the guidelines in Red Binder II-10. Subsequent merit reviews will be conducted every three years to be effective July 1. At such time, a Continuing Appointment Lecturer who is found to be excellent will receive a merit increase of at least six percent. A Continuing Supervisor of Teacher Education will receive a merit of at least two-steps if found excellent.
- E. Appointments of a full academic year (three quarters) will be made on a 9/12 basis effective July 1. Appointments for only one or two consecutive quarters are made on a 9/9 basis and are effective October 1 for fall quarter, January 1 for winter quarter and April 1 for spring quarter. If the Lecturer concurrently holds another appointment at UCSB the decision to appoint as 9/12 or 9/9 may be dependent on the basis- paid- over of the other appointment. Departments are encouraged to consult with the College or Academic Personnel Analysts in these situations.

## VI. Reappointment and Advancement

- A. Reappointment that commences prior to completion of six years of service in the same department.

A reappointment to one of these titles requires an assessment of the performance of the individual in accord with the department assessment procedures. Assessments are to be made on the basis of demonstrated competence in the field, demonstrated ability in teaching, academic responsibility, and other assigned duties. Reappointment to the Senior Lecturer title also requires service of exceptional value to the University. See Red Binder II-6 for procedural guidelines.

- B. Appointments and reappointments that commence after six or more years of service in the same department.

See Red Binder II-8 for procedures to be followed with respect to resource allocations and Red Binder II-10 for procedures to be followed in the Personnel Review process.

The department must submit annual workload requests for all Continuing Lecturers and Supervisors of Teacher Education to the Dean for approval. The statement must clearly identify any temporary or permanent increases in FTE. (see XI below)

- C. Department Chairpersons have responsibility for administering departmental consideration of personnel actions regarding positions with titles in this series. Departmental evaluations and recommendations regarding appointments and reappointments shall be made pursuant to departmental procedures and in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding.

## VII. Restrictions

- A. Graduate level courses may be taught by appointees to these titles with the approval of the Graduate Council.
- B. Registered UC graduate students may not be appointed to these titles. Degree candidates who are

not currently registered may be appointed as lecturer by exception. Such appointment requires prior approval of the Graduate Division.

- C. Recall appointments as Lecturer or Senior Lecturer may not exceed 43% time, alone or in combination with other recall appointments. Appointments are requested using the [Academic Recall Appointment Form](#). Recall appointments are to be entered into PPS using the ~~Non-Senate Recall title (3802)~~ *Recall: Teaching title (1700)*.

**VIII. Non-reappointment, Reduction of Time, and Layoff**

- A. No notice of non-reappointment is required for appointments that terminate on the scheduled end date when total service is less than six years. Termination prior to the scheduled end date must be in compliance with MOU Article 17 C.2.
- B. If an individual holding a Continuing Appointment that commenced after six or more years of service in the same department has their workload reduced by up to one course or duties equivalent to one course, 30-day notice is required. If more than one course is eliminated, 60-day notice is required. A twelve-month notice will be given in cases of layoff. If less than a twelve-month notice is given, pay in lieu of notice will be given in accordance with MOU Article 17.D.2. Any Layoff must comply with the provisions of Article 17.B

**IX. Approval Authority**

<u>Action</u>	<u>Authority</u>
Workload	Dean
Continuing Appointment FTE requests	AVC
Appointments for 1 year or less	Dean
Years 1-6, Merits	Dean
Excellence Review	AVC
Promotion to Sr. Lecturer	AVC
Continuing appointment merits	Dean

**X. Sample Chair's letter for Unit 18 appointments (Lecturer, Supervisor of Teacher Education)**

TO: Dean  
FROM: Department Chair  
RE: Appointment of \_\_\_\_\_

The department of \_\_\_\_\_ proposes the appointment of \_\_\_\_\_.

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Quarters: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Percent time: \_\_\_\_\_ FTE: \_\_\_\_\_

Annual salary: \_\_\_\_\_ Current Year Cost: \_\_\_\_\_

Salary at Previous Appointment: \_\_\_\_\_

Quarters of service to date in Unit 18 titles in this department: \_\_\_\_\_

Date(s) of Affirmative Action Search(es): \_\_\_\_\_

Workload (by quarter; including total/quarter)

<u>Course</u>	<u>#Units</u>	<u>Hrs/Wk</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>#IWC</u>
---------------	---------------	---------------	-------------------	-----------------	-------------

Which, if any, of the assigned courses are augmentations? Are these temporary or permanent augmentations?

Description of non-instructional assignments, if any: \_\_\_\_\_

Reports to: \_\_\_\_\_

Qualifications and experience: \_\_\_\_\_

If candidate will hold another UCSB appointment concurrently with the proposed Lecturer appointment, provide the title, department and pay basis for the other appointment: \_\_\_\_\_

**For reappointments also include:**

When and by whom was the assessment conducted? \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation of teaching: \_\_\_\_\_

Policy exception request and justification: \_\_\_\_\_

XI. **Sample Chair's letter for Continuing Lecturer annual workload**  
(submit one copy, no other materials required)

To: Dean

From: Department Chair

Re: Workload assignment for \_\_\_\_\_, Continuing Lecturer

The Department of \_\_\_\_\_ proposes the following workload for \_\_\_\_\_.

Quarters: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Percent time: \_\_\_\_\_ FTE: \_\_\_\_\_

Annual salary: \_\_\_\_\_ Current Year Cost: \_\_\_\_\_

Workload (by quarter, including total IWC/quarter)

<u>Course</u>	<u># Units</u>	<u>Hrs/Wk</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>#IWC</u>
---------------	----------------	---------------	-------------------	-----------------	-------------

Which, if any of the assigned courses are augmentations to the permanent FTE allocation for this Lecturer?  
Are these temporary or permanent augmentations?

Description of non-instructional assignments, if any: \_\_\_\_\_

Reports to: \_\_\_\_\_



**DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT  
EXCELLENCE REVIEWS AND SUBSEQUENT MERIT REVIEWS**

(Revised 09/13)04/15)

All personnel review cases are submitted via ~~the on-line case processing system~~ AP Folio

**I. Departmental review committee letter of recommendation**

Accurate and analytical letters of recommendation from the departmental review committee are essential in the review process. See Red Binder II-10 for further detail of content of departmental recommendations

- Are the effective date and recommended salary clearly stated?
- Is the letter an accurate, extensive, and **analytical** representation of the case?
- Is the actual vote included (e.g. 10(yes)-0(no)-0(abstentions)-3(not voting))? Is there an indication of how many were eligible to vote?
- If the case contains extramural letters, are letter writers identified **only** by coded list, with no identifying statements?
- Are all areas of review covered: ability in teaching, competence in the field, academic responsibility and other assigned duties?
- If there is a recommendation for an acceleration, are the reasons for the acceleration specifically stated?
- Is all relevant information from the Departmental letter accurately entered on the case up-load screen?

**II. Letters of evaluation solicited by the department (Excellence Review or Promotion only)**

- Have all letters been coded, on all copies?
- If the letters were sent via email, is a copy of the email and any attachment included?
- Was the proper wording used in the solicitation letter (Red Binder II-10)?
- If different versions of either the letter or the materials went out, is a sample of each included?
- Is a Coded list of referees, along with a brief biography of each included with the case?
- Do the codes on the letters match the codes on the list and the codes used in the departmental letter?
- Does the list clearly indicate if the referees were candidate, department or jointly selected?
- Is a copy of the redacted letters given to the individual included?

**III. Complete CV**

- Is the CV up to date?

**IV. Safeguard Statement.**

The candidate must sign an on-line safeguard which will be forwarded with the departmental recommendation. If it is difficult or impossible to obtain this document, the Chairperson should explain the situation and indicate in what manner he/she has attempted to meet the requirements outlined in the form.

- Has the candidate signed the safeguard statements? The case may not be forwarded until the candidate has signed.
- If there are no confidential documents (e.g. external letters, minority opinion letter), the appropriate box under #5 should be checked.
- Are copies of everything the candidate has provided, or been provided, included with the case?

**V. Evaluation of the teaching record.**

At a minimum, two sources must be included in the case. ESCI summary sheets and scores for questions A and B are mandatory.

- Is the B&P printout, or similar listing of classes included in the case?
- On the B&P printout, or similar listing of classes, is it noted which classes have ESCI's included with the case?
- Does the file accurately indicate which course evaluations were done via hard-copy and which were done on-line?
- Has the second source of teaching been clearly identified on the coversheet?
- If a self-assessment of teaching was submitted, is it included with the case?

**VI. Other Materials submitted by the candidate**

- Are all materials identified as candidate submitted?
- Were all materials considered and evaluated as part of the departmental review?

**LECTURER AND SENIOR LECTURER : PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARD STATEMENT**

*Informational only: all safeguards are to be completed ~~on-line~~ via AP Folio*

(Revised 10/1004/15)

**PRIOR TO DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW:**

1. I was informed that I was to be reviewed for this personnel action and of the process as described in MOU Article 7.B and 7.C
2. I had the opportunity to ask questions, supply information and evidence, and add material to my file in preparation for the review (Article 7.B.E.2 and E.3)
3. I was informed whether or not letters of evaluation were to be sought as part of this personnel action.
4. If letters were sought
  - A. I had an opportunity to suggest names of evaluators; and
  - B. I had the opportunity to submit, in writing, names of persons who, for reasons set forth by me, might not provide objective evaluations.
5. I was informed whether or not there were confidential documents (i.e. external letters, minority opinion reports) in my department review file and of my right to review a summary of any such documents.

Yes, there are confidential documents in my file (proceed to #6)

No, there are not any confidential documents in my file (proceed to #7)

6. If yes to #5, I was provided the contents of the confidential documents (i.e. external letters, minority opinion reports) in my file by means of:

A. Redacted Copies

C. Chose not to receive contents

B. Oral Summary

7. I had the opportunity to inspect all non-confidential documents in the review file.
8. I had the opportunity to provide a written statement in response to or comment upon all materials in the file.

**FOLLOWING THE DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS:**

9. I was informed of the departmental recommendation and the substance of the evaluation under each of the applicable review criteria by means of:

A. Copy of Departmental Recommendation

B. Oral Summary

C. Chose not to be informed

10. I was informed of my right to make written comments, within five working days, to the Chair (or appropriate person) regarding the departmental recommendation. I was aware that these comments would be included in the file and made available to other voting faculty in the department.
11. I was informed of my right to make written comments regarding the departmental recommendation to the Dean and that these comments would be included in the file and available to other reviewing agencies outside of the Department.

I HAVE SUBMITTED THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL MATERIALS:

Suggested names of evaluators (in accordance with 4A above).

Names of persons who might not provide objective evaluations (in accordance with 4B above).

A written statement in response to materials in the file (in accordance with 8 above)

A written statement about the departmental recommendation to the Chair (in accordance with 10 above).

A written statement about the recommendation to the Dean (in accordance with 11 above).

**REVIEWING AGENCY REPORTS**

I request that copies of reviewing agency reports (Dean, CAP, and any correspondence between them) be provided to me after the conclusion of my review

I do not wish to receive copies of reviewing agency reports (Dean, CAP, and any correspondence between them at the conclusion of my review, but understand that I may request them at any time in the future.

SIGNED \_\_\_\_\_ DATED \_\_\_\_\_

PRINT NAME \_\_\_\_\_ DEPARTMENT \_\_\_\_\_

II-24  
**CONTINUING EDUCATOR**  
(Revised 07/05/15)

**I. Definition**

This series is used for those appointees in University Extension who, as professional educators represent the University in serving the public through planning, coordinating and implementing continuing education programs, classes, conferences, short courses, discussion groups, lectures and media programs. See APM 340 for System Wide policy on Continuing Educators

**II. Levels**

Appointments may be made at level I, II or III.

**III. Appointment Criteria**

- A. A candidate for appointment to a position in this series is expected to have the appropriate academic and educational background. Normally the candidate will have received the highest level terminal professional degree in the programmatic area. However, a person with a Bachelor's degree with exceptional experience in one or more professional fields relevant to services may also be appropriate to this series.

Appointees shall be judged in the context of performance in the areas of:

1. Academic planning and curriculum development.
  2. Program administration/management/marketing
  3. Human resource management and development
  4. Professional competence
  5. University and public service.
- B. The appropriate level will be determined by taking into consideration such factors as program scope, program complexity and interface with UC faculty and/or industry sectors. APM 340-10c. provides guidelines for determining appropriate level. In general, the levels are differentiated as follows:
1. Continuing Educator I:  
Appointees will have responsibility for programs that are relatively simple in their organization and that may be administered with a small support staff, or where local University or community activities have a limited breadth or a narrow focus. The appointee will typically receive general supervision.
  2. Continuing Educator II:  
Appointees will have responsibility for programs of moderate complexity. Duties may include the independent planning and coordination of a program or programs with a moderately-sized support staff or, in a smaller unit, duties that encompass multi-program development.
  3. Continuing Educator III:  
Appointees will have extensive independent academic or administrative responsibility, including primary responsibility for the administration, management, and coordination of large complex programs. Appointment at this level requires demonstrated superior professional ability and attainment, evidence of professional achievement and outstanding accomplishment in job-related activities. Appointees will normally report to the Dean of University Extension.
- C. Appointment and reappointment requests should be processed using the checklist at Red Binder II-25.

#### **IV. Term of appointment**

- A. Appointments will normally be made for one year at a time but may be made for up to three years. A performance evaluation must take place prior to each reappointment.
- B. No further notice of non-reappointment is necessary for appointments at less than 50% or for appointment of less than eight consecutive years in the same title or series.

Notice of non-reappointment must be given if the employee has served at 50% or more for eight or more consecutive years in the same title or series (APM 137-30). Written Notice of Intent not to reappoint must be given at least 60 days prior to the appointment's specified end date. The notice must state (1) the intended non-reappointment and the proposed effective date; (2) the basis for non-reappointment; and (3) the employee's right to respond within 14 days and the name of the person to whom they should respond. Within 30 days of the Notice of Intent, and after review of any response, the University will issue a written Notice of Action to the employee. Pay in lieu of notice may be given.

#### **V. Advancement**

Movement between levels will require significant changes in the scope and complexity of the program being administered.

Merit within the level is not automatic but rather is based on individual qualifications and meritorious performance. A merit review will be conducted at least once every three years. Earlier advancement is possible when supported by the record of performance.

Evaluation of the performance should be based on the criteria listed below, as they apply to the specific position. See APM 340, Appendix A for further detail of the various criteria:

1. Academic Planning and Curriculum Development
2. Program Administration/Management/Marketing
3. Human Resource Management and Development
4. Professional Competence and Growth
5. University and Public Service

Merit requests should be prepared using the checklist on Red Binder II-25.

When processing appointments or promotions it is not appropriate in this series to solicit comments from outside evaluators as is the practice with Ladder Faculty, Researchers or Specialists. Rather, opinions from individuals at other institutions where the nominee has been employed and/or from other qualified persons having first-hand knowledge of the nominee's attainments should be included. Opinions from faculty members or other similarly qualified professionals are important in the case of proposed appointments to Rank III or above.

When soliciting extramural letters for appointment or promotion, the procedures found in Red Binder I-46, Extramural Evaluators, should be followed with wording modified as appropriate for this series.

Along with copies of any publications a representative sampling of Extension programs developed by the candidate between the prior and current review should be included with a case for advancement. This sampling should include information on attendance, representative evaluations by students (if available), and a statement written by the Dean evaluating the programs.

#### **VII. Approval Authority**

Action

Authority

All actions

AVC for ~~Academic Programs~~ *Academic Personnel*

II-31  
**SHORT TERM TEACHING**  
(Revised 05/14)04/15)

Departments may occasionally have need for a short-term, less than one full quarter, teaching appointment. Depending on the nature of the assignment, various types of appointments may be appropriate.

**Guest Lecturers not employed by UC**

Guest Lecturers *may not be the instructor of record, and* are limited to service of 2 weeks or less. ~~Guest Lecturers are not the instructor of record.~~ Guest Lecturers who are not otherwise employed by UC may be compensated for travel and living expenses through an honorarium paid from the department's supplies and expense budget. *The honorarium request is processed via a Form 5 through the Accounts Payable office. Guest Lecturers are not entered into PPS.* The Department Chair or P.I. may sign for honoraria of \$2,000 or less; honoraria of up to \$4,000 must be approved by the appropriate Dean or Vice Chancellor. Honoraria exceeding \$4,000 are approved by the Executive Vice Chancellor or Chancellor. Supporting documentation should include a curriculum vita and a statement of purpose.

Foreign visitors must have the proper visa if any form of financial payment is to be made to them. A J1, HI and FI visa, issued by this campus, will allow payment of payroll and non-payroll expenses. A B1 will allow the payment of travel and subsistence only (i.e., university per diem rate and airfare expenses). A B2 will not allow reimbursement or payment of any kind. Questions regarding these matters should be directed to the Office of International Students and Scholars.

**Guest Lecturers from another UC campus**

For payment to a UC faculty for visits of two weeks or less, see Red Binder VI-15, one-time payments.

**Guest Lectures or other short term teaching by current UCSB employees**

Employees currently working at UCSB at less than 100% may take on additional teaching responsibilities, subject to appropriate approval, as long as the total employment does not exceed 100% time. For employees already employed at 100%, or in cases where the additional assignment would cause total employment to exceed 100%, departments are strongly urged to contact Academic Personnel prior to making a commitment or having the individual provide services. In cases where the employee holds a full time staff position, Human Resources must also be consulted. Employment beyond 100% will only be approved in rare and unusual circumstances. Individuals approved for appointment as a guest lecture or other short term teaching, such as emergency partial quarter replacements, will be appointed in an appropriate teaching title using the TFR dos code. Use of the TFR dos code will require approval of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel regardless of appointment title.

III-5  
**PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARD STATEMENT  
TEMPORARY ACADEMIC TITLES-**

(Revised 2/15/04/15)

*Informational only: all safeguards are to be completed online via AP Folio*

**PRIOR TO DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW:**

1. I was informed that I was to be reviewed for this personnel action and of the process as described in APM 160, 310, 311, 330, 340 and 375 as appropriate.
2. I had the opportunity to ask questions, supply information and evidence, and add material to my file in preparation for the review.
3. I was informed whether or not letters of evaluation were to be sought as part of this personnel action.
4. If letters were sought (e.g., for promotion)
  - A. I had an opportunity to suggest names of evaluators; and
  - B. I had the opportunity to submit, in writing, names of persons who, for reasons set forth by me, might not provide objective evaluations.
5. I was informed whether or not there were confidential documents (i.e. external letters, minority opinion reports) in my department review file and of my right to review a summary of any such documents.

Yes, there are confidential documents in my file (proceed to #6)

No, there are not any confidential documents in my file (proceed to #7)

6. If yes to #5, I was provided the contents of the confidential documents (i.e. external letters, minority opinion reports) in my file by means of:

A. Redacted copy

C. Chose not to receive contents

B. Oral Summary

7. I had the opportunity to inspect all non-confidential documents in the review file.
8. I had the opportunity to provide a written statement in response to or comment upon all materials in the file.

**FOLLOWING THE DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS:**

9. I was informed of the departmental recommendation and the substance of the evaluation under each of the applicable review criteria by means of:

A. Copy of the departmental recommendation

B. Oral Summary

C. Chose not to be informed



10. I was informed whether or not the department vote for the recommendation was unanimous or by a strong or a narrow majority.
11. I was informed of my right to make written comments, within five working days, to the Chair (or appropriate person) regarding the departmental recommendation. I was aware that these comments would be included in the file and made available to other voting faculty in the department.
12. I was informed of my right to make written comments regarding the departmental recommendation to the dean and that these comments would be included in the file and available to other reviewing agencies outside of the Department

I HAVE SUBMITTED THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL MATERIALS:

- Suggested names of evaluators (in accordance with 4A above).
- Names of persons who might not provide objective evaluations (in accordance with 4B above).
- A written statement in response to materials in the file (in accordance with 8 above).
- A written statement about the departmental recommendation to the Chair (in accordance with 11 above).
- A written statement about the recommendation to the dean (in accordance with 12 above)

**REVIEWING AGENCY REPORTS**

- I request that copies of reviewing agency reports (Dean, Vice Chancellor for Research, and any correspondence between them) be provided to me after the conclusion of my review.
- I do not wish to receive copies of reviewing agency reports (Dean, Vice Chancellor for Research and any correspondence between them) at the conclusion of my review, but understand that I may request them at any time in the future.

SIGNED \_\_\_\_\_ DATED \_\_\_\_\_

PRINT NAME \_\_\_\_\_ DEPARTMENT \_\_\_\_\_

III-7  
**DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR**  
**RESEARCH APPOINTMENTS**  
(Revised 2/15/04/15)

All appointment cases are to be submitted via ~~the online case processing system~~ *AP Folio*.

- I. **Department Letter:** Accurate and analytical letters of recommendation from the department are essential in the review process. See Red Binder I-35 for further detail of content of departmental recommendations
- Are the dates of the appointment, rank and step all clearly stated?
  - Is the recommended salary on the published salary scale?
  - If a request is being made to use the Engineering scale in a non-Engineering unit (RB III-12 V, A, 2) is appropriate justification provided?
  - Is the off-scale supplement correct (if applicable), per off-scale general policies (RB I-8)?
  - If the salary is off-scale or above scale is it rounded to the nearest \$100 for the Research and Project Scientist series?*
  - If a vote was taken, is the actual vote included (e.g. 10(yes)-0(no)-0(abstentions)-3(not voting))?* *Is there an indication of how many were eligible to vote?*
  - If no vote was taken, is the review procedure (i.e., committee, chair/director review) explained?*
  - Does the departmental letter, provide thorough justification for the ~~level of appointment~~ *ranks, step, and salary* requested?
  - Does the departmental letter provide an accurate, extensive, and **analytical** representation of the candidate's qualifications?
  - If the case contains extramural letters, are letter writers identified **only** by coded list, with no identifying statements?
- II. **Extramural letters of evaluation and list of evaluators** for appointment at the Associate and full level as required (Red Binder I-~~49~~ *46*)
- Extramural Letters**
- Are the required number of letters included, including letters from UC or UC familiar referees when appropriate (RB III-12, III-14, III-16)
  - Are at least half of the letters from references chosen by the Chair/Dept independent of the candidate?
  - Have all letters been coded, on all copies?
  - If the letters were sent via email, is a copy of the email and any attachment included?
- Sample Solicitation Letter(s) and/or thank you letter(s) for unsolicited letters**
- Was the proper wording used in the letter (RB I-49 to I-50, III-12, III-14, III-16)
  - Is a list of all informational items sent to referees (e.g. CV, Bio-Bib, publications sent, etc, per RB I-~~46~~ *51*) included? Is a copy of each item included as either part of the case or a one-of-a-kind item?
  - If different versions of either the letter or the materials went out, is a sample of each included?
- List of Referees, including brief Biography and indicating who selected referees** *(RB I-46-V)*
- Do the codes on the letters match the codes on the list and the codes used in the departmental letter?
  - Does the list clearly indicate if the referees were candidate, department or jointly selected?
  - Are the names of everyone who was asked to write included? For those who did not respond is a reason for no response listed?
- III. **Complete CV and UCSB Academic biography form.**
- Is the CV up to date?
  - Is the UCSB Academic biography form complete, signed and dated?
- IV. **Copies of publications**
- Has a representative sampling of publications been submitted?
- V. **Recruitment Packet (original only)**
- If required by Red Binder VII-I, III has the Academic Recruitment Packet been included?

**Note:** The Procedural Safeguard Statement is not used for new appointments. However, candidates for appointment, once appointed, do have the right to inspect non-confidential documents in their files and to have a redacted copy of the confidential academic review records contained in the personnel review file received pursuant

to APM 220-80-i.

III-9  
**DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR**  
**RESEARCH REVIEWS**  
(Revised ~~2/15~~04/15)

All personnel review cases are submitted via ~~the online case processing system.~~ *AP Folio*.

**I. Departmental letter of recommendation**

Accurate and analytical letters of recommendation from the department are essential in the review process. See Red Binder I-35 for further detail of content of departmental recommendations

For All Cases:

- Are the listed 'current' and 'proposed' salary rates the total salary rate, inclusive of any off-scale supplement?
- If the salary is off-scale or above scale is it rounded to the nearest \$100 for the Research and Project Scientist series?
- Is the off-scale supplement correct (if applicable), per off-scale general policies (RB I-8)?
- If a vote was taken*, is the actual vote included (e.g. 10(yes)-0(no)-0(abstentions)-3(not voting))? Is there an indication of how many were eligible to vote?
- If no vote was taken, is the review procedure (i.e., committee, chair/director review) explained?
- Is the letter an accurate, extensive, and **analytical** representation of the case?
- Are all areas of review covered: research; professional activity; and, university and public service as appropriate?
- If there is a recommendation for an acceleration, are the reasons for the acceleration specifically stated?
- In the case of a negative departmental recommendation, is the basis of the recommendation clearly documented?

For Career Reviews:

- If the case contains extramural letters, letter writers identified **only** by coded list, with no identifying statements?
- Does the letter provide an overview of the career accomplishments as well as analysis of the achievements within the most recent review period?

**II. Chair's Separate Confidential Letter (optional)**

See Red Binder I-35 for further information.

- Is the letter clearly marked "Chair's Separate Confidential"?

**III. Safeguard Statement**

The candidate must sign an online safeguard *for each departmental recommendation*. A signed safeguard *must be forwarded with each departmental recommendation*. If it is difficult or impossible to obtain this document, the Chairperson should explain the situation and indicate in what manner he/she has attempted to meet the requirements outlined in the form.

- If there are no confidential documents (e.g. external letters, minority opinion report), the appropriate box under #5 should be checked.
- Are copies of everything the candidate has provided, or been provided, included with the case (e.g. redacted letters, list of potential evaluators)?

**IV. Bio-bibliographical Update** (excluding teaching section).

- Is it in the proper format? (See Red Binder I-27)
- Is the Research section a **cumulative** list of publications (or creative activities) with a line drawn separating all new items from where the bio-bib from the last review case had ended?
- Are the numbers the same as in the previously submitted bio-bib, and have items previously listed as "In Press", "Submitted" been accounted for?
- Are all items, including "In Press", "Submitted", and "In Progress" properly numbered?
- Are publications identified as "refereed" when appropriate?
- If sections other than Research are cumulative, are lines drawn showing what is new since the last successful review?
- If publications are being submitted via electronic links, are the links current and direct to the specific item?

V. **Extramural letters of evaluation and list of evaluators (RB I-46)**

**Extramural Letters**

- Are the required number of letters included, including letters from UC or UC familiar referees when appropriate (RB III-12, III-14, III-16) ?
- Are at least half of the letters from references chosen by the Chair/Dept independent of the candidate?
- Have all letters been coded? Are the codes also on the copies and the redacted versions?
- If the letters were sent via email, is a copy of the email and any attachment included?
- If redacted copies of the letters were provided to the candidate, is a copy included (one copy only), and did he/she check box 6A on the Procedural Safeguards Statement?

**Sample Solicitation Letter(s)and/or Thank you letter(s) for unsolicited letters**

- Was the proper wording used in the letter (RB I-49 to I-50, III-12, III-14, III-16)?
- Is a list of all informational items sent to referees (e.g. CV, bio-bib, publications sent, etc, per RB I-46 V 5I) included? Is a copy of each item included as either part of the case or a one-of-a-kind item?
- If different versions of the letters or materials went out, is a sample of each included?

**List of Referees, including brief Biography and indicating who selected referees (RB I-46-V)**

- Do the codes on the letters match the codes on the list and the codes used in the departmental letter?
- Does the list clearly indicate if the referees were candidate, department or jointly selected?
- Are the names of everyone who was asked to write included? For those who did not respond is a reason for no response listed?

VI. **Self-Assessment of research and/or other activity and accomplishments (optional)**

- If a self-assessment of research and/or other activity and accomplishments was submitted, is it included in the case? Self-statements may address research, professional activity, service, or contributions to diversity and equal opportunity.

VII. **Copies of publications.**

It is the responsibility of each candidate to maintain copies of published research or other creative work and reviews. One set of publications for the review period should be forwarded with the case. Publications submitted with the case, along with other single copy items, will be returned to the department upon completion of the review.

- Have all items included in Part I of the bio-bib for the current review period been submitted, including In Press and Submitted items?
- Do all of the titles on the actual publications match those listed on the bio-bib?
- For promotion to the Associate level, are all publications included?
- If publications are being included via a link in the bio-bib, has the link been verified?
- If any publications are missing from the file, is a note included noting which are missing and explaining why?
- For other career reviews (promotion to Full in any series, advancement to Researcher Step VI or Above Scale), are all publications since last review, and all or a representative sample of publications from the prior record included?

III-12  
**PROFESSIONAL RESEARCH SERIES**  
(Revised ~~2/15~~ 04/15)

**I. Definition**

The titles in this series are given only to those who engage in independent research equivalent to that required for the Professor series. Individuals whose duties are defined as making significant and creative contributions to a research project, or to providing technical assistance to research activity should not be appointed in this series. For use of the Visiting prefix with this series, see Red Binder III-23.

**II. Ranks and Steps**

- A. Assistant Research \_\_\_\_\_ II – V (Steps V is considered a “special step”)
- B. Associate Research \_\_\_\_\_ I – IV (Step IV is considered a “special step”)
- C. Research \_\_\_\_\_ I –IX

The normal time of service at each step within the Assistant and Associate rank is 2 years, except for service at the special steps of Assistant Researcher V and Associate Researcher IV (Red Binder I-4, II). Within the Researcher rank normal service at Steps I-IV is 3 years. Service at Step V and above may be for an indefinite time: however, normal service is 3 years at Steps V through VIII and 4 years at Step IX and within Above Scale. Eligibility for normal advancement occurs after the normal time of service at each step. If not advanced in step at that time, the candidate will continue to be eligible each year until advancement in step occurs.

**III. Appointment and Advancement Criteria**

The candidate must possess a doctorate or its equivalent at the time of initial appointment. The candidate will be judged based on the following criteria:

- A. Research qualifications and accomplishments equivalent to those for the Professor series, including demonstrated continuous and effective engagement in independent and creative activity of high quality and significance.
- B. Professional competence and activity equivalent to those for the Professor series.
- C. University and/or public service at the Associate Researcher and Researcher ranks.

**IV. Term of Appointment**

- A. Service as Assistant Researcher is limited to eight years of service. Six months or more of service within any fiscal year, either paid or without salary, as an Assistant Researcher or Visiting Assistant Researcher counts towards the eight year limit.
- B. Appointments or reappointments may be for up to two years at a time at the Assistant Researcher and Associate Researcher level and for up to three years at a time at the Researcher level if guaranteed funding is available.

**V. Compensation**

- A. Individuals appointed to this series are compensated on the salary scales established for the Professional Research series on a fiscal year (11 months) basis. The Economics/ Engineering Professional Research salary scale will be used when either:
  - 1. The unit is an Engineering unit (departments and research units reporting to the Dean of Engineering) or the Department of Economicsor:
  - 2. The unit is multi or interdisciplinary and includes both engineering or economics and other

disciplinary activity (for example: CNSI, ICB, MATP). In this case two additional criteria must be met: a) The individual's background and training is in engineering or economics, and b) The project with which the individual is associated is an engineering or economics project.

When option #2 is used, the justification for use of the Engineering scale must be clearly stated in the departmental appointment recommendation.

- B. Salaries are subject to range adjustment.
- C. Each source which provides compensation for service in this series must permit research.
- D. Off-scale salaries are allowed within the same limits and policies as ladder faculty off-scale salaries. (Red Binder I-8)

## VI. Requests for Appointment, Reappointment, and Advancement

### Appointment

Appointment cases are to be submitted via the on-line case processing system *AP Folio* and using the checklist of documents to be submitted by the Chair for appointments (Red Binder III-7). Particular attention should be paid to assuring the Departmental letter provides justification demonstrating the equivalence of the requested position to the same level faculty position, and an analytical evaluation of the candidate and his or her accomplishments.

### Reappointment

Reappointments are to be submitted via the online reappointment and modification module *of AP Folio*. The timing of the reappointment will be based on the original start date of the appointment and/or the availability of funding.

### Advancement: Merit and Promotion

Advancement cases are to be submitted via the on-line case processing system *AP Folio* and using the checklist of documents to be submitted by the chair for research reviews (Red Binder III-9). Red Binder I-22, Departmental Checklist for Academic Advancement may also be used as a guideline for departmental review. All advancement actions are based on the individual's achievements. Normal advancement will occur after 2 years at step at the Assistant or Associate level and after 3 years at the Full Research level steps I-VIII, and after 4 years at step IX or within Above Scale. Any advancement requested prior to that time will be considered an acceleration and must be justified as such. Merit increases are based on the academic record since the time of last review while promotions, merit to Researcher VI and merit to Researcher Above Scale are based on the career academic record.

All merits and promotions will be effective July 1. Completed cases must be submitted to the Academic Personnel Office or Dean's Office, as appropriate, by **March 1**, preceding the effective date. Cases received after the due date will be returned to the Department and will not be processed. A missed deadline may not be used as justification for retroactivity in a future review.

Deferral will be automatic if a Researcher does not submit material by the departmental due date and no case is forwarded by the department, with the exception of mandatory reviews.

Appointees in the Research series must undergo a performance review at least once every five years, including an evaluation of the researcher's record in all review areas. This review may not be deferred. If the candidate does not turn in materials by the departmental due date, the department will conduct the review based on the materials available in the department as of the due date.

In cases where the final decision is a lesser advancement than recommended by the department, a reconsideration may be requested. Procedures outlined in Red Binder I-10 must be followed.

### **Chair/Director Letters of Recommendation**

The Chair/Director's letter of recommendation for appointment or advancement should include an evaluation of the candidate's record in all review areas (see III Appointment and Advancement criteria, above). The evaluation is expected to meet the standards set forth in APM 310 which prescribes that candidates for appointment or advancement in the Research series have research qualifications equivalent to those of the corresponding ladder faculty rank. Each unit should establish set procedures for evaluation

of Research appointments and advancements and development of the letter of recommendation. While a full review completed by a departmental committee knowledgeable of the candidate's field is preferred, in cases where this is not appropriate, a review done solely by the Chair, Director or P.I. is acceptable. If a committee is not formed, an explanation should be provided in the letter of recommendation. Red Binder I-35 provides additional guidance on developing the letter of recommendation.

### **Bio-Bibliography**

It is the responsibility of each Researcher to maintain an up to date bio-bibliography (bio-bib). The bio-bib should contain information ending at the cut-off date established by the candidate's department. Information that falls beyond that date will not be considered in the review. Bio-bibs must follow the bio-bib template available in the Forms section of the Academic Personnel web-site, and the instructions in Red Binder I-27 excluding the Teaching section

### **External Evaluation**

External letters of evaluation will be required in cases of: appointment as Associate Researcher, appointment as Researcher, promotion to Associate Researcher, promotion to Researcher, merit to Researcher, Step VI and merit to Researcher Above Scale. A minimum of 4 letters must be included at the Associate level, a minimum of 6 at the Full Researcher level. In addition to the foregoing, recommendations for promotion or advancement to Researcher, Step VI must include at least 6 extramural evaluations from references. At least half of the letters submitted with the case should come from references chosen by the Department or Program independent of the candidate. Letters from faculty or researchers at other UC campuses are essential for appointment/ advancement to Research VI, preferably from individuals already at the senior ranks. Solicitations of extramural evaluations should not merely ask for opinions regarding the suitability of the candidate for promotion, but should invite analytical evaluations of the candidate's research with respect to quality and significance. Reviewing agencies reserve the right to request letters be solicited in any advancement case if it is determined that more information is necessary to support the proposed action.

In all cases of solicitation of outside letters, the sample letter for solicitation of extramural letters (Red Binder I-49) is to be used.

For promotion or appointment to Associate Researcher, the following wording should be inserted as appropriate:

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for (an appointment/promotion to) Associate Researcher in the (department/unit). Appointment (or promotion) to Associate Researcher within the UC system requires a research record equivalent to that of an Associate Professor. Superior intellectual attainment in research is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to Associate Researcher. [Sample wording for evaluation request: e.g., I would greatly appreciate your evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_'s work.]

For promotion or appointment to full Researcher, the following wording should be inserted as appropriate:

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for (an appointment/promotion to) Researcher in the (department/unit). Appointment (or promotion) to Researcher within the UC system requires a research record equivalent to that of a Professor. A candidate for this position is expected to have an accomplished record of research that is judged to be excellent by his or her peers within the larger discipline or field. [Sample wording for evaluation request: e.g., I would greatly appreciate your evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_'s work]

For a merit advancement to Researcher, Step VI or appointment at Step VI or above, the following wording should be inserted as appropriate:

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for advancement to Researcher [specify step] in the (dept/unit). In the UC system there are 9 steps within the rank of Researcher. The normal period of service is three years in each of the first five steps. Service at Research, Step V, may be of indefinite duration. Advancement to Step VI will be granted on evidence of highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellence in research, and in addition, great distinction recognized nationally or internationally, in research. [Sample wording for



evaluation request: e.g., I would greatly appreciate your evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_'s work]

For appointment as, or merit advancement to Researcher Above Scale, the following wording should be inserted as appropriate:

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for (an appointment as/ advancement to) Researcher Above Scale in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_. In the University of California, there are nine steps within the rank of Researcher. Steps VI, VII, VIII, and IX are reserved for highly distinguished scholars. (Appointment/advancement) to an Above Scale salary is reserved for scholars of the highest distinction, whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed. [Sample wording for evaluation request: e.g., I would greatly appreciate your evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_'s work.]

**VII. Approval Authority**

Action

Authority

All actions

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

III-14  
**PROJECT SCIENTIST SERIES**  
(Revised ~~2/15~~04/15)

**I. Definition**

The titles in this series are given only to those who make significant and creative contributions to a research or creative project. Appointees may be ongoing members of a research team, or may contribute high-level skills to a specific project for a limited time. Demonstrated capacity for fully independent research or research leadership as required in the Researcher series are not required in this series. However, a broad range of knowledge and competency and a higher level of independence than appointees in the Specialist series are expected. See APM 311 for System Wide policy on Project Scientists. See Red Binder III-23 for procedures for Visiting appointments in this series.

**II. Ranks and Steps**

- A. Assistant Project Scientist I – V (Steps V is considered a “special step”)
- B. Associate Project Scientist I – IV (Step IV is considered a “special step”)
- C. Project Scientist I –IX

The normal time of service at each step within the Assistant and Associate rank is 2 years, except for service at the special steps of Assistant Project Scientist V and Associate Project Scientist IV (Red Binder I-4, II). Within the Project Scientist rank normal service at Steps I-IV is 3 years. Service at Step V and above may be for an indefinite time: however, normal service is 3 years at Steps V through VIII and 4 years at Step IX and within Above Scale. Eligibility for normal advancement occurs after the normal time of service at each step. If not advanced in step at that time, the candidate will continue to be eligible each year until advancement in step occurs.

**III. Appointment and Advancement Criteria**

The candidate must possess a doctorate or its equivalent at the time of initial appointment. The candidate will be judged based on the following criteria:

- A. Demonstrated significant, original, and creative contributions to a research or creative program or project
- B. Professional competence and activity

University and public service are encouraged but not required.

**IV. Term of Appointment**

- A. Appointments or reappointments may be for up to two years at a time at the Assistant Project Scientist and Associate Project Scientist level and for up to three years at a time at the Project Scientist level if guaranteed funding is available.
- B. There are no limits on service at any level in this series.

**V. Compensation**

- A. A. Individuals appointed to this series are compensated on the salary scales established for the Project Scientist series on a fiscal year (11 months) basis. The Economics/Project Scientist salary scale will be used when either:
  - 1. The unit is an Engineering unit (departments and research units reporting to the Dean of Engineering) or the Department of Economics  
or:
  - 2. The unit is multi or interdisciplinary and includes both engineering or economics

and other disciplinary activity (for example: CNSI, ICB, MATP). In this case two additional criteria must be met: a) The individual's background and training is in engineering or economics, and b) The project with which the individual is associated is an engineering or economics project.

When option #2 is used, the justification for use of the Engineering scale must be clearly stated in the departmental appointment recommendation

- B. Salaries are subject to range adjustment.
- C. Each source which provides compensation for service in this series must permit research.
- D. Off-scale salaries are allowed within the same limits and policies as ladder faculty off-scale salaries. (Red Binder I-8)

## **VI. Requests for Appointment and Advancement**

### Appointment

Appointment cases are to be submitted via the online case processing system *AP Folio* and using the checklist of documents to be submitted by the Chair for appointments (Red Binder III-7). Particular attention should be paid to assuring the department provides justification for the level of appointment and analytical evaluation of the candidate and his or her accomplishments.

### Reappointment

Reappointments are to be submitted via the on-line reappointment and modification module *of AP Folio*. The timing of the reappointment will be based on the original start date of the appointment and/or the availability of funding.

### Advancement: Merit and Promotion

Advancement cases are to be submitted via the on-line case processing system *AP Folio* and using the checklist of documents to be submitted by the chair for research reviews (Red Binder III-9). All advancement actions are based on the individual's achievements. Normal advancement will occur after 2 years at step at the Assistant or Associate level and after 3 years at the Full Project Scientist level steps I-VIII and after 4 years at step IX or within Above Scale. Any advancement requested prior to that time will be considered an acceleration and must be justified as such. Merit increases are based on the academic record since the time of last review while promotions are based on the career academic record.

All merits and promotions will be effective July 1. Completed cases must be submitted to the Academic Personnel Office by **April 1**, preceding the effective date. Cases received after the due date will be returned to the Department and will not be processed. A missed deadline may not be used as justification for retroactivity in a future review. Deferral will be automatic if a Project Scientist does not submit material by the departmental due date and no case is forwarded by the department.

### **Chair/Director Letters of Recommendation**

The Chair/Director's letter of recommendation for appointment or advancement should include an evaluation of the candidate's record in all review areas (see III Appointment and Advancement Criteria, above). Each unit should establish set procedures for evaluation of Project Scientist appointments and advancements and development of the letter of recommendation. While review done solely by the Director or PI is acceptable at the Assistant Project Scientist level, a fuller review, including input from other equal or higher ranking individuals in the unit is preferable for Associate Project Scientist and Project Scientist level actions. Red Binder I-35 provides additional guidance on developing the letter of recommendation.

### **Bio-Bibliography**

It is the responsibility of each Project Scientist to maintain an up to date bio-bibliography (bio-bib). The bio-bib should contain information ending at the cut-off date established by the candidate's department. Information that falls beyond that date will not be considered in the review. Bio-bibs must follow the bio-bib template available in the Forms section of the Academic Personnel web-site, and the instructions in Red Binder I-27 excluding the Teaching section.

## **External Evaluation**

External letters of evaluation are normally required in cases of: appointment as Associate Project Scientist, appointment as Project Scientist, promotion to Associate Project Scientist, and promotion to Project Scientist. A minimum of four letters at the Associate level, and six at the Full Project Scientist level should be included. Due to the nature of Project Scientist positions, it is possible that in some cases solicitation of internal letters of evaluation are more helpful. Internal evaluators are defined as external to the employing unit, but internal to UCSB. In these cases, the decision to solicit from internal sources should be clearly discussed in the departmental letter. Reviewing agencies reserve the right to request that additional letters be solicited in any advancement case if it is determined that more information is necessary to support the proposed action. When letters are solicited either externally or internally, the sample letter for solicitation of extramural evaluators (Red Binder I-49) should be used, with the following wording inserted as appropriate. In rare circumstances it may be appropriate to waive the requirement for letters of evaluation. Requests to waive letters must be submitted to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel prior to submission of the appointment or promotion case.

Appointment (or Promotion) to Associate Project Scientist/Project Scientist requires evaluation in the areas of: 1) Demonstrated significant, original, and creative contributions to a research or creative program or project, 2) Professional competence and activity.

## **VII. Approval Authority**

### Action

All actions

### Authority

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

III-16  
**SPECIALIST SERIES**  
(Revised ~~2/15~~ 04/15)

**I. Definition**

The Specialist series is used for academic appointees who engage in specialized research and who do not have any teaching responsibilities. See APM 330 for System Wide policy on Specialists.

**II. Ranks and Steps**

- A. Jr. Specialist I-II
- B. Assistant Specialist I - III
- C. Associate Specialist I - IV
- D. Specialist I - V

**III. Appointment *and Advancement* Criteria**

Appointees to the Specialist series provide research projects with special skills, experience, and knowledge. At the Junior and Assistant levels, the appointee enables research as part of a team. At the Associate and full level, the appointee provides considerable independent input into the planning and execution of research and may work under the direction of a member of the Project Scientist, Professional Research or Professorial series. A few individuals are appointed to the Specialist Series to provide specialized skills in support of research, rather than conducting research as the principle responsibility.

In judging a candidate for appointment or promotion to a position in this series, the following criteria are provided as guidelines and may be used flexibly where deemed necessary.

- 1. Performance in research in specialized areas.
- 2. Professional competence and activity.
- 3. University and public service

**IV. Term of Appointment**

- A. There are no limits on service at any level in this series.
- B. Appointments may be made for up to one year at a time at the Junior Specialist Rank, for up to two years at a time at the Assistant and Associate Specialist rank, and for up to three years at a time at the full Specialist rank.

**V. Compensation**

- A. Individuals appointed to this series are compensated on the salary scales established for the Specialist Series on a fiscal year (11 month) basis.
- B. Off-scale salaries are allowed within the same limits and policies as ladder faculty off-scale salaries. (Red Binder I-8)
- C. Salaries are subject to range adjustment.
- D. Each source that provides compensation for service in this series must permit research.

**VI. *Requests for Appointment and Advancement***

Appointment

Appointment cases are to be submitted via the online case processing system *AP Folio* and using the checklist of documents to be submitted by the Chair for appointments (Red Binder III-7). Particular attention should be paid to assuring the department provides justification for the level of appointment and analytical evaluation of the candidate and his or her accomplishments.

### Reappointment

Reappointments are to be submitted via the **on-line** reappointment and modification module **of AP Folio**. The timing of the reappointment will be based on the original start date of the appointment and/or the availability of funding.

### Advancement: Merit and Promotion

Advancement cases are to be submitted via **the online case processing system AP Folio** and using the checklist of documents to be submitted by the chair for research reviews (Red Binder III-9). All advancement actions are based on the individual's achievements. Normal advancement will occur after one year at step at the Junior level, two years at step at the Assistant and Associate level and after three years at the Full Specialist level, steps I-IV, and after four years at step V and within Above Scale. Any advancement requested prior to that time will be considered an acceleration and must be justified as such. Merits are based on the academic record since the time of last review while promotions are based on the career academic record.

### **Chair/Director Letters of Recommendation**

The Chair/Director's letter of recommendation for **merit or promotion appointment or advancement** should include an evaluation of the candidate's work and an evaluation of the candidate's contributions to the group effort, if relevant. In addition to the foregoing, recommendations for promotion must provide documentation of the scientific, technical, or otherwise creative contributions of the candidate (as contrasted to contributions to a group effort). Each unit should establish set procedures for evaluation of Specialist series appointments and advancements and development of the letter of recommendation. While review done solely by the Director or PI is acceptable, a fuller review, including input from other equal or higher ranking individuals in the unit is preferable.

### **Bio-Bibliography**

It is the responsibility of each Specialist to maintain an up to date bio-bibliography (bio-bib). The bio-bib should contain information ending at the cut-off date established by the candidate's department. Information that falls beyond that date will not be considered in the review. Bio-bibs must follow the bio-bib template available in the Forms section of the Academic Personnel web-site, and the instructions in Red Binder I-27 excluding the Teaching section.

### **External Evaluation**

While extramural letters of evaluation are not required for appointment, promotion, or advancement to Above Scale in the Specialist series they may, in some cases, be helpful in evaluating the candidate's record. When letters are solicited, the sample letter for solicitation of extramural evaluators (Red Binder I-49) should be used, with the following wording inserted as appropriate:

Appointment (or Promotion) to Associate Specialist/Specialist requires evaluation in the areas of:  
1) research in a specialized area, 2) professional competence and activity, 3) university and public service.

Reviewing agencies reserve the right to request that letters be solicited in any advancement case if it is determined that more information is necessary to support the proposed action.

## **VII. Approval Authority**

### Action

All actions

### Authority

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

III-17  
**POSTDOCTORAL SCHOLARS**  
(Revised 11/14/15)

**I. Definition**

Postdoctoral Scholar appointments are intended to provide a full-time training program of advanced academic preparation and research training under the mentorship of a faculty member (defined as ladder faculty or professional researcher). System-wide policies regarding Postdoctoral Scholars may be found in APM 390 and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the Postdoctoral Scholar unit.

**II. Appointment Criteria**

Appointment to the title requires a doctorate or its equivalent. Postdoctoral Scholars may be appointed into the following titles:

- A. Postdoctoral Scholar- Employee (3252)  
Used when payment for the appointment will be made via the University payroll system. Positive time appointment in PPS.
- B. Postdoctoral Scholar- Fellow (3253)  
Used when the Scholar has been awarded a fellowship or traineeship that will be paid through a University account. The appointment in PPS may be with salary or without salary (funds paid as a stipend) depending on the fund source.
- C. Postdoctoral Scholar- Paid Direct (3254)  
Used when the Scholar is paid a fellowship or traineeship directly by the granting agency. Appointed without salary in PPS.

The [Chart Defining Postdoctoral Scholar Positions](http://www.graddiv.ucsb.edu/scholars/staff_resources) flowchart on the Graduate Division web site at [http://www.graddiv.ucsb.edu/scholars/staff\\_resources](http://www.graddiv.ucsb.edu/scholars/staff_resources)—may be helpful in determining if the candidate is appropriately appointed as a Postdoctoral Scholar, and if so, which of the Postdoctoral Scholar titles to use.

**III. Appointment Process**

Appointments and reappointments require submission of the completed and signed [Postdoctoral Scholars Appointment Form](#)

In addition, the following documents must be submitted:

Initial Appointments

- 1. UCSB Biography form
- 2. An up to date curriculum vitae
- 3. Academic Recruitment Packet- required if an open search was conducted
- 4. For Postdoctoral Scholar Fellows and Paid Direct, a copy of the external funding agency's award letter. The letter should include specific information regarding the salary support and the amount of funding available for coverage of health insurance and other required benefits. If the external agency will not provide funds for health insurance and other benefits, a departmental funding source must be provided.

Reappointments

- 1. Annual evaluation form

The complete packet should be submitted to Academic Personnel at least a month prior to the start date of the appointment. A copy should be maintained in the departmental files.

Upon notification of approval from Academic Personnel of appointment or reappointment, the Department must provide the Postdoctoral Scholar with an appointment *or reappointment* letter using the sample found at <https://ap.ucsb.edu/employment/postdoctoral.scholars/> <http://www.graddiv.ucsb.edu/scholars/staff>

[resources](#) -along with appropriate attachments.

The Postdoctoral Scholar must submit their written acceptance on or before the first day of employment. Upon receipt of the acceptance, the Department may enter the Postdoctoral Scholar into PPS. A copy of the signed acceptance should be forwarded to Academic Personnel.

#### **IV. Term of Appointment**

- A. Appointment must be made at 100% time. In special situations, exceptions may be granted by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel. Please note that if a Postdoctoral Scholar has an H-1B visa, an amendment to the H-1B must be filed reflecting the appointment percentage.
- B. Initial Appointments must be made for one year at a time. Reappointments will normally be for one year, but may be for less than one year under the following circumstances:
  - 1. Funding is available for less than an additional full year.
  - 2. The project will last less than an additional full year.
  - 3. Visa limitations
  - 4. At the request of the Postdoctoral Scholar, to “bridge” for a short period prior to other employment

The total duration, including postdoctoral service at other institutions, may not exceed five years.

#### **V. Compensation**

- A. All Postdoctoral Scholars must be paid at or higher than the minimum for their experience level, as indicated on the posted salary scale (Salary Scale 23.) If an extramural granting agency will provide less than the minimum salary for the experience level, the faculty mentor must arrange additional funding prior to the beginning date of the appointment in order to provide the minimum salary.
- B. Postdoctoral Scholar- Fellows or Postdoctoral Scholar-Paid Directs may have their salary supplemented through the use of the Postdoctoral Scholar-Employee title.
- C. Movement to the next experience level pay rate must occur no later than the anniversary date of the original appointment. Postdoctoral Scholars who are already above the new experience rate must receive at least a 2% salary increase on the anniversary date of the original appointment. When the anniversary date occurs mid-appointment, the [Postdoctoral Scholars Mid Appointment Salary Increase](#) form is to be completed and submitted Academic Personnel for approval of the increase.
- D. Mid-year salary increases are allowed but do not negate the mandatory increase on the anniversary date.

#### **VI. Leaves**

Sick leave and personal time off are both recorded in full day increments. Approved absences of less than one full day do not require the use of personal time off or sick leave. Leave usages is to be tracked outside of the PPS system by the Department.

- A. Postdoctoral Scholars are eligible for 12 days of sick leave per twelve-month appointment period. All 12 days of leave are available for use effective the first day of the appointment. Any balance remaining at the end of an appointment period is to be carried forward to any subsequent Postdoctoral appointment or other University appointment that provides sick leave. A Postdoctoral Scholar who is reemployed after a separation with a break of less than six months will have sick leave reinstated in accord with article 22 of the contract.
- B. Postdoctoral Scholars are eligible for 24 days of personal time off per year. All 24 days of leave are available for use effective the first day of the appointment. Balances remaining at the end of an appointment do not carry forward to subsequent appointments. Time off for Postdoctoral Scholar-Fellow and Postdoctoral Scholar-Paid Direct appointees may be paid or unpaid, depending on the



provisions of the funding agency agreement.

Postdoctoral Scholars are also eligible for unpaid leaves of absence as outlined in Article 13 of the MOU. Leaves of absence, other than use of personal time off or sick leave, require prior approval from the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel.

## **VII. Reviews and evaluations**

- A. Mentors must, within a reasonable time after the beginning of each appointment communicate to the Postdoctoral Scholar the mentor's research and progress expectations for the period of the appointment. The Postdoctoral Scholar may request that the expectations be provided in writing.
- B. Mentors shall conduct an annual written review of each Postdoctoral Scholar. A sample evaluation form is available at: <http://www.graddiv.ucsb.edu/scholars/staff-resources>. The evaluation form must be submitted with any request for reappointment, with a copy of the evaluation provided to the Postdoctoral Scholar upon request and a copy kept in the department personnel file. In addition, mentors and Postdoctoral Scholars must periodically engage in informal oral progress assessments.
- C. A Postdoctoral Scholar may elect to develop an Individual Development Plan (IDP) that identifies the Postdoctoral Scholar's research goals as well as professional development and career objects. The Postdoctoral Scholar's mentor should, upon request from the Postdoctoral Scholar, engage in the process of reviewing and discussing the IDP with the Postdoctoral Scholar.

## **VI. Layoff**

Layoff may occur as a result of the loss of appropriate funding for the position prior to the stated end date of the appointment. A Postdoctoral Scholar will be given 30 calendar days notice of layoff. Pay in lieu of notice may be given. The Postdoctoral Scholar may request a written summary concerning unavailability of funds. Consultation with Academic Personnel and Labor Relations prior to the initiation of any layoff action is strongly encouraged.

## **VII. Discipline and Dismissal**

Discipline or dismissal may take place when, in the University's judgment, the Postdoctoral Scholar's performance or conduct merits such action. Dismissal is termination of the appointment, prior to the appointment end date based on conduct or performance such that continued employment is not justified. Discipline may take one of the following forms:

- A. Written warning informing the Postdoctoral Scholar of the nature of the problem, requirements for continuation of the appointment, and possible consequences if the problems are unresolved.
- B. Suspension from the training program, without pay, for a stated period of time. Unless otherwise stated, such suspension will include loss of other privileges such as parking, access to University property and library privileges.
- C. Dismissal from the Postdoctoral Scholar position.  
Mentors and Departmental staff are strongly encouraged to contact Academic Personnel or Labor Relations prior to initiating any disciplinary action.

## **VIII. Approval Authority**

### Action

All actions

### Authority

Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel

III-23  
**VISITING [RESEARCHER AND PROJECT SCIENTIST] APPOINTMENTS**  
(Revised 2/15 4/15)

**I. Definition**

The Visiting prefix is used to designate one who:

1. Is appointed temporarily to perform the duties of the title to which the prefix is attached; and
2. Either has held, is on leave from, or is retired from an academic or research position at another educational institution; or whose research, creative activities or professional achievement makes a visiting appointment appropriate.

See APM 230 for System Wide policy on Visiting titles.

**II. Appointment Criteria**

The Visiting prefix may be used with titles in the Professional Research series or the Project Scientist series. When the title with the Visiting prefix is assigned to an individual on leave or retired from another institution, the title will usually be the same as the individual's title at the home educational institution.

The criteria for evaluation shall be the same as for the corresponding regular title. Because the appointment is temporary, reasonable flexibility may be employed in the application of these criteria. Care should be taken to inform the appointee of the provisions of IV below.

**III. Term of Appointment**

Each appointment or reappointment with a Visiting prefix shall not exceed one year. The total period of consecutive service shall not exceed two years.

If the appointee is later considered for transfer to a corresponding appointment in the regular series, the proposal for such transfer shall be treated as a new appointment subject to full customary review.

**IV. Compensation**

Appointments may be made on a paid or without salary basis. For paid appointments the salary for a visiting position is negotiated. While the salary does not have to be on-scale on the corresponding regular series scale, the salary may not be below the minimum rate for the rank. For example, a Visiting Researcher may not be paid below the Researcher Step I rate. Because these salaries are negotiated on an individual basis, they are not subject to range adjustments. For travel expense reimbursement, see APM 230-20h.

When an individual is paid an academic- year salary at their home institution and a visiting researcher appointment is proposed, the following formula is used to convert the salary:

$$\text{Salary at home institution} \times 1.16 = \text{salary for fiscal- year visiting appointment}$$

**V. Appointment process**

Requests for appointment in the Visiting Researcher series or Visiting Project Scientist series should be prepared using the [Visiting \(Researcher and Project Scientist\) Appointment Form](#). A UCSB Biography form and a CV must also be submitted.

**VI. Restrictions**

Neither tenure nor security of employment is acquired, although eligible service as a Visiting Assistant Researcher will count towards the University's eight-year limit (APM 133).

**VII. Approval Authority**

Action

All actions

Authority

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

IV-2  
**EMPLOYMENT LIMITS DURING MONTHS THAT INCLUDE  
 INTER-QUARTER AND SUMMER PERIODS  
 FOR REGISTERED GRADUATE STUDENTS  
 2015-16**  
 (Revised 04/15)

The following chart indicates the number of hours or time factors which may be reported during those months which include inter-quarter or off-quarter period without exceeding the permissible total employment computed at 50% for academic quarter service and 100% for inter-quarter or summer service:

<u>Pay Basis</u> <u>During</u> <u>Academic Quarter</u>	<u>Month</u>	<u>Period at 50%</u>	<u>Period at 100%</u>	<u>Maximum which may be reported for the month:</u>	
				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Percent</u>
11 month GSR	December	12/1/15 thru 12/11/15	12/12/15 thru 12/31/15	148	.8043*
	January	1/4/16 thru 1/31/16	1/1/16 thru 1/3/16	88	.5238 **
	March	3/1/16 thru 3/18/16, and 3/28/16 thru 3/31/16	3/19/16 thru 3/27/16	112	.6087***
	June	6/1/16 thru 6/10/16	6/11/16 thru 6/30/16	145	.8239

<u>Pay Basis</u> <u>During</u> <u>Academic Quarter</u> 9 month (TA or Associate)	<u>Month</u>	<u>Period during which employment beyond 50% may occur</u>	<u>Maximum <b>Additional</b> time reported beyond 50% for the month:</u>	
			<u>Hours</u>	<u>Percent</u>
	December	12/12/15 thru 12/31/15	56	.3043*
	January	1/1/16 thru 1/3/16	4	.0060**
	March	3/19/16 thru 3/27/16	20	.1087***
	June	6/11/16 thru 6/30/16	56	.3182

\*includes December 24, 25, and 31 holidays

\*\*includes January 1 holiday

\*\* includes March 25 holiday

V-1  
**ACADEMIC COORDINATOR**

(Revised 2/15)04/15)

**I. Definition**

This title is appropriate for appointees who administer academic programs that provide service to academic departments or research units, to students, or to the general public. The service must be closely related to the teaching or research mission of the University.

The duties of an Academic Coordinator are primarily administrative. Teaching or research related responsibilities will require appointment in an appropriate academic title. Occasional non-credit seminars or workshops may be conducted under the Academic Coordinator title. See APM 375 for System Wide policy on Academic Coordinators.

**II. Rank and Step**

This series contains ranks I - III. Ranks I and II include 15 steps, Rank III includes 9 steps.

**III. Appointment Criteria**

Appointment cases are to be submitted via the online case processing system *AP Folio* and using the "Documents to be submitted by the Chair" (Red Binder V-2.) .Reappointments are to be submitted via the ~~on-line~~ reappointment and modification module *of AP Folio*. The timing of the reappointment will be based on the original start date of the appointment and/or the availability of funding.

- A. An appointee must have a professional background of academic training and/or experience for appointment to this series. A Master's or equivalent or other appropriate degree(s) is usually required. Certain positions may require a doctorate or equivalent experience.
- B. The appropriate rank will be determined by taking into consideration such factors as program scope and complexity. APM 375, Appendix A provides guidelines for determining appropriate rank. In general, the ranks are differentiated as follows:
  - 1. Academic Coordinator I:  
Appointees will have responsibility for programs of minimal to moderate complexity. The program will normally have a small staff, and may consist primarily of local University-related activities with limited breadth or narrow focus. The appointee will likely receive general supervision from the department chair, a faculty member or other academic or professional staff.
  - 2. Academic Coordinator II:  
Appointees will have responsibility for programs of moderate complexity. The program will normally have a moderately-sized staff or a scope that encompasses several units or activities. The appointee is expected to manage the program with a great amount of independence.
  - 3. Academic Coordinator III:  
Appointees will have primary responsibility for the administration, management, and coordination of large programs with broad and substantial complexity. Responsibilities will be fulfilled independently (for example, unit heads who report directly to a dean or vice chancellor). Appointments to this level will require demonstrated superior professional ability, outstanding accomplishment in job-related activities, and the assumption of greater responsibility than typically delegated to Academic Coordinators at other levels.

**IV. Term of appointment**

- A. Appointments will normally be made for one year at a time, but may, with justification, be made for up to a maximum of three years at a time.
- B. No further notice of non-reappointment is necessary for appointments at less than 50% or for appointment of less than eight consecutive years in the same title or series.

Notice of non-reappointment must be given if the employee has served at 50% or more for eight or more consecutive years in the same title or series (APM 137-30). Written Notice of Intent not to reappoint must be given at least 60 days prior to the appointment's specified end date. The notice must

state (1) the intended non-reappointment and the proposed effective date; (2) the basis for non-reappointment; and (3) the employees right to respond within 14 days and the name of the person to whom they should respond. Within 30 days of the Notice of Intent, and after review of any response, the University will issue a written Notice of Action to the employee. Pay in lieu of notice may be given.

## V. Compensation

- A. Individuals appointed to this series may be compensated on an academic-year or fiscal-year basis, dependent on the nature of the position.
- B. Off-scale salaries are allowed within the same limits and policies as ladder faculty off-scale salaries. (Red Binder I-8)
- C. Salaries are subject to range adjustment.

## VI. Advancement

Advancement cases are to be submitted via ~~the online case processing system~~ *AP Folio* and using the checklist of documents to be submitted by the chair for Academic Coordinator reviews (Red Binder V-2).

- A. Merit increases will normally occur once every 2 years at Rank I and II and once every 3 years at Rank III. A personnel review must be conducted at least once every two years at Rank I and II and at least once every three years at Rank III. If advancement is not justified, a recommendation of “no change” may be made.
- B. All merits and promotions will be effective July 1. Completed cases must be submitted to the appropriate control point by May 1, preceding the effective date.
- C. Advancement from one step to the next is based on merit. Promotion to a higher rank will require significant change in the scope and complexity of the program administered.
- D. A request for merit advancement will require evaluation of the candidate’s performance and activity in the areas of: a) Coordination of the Academic Program, b) Professional Competence, and c) University and Public service. A request for promotion must also address the change in scope and complexity of the program administered. An updated job description must be included with each request for merit, promotion or reappointment.

## VII. Approval Authority

<u>Action</u>	<u>Authority</u>
New appointments	Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel
Reappointments and merits	Dean or Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, as appropriate
Promotions	Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

V-2  
**DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR**  
**ACADEMIC COORDINATORS**  
(Revised ~~2/15~~04/15)

All appointments and advancements are to be submitted via the online case processing system. AP Folio

**APPOINTMENTS**

- I. **Departmental letter of recommendation**  
Accurate and analytical letters of recommendation from the department are essential in the review process. See Red Binder I-35 for further detail of content of departmental recommendations:
- Are the dates of the appointment, rank and step all clearly stated?
  - Is the recommended salary on the published salary scale?
- II. **Complete CV and UCSB Academic biography form**
- Is the CV up to date?
  - Is the UCSB Academic biography form complete, signed and dated?
- III. **Job Description**
- Does the job description address program scope and complexity, degree of independence, budgetary responsibility, level of professional accomplishment required and scope of impact on the campus mission (See APM 375, Appendix A)?
- IV. **Copies of other supportive documentation**
- Has a representative sampling of supporting documentation been submitted?
- V. **Recruitment Packet**
- If required by Red Binder VII-I, III has the Academic Recruitment Packet been included?
  - If an exception to open recruitment is being requested, has it been reviewed by the Office of Equal Opportunity?

**Note:** The Procedural Safeguard Statement is not used for new appointments. However, candidates for appointment, once appointed, do have the right to inspect non-confidential documents in their files and to have a redacted copy of the confidential academic review records contained in the personnel review file received pursuant to APM 220-80-i.

**MERITS AND PROMOTIONS**

- I. **Departmental letter of recommendation**  
Accurate and analytical letters of recommendation from the department are essential in the review process. See Red Binder I-35 for further detail of content of departmental recommendations:
- Is the letter an accurate, extensive, and **analytical** representation of the case?
  - If there is a recommendation for an acceleration, are the reasons for the acceleration specifically stated?
  - In the case of a negative departmental recommendation, is the basis of the recommendation clearly documented?
  - Is all relevant information from the Departmental letter accurately entered on the case up-load screen?
- II. **Updated CV or Bio-bib**
- Is the CV up to date?
  - Is the Bio-Bib in the proper format?
  - Is the Research section a **cumulative** list of publications (or creative activities) with a line drawn separating all new items from where the bio-bib from the last review case had ended?
  - Are the numbers the same as in the previously submitted bio-bib, and have items previously listed as “In Press”, “Submitted” been accounted for?
  - Are all items, including “In Press”, “Submitted”, and “In Progress” properly numbered?
  - If sections other than Research are cumulative, are lines drawn showing what is new since the last successful review?
- III. **Job Description**

- Is an updated job description included if there have been changes since the last review?
- If there have not been changes in the job description, does the departmental letter state that fact?

IV. **Safeguard Statement (RB III-5).**

The candidate must sign an on-line safeguard which will be forwarded with the departmental recommendation. If it is difficult or impossible to obtain this document, the Chairperson should explain the situation and indicate in what manner he/she has attempted to meet the requirements outlined in the form.

- Has the candidate signed the safeguard statement? The case may not be forwarded until the candidate has signed.
- If there are confidential documents (e.g. letters of evaluation), the appropriate box under #5 and #6 should be checked.
- Are copies of everything the candidate has provided, or been provided, included with the case (e.g. redacted letters, list of potential evaluators)?

V. **Copies of supportive documentation**

- Has a representative sampling of supportive documentation been submitted?



V-6  
**CURATOR**  
(Revised 10/10/15)

There is no APM section describing this title. The title code for this series is 3650. At UCSB, the application of this policy is outlined in the following:

**I. Definition and appointment criteria**

An individual may be appointed to the without salary Curator title in a recognized Center or Museum when they:

- A. Have expertise in a particular discipline or collection
- B. Are a recognized authority in the particular discipline or collection
- C. Are actively involved in the management, curation, and conservation of the collection.

In addition, an individual appointment into the title of Curator is expected to:

- A. Advise the collections staff on curation
- B. Educate the public through such activities as workshops, seminars, leading tours for university classes, K-12 outreach programs
- C. Assist in grant writing and fund-raising as appropriate.

**II. Conditions of use of title**

An individual appointed as Curator will continue to hold their underlying ~~faculty~~ *academic* or staff title on a paid basis. The hiring unit will define the specific curatorial responsibilities for each appointee.

**III. Approval authority**

Action

All appointments  
*Personnel*

Authority

Dean or ~~VC Research~~ *Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic*

**ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIANS**

~~(10/10)~~ (Revised 04/15)

**I. Definition**

The titles in this series are used for academic appointees who provide top-level professional and administrative services to the University libraries as officers assisting the University Librarian.

**II. Ranks and Steps**

There are no steps within ranks of Assistant and Associate University Librarian.

The titles of Acting Associate Librarian and Acting Assistant Librarian may be used only for individuals on temporary assignments.

**III. Appointment Criteria and Process**

The candidate will normally hold a professional degree from a library school and have considerable subsequent experience as a professional librarian. Demonstrated superior professional ability and attainment are indispensable qualifications for appointment to either rank in the series. Appointees may be assigned authority for management of a section of the library or of a major functional area of library administration

Appointees as Assistant University Librarian will have major responsibility for assisting with planning and managing library operations.

Appointees as Associate University Librarian will have high level responsibility in the planning and management of the operation of the library or libraries of the campus. An Associate University Librarian is expected to be capable of functioning as deputy for the University Librarian when necessary.

Appointment cases are to be prepared by the University Librarian according to the checklist in V-11. The case is forwarded to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel.

**IV. Advancement Criteria and Process**

Reviews will be based on the criteria outlined in APM 365 including:

- A. Qualifications and accomplishments consistent with the planning and management of operations of the University Library or Libraries.
- B. Professional competence and quality of service within the Library
- C. University and public service; and professional activities outside the Library
- D. Research and other creative activity

The candidate will submit a memo to the University Librarian describing contributions and accomplishments during the review period, and may include any other relevant documents such as publications, evidence of presentations or other such materials. The candidate and the University Librarian will discuss the option of soliciting letters of recommendation for the case. If the result of this discussion is a decision to solicit letters, the candidate will submit a list of potential reviewers to the University Librarian who will then make the final determination of individuals to be asked for letters. The University Librarian may also solicit letters from individuals not on the candidates list but must notify the candidate if this option is exercised. The candidate may also provide names of persons who, in the view of the candidate, and for reasons set forth, might not provide objective evaluations.

Merit increases are not automatic but rather must be justified by the quality of professional and administrative service rendered by the appointee.

Advancement cases are to be prepared using the checklists of documents to be for AUL merits and promotions (Red Binder V-11). All advancement actions are based on the individual's achievements. Merit increases are based on the record since the time of last review while promotions are based on the career record.

The normal period of service between reviews is two years for an Assistant University Librarian and three years for an Associate University Librarian.

Merit increases will normally be 7% for a routine, *an* on time merit. Requests for increases of more than 7% must include evidence of excellence and performance beyond the expected standards for the position.

Promotion from Assistant University Librarian to Associate University Librarian must be justified not only by excellence of service and attainments, but also by demonstrated professional growth and accomplishment and/or the assumption of greater responsibility.

All merits and promotions will be effective July 1. Completed cases must be submitted to the Academic Personnel Office by May 31. Cases received after the due date will be returned to the Library and will not be processed. A missed deadline may not be used as justification for retroactivity in a future review.

Deferral will be automatic if an AUL does not submit material by the departmental due date and no case is forwarded by the library, with the exception of mandatory reviews.

Appointees must undergo a performance review at least once every five years, including an evaluation of the complete record since last review. This review may not be deferred. If the candidate does not turn in materials by the library due date, the University Librarian will conduct the review based on the materials available as of the due date.

In cases where the final decision is a lesser advancement than recommended by the department, a reconsideration may be requested. Procedures outlined in Red Binder I-10 must be followed.

## V. Compensation and term of appointment

- A. Appointment as Assistant or Associate University Librarian is for an indefinite term.
- B. The effective date of merits and promotions will be July 1.
- C. Salaries must be within the established ranges on the annually published salary scales from Office of the President. Exceptions above the maximum will require further review and approval by the Executive Vice Chancellor.
- D. Salaries are subject to range adjustment.
- E. Appointees accrue vacation and sick leave in accord with APM 710 and 730
- F. If an appointee is to be terminated, the conditions outlined in APM 365-20 must be followed. Termination due to lack of work or lack of funds requires at least one month's notice. Termination due to conduct or performance of duty such that immediate dismissal is justified requires no notice. Termination for any other reason requires four months notice if the appointee has less than one year of service, and six months notice if the appointee has one year or more of service. Assistant and Associate University Librarians are covered by Red Binder III-35 and APM 140 Grievance Policies for Non-Senate Academics.

## VII. Approval Authority

### Action

### Authority

All Actions

Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel

**V-20**  
**PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE**  
~~(05/14)~~ (Revised 04/15)

**I. Definition**

Appointees in the Professor of Practice series are distinguished professionals, either practicing or retired. A few may have traditional academic backgrounds, but most do not.

Professors of Practice help promote the integration of academic scholarship with practical experience. They provide faculty, undergraduate students, and graduate students with an understanding of the practical applications of a particular field of study. Professors of Practice teach courses, advise students, and collaborate in areas directly related to their expertise and experience.

Appointment may be made as Professor of Practice or Visiting Professor of Practice. The underlying title of Adjunct Professor will be used for payroll purposes.

**II. Appointment and advancement criteria**

Evaluation of the candidate for appointment or advancement ~~in this series~~ *as Professor of Practice or Visiting Professor of Practice* shall take into account the nature of the duties and responsibilities and shall adjust accordingly as to the emphasis placed on each of the following four criteria:

1. Professional competence and activity

For appointments, departments must identify the candidate's leadership in, and major contributions to, the field in question as well as document what credentials from practice he or she will bring to bear in teaching, research, and service. At the time of review, the department must demonstrate the appointee's continued record of exemplary professional practice and leadership in the field.

2. Teaching contributions

Professors of practice will design and teach undergraduate and graduate courses based on their expertise. Appointees are expected to teach primarily in professional programs at the graduate level. Instruction at the undergraduate level is permissible when an appointee's expertise warrants such an assignment, but is not required or normally expected.

3. Research contributions

Candidates in this series will have extensive practical experience that contributes to the research and teaching mission of the University. Appointees must have a well-established, evidence-based reputation for superior accomplishments in their fields. This may be evidenced by published works or presentations disseminated outside the scope of traditional scholarly journals and conferences, but otherwise subject to the same standards of quality and impact that govern other research contributions within the University.

4. Service contributions

Appointees, to the degree practicable, must bring their career experience to bear in university service. Such service activities should be related to the candidate's professional expertise and achievements.

### **III. Terms of service**

1. Faculty in the A Professor of Practice *or Visiting Professor of Practice* series may serve full time or part time, and with or without salary.
2. Salaried Professors of Practice *or Visiting Professors of Practice* may be appointed up to 100% time, but are normally appointed at 50% time or less. If appointed at 100% time, the appointee's full professional commitment must be to the University.
3. Appointments will be made at the Professor rank, steps I through IX. Appointments may also be Above Scale. The normal period of service at steps I-IX is 3 years. Service at step IX or above scale is normally 4 years. Eligibility for normal advancement occurs after the normal time of service at each step.
4. An appointment or reappointment as Professor of Practice may be for a period not to exceed three years, normally ending on the third June 30 following the date of appointment or reappointment. Appointment or reappointment may be for a shorter duration.
5. Visiting Professors of Practice may serve a maximum of two consecutive years and may not be reappointed.
6. Appointment or reappointment in the Professor of Practice series must have a specified ending date.

### **IV. Compensation**

1. The salary paid to a Professor of Practice will be at a negotiated annual rate. It will take into account but not necessarily be made equivalent to, the appointee's professional income.
2. The departmental recommendation letter must justify the salary level recommended.
3. The minimum pay level for the Professor of Practice series is no less than that of Professor, Step I. Step and salary will be based on the Professorial pay scale. Off-scale salaries are permissible to the same extent as for ladder-rank faculty.
4. At least one-half (50%) of any appointment in the Professor of Practice series must be supported by non-state funds.

### **V. Restrictions and Conditions of Employment**

1. This series does not accord tenure or security of employment.
2. This series does not convey membership in the Academic Senate.
3. Appointees in this series are subject to APM 137, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Term Appointment.

4. Appointees in this series are not eligible for sabbatical leave, but are eligible for other types of leave with pay in accordance with APM and campus policies
5. Salaried Professors of Practice are subject to the restrictions set forth in APM 025, Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members.

## VI. Appointment and advancement processes

1. Paid appointments *as Professor of Practice* that exceed one year will be considered the equivalent of ladder-rank faculty appointments for purposes of appointment and advancement. Procedures and policies concerning appointment and advancement within the ladder ranks will apply to these positions (Red Binder I). The checklists for appointment (Red Binder I-15) and for advancement (Red Binder I-31 and I-34) should be used when preparing cases.
2. All advancement actions are based on the individual's achievements. Merit increases are based on the academic record since the time of last review. Any advancement requested prior to the normative time at step will be considered an acceleration and must be justified as such.
3. All merits and promotions will be effective July 1. Completed cases must be submitted to the college by the deadlines established for ladder-faculty cases. Cases received after the due date will be returned to the Department and will not be processed. A missed deadline may not be used as justification for retroactivity in a future review.
4. Deferral will be automatic if a Professor of Practice does not submit material by the departmental due date and no case is forwarded by the department, with the exception of formal appraisals and mandatory reviews.
5. Appointees in the Professor of Practice series must undergo a performance review at least once every five years, including an evaluation of the record in all review areas. This review may not be deferred. If the candidate does not turn in materials by the departmental due date, the department will conduct the review based on the materials available in the department as of the due date.
6. External letters of evaluation will be required in cases of: appointment as Professor of Practice, merit to Professor of Practice, Step VI and merit to Professor of Practice Above Scale. The policies related to solicitation of external evaluation for ladder faculty must be followed (Red Binder I-46 to I-50).
7. Professional activity, teaching, and creative contributions may differ from standard ladder-rank professorial activities, and can also be judged on the basis of professional competence, intellectual contribution, originality, and the total value of the appointee's engagement with the department. Evaluation of the candidate with respect to these criteria should take into account the nature of the University assignment of duties and responsibilities.
8. *Appointments as Visiting Professor of Practice will follow the same process as appointment as a Visiting Professor (Red Binder II-28, V). Visiting Professors of Practice are not eligible for merit increases.*

## VII. Approval Authority

Action

Authority

All actions

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

**FACULTY ADMINISTRATORS**

~~(10/10)~~ (Revised 04/15)

Faculty Administrative titles require that the appointee hold an underlying academic title. Most often the title will be an Academic Senate title, but individuals from other series may also be appointed. Use of all titles requires prior approval as indicated in the following sections.

Appointment to a Faculty Administrative position is subject to approval by the Chancellor, or the Executive Vice Chancellor, and is governed by the applicable Academic Personnel Manual Policy and ~~campus~~ Red Binder policy. *The Executive Vice Chancellor will consult with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel prior to approval of any new faculty administrator positions.*

Individuals appointed to a full time administrative position are not subject to the mandatory five year review on the Professorial title, but will be reviewed in the administrative position once each five years as required by Senior Management Group and Academic Personnel Manual policy. Individuals compensated via an administrative stipend will continue to be subject to review on their Professorial title. Red Binder I-67 provides guidance concerning evaluation of administrative service in the personnel process.

The titles of Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, and University Librarian are covered by Senior Management Group policies.

Appointees to Faculty Administrative titles maintain their underlying academic title and all rights associated with the underlying academic title.

**Approval Authority**

<u>Type of appointment</u>	<u>Authority</u>
<i>Department Chair, Vice Chair</i>	<i>Executive Vice Chancellor</i>
<i>ORU Director, Assoc. Director</i>	<i>Executive Vice Chancellor</i>
<i>Dean</i>	<i>Chancellor</i>
<i>Associate Dean</i>	<i>Executive Vice Chancellor</i>
<i>All other titles</i>	<i>Executive Vice Chancellor</i>



**OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS**~~(10/10)~~ (Revised 04/15)

Service to the Campus and University is expected of every faculty member. In rare circumstances it may be appropriate to compensate faculty for short-term administrative assignments beyond those listed in Red Binder V-31. Examples include but are not limited to Chair of the Program Review Panel (PRP) or WASC Liaison Officer. Compensation for such service will normally be made via an administrative stipend. *All administrative stipends* and must be approved by the Executive Vice Chancellor. *Requests for new administrative stipends will be reviewed by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel prior to final approval by the Executive Vice Chancellor.* Rates will depend on the scope of the assignment's responsibilities. Stipends are not subject to general range adjustments. Faculty are limited to one administrative stipend at any given time (including stipends for Faculty Administrators at less than 100% time). Exceptions may be approved by the Executive Vice Chancellor and will occur only in rare and unusual circumstances.

VI-1  
**LEAVES OF ABSENCE**  
(Revised 11/14 04/15)

Policies on Leaves of Absence for both academic-year and fiscal-year appointees are outlined in APM 700 - 760. The following contains procedures on the Santa Barbara campus relating to these policies.

**I. General**

- A. Specific regulations have been established by The Regents and the President on certain types of leaves of absence. These are:
1. Sabbatical Leave (APM 740)
  2. Sick Leave (APM 710)
  3. Family and Medical Leave (APM 715)
  4. Vacation (APM 730)
  5. Holidays (APM 720)
  6. Leave to attend Professional Meetings (APM 752)
  7. Miscellaneous Leaves (APM 750, 751, 758, 759)
  8. Parental Leave, Childbearing and Active Service Modified Duties (APM 760)
- B. Because academic-year appointees are expected to be present from the beginning of the Fall quarter through the end of the Spring quarter, any appointee returning after the beginning of the Fall quarter or leaving before the end of the Spring quarter, should apply for a leave of absence in accordance with the applicable policy.
- C. ~~A faculty member~~ *All faculty (Senate and non-senate)* must submit their leave request to the Department Chair at least 45 days in advance of the begin date of the pay period of the quarter in which the leave is to be taken, unless circumstances beyond the control of the faculty member make this impossible. Requests for sabbatical leaves must be submitted three months in advance of the begin date of the pay period for the leave. Appointees in other titles are encouraged to submit leave requests as early as possible.
- D. Leave requests for periods of more than seven calendar days (other than vacation and sick leave for those in accruing titles) must be forwarded to the Dean or control point for approval, accompanied by a memo from the Department Chair or Director endorsing the leave (see IV below). Leave requests for more than 30 days also require input into the payroll system. **NOTE:** A leave without salary must be entered into the payroll system regardless of the length of the leave.
- E. All academic employees are covered by FML, CFRA and FEHA. In most cases university policy provides greater coverage than that required by State and Federal law. Please see the appropriate APM sections, as listed above, for information concerning coordination of University policy and State and Federal Law. FML will normally run concurrently with other approved leave.

**II. Leaves and the Eight Year Probationary Period; Assistant Professors, ~~and~~ Lecturers PSOE, and Assistant Researchers**

- A. Childbearing, Parental Leave or a combination of both, ~~which is equal to or exceeds~~ *of one quarter or more and which is not greater than one year*, whether with or without salary, is automatically excluded from service toward the eight-year probationary period. The *employee* (Assistant Professor, Lecturer PSOE, *or Assistant Researcher*) must inform the Department Chair in writing ~~before, during, or~~ *within one quarter after of the end of* the leave, if he/she wishes the time to be included as service toward the eight-year period. It should be noted that this is considered time ~~excluded~~ *excluded* from the ~~tenure/SOE~~ *clock* and the ~~Assistant Professor or Lecturer PSOE~~ *employee* should not be expected to produce any additional materials/ publications because of ~~this exclusion~~ *the lengthening of the probationary period*. Any materials/publications that are produced, however, should be considered in the next appropriate review.
- B. ~~A period~~ *Periods* of Active Service-Modified Duties ~~is~~ *are* included as service toward the eight-

year probationary period. ~~or toward other service limits described in APM 133.~~

- C. Upon request of an *employee* Assistant Professor or Lecturer PSOE who has 50 percent or more of the responsibility for the care of an infant up to age two, or a child under age five newly placed for adoption or foster care, an extension of the probationary period of up to one year may be granted by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel. The request for an extension must include a written statement by the ~~faculty member~~ *employee* certifying that he/she has 50 percent or more of the responsibility. Requests for such extension must be made within two years of a birth or adoption, and may not be made after the tenure review has begun. There is a limit of two such extensions during the probationary period to provide for birth or adoption.
- D. With the exception of Childbearing or Parental Leave *as noted in A. above*, periods of leave, either with or without salary, are included as service toward the eight-year period. Exception may be granted only if requested in conjunction with the original leave request, or in the case of sick leave, within one quarter or semester after the leave is taken. The Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, after consultation with the Committee on Academic Personnel, may determine that the activity undertaken during the course of the leave is substantially unrelated to the individual's academic career.
- E. For purposes of review for advancement or promotion accomplishments produced during the leave period will be considered as part of the total record, but the period of extension shall be excluded when evaluating the rate of research or teaching performance.

### III. Leaves and Sabbatical Leave Accrual

- A. Sabbatical leave credit is not accrued during a period of leave with or without pay. Credit will accrue if an absence is for less than one-half of a quarter.
- B. Sabbatical leave credit will accrue during a period of Active Service-Modified Duties when the duties are equivalent to at least 50% of normal duties. When such is the case, the Chairperson's endorsement of a period of Active Service-Modified Duties should include a statement to that effect.
- C. Sabbatical leave credit is not accrued during periods of service when more than 50% of the appointment is paid from extramural grant funding. Payment from extramural funding requires appointment in a Research title that does not allow accrual of sabbatical leave credit.

### IV. Chair's/Director's Request For Leave Approval Sample Letter

Date \_\_\_\_\_

TO: Dean/Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

FROM: Department Chair/Director

RE: Request for \_\_\_\_\_ Leave during 20\_\_-20\_\_ for \_\_\_\_\_  
(Type of Leave) (Name)

I endorse the request of \_\_\_\_\_ for a \_\_\_\_\_ leave  
(Name) (Type of Leave)  
for the period of \_\_\_\_\_ through \_\_\_\_\_ [for the \_\_\_\_\_ quarters.] A  
(Date) (Date) (Fall/Winter/Spring)  
copy of the written request is attached. \_\_\_\_\_ will return from the leave on  
(Name)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

The purpose of the leave is to \_\_\_\_\_  
(Explanation)

(For sabbatical leave include the location while on leave, collaborator, if applicable, source and amount of financial support while on leave, sabbatical leave credits to be used and sabbatical leave credit balance, as well as any request

for forfeit or liens of sabbatical leave credits).

\_\_\_\_\_ will receive \_\_\_\_\_% income from UC during the period of the leave (or will be without salary),  
(Name) (percent)  
\_\_\_\_\_ 's assigned courses will be covered by \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name) (Name)

[He/She is a Principal Investigator of a grant and appoints Professor \_\_\_\_\_ as a substitute for the  
(Name)  
period with approval of the sponsoring agency.]

I request your approval of this leave. (for sabbatical leave requests: Attached you will find a list of other faculty on approved leave during the period.)

Attachment(s) (written request for leave and list of other faculty on leave during the period.)

VI-9  
**PAY & SERVICE PERIODS FOR 2015-16**  
 (Revised 04/15)

**9-MONTH FACULTY TEACHING THE ENTIRE  
 ACADEMIC YEAR (or on leave for any portion)**  
**NOTE: Monthly salary equals 1/12th of annual**

<b>Quarter</b>	<b>Actual Service Period</b>	<b>Pay Period</b>	<b>Checks Issued</b>
Fall	09/20/15 - 12/11/15	07/01/15 - 10/31/15	07/31/15 09/01/15 10/01/15 10/30/15
Winter	01/04/16 - 03/18/16	11/01/15- 02/29/16	12/01/15 01/01/16 02/01/16 03/01/16
Spring	03/28/16 - 06/10/16	03/01/16 - 06/30/16	04/01/16 04/29/16 06/01/16 07/01/16

**9-MONTH TEMPORARY ACADEMICS TEACHING LESS THAN  
 3 FULL QUARTERS AND ALL REGISTERED GRADUATE STUDENTS IN TEACHING TITLES**  
**NOTE: Monthly salary equals 1/9th of annual**

<b>Quarter</b>	<b>Actual Service Period</b>	<b>Pay Period</b>	<b>Checks Issued</b>
Fall	09/20/15 - 12/11/15	10/01/15 - 12/31/15	10/30/15 12/01/15 01/01/16
Winter	01/04/16 - 03/18/16	01/01/16-03/31/16	02/01/16 03/01/16 04/01/16
Spring	03/28/16 - 06/10/16	04/01/16-06/30/16	04/29/16 06/01/16 07/01/16

NOTE: The pay per quarter is the same in both cases. The monthly checks for persons paid in four rather than three installments per quarter will be smaller, but the total amount paid will be the same. The annual amount is the same -- the amount per month is different.

VI-10  
**ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION**  
(Revised 4/15)

**General Policies**

Reference: APM 660

Additional compensation is any compensation, paid to an academic appointee by the University in excess of their full-time salary. The term "University" includes all campuses within the UC system. The term "additional compensation" refers only to compensation paid through the University payroll system and is not used to refer to compensation for employment outside of the University.

Additional compensation during the Summer quarter is allowed for academic appointees paid on a 9/12 basis. This is possible because the individual works for the University from September through June, but receives 12 paychecks spread over the year. If they do additional work for the University during the Summer, they can be paid additional money. They will continue to receive their regular pay as well as the additional compensation. All ladder rank faculty, as well as those in the Visiting Professors, Adjunct Professors, and Lecturer SOE series are eligible to earn additional compensation. Non-Senate faculty (Lecturer, Supervisor of Teacher Education, etc.) may also earn additional compensation subject to Article 37 of the Memorandum of Understanding. Additional compensation payments for research activities are made at the 1/9th rate based on the annual salary at the time of the activity. Additional Compensation payments for Summer Session teaching are made on a flat rate basis. The total additional compensation during the summer may not exceed the equivalent of **3/9ths of the faculty member's annual salary.**

Additional compensation during the academic year is allowed only for duties not directly related to the individual's recognized University duties. Examples of this include department chair stipends, Extension teaching, lectures given on other UC campuses and faculty consulting.

Additional compensation for fiscal year academic employees is generally not allowed, with the exception of some types of honoraria and Summer Session teaching.

Red Binder VI-14 and VI-17 provide further detail regarding specific types of additional compensation.

Other than the specific types of service covered by policy, Academic appointees may not be employed beyond 100% except in rare and unusual circumstance. Such requests must have prior approval from the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel and from Human Resources if a staff position is also involved.

Additional compensation for the summer period is calculated using the "Daily Factors 19-day Chart (Red Binder VI-12). The chart is used to determine the percentage of time and effort equivalent to the number of summer days worked. Each day during the summer can only be used once and the total percent time for each day may not exceed 100%.

Summer additional compensation may only be paid during the designated summer period. This is the time period from the day following the last day of final exams in the spring, through the last day before classes start in the fall. The dates represent the available days in each month of the summer period. This information will be updated on an annual basis. Actual days to be used will be representative of the dates of service.

Dates for 2014 Additional compensation

Dates for 2015 Additional compensation

<u>Month</u>	<u>Number Of Days</u>	<u>Percent time</u>
June 16-30	11	.5789
July 1-31	23	1.2105
Aug. 1-31	21	1.1053
Sept. 1-26	20	1.0526

<u>Month</u>	<u>Number Of Days</u>	<u>Percent time</u>
June 15-30	12	.6316
July 1-31	23	1.2105
Aug. 1-31	21	1.1053
Sept. 1-19	14	.7368

VI-15  
**INTERCAMPUS PAYMENTS**  
(Revised ~~11/14~~ 04/15)

Reference: APM 666

**One-time Payments**

Under certain circumstances Academic appointees holding full-time appointments may receive honoraria for lectures or similar services given on another UC campus. Such compensation may not be made from state funds, but is permitted from gifts, endowments, contracts and grants with specifically budget provisions for such honoraria or from University Extension. If non-state funds are not available, a faculty member may only be reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in presenting lectures or performing similar services from 19900 funds.

One-time honoraria payments are allowable up to \$1,500 per event, and up to \$3,000 by exception, requiring the approval of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel. During the academic year the total earned for lectures and similar services may not exceed 10% of the individual's annual salary. Payment will be made using the DOS code of **HON**.

Payments for lectures and similar services that take place during the summer count toward the 3/9th limit for summer additional compensation.

**Multi-campus appointments**

In situations where an academic employee is simultaneously employed on two campuses approval from the appropriate Dean's office and/or Academic Personnel office must be obtained **prior** to the processing of the Temporary Intercampus or Multi-campus Appointment Form. The total percent time on the two campuses may not exceed 100%. The employee will continue to receive a single paycheck from the home campus, with accounting processing payroll transfers from the host campus to cover the cost.

Processing of forms

When UCSB is the host campus, the department will prepare an [Intercampus One-Time Payment](#) form or [Temporary Intercampus or Multicampus Appointment Form](#) indicating the desire to hire a person from the home campus. The UCSB department should contact the home department to verify the individual's current title, pay rate and basis of pay. The form should be filled out to include the person's name, title for payment, the host department's name, the rate of pay and the period of the appointment. The appropriate individual in the department should sign as the "Host Campus Fund Source Authorization. The completed form must be submitted to the Academic Personnel office, with a copy sent to College office or other appropriate control point. *The Academic Personnel office will assure that the payment is allowed by policy and that the appropriate appointment paperwork has been processed for multi-campus appointments.*

When UCSB is the home campus, the [Intercampus One-Time Payment](#) form or [Temporary Intercampus or Multicampus Appointment Form](#) will be prepared and sent by the host campus department directly to the UCSB Academic Personnel office, and will then be forwarded to the home department. The department should verify the accuracy of the information on the form, ensure policy compliance, and obtain the appropriate departmental signature on the "Home Campus Dean's Office/Academic or Staff Personnel" line. The completed form must be submitted to the Academic Personnel office, with a copy sent to the College office or other appropriate control point.

VI-22  
**APPLICATION FOR ALIEN SALARY ADVANCE**  
(Revised ~~10/97~~ 04/15)

The Alien Salary Advance procedure was established to assist incoming alien academic appointees who need monetary assistance while getting settled in the United States. This fund is only available to those who have entered this country within the last 6 months.

An alien salary advance may be requested for up to \$8,000.00. The advance must be paid in full thirty days prior to the ending date of the appointment or within six months of arrival, whichever comes first.

Advances are not available (except on rare occasions) until the first day of the ~~faculty member's~~ *employee's* appointment. The ~~faculty member~~ *employee* may apply three to four days prior to the beginning date of the appointment to allow for processing of the application.

The application for the advance should include the following, which is prepared by the department:

- 1) The request should be made on departmental letterhead, addressed to the Associate Vice Chancellor, explaining the reason for the advance request; the amount; and the monthly repayments most convenient for the applicant. This letter should include the department chair's signature as well as the applicant's signature.
- 2) The department prepares a Form 5 check-request with the following information: The name of the person receiving the check, the reason for the check (i.e., "Alien Salary Advance"), the amount, and the departmental contact for check pick-up.
- 3) A copy of the appointment letter with final approval along with an IDOC or print screen from PPS showing the appointment has been entered into the system.

The Associate Vice Chancellor will approve the letter of request, sign the check request, and send the forms to Accounting for processing. Questions concerning alien advances should be directed to Academic Personnel, extension 3445.



VII- 7  
**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION ON ACADEMIC ADVERTISING**  
(Revised 05/14)

**I. General**

The OEOSH/TC, whether the advertising source is free or for a fee, must approve all academic advertisements.

Responsibility for the cost and placement of ads with vendors, distribution of advertisement flyers, etc., is the responsibility of each hiring department. Deans or control points may allocate funds to departments for the purpose of advertising. Costs beyond those allocations are the responsibility of the department.

All academic position advertisements are posted on UCRecruit.

**II. Basic Elements of an Advertisement**

1. Name of campus department and the academic program where the vacancy is located
2. Job Number–Assigned by UCRecruit at the time the position is posted.
3. Expected recruitment type (external or internal search)
4. Expected hire type (single, multiple, or pooled recruitment)
5. The level of the position if determined (e.g., Assistant, Associate, Open). For Senate faculty positions the level of the position listed in the ad must reflect the approved level of the provision.
6. The area of specialization/research–Preference or emphasis for a particular area of specialization can also be included. For Senate faculty positions the area must reflect the approved area of the provision.
7. The effective date of the position (e.g., effective July 1, 2001; or effective 2001–02)
8. Requirements–List any educational or other academic degree requirements if applicable. Care should be taken to clearly identify required qualifications from desired qualifications for the position.
9. Specify what constitutes a complete application. Departments may wish to request items such as the following:
  - a curriculum vita
  - statement of research interests
  - samples of published work
  - number of references required and the manner by which a letter of recommendation is obtained.
10. Specify a deadline for receiving applications. Whenever possible, Senate faculty searches should set an application deadline between November 15 and December 31. Application deadlines later than February 1 should be avoided when anticipating a July 1 start date. Departments should be mindful of the AAU recruitment deadline of April 30, and the Intercampus deadline of April 1 (APM 500-16).
11. Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Language–The following wording must be included in each ad: “The department is especially interested in candidates who can contribute to the diversity and excellence of the academic community through research, teaching and service.” The advertisement must end with: The University of California is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer and all qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, religion, sex, *sexual orientation, gender identity*, national origin, *disability status, protected veteran status*, or any other characteristic protected by law. ~~including protected Veterans and individuals with disabilities.~~”

VIII-1  
CAREER DEVELOPMENT AWARDS  
(Revised 09/08)

*The Career Development Awards are available to Senate Faculty and include three distinct awards and fellowships:*

**1. FACULTY CAREER DEVELOPMENT AWARD (FCDA)**

The **Faculty Career Development Award (FCDA)** program provides Assistant Professors and Lecturers with Potential Security of Employment the opportunity to strengthen their records in research and other creative activity by providing funds to enable them to spend uninterrupted time pursuing research interests or independent study. The FCDA program is specifically geared toward non-tenured faculty who, because of the nature of their position or their role in campus affairs, have encountered significant obstacles in pursuit of their research, creative work, teaching, service, or mentoring obligations, or who have made unusually time-consuming efforts in helping to achieve campus diversity. The FCDA program is also intended to support these faculty in helping the campus in meeting the goals of academic excellence and faculty diversity by ultimately contributing to the recruitment and retention of quality faculty.

**Eligibility:** Eligible faculty include Assistant Professors and Lecturers with PSOE. Applications may be submitted by faculty who are under review for tenure or security of employment. **However, if the applicant is subsequently awarded tenure or security of employment during the award period, then he/she is no longer eligible.** This policy is consistent with the principal purpose of the program, which is to help eligible non-tenured faculty develop a substantial record in research and creative work necessary for advancement to tenure, and should be taken into account in deciding whether to apply. *Faculty are eligible to receive two FCDA awards during their career.*

**2. REGENTS' JUNIOR FACULTY FELLOWSHIP**

The principal purpose of the program is to help eligible junior faculty develop a substantial record in research and creative work necessary for advancement to tenure.

**Eligibility:** Eligible faculty include Assistant Professors and Lecturers with PSOE. Applications may be submitted by faculty who are under review for tenure or security of employment. **However, if the applicant is subsequently awarded tenure or security of employment during the award period, he/she is no longer eligible.** *Faculty are eligible to receive two Regent's Junior Faculty Fellowships during their career.*

**3. REGENTS' HUMANITIES FACULTY FELLOWSHIP**

The purpose of the **Regents' Humanities Faculty Fellowship** program is to encourage and facilitate research, advanced or independent study, or improvement of teaching effectiveness in the humanities by providing supplemental summer or sabbatical leave salary.

**Eligibility:** The Humanities Fellowship Program is open to faculty members in the regular and acting Assistant and Associate professorial series, Lecturers with PSOE, and Lecturers with SOE regardless of department affiliation. However, awards are recommended only for those whose projects are clearly humanistic (i.e., studies in language, both modern and classical; religion; literature; jurisprudence; philosophy, archaeology, the history, criticism and theory of the arts; and those aspects of history, linguistics and the social sciences that have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods) or in the creative arts (painters, sculptors, composers, writers, poets, stage designers, performers and other artists in creative fields). *There is no limitation on the number of awards a faculty member may receive during their career.*

An annual call is issued during fall quarter for submission of applications *for the Career Development Awards*. Awards are normally announced by the end of Winter quarter.

**Nature of Support:** Career Development Award funding is granted for specific research proposals and related scholarly activities. ~~The FCDA program offers~~ Two types of awards *are available*: course release (one course) or summer research funds. Applications specify which type of award is being sought during the application process.

~~Faculty are eligible for up to two FCDA short term awards of the same type (one per year) during their career at UCSB.~~

**Evaluation Criteria** Applications for each award are carefully evaluated with respect to the following criteria:

- a. Quality of the proposal, particularly with respect to potential for long-term career opportunities and development.
- b. Timing of the proposed project in terms of critical periods of career advancement (e.g., tenure appraisal or other impending personnel reviews).

In addition, applications for FCDA award will also be evaluated for

Overall program goals, with particular consideration for prior and current obstacles to the development of a record in research and creative work necessary for achievement of tenure and further advancement.

**Administration:** The program is administered by the Office of Academic Personnel in consultation with the Office of Equal Opportunity and Deans. The Career Development Award Advisory Committee will review the proposals and make recommendations in each award category to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Academic Policy.

**Reporting Requirements:** At the conclusion of the award period, a brief narrative report specifying activities undertaken and the manner in which they contributed to the academic career development of the awardee is required. This report is due one month after fellowship termination and should be addressed to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel. Future awards will not be granted if this report is not received.

VIII-3  
**HELLMAN FELLOWS PROGRAM**

(04/15)

The Hellman Fellows Program was established through a generous gift from the Hellman Family Faculty Fund of the Hellman Family Foundation. The fellowships are awarded annually and are intended to support the research and creative activity of promising Assistant Professors to assist in the successful attainment of tenure.

An annual call is issued during winter quarter for submission of applications. Awards are normally announced by the end of spring quarter.

**Eligibility:** Assistant Professors who have served at least two years at rank are eligible to apply. Hellman Fellowships may not be received during the year an assistant professor is undergoing tenure review. The Hellman Fellowship is a one-time award.

**Nature of Support:** Awards may be used for such research-related expenses as research assistants, equipment, or travel. Faculty salaries, including summer salary, are excluded. All funds need not be spent in one year, but recipients must exhaust their funding before they come under tenure review. All expenditures must relate to the project proposed in the Hellman application.

**Evaluation Criteria** Awards are made without regard to the apparent timeliness or popularity of the field of study; preference will be given to research not substantially supported by other sources.

**Administration:** The program is administered by the Office of Academic Personnel. An advisory committee will be appointed to review the proposals and make recommendations to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel.

IX-18  
**Academic Personnel Records Retention**  
(Revised ~~11/14~~04/15)

The following guidelines are based on the University of California Records Disposition Schedule, available on-line at <http://www.policies.uci.edu/adm/records/721-11a.html>

The Academic Personnel Office is the office of record for personnel files of all academic employees other than the following:

<u>Series</u>	<u>Office of record</u>
Librarians	Library
Teaching Assistants, Readers, Graduate Student Researchers	Department

### **I. Retention of files**

Documents are to be maintained as follows:

#### Personnel files\*:

Senate faculty: Academic Personnel maintains files for Senate faculty indefinitely. If a Department or College is keeping a secondary file, that file must be maintained until the employee separates from the University.

Non-Senate Academics: Academic Personnel, as the office of record, maintains files for 5 years after separation. Departments must retain files until the employee separates from the University.

\*Items that are stored electronically ~~on line~~ *in AP Folio* by the Academic Personnel office and are accessible to the department or college do not need to be separately maintained in the department or college.

#### Applicant files

~~Files of applicants who do not become employees are to be maintained by the department for 3 years. UCRecruit is the file of record for applicant files. Departments do not need to maintain hard copy of applicant files.~~

Faculty appointment cases that are put forward but for review, but are ultimately unsuccessful recruitments will be maintained by Academic Personnel for 3 years.

Teaching evaluations (student comments and ESCIs) are to be maintained for the longer of:

- 1) until used in a review file, or
- 2) as long as a need is present

### **II. Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Obligations**

The United States Department of Labor sets forth specific obligations as an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer. In general, any personnel or employment record must be kept a period of not less than two years from the date of the making of the record or personnel action involved, whichever occurs later. . . . Such records include, but are not necessarily limited to, records pertaining to hiring, assignment, promotion, demotion, transfer, lay off or termination, rates of pay or other terms of compensation, and selection for training or apprenticeship, and other records having to do with requests for reasonable accommodation, the results of any physical examination, job advertisements and postings, applications and resumes, tests and test results, and interview notes. In the case of involuntary termination of an employee, the personnel records of the individual shall be kept for a period of not less than two years from the date of the termination.

The requirements of this section shall apply only to records made or kept on or after December 22, 1997.