

September 28, 2021

TO: Deans, Department Chairs, Directors, Senate Faculty, and Business Officers

FROM: June Betancourt, Director  
Academic Personnel

RE: **Revised:** 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 to be effective September 28, 2021.

A summary of changes is listed below. The complete Red Binder, as well as the annotated changes are available on the Academic Personnel website at:

<https://ap.ucsb.edu/policies.and.procedures/red.binder/>

Summary of changes

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| I-4                                 | Clarifies eligibility & normal periods of service within step         |
| I-8                                 | Off-scale advancements within Prof IX                                 |
| I-14                                | Clarification on appointment salary recommendations                   |
| I-26, I-60                          | Ad hoc review committee process and procedure clarified               |
| I-27, I-31, I-34, II-25, III-9, V-2 | Standardizes use of cumulative sections of biobib                     |
| I-30, <b>I-33</b>                   | Clarifies dean's authority merit reviews                              |
| I-36                                | Clarifies justification for accelerations                             |
| I-70                                | Streamlines process by which emeriti may serve on graduate committees |
| I-75                                | Reviewing agency tentative procedure                                  |
| III-14                              | Correction to extramural letters instruction                          |
| VI-1, VI-7                          | Adds bereavement and jury duty leave; clarifies approvals             |
| VI-4                                | Pronouns updated; adds PFCB leave                                     |
| VI-14                               | Release to grant funding threshold clarification                      |
| VII-4                               | Corrects language about senate search committee                       |

I-4  
**ELIGIBILITY, DEFERRAL AND MANDATORY REVIEW**  
(Revised ~~6/20~~)

### **I. Service Credit**

Six months or more of service in any one fiscal year normally count as one full year of service for merit eligibility. Less than six months of service 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 or Lecturer with Potential SOE (including time as an Acting or Visiting Assistant Professor) is limited to 8 years. Service at the Associate Professor/Lecturer SOE and Professor/Sr. Lecturer SOE levels is unlimited.

### **II. Extensions of the 8- year limit for Assistant Professors, Lecturers with Potential Security of Employment, or Assistant Researchers**

Under specific circumstances, an Assistant Professor, Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, or Assistant Researcher may request an extension of the 8-year limit. An individual may have no more than two extensions during the probationary period and requests may not be made after the tenure/SOE/Associate Researcher review has begun. Request for extension are to be addressed to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, via the appropriate Chair, Director and Dean or other control point. Extensions of the clock may be requested for the following reasons:

- a. **Childbearing or Childrearing:** A request may be made to allow the employee to care for any child who is, or becomes part of the employee's family. The employee must be responsible for 50 percent or more of the care of the child. The birth or placement of more than one child at a time constitutes a single event of birth or placement.
- b. **Serious Health Condition:** A request may made when the employee's ability to pursue his or her duties is significantly disrupted by a serious health condition or disability, by the need to care for a close family member who is seriously ill, or the death of a close family member. Supporting documentation must be provided with the request for extension.
- c. **Significant Circumstance or Event:** A request may be made when significant circumstances or events beyond the individual's control disrupt the individual's ability to pursue his or her duties. Examples include, the effects of a natural disaster or extraordinary delays in the provision of research resources committed to the individual which are necessary for his or her research activities. Supporting documentation must be provided with the request for extension.

When an extension of the tenure clock has been approved the individual should not be expected to have produced more or performed at a higher level than an individual who has 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. Extension of the tenure clock does not delay eligibility for appraisal, merit, or promotion. However, the extension may be used as the basis of a request for deferral of any of these actions for a period equivalent to the extension.

### **III. Regular Ranks, Steps, Normal Periods of Service**

The Assistant Professor/ Lecturer PSOE rank contains steps I-VI, although steps I and VI are not used at UCSB. The Associate Professor/Lecturer SOE rank contains steps I-V, although step V is not used at UCSB. The normal time of service at each step within the Assistant/PSOE and Associate/SOE rank is 2 years, except for service at the special steps of Assistant Professor/Lecturer PSOE V and Associate Professor/Lecturer SOE IV (Red Binder I-37). The Professor/Sr. Lecturer SOE 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 rank or step at that time, the candidate will continue to be eligible for the same advancement in rank or step each year until the advancement in rank or step occurs. *Although eligible, if advancement in rank or step occurs earlier than the normative period of service, it should be treated as an acceleration in time and guided by the parameters detailed in Red Binder I-*

**36.** Further advancement within step will only be allowed when the normative number of years at step have passed. Normal periods of service in other academic series are described in the Red Binder section covering the series.

#### **IV. 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.

#### **V. Mandatory Five-Year Reviews**

Senate faculty and appointees to the Research, Project Scientist, and Specialist series must undergo a performance review at least once every five years, including an evaluation of the individual's record in all review areas. This review may not be deferred. Most appointees in these series are reviewed for merit advance every two to four years, depending on rank and step. Appointees 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 will not constitute automatic deferral. If an individual 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.

#### **VI. Deferral of Review**

Deferral of non-mandatory reviews will be automatic if a tenured Senate 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 appointees in the Research, Project Scientist, or Specialist series must state the reason for the deferral. The request along with the endorsement from the Chair or Director must be submitted via AP Folio.

Deferral requests made by Assistant Professors or Lecturers PSOE 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 or Security of Employment 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 AP Folio. Deferral beyond the 7<sup>th</sup> year will not be considered. The Formal Appraisal review may not be deferred, except in cases of extension of the tenure clock.

I-8  
**OFF-SCALE SALARIES**  
(Revised 9/20)

### **I. UCSB Minimum Scale Rate**

As a result of salary increase programs, all academic employees must be paid at least at the UCSB minimum scale rate. The associated off-scale supplement assures equity among academic employees and with other UC campuses. An employee paid at UCSB Minimum Scale rate will be advanced to the Minimum Scale rate at the next step upon on-time advancement.

### **II. Off-Scale Appointments**

In instances of market pressures, efforts should be made to separate the issue of academically merited rank and step from the issue of the requisite salary needed to recruit a member of the faculty. For those academic areas in which market pressures are a consideration, departmental recommendations for appointment should reflect (a) a recommended rank and step appropriate to academic and professional achievement; and (b) an appropriate off-scale together with documentation of the market conditions that justify it.

### **III. Off-Scale Advancements**

Off-scale supplements are retained in on-time advancements. When properly justified an advancement with an increase in off-scale salary may be approved in situations which cannot properly be accommodated through advancement in step only. For example:

- a) a record of performance that exceeds that expected for a one-step increase but does not meet the expectations for a one-step acceleration.
- b) the record of performance does not justify advancement to the next step at the normative time but does represent a level of performance that supports a within-step increase.
- c) recognition of special services or other achievements not normally recognized by on-schedule or accelerated step advancement;

Red Binder I-36 provides further guidance regarding accelerated actions. Red Binder I-44 provides further guidance regarding the use of off-scale salary in retention efforts.

For faculty already at Step IX, consideration for further merit increase within Step IX is reserved for cases of highly meritorious contributions to teaching, research, professional activities, and service, which fully meet the performance expectations for faculty at the top step of the professorial ladder and which demonstrate progress towards eventual advancement to Above Scale status. An increase within Step IX may not exceed the dollar amount of an Above Scale ~~one-two~~-increment advancement. ~~Once~~ *If* advanced within Step IX, *if advancement progression* to Above Scale *should* occur at *sooner than* the normative time at step (four years), *with early* advancement ~~should be~~ *being* lateral (*maintaining salary but advancing in rank*) and eligibility for future merit ~~will be~~ determined based on the combination of years since *last salary* advancement within Step IX and the years at Above Scale.

A faculty member may receive no more than two within-step increases in the off-scale supplement. Additional off-scale increases may not be granted unless accompanied by advancement in rank or step.

I-14  
**SENATE FACULTY APPOINTMENTS**  
(Revised 12/19)

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://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws-regulations/bylaws/blpart1.html>

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 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.

#### **4. Affiliated status**

A 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 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 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.

Affiliated appointments are not entered into the payroll system.

5. Other "Professor" titles

For appointments of Adjunct or Visiting Professors refer to Red Binder V-17 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. *A justification for the proposed salary should be provided in the appointment recommendation based on factors such as the qualifications of the individual as they relate to the position and their record of academic accomplishment. Market forces can be relevant in new hires in competitive recruitments, but the salary of a recent departmental hire should not be used to determine the salary of a subsequent hire.*

## III. Letter to Prospective Senate Faculty 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 pleased to recommend you for an appointment as \_\_\_\_\_ in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ at the University of California, Santa Barbara. On behalf of my colleagues, and with the enthusiastic support of Dean \_\_\_\_\_, I would like to express our excitement at the prospect of your joining our faculty. According to the procedures of the University of California, formal review of the recommendation is necessary prior to the final approval of your appointment by the Chancellor. The department is recommending that you be appointed as a/an \_\_\_\_\_ with a 9-month salary of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ at 100% time effective, \_\_\_\_\_. The exact step and annual

salary will be determined by the academic personnel appointment review process. Following the review process, formal offers of appointment are extended by the Executive Vice Chancellor or Chancellor.

#### **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.

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

| <u>Rank/Step</u>  | <u>Authority</u>          |
|---|---------------------------|
| Assistant Professor/Lecturer PSOE II, III,<br>Including Acting titles | Dean                      |
| Assistant Professor/Lecturer PSOE IV and V                            | Associate Vice Chancellor |
| Associate Professor/Lecturer SOE                                      | Chancellor                |
| Professor, Sr. Lecturer SOE   | Chancellor                |
| Affiliated Appointments (0%<br>or without salary)                     | Associate Vice Chancellor |

**SENATE FACULTY ADVANCEMENT: PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARD AND CERTIFICATION STATEMENT**  
(Revised 7/19)

*Informational only: all safeguards are to be completed 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, 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 understand that I will be contacted by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel regarding* ~~was advised of my right to utilize either of the two~~ *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.

**CERTIFICATIONS**

- I certify that I have filed annual reports on outside professional activities in accord with APM 025 for each year of the review period for this advancement action.

Reports for the 2017-18 year and earlier may be submitted via AP Folio at \_\_\_\_\_

Reports for the 2018-19 year and later may be submitted via OATS at \_\_\_\_\_

- I certify that my bio-bibliography update (bio-bib) is complete, accurate, up to date, and prepared in accord with Red Binder I-27 Instructions for Completion of the Bio-Bibliography.

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

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

I-27  
**INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF THE**  
BIO-BIBLIOGRAPHY  
(Revised 9/20)

It is the responsibility of each faculty member and academic employee in a research title to maintain an up to date bio-bibliography (bio-bib). The bio-bib should contain information ending at the appropriate campus cut-off date as follows:

|                              |              |
|------------------------------|--------------|
| Senate Faculty               | September 15 |
| Research series              | December 31  |
| Project Scientist/Specialist | January 31   |

Departments may establish earlier submission dates if they desire. Information that falls beyond the cut-off 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.)

Contributions in all areas of review that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be listed under the appropriate review area and will be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. Contributions may take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of diverse populations, or research that highlights inequalities.

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, Previous and currently held Academic or Professional Appointments and Professional Organizations.

Research and creative activity

Appointees to the Lecturer SOE series will typically use a single section titled Professional and/or Scholarly achievement and Activity rather than two separate sections titled Research and Professional Activity.

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 must 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 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.

All copies of publications (including in-press, submitted, and in progress items) and evidence of creative activity are to be provided electronically. Published articles must be the final, published version. All items must be the version that reflects the status of the item as of the departmental cut-off date for submission of materials. Faculty and other academic employees should not have access to modify or switch versions of the documents once they are submitted to the department. Items may not be modified during the course of the review. All links should be verified before submission of the case.

Submission options:

1. Provide a separate link to each individual publication or creative work. Links may be to a locally maintained site or to an on-line publication site. The link must be listed at the end of the "Title and Author" information. The link must go directly to the specific item and must allow access to the full publication.
2. Provide a single link at the top of the Research and Creative Activities section of the bio-bib. A folder may be created that contains all publications and creative work. If this method is used, individual files within the folder must be labeled using the same formatting as the bio-bib, including the item number and title (e.g. A1: The Beginning of Time)

Proof of in-press status documentation should be stored either in a separate folder or along with the in-press items and documents must be clearly labeled to reference the appropriate publication (e.g. A 52 proof of in-press.)

If there are items that cannot be provided electronically, departments should work with their dean's offices (or in the case of academic researcher cases, with Academic Personnel) to facilitate alternate methods of submission. It is assumed that hard-copy submission will occur on a very limited basis.

#### 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.

A single link should be inserted at the top of the teaching section of the bio-bib linking to the electronic version of individual course ESCIs and student written evaluations. A separate file or PDF must be created for each course using a standard naming structure: Year, quarter, course. (e.g. 2020-21, Fall, INTR 201.)

#### Professional Activity

Appointees to the Lecturer SOE series will typically use a single section titled Professional and/or Scholarly achievement and Activity rather than two separate sections titled Research and 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.

If there is supporting documentation, it must be provided via a single link at the top of bio-bib section. Individual documents must be clearly labeled with the same title as the corresponding item on the bio-bib.

#### 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. Mentoring and advising of students and faculty that furthers diversity and equal opportunity may be listed as University service. If a cumulative list is maintained, a line must be drawn to show which activity is new since the last review.

If there is supporting documentation, it must be provided via a single link at the top of bio-bib section. Individual documents must be clearly labeled with the same title as the corresponding item on the bio-bib.

I-30  
DEAN'S AUTHORITY MERIT REVIEWS  
(Revised 4/19)

Deans have the approval authority for the following actions when the departmental recommendation is ~~for an on-schedule (one-step) merit advance with no increase or decrease the off-scale salary supplement,~~ at normative time or longer:

Assistant Professor and Lecturer PSOE:

*One-step a* Advances from Step II to III, ~~and or from~~ III to IV, *with up to an additional ½ step in off-scale supplement*

Associate Professor and Lecturer SOE:

*One-step a* Advances from Step I to II ~~and or from~~ II to III, *with up to an additional ½ step in off-scale supplement*

Professor and Sr. Lecturer SOE:

*One-step a* Advances Advances from Step I to II, II to III, III to IV, IV to V, VI to VII, VII to VIII, VIII to IX

Should a Dean 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.

I-31  
**DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR**  
**DEAN'S AUTHORITY MERITS**  
(Revised 9/20)

*All personnel review cases are submitted via 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 and Red Binder I-35 for details regarding the content of the departmental letter.

- Is the letter an accurate, concise and **analytical** representation of the case?
- Is the final departmental 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 appropriate 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 and Certification Statement.**

The candidate must sign an on-line safeguard and certification 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 and certification 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?**
- Have all links to supporting documents and one-of-a-kind items been verified?

**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?
- If small courses do not have ESCIs is an explanation provided in the departmental letter and an alternate form of teaching evaluation included?
- 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 advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion.

VII. **Sabbatical leave reports.**

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

VIII. **Copies of publications.**

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to maintain copies of published research or other creative work and reviews.

- Have all items included in Part I of the bio-bib for the current review period been submitted, including In Press and Submitted items?
- Has appropriate evidence been provided for In Press items?
- Do all of the titles on the actual publications match those listed on the bio-bib?
- Have links to electronically submitted items been verified?
- If items cannot be submitted electronically, have arrangements been made with the Dean's office?
- If any publications are missing from the file, is a note included noting which are missing and explaining why?



I-33  
**EXPANDED REVIEWS**  
(Revised 9/21)

The following actions for advancement in the Professorial or Lecturer SOE series require expanded review beyond the Dean:

Formal Appraisal

Terminal Appointments

Promotion to Associate Professor or Lecturer SOE

Promotion to Professor or Sr. Lecturer SOE

Merit to a special step

Merit to Professor/Lecturer SOE Step VI

Merit to or within Professor/Sr. Lecturer SOE Above Scale

Accelerated actions, except one-step advances as noted in RB I-30

Reduction in off-scale supplement

All 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 Expanded Review cases.

Senate members serving on the Committee on Academic Personnel will have Expanded Review actions reviewed by a shadow CAP instead of the current membership of CAP.

**DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR**  
**EXPANDED REVIEW CASES**

(Revised **2/21**)

*All personnel review cases are submitted via 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-75 for further discussion of evaluation of four areas of review and 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 final departmental 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 appropriate 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 and Certification Statement.**

The candidate must sign an on-line safeguard and certification statement 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 and certification 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?**
- Have all links to supporting documents and one-of-a-kind items been verified?

- V. **Extramural letters of evaluation** and list of evaluators in cases where extramural letters are required; promotion, or 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 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?
- Are any anomalies in the composition of reviewers (e.g. less than six letters, letter writer who wrote in previous review, etc.) explained?

**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 suggested, department suggested, or independently suggested by both?
- 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?
- If small courses do not have ESCIs is an explanation provided in the departmental letter and an alternate form of teaching evaluation included?
- 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 advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion.

- VIII. **Sabbatical leave reports.**

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

- IX. **Copies of publications.**

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to maintain copies of published research or other creative work and reviews.

- Have all items included in Part I of the bio-bib for the current review period been submitted, including In Press and Submitted items?
- Has appropriate evidence been provided for In Press 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?
- Have links to electronically submitted items been verified?
- If items cannot be submitted electronically, have arrangements been made with the Dean's office?
- 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?

I-36  
ACCELERATIONS  
(Revised 6/20)

Departments should not hesitate to propose accelerated advancement to reward cases of superior performance where there is clear justification. *When warranted, Acceleration can will typically* occur during an on-time review, ~~or through~~ *though in special cases it may occur through* early advancement to the next step or rank. For on-time reviews, an adjustment in salary via an increase in an existing off-scale supplement may be proposed when the appropriate reward does not correspond to early advancement in step. *Early advancement requires additional extraordinary achievements, prizes, or activities, in order to justify the acceleration in time.* Response to “market pressures,” as evidenced by competitive outside offers in the context of a retention case, would typically be addressed via increase in the off-scale salary supplement, *as described in Red Binder I-8*, and not necessarily by advancement in step, *as described in Red Binder I-8 and I-44.*

In formulating justifications for ~~larger than normal~~ *accelerated* advancements, the department and reviewing agencies must first provide evidence that the candidate has met the requirements for a normal, one-step advancement, *commensurate with expectations for the normative time at step*, prior to addressing any recommendation for acceleration. The record must include evidence of superior performance beyond the requirements for the one-step advancement, with no significant deficiencies in the record.

Examples of possible evidence of superior performance include but are not limited to:

- Achievement well above disciplinary/field norms in creative activities (such as research publication, exhibitions, or performance), with particular emphasis on research/creative activities in significant venues that would have an impact beyond normal expectations.
- Prestigious new awards or other such evidence of peer recognition for the impact of past creative work or teaching.
- Extraordinary achievements in two or more areas of review, coupled with excellent performance in the other areas.

Acceleration at the time of a merit review must be based on activity during the period since the last review. Acceleration at the time of a career review may be based on the cumulative record.

As with any on time advancement, the individual’s next eligible date for advancement will be based on the effective date of the accelerated advancement if an advancement in step occurs. The next eligible date will not normally be affected by an increase in off-scale supplement with no change in step.

**AD HOC REVIEW COMMITTEES**

(Revised 11/14)

**I. General**

Ad hoc review committees are required for the following reviews:

- 1) recommendation for termination
- 2) appointment or promotion to tenure or security of employment

An ad hoc review committee may be appointed for any level of review when it is determined by CAP or the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel that additional expert analysis is required in order to make a more informed recommendation. CAP may waive the requirement of ad hoc committee review in appointment cases at Professor VI or above. CAP may act as its own internal ad hoc committee in cases other than recommendations for termination.

**II. Make-up of Ad Hoc Review Committees**

Ad hoc review committees are made up of three members plus a non-voting departmental representative. ~~Under special circumstances, the Chairperson of a department may serve as departmental representative. In cases of advancement to Above Scale, a departmental representative is not normally appointed to the committee. Normally the Department Chair will be asked to serve as the departmental representative. If the Department Chair is unable to serve, a vice-chair or other senior faculty member in the department may be asked to serve.~~

When an ad hoc review committee is considering its recommendation, the department representative will participate in the discussions to some reasonable point before the conclusion of the discussion and the vote. ~~The departmental representative is charged with providing information about the departmental recommendation and about discipline and department specific norms and expectations, not their own personal position on the case.~~ A departmental representative will be provided an adequate opportunity to present any and all relevant information that ~~he or she wishes they wish or is requested are asked~~ to provide, but ~~he or she they~~ will not contribute to, or see the letter of the ad hoc review committee.

**III. Appointment of Ad Hoc Review Committees**

Faculty members are nominated by the Committee on Academic Personnel to serve on ad hoc review committees. ~~If the Department Chair is unable to serve as the departmental representative, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel may request that the department chair recommend another appropriate member of the department to serve in this role.~~

~~When an ad hoc committee is to be appointed, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel will contact the Department Chair to solicit recommendations of departmental faculty members for service as departmental representative on the ad hoc committee. Normally three names will be requested. The Department Chair must not disclose to the candidate or to other faculty in the department the names included in the recommendation.~~

~~The Department Chair should select faculty members who: (1) participated in the departmental review and voted on the case; (2) have familiarity with the research area of the candidate; and (3) will be in residence during the quarter the case is likely to be considered. Possible suggestions for ad hoc committee service may include faculty members who were centrally involved in the preparation and/or presentation of the candidate's case to the department. In all cases, the Department Chair should provide a slate of nominees who will be as objective as possible.~~

~~The recommendation by the Chair of a particular faculty member, or members, does not in any way limit the ability of the Committee on Academic Personnel to nominate other eligible faculty members from the department to serve as departmental representative.~~ Committees are appointed by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel. The committee is informed that its membership, deliberations and decision are strictly confidential, as is the name of the candidate. In accordance with APM 160, the candidate is entitled to receive a redacted copy of the ad hoc review committee's report, without disclosure of the identity of review committee members.

**IV. Candidate Request Concerning Ad Hoc Membership**

Requests concerning the membership of the ad hoc committee should be submitted by the faculty member directly to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel. Such requests will be kept confidential and will be honored

to the extent possible. Faculty members may request the following prior to the formation of the ad hoc committee:

~~(a) — that two members of his or her department representing majority and minority opinion in his or her case be appointed to the review committee.~~

~~(a) (b)~~ that a member of the review committee be appointed from another UC campus.

~~(b) (c)~~ that a limited number of specific faculty members from ~~his or her~~ *their* department not be appointed as the Department Representative for the ad hoc committee. ~~to review his or her case~~. In no case may more than 20% of the department faculty eligible for service on the particular review committee be excluded, except that one person may be named no matter how small the department.

#### ~~V. Department Representative~~

~~The designated departmental representative should decline to serve:~~

~~1) — If he/she has not participated in the departmental review of the candidate, or~~

~~2) — If he/she voted with a minority of faculty members regarding the merits of the case or would, on other grounds, find it difficult to represent the department's position.~~

#### ~~VI. V. Ad Hoc Committee Reports~~

The Chairperson of the ad hoc review committee is encouraged to write the committee report immediately after the meeting takes place. In any event, the Chairperson's draft report is due in the Academic Senate office within ~~48~~ *72* hours of the ad hoc committee meeting. ~~If circumstances prevent meeting this deadline, it is appreciated if the Chairperson notifies the Senate Secretariat of the anticipated delay.~~

All members of the ad hoc committee are bound by a "modified signature waiver" under which members are obligated to sign the final version of the ad hoc committee report within three working days of being notified that the final version is ready for signature. A member's signature will be assumed if ~~he or she has~~ *they have* not physically signed the final report or submitted a minority statement by the end of the three working day period.

**PROCEDURE FOR RECALL OF SENATE FACULTY**

(Revised 4/19)

A Senate Faculty member who has retired may be recalled to active teaching duty for one quarter or more. Retired faculty may also be recalled for research activity. A faculty member may be recalled 90 days after the date of retirement, or after receipt of the first retirement payment, whichever occurs first. However, in no case may a faculty member be recalled sooner than 30 calendar days after the retirement date. Appointments may not exceed 43% time, alone or in combination with other recall appointments. Exceptions to this limit may be granted only by the Chancellor and will rarely occur. A faculty member considering returning on a recall basis in the quarter immediately following retirement should consult with the benefits office.

Requests for recall appointments are made using the [Academic Recall Appointment Form](#).

**I. Teaching appointments**

The appropriate annual salary for the recall appointment is the annual rate at the time of retirement, range adjusted forward. A retired Senate Faculty member may be recalled to teach one quarter or more. If recalled for only one quarter, the appointment should be on a 9/9 basis. If the appointment is for one full year it may be made on a 9/12 basis. Appointments will be entered into UCPath using the Recall Teaching title.

**II. Research appointments**

A retired Senate Faculty member who is recalled to serve in an extramurally funded research capacity may be appointed as a Research Professor. These are normally year-to-year appointments. Appointments may also be made for shorter periods of time. The terms and conditions of employment for a faculty member who is recalled for research parallel those of a faculty member who is recalled to teach. ~~However, those holding the Research Professor title will have the right to direct Masters and Ph.D. theses without the need to petition the Graduate Council for permission.~~ In the event that a Senate Faculty member is recalled both to teach and for extramurally funded research in the same department for the same time period, the Research Professor title will be used. Requests for appointment as Research Professor may be sent directly from the employing unit to Academic Personnel. Paid appointments as Research Professor are made on an 11/12 rate. The appropriate annual rate at the time of retirement, range adjusted forward, converted to an 11/12 basis (multiply the current 9/12 rate x 1.16). Appointments will be entered into UCPath using the Recall Faculty title.

**III. Administrative appointments**

Recall appointments will be approved for administrative service only in rare and unusual circumstances and may be approved only by the Executive Vice Chancellor after consultation with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel. Terms of such appointments will be individually set based on the nature of the service. The Academic Personnel office should be consulted to determine the appropriate annualized salary rate. Appointments will be entered into UCPath using the Recall Faculty title.

**IV. Approval authority**

| <u>Title</u>                  | <u>Job Code</u>        | <u>Approval Authority</u> |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Professor Emeriti             | 1132                   |                           |
| Sr. Lecturer SOE Emeriti      | 1621                   |                           |
| Lecturer SOE Emeriti          | 1620                   |                           |
| Recall: teaching              | 1700 (Recall-Teaching) | Dean                      |
| Recall: research              | 1702 (Recall-Faculty)  | Associate Vice Chancellor |
| Recall: teaching and research | 1702 (Recall-Faculty)  | Associate Vice Chancellor |
| Recall: administrative        | 1702 (Recall-Faculty)  | Executive Vice Chancellor |

## APPOINTMENT AND ADVANCEMENT

**A publication of the  
Committee on Academic Personnel  
prepared in consultation with the  
Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel  
(Revised 9/20)**

This compilation is intended as an aid for the use of Departmental Chairs and Senate faculty. It is not a substitute for the official documents governing appointment and advancement at UCSB, the Academic Personnel Manual and Red Binder, which are authoritative and must be carefully adhered to in personnel actions. Rather it is intended to provide a comprehensive overview of the policies and procedures governing appointment and advancement from the perspective of the Committee on Academic Personnel. Key terms are in **boldface type** to draw attention to their importance; *italics* are used for emphasis.

The official manual governing personnel actions is the Academic Personnel Manual (APM), issued and revised by the President of the University. UCSB campus policies and procedures are contained in the “Red Binder.” The President also issues an annual list of salary scales. These documents are available for reference at <https://ap.ucsb.edu/>

| <b>CONTENTS</b>  | <b>Section</b> |
|--|----------------|
| Ranks, Steps, and Normal Periods of Service within Steps | I              |
| Materials Required for Personnel Actions                 | II             |
| The Review Process                                       | III            |
| Some Procedural Matters                                  | IV             |
| Criteria   | V              |
| Confidentiality and Personnel Safeguards                 | VI             |
| Departmental Voting on Personnel Cases                   | VII            |
| Diversity Self-Assessment                                | VIII           |



## I. RANKS, STEPS, AND NORMAL PERIODS OF SERVICE WITHIN STEPS

The information in this summary concerns primarily the faculty in the **professorial and lecturer security of employment (SOE) ranks**: Assistant Professor/Lecturer PSOE, Associate Professor/Lecturer SOE, and Professor/Sr. Lecturer SOE. There is a normal period of service for most **steps** within these ranks, as indicated in the following table. However, movement between ranks (**promotion**) or from one step to another within a rank (**merit advancement** or **merit increase**) depends upon merit. It is never automatic, and it can be faster than normal in recognition of outstanding performance (an **acceleration**) or delayed when performance is not up to normal (a **deceleration**).

### REGULAR RANKS, STEPS, NORMAL PERIODS OF SERVICE

| ASSISTANT PROFESSOR<br>LECTURER PSOE<br>(8 year limit,<br>non-tenured) |                                     | ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR<br>LECTURER SOE<br>(6 years normal,<br>tenured) |                                     | PROFESSOR<br>SR. LECTURER SOE<br>(indefinite, tenured) |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <u>Step</u>  | <u>Normal<br/>period of service</u> | <u>Step</u>   | <u>Normal<br/>period of service</u> | <u>Step</u>  | <u>Normal<br/>period of service</u> |
| I  | 2 (not used at UCSB)                |   |                                     |  |                                     |
| II   | 2                                   |   |                                     |  |                                     |
| III  | 2                                   |   |                                     |  |                                     |
| IV   | 2                                   |   |                                     |  |                                     |
| V  | 2 (over-lapping step)               | I   | 2                                   |  |                                     |
| VI   | 2 (not used at UCSB)                | II  | 2                                   |  |                                     |
|  |                                     | III   | 2                                   |  |                                     |
|  |                                     | IV  | 3 (over-lapping step)               | I  | 3                                   |
|  |                                     | V   | 3 (not used at UCSB)                | II   | 3                                   |
|  |                                     |   |                                     | III  | 3                                   |
|  |                                     |   |                                     | IV   | 3                                   |
|  |                                     |   |                                     | V  | 3                                   |
|  |                                     |   |                                     | VI   | 3                                   |
|  |                                     |   |                                     | VII  | 3                                   |
|  |                                     |   |                                     | VIII   | 3                                   |
|  |                                     |   |                                     | IX   | 4                                   |

**Information contained within this document applies equally to both series unless otherwise noted. For ease of use, only the professorial series ranks are listed.**

Assistant Professor V and Associate Professor IV are **special steps**. Service at these steps may count as "**time-in- step**" in the related steps of the next higher rank; e.g., after two years as Associate Professor IV and one year as Professor I, a candidate may be reviewed for a normal merit increase to Professor II, just as would be done after three years at Professor I. Normal advancement occupies six years at the Assistant Professor rank with eight as the maximum before either promotion or termination; six years at the Associate Professor rank; and an indefinite time in the Professorship.

In addition to the regular steps, some appointments or advancements may be made **Above Scale**, i.e., to salaries above Professor IX. These salaries are reserved for scholars of "the highest distinction, whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed." An exceptionally high salary must be approved by the President.

Service at Professor V through IX, or at Above Scale salary may be for indefinite duration. Accelerated advancement before three years of service at these steps (four years at Step IX and Above Scale) will occur only in exceptional cases. Everyone will be formally evaluated at least once every five years (**a mandatory review**).

### Off-scale salary supplements

An individual may be given an **off-scale** salary, consisting of a **salary supplement** added to the listed salary at the assigned step. A recommendation for such a salary increase must be fully justified by the department or reviewing agencies recommending it. At UCSB off-scale salaries are used to respond to external market conditions in recruitment and retention, as well as to provide a partial reward in cases when a full step advancement is not indicated.

## II. MATERIALS REQUIRED FOR PERSONNEL ACTIONS

Each time a recommendation for a personnel action is initiated, a **dossier** or **file** containing materials relevant to that recommendation is prepared by the Department Chair. The complete dossier includes the following:

1. The **UCSB Biography** form supplied by the candidate at the time of appointment, which summarizes their professional career including salaries up to that time. (*Needed only for appointments*)
2. The updated **Bio-Bibliography** prepared by the faculty member (Not required for appointments)
3. In certain cases **extramural letters** of appraisal or recommendation from qualified experts evaluating the quality of a person's research or creative work and their professional reputation. Such letters are required in all cases of appointment and promotion, and for advancement to Professor VI and Professor Above Scale. A minimum of six analytical letters is required, and at least half should be chosen by the Chair in consultation with the department but independent of the candidate. The other half can be nominated by the candidate. It is important that at least some of the external evaluators are familiar with UC standards. For certain advancement cases, UC familiar references are required. The department's submission must include a coded list including a brief resume of the qualifications of each reviewer, indicating whether the reviewer was chosen by the candidate or by the department. This list should also indicate any relationships between the candidate and the reviewer (e.g., thesis advisor, co-author, etc.) and if the reviewer has previously written for the candidate.

The Chair should have minimum contact with the extramural evaluators beyond the letter soliciting the evaluation, because intended or unintended suggestions or hints to the evaluators may distort results and work unfairly either for or against the candidate.

4. A letter of recommendation initiating the proposed appointment or advancement, normally written by the Department Chair. (When a Chair is under consideration for advancement the case will be handled by a Vice-Chair or other senior faculty member). The Chair's letter should be accompanied by all relevant information, including particularly the signed **Safeguard Statement** in advancement cases.
5. A thorough evaluation of teaching as described in Section V below.
6. A complete set of publications covering the review period. "Review period" in cases for appointment and promotion means the complete record of the candidate (in cases where this is impractical, a complete record of the most recent work and a sample of other significant works may be submitted). For merit review cases "review period" means years at step, ignoring any off-scale salary supplement. All items are to be submitted electronically via links in the bio-bib. If this is not possible, the department must work with the respective Dean's office to arrange alternate submission.

## III. THE REVIEW PROCESS

Overview of the reviewing process (many of these steps are not applicable to appointment cases)

1. In the spring the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel publishes a list of faculty members eligible for normal advancement or promotion during the coming academic year.
2. The Department Chair notifies each faculty member of their eligibility for personnel review. The Chair should also review faculty not on the eligibility list for the possibility of accelerated merit or promotion.
3. The faculty member *either* requests a deferral of action for one year *or* prepares evidence for the review, with the assistance of a departmental personnel committee, or a case supervisor, or the Chair. Deadlines for submission of materials to departments should be set in line with College or Campus deadlines to allow timely processing of cases.
4. The candidate is given the opportunity to respond to the materials in the file.
5. The case is presented and discussed. This is followed by a vote of eligible faculty in accordance with Senate By-Law 55 or other departmental voting procedures approved by CAP.
6. The Chair writes a letter analyzing the case and summarizing the department's recommendation. This letter is available for inspection, amendment, or rebuttal by all eligible department members.

7. A candidate for advancement is given an oral summary or written copy of the departmental recommendation and provided the opportunity to comment.
8. The candidate completes the Safeguard Statement.
9. A separate confidential letter from the Chair should not be submitted except on the rare occasions when evidence exists that could not be appropriately shared in the department letter.
10. The department letter, along with all publications, teaching evidence and other materials pertaining to this review (the “dossier”) is sent forward to the Dean.
11. In cases where the Dean does not have final authority, the dossier, including the Dean's letter, is sent to the Office of Academic Personnel, which forwards it to the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). CAP assigns the case to one or more members, usually from as similar a field as possible. (Note: cases are *never* assigned to a CAP member who belongs to the candidate's own department; in fact, CAP members are never present during discussion of cases from their own departments.)
12. In appointments and promotion to tenure, terminations, and advancements to Above Scale, an ad hoc review committee is appointed by the Chancellor’s designee on nomination from CAP. CAP may elect to serve as their own internal ad hoc except in the case of a terminal appointment recommendation.
13. CAP considers the case *after* the ad hoc committee and the Dean have submitted their letters. If no ad hoc review is required, CAP proceeds once the Dean’s recommendation is received. A draft letter is written by the assigned member, distributed to the whole committee, read aloud, and fully discussed. A vote is taken in the rare cases when a consensus recommendation cannot be reached.
14. CAP's recommendation is forwarded to the Office of Academic Personnel for the final decision. If the Chancellor's (or designee's) *tentative decision* differs from CAP's and/or the Dean's recommendation, it is sent back to that agency for further comment. If the recommendations vary by \$4,000 or less, the Chancellor (or designee) will not be required to consult further. However, when the recommendation differs by greater than \$2,000 but less than \$4,000, the Chancellor (or designee) will provide written justification of the recommendation to the file. *by 1 step/increment or more (in salary or step), it is sent back to that agency for further comment. If the recommendations differ by less than 1 step/increment but greater than ½ step/increment, the Chancellor (or designee) will provide written justification of the recommendation to the file. When the recommendation differs by a ½ step/increment or less, the Chancellor (or designee) will not be required to consult further.*
15. The Chancellor's (or designee's) final decision is communicated to the department and the candidate. In certain cases a “Chancellor’s tentative decision” must precede the final decision. (See Red Binder I-39)

#### Details of the review process

1. Preparation of the Recommendation: (see Red Binder I-35) Recommendations for personnel actions normally originate with the Department Chair. Their letter should provide a comprehensive assessment of the candidate's qualifications together with detailed evidence to support the evaluation. The letter should also present a report of the Chair's consultation with the members of the department, including the vote tally and the basis for any dissent. The Chair should explain any apparent anomalies in the voting, e.g., a disproportionately small number of votes relative to departmental size, or excessive abstentions.

The departmental 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 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 the letter refer to the candidate's past accomplishments and which refer to accomplishments falling within the current **review period**.

The candidate has the right to augment the dossier with items relevant to the case, so long as the submission does not violate the privacy of third parties or other campus policies. Such materials may include self-assessments, award letters and other professional items. Dissenting department members have the right to have a minority report included with the department letter. However, a minority report should not be submitted unless, after good-faith efforts by all parties, the minority believes that its views are not accurately represented in the Chair’s letter.

The Chair should also communicate with the candidate as required by Section 220-80 of the APM and outlined in "Departmental Checklist for Academic Advancement", Red Binder I-22. An oral summary or preferably a written copy of the departmental letter is given to the candidate as part of the review process.

2. The Dean of the appropriate college or division makes their analysis and recommendation without reference to the recommendation of any reviewing agency other than the Department. They have access only to the departmental file, to previous departmental letters, and to previous Dean's recommendations. Of course, publicly available scholarly materials are available to all reviewing agencies.
3. On behalf of the Chancellor, An *ad hoc* review committee (nominated by CAP and appointed by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel) is may be formed for cases involving promotion to tenure, tenure appointment, and terminal appointment. The membership of such a committee is known only to CAP and to the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, and the committee itself. In promotion and appointment cases, the ad hoc review committee includes a representative from the Department who is not present during the final discussion and vote; it normally includes faculty of the same or higher rank and step from related departments. The ad hoc review committee makes its recommendation independently of all other reviewing agencies; it has access only to the file as it comes from the department. It does not have access to the prior personnel review file, to the Dean's letter, or to a separate confidential letter from the Chair, if one was submitted.
4. The Committee on Academic Personnel has access to the analyses and recommendations of all the aforementioned agencies, and to previous recommendations concerning the candidate.
5. The Chancellor (or designee) reviews the recommendations of all reviewing agencies (department, Dean's office, ad hoc review committee, if any, and CAP). If there is an inclination to make a decision which differs from the CAP's or the Dean's recommendation, that agency is informed of the tentative decision and given the opportunity to respond. **If the recommendations vary by \$2,000 or less, the Chancellor (or designee) will not be required to consult further. If the recommendations vary by \$4,000 but more than \$2,000 the Chancellor (or designee) will write a note to the file explaining their decision in lieu of a tentative decision. The final decision is communicated to the candidate and the department. (Note: some cases with salaries above a certain level require Presidential approval.) if the recommendation differs by 1 step/increment or more (in salary or step). If the recommendations differ by less than 1 step/increment but greater than 1/2 step/increment, the Chancellor (or designee) will provide written justification of the recommendation to the file. When the recommendation differs by a 1/2 step/increment or less, the Chancellor (or designee) will not be required to consult further.**

#### IV. SOME PROCEDURAL MATTERS

1. Requests for Further Information: Any reviewing agency may request additional information or documentation. The Dean sometimes requests such information directly from the Chair; ad hoc review committees and CAP always make such requests through the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel. Such requests do not reflect on the merit of the candidate, nor do they imply that the departmental recommendation is not credible. They are meant to make the case file complete. The candidate should be informed of additional materials obtained (APM, Section 220-80-h).

Chairs should take special care to prepare the case thoroughly and properly. Significant delays result from improper or inadequate preparation of cases at the departmental level. When a reviewing agency requests additional information, 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.

2. Reconsideration: In special circumstances, after a decision is made, the Department Chair may begin the process of review again by requesting reconsideration. *Requests for reconsideration must include important additional evidence or documentation of previously mentioned work pertinent to the review period omitted in the original recommendation, such as a major publication, award, etc., or evidence that the decision was not based on a reasonable evaluation of the case.* Sometimes departments may wish to request reconsideration without such evidence in order to show solidarity with the candidate or for similar reasons. This clogs the whole process. *Such requests should not be submitted.*

3. **Non-Reappointment:** When it is decided that an Assistant Professor should not be reappointed (given a **terminal appointment**), or when a department recommendation for promotion to tenure may be denied, the Assistant Professor is given due notice, in accord with APM Section 220-20-c. Terminal appointments, whether originated by the department or elsewhere, are always given a full review, including consideration by the Dean, ad hoc committee, and CAP. (See APM Section 220-84.)
4. **Formal Appraisal:** The APM requires that at a certain point in their career each Assistant Professor should be appraised. The purpose of the **appraisal** as stated in the APM is:

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. (Section 220-83.)

This appraisal is normally made during the fourth year of the Assistant Professor's career at the University. When an assistant professor has been appointed at a high step, the department may recommend tenure without a preliminary appraisal, if the record merits it.

The departmental letter concerning an appraisal should contain:

- a. A description and analysis of the candidate's total performance in each of the four areas of evaluation.
- b. An evaluation of that performance as progress toward eventual tenure.
- c. A clear statement that the recommendation of the department is: (a) "continued candidacy for eventual promotion", (b) "continued candidacy with reservations" (which should be specified), or (c) "terminal appointment". An Appraisal decision should never be interpreted as a *promise* of eventual promotion to tenure.

The appraisal recommendation may be integrated into the letter concerning the merit increase provided that the fact that an appraisal has been made is clearly stated.

After the review is completed, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel will provide redacted copies of the review documents to the candidate.

5. Like a recommendation for advancement, a departmental recommendation for no change in rank, step, or salary must include an evaluation of the case, a summary of the relevant evidence, a summary of departmental views, and a record of the departmental vote.
6. Sometimes a candidate asks not to be reviewed for advancement, i.e., to be granted a **deferral**; Except for Assistant Professors, deferrals are automatic if no case is submitted by the relevant deadline. For Assistant Professors, the Chair should determine whether the candidate's self-evaluation is accurate and should briefly review the available evidence in their letter. The request is then forwarded to the Dean. No person at any rank may go more than five years without a formal evaluation. Mandatory reviews may not be deferred.
7. **Reviewing Agency Reports:** When the candidate signs their safeguard statement, they may request that reviewing agency reports be supplied to them at the close of the case. The reviewer reports will be automatically provided once the case is decided. If the candidate does not make the request at the time the safeguard statement is signed, they may do so at a later date via AP Folio. The candidate will already have been given an oral summary or written copy of the departmental letter and of any confidential materials submitted with the file.

## V. CRITERIA

The criteria for promotion and advancement in the professorial series are:

- (1) Teaching
- (2) Research and other Professional Creative Work

- (3) Professional Competence, Activity, and Recognition
- (4) University and Public Service

The criteria for promotion and advancement in the Lecturer SOE series are:

- (1) Teaching
- (2) Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity
- (3) University and Public Service

Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievements, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions in the professorial series. Clear evidence and documentation of consistent and sustained excellence in teaching is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to security of employment positions in the lecturer SOE series. Insistence upon these standards is necessary for maintenance of the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge. Teaching, research, professional and public service contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be given due recognition in the evaluation of the candidate's qualifications. An individual may not be arbitrarily disadvantaged if he or she elected to take a childbearing or parental leave, to stop the clock, or to defer a personnel review.

### **Evidence of Teaching (Professorial and Lecturer SOE series)**

According to University policy and the APM, professors at all ranks must have a current teaching record in order to be advanced.

In the Professorial series, effective teaching is an essential criterion for appointment or advancement. In the Lecturer SOE series, consistent and sustained excellence in teaching is the **primary** criterion for appointment or advancement. Clear documentation of ability and diligence in teaching is required.

In judging the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching, the following should be considered: the candidate's command of the subject; continuous growth in the subject field; ability to organize material and to present it with force and logic; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; fostering of student independence and capability to reason; spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize the candidate's learning and teaching; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students, to encourage high standards, and to stimulate advanced students to creative work; personal attributes as they affect teaching and students; extent and skill of the candidate's participation in the general guidance, outreach and mentoring, and advising of students; effectiveness in creating an academic environment that is open and encouraging to all students. Attention should also be paid to the variety of demands placed on instructors by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels, with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities. (APM 210.1.d(1)).

The principle in evaluating teaching is that consistency be applied across the campus in order to facilitate appropriate comparisons. However, to accommodate varying departmental needs, the requirement for consistency in reporting is held to a minimum number of items. Beyond that minimum, departments must determine which aspects of evaluation are the most appropriate for them and then must apply these standards consistently in all personnel cases at all levels.

The information used in assessing teaching must be summarized for each case and should include:

- a. Nominal information tabulating the teaching record of the candidate during the review period, including:
  - i. A listing (by course name and catalog number) of the candidate's teaching load, the academic quarters during which the courses were taught, a class-by-class enumeration of the number of students enrolled, and the number completing the two campus wide student survey items (see section b. i)
  - ii. Enumeration of the M.A. and Ph. D. candidates they are supervising or has directed to completion of their degrees, the M.A. and Ph.D. committees on which they have served, and

other contributions to the graduate program.

This nominal information is summarized using the standardized format contained in the bio-bibliographic form.

- b. Evaluative information assessing the teaching record of the individual during the review period must be presented. In order for the numerical scores on the student evaluation forms to not assume disproportionate weight, departments are urged to include as many other criteria as appropriate.
  - i. *Student respondents*: Systematic surveys of student opinions are essential for all classes taught by the candidate. These evaluations must be part of the record. The departmental letter must compare the candidate's scores with departmental scores for comparable classes. It is understood that it may not be appropriate to conduct student evaluations in very small classes. In cases where evaluations are not available for the majority of classes due to small class size, the departmental letter must indicate the reason surveys were not conducted and an additional, alternate source of teaching evaluation (other than the overall departmental assessment) must be included in the case.

Departments may include whatever questions they like, except that:

All student evaluations *must* include at a minimum the following two standard campus wide survey items: (1) *Please rate the overall quality of the instructor's teaching*; (2) *Please rate the overall quality of the course, including its material or content, independent of the instructor's teaching*.

These evaluations must be part of the record and must be supplied for each course taught. To enable and strengthen comparative ratings on a campus wide basis, all student evaluations based on the two campus wide survey items must use a 1-5 scale with 1 high, with the following description explicitly stated on the form: (1) Excellent; (2) Very Good; (3) Good; (4) Fair; (5) Poor.

Reviewing agencies will return cases to the departments if they do not conform to these guidelines.

- ii. *Departments must also provide other items they judge appropriate for determining the effectiveness of teaching*. APM 210-1 specifies that for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor comments from other faculty members on the candidate's teaching are required.

*Suggestions*. Open-ended questions asked of graduating seniors, graduate students, or alumni are extremely effective when compiled over time. Graduate student and/or teaching assistant ratings are useful, particularly when these ratings are collected over time and then summarized by a disinterested third party so as to guarantee student anonymity.

Placement of graduate students is one of the best measures of success in graduate teaching.

*Peer assessments*. On-campus and/or off-campus peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching effectiveness may also be included in the teaching dossier. These assessments may be based on evaluations of syllabi, reading lists, examinations, laboratory reports, class notes, or in-class visitations. If a department chooses such methods, they must be consistently applied at all ranks and steps with regard to principles of academic fairness. No intimidation or chilling effect arising from methodological or ideological postures may be allowed to contaminate the process.

*Departmental Perspective*: The Department Chair or other agency 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.

*Self-Evaluation*: The department should encourage the candidate to submit a brief self-assessment of teaching effectiveness. This can include past, present, and future goals and objectives and how these were (will be) met. Details may include philosophy of instruction;

strategies used; innovative instructional activities; instructional grants; comments about any strengths or deficiencies suggested by students or peers.

The department should provide such self-assessments to reviewing agencies along with the case, or explain why such assessment is impractical.

### **Evidence of Research and Creative Work (Professorial series):**

Research and creative accomplishments should be evaluated in the context of the faculty member's overall record of their intellectual growth, and of the contribution their work makes to the discipline. There should be evidence of continued and effective engagement in work of high quality and significance. No appointment or promotion to a tenured position will be made without evidence of intellectual distinction in research or creative activity. The research record should show growth, direction, and promise for the future.

A work once counted for an advancement cannot be counted again (except in highly unusual and demonstrably appropriate circumstances). The departmental letter must present the publication record for the current review period according to the following format: [A] Published work; [B] Work in press; [C] Work submitted; [D] work in progress. "Work in press" means 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. "Work submitted" is work that has been submitted but not yet accepted. This work is not usually counted for the advancement, but it is used as evidence of continuing scholarly productivity. "Work in progress" is 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. If nonstandard terms such as "forthcoming" are also used, the department must define them carefully and state how they relate to the three categories above. *Not doing this may prevent a candidate from receiving proper credit or cause other anomalies in the review process.*

Classifying works is not always easy, but identification should be as precise as possible, and should refer to intellectual content rather than to physical format. For example, in literature and history a "book" may be an extended piece of research reviewed for publication by expert referees; such a work should be distinguished from editions, anthologies, translations, or collections of other scholars' work. An "article" is normally a piece of research published in a refereed scholarly journal; it should be distinguished from popular pieces, preliminary research reports, reports for industrial or governmental agencies, and chapters (i.e., solicited pieces of an interpretative and summarizing nature). Similarly, in many disciplines, a review-article is normally a survey of current research in the field, not a lengthy book-review; while "editions" may be mere reprints with brief introductions, or they may be major works of historical reconstruction and critical interpretation. In different disciplines the standard terms (and the possibilities of ambiguity) are different; but in every case the classification should be as clear and helpful as possible.

It will help reviewing agencies to accurately evaluate the record if departments comment upon the prestige and significance of journals, publishers, or exhibition or performance venues in particular fields, along with other accepted measures or impact in a discipline (such as citation indexes or reviews).

Textbooks, reports, circulars, and similar publications are normally considered evidence of teaching ability or public service. However contributions by faculty members to the professional literature or to the advancement of professional practice or professional education, should be judged creative work when they present new ideas or incorporate original scholarly research. (APM 210.1.d(2)).

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.



### **Professional Competence and Activity (Professorial series):**

Evidence includes such items as a) election to significant offices of professional or learned societies; b) appointment as editor or referee for professional journals or other publications; c) invitations to lecture, present papers, review books, perform or exhibit; d) awards, grants or honors bestowed by organizations or foundations; e) requests for consultative service. Opinions expressed by extramural evaluators, and reviews of the candidate's work or citations of their work by other researchers also constitute evidence of professional recognition. Departments should provide background and context for these accomplishments so reviewing agencies can evaluate their significance and importance.

### **Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity (Lecturer SOE series)**

Professional and/or scholarly activities may be related to the underlying discipline itself or to the pedagogy. Such activities should provide evidence of achievement, leadership, and/or influence on the campus or beyond. Certain administrative work (e.g., of learning centers and teaching programs) and community outreach work are also relevant, as would be presentations of seminars or lectures at other institutions or professional societies, or participation in scholarly activities (e.g., summer seminars) designed to enhance scholarly expertise in relevant fields. Other records of participation in intensive programs of study - in order to be a more effective teacher and scholar, with the goal of enhancing one's teaching and scholarly responsibilities - are also relevant evidence of professional and/or scholarly activity. Creative activities count as relevant professional and/or scholarly activities in appropriate disciplines. In certain fields, such as art, architecture, dance, music, literature, and drama, an accomplished creation should receive consideration as an example of professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity. In evaluating creative activities, an attempt should be made to define the candidate's merit in light of such criteria as originality, scope, richness, and depth of creative expression. Evidence includes such items as:

- a. Documentation of the development of or contributions to:
  - i. Original materials designed to improve learning outcomes;
  - ii. Evidence-based design and evaluation of educational curricula or pedagogy;
  - iii. Administration and evaluation of a teaching program or a learning center;
  - iv. Systematic quality improvement programs and evaluation of their implementation;
  - v. Discipline-specific information systems;
  - vi. Development and evaluation of community outreach or community-oriented programs.
- b. First, senior, or collaborative authorship of scholarly or professional publication;
- c. Accomplished performance, including conducting and directing;
- d. Accomplished artistic or literary creation, including exhibits;
- e. Accepted invitations to present seminars or lectures at other institutions or before professional societies.

Activities may be listed on the bio-bib in the separate traditional categories of research/creative activity and University/Public service, or may be combined into a single category of Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity.

### **University and Public Service (Professorial and Lecturer SOE series):**

The bio-bibliographic update should include a list of the candidate's service (with dates) in departmental, Senate, other campus, and administrative capacities (including committee service), and of their formal service to the community or to public agencies. Evaluation of the quality of their service in these areas is important. Recognition should be accorded faculty for able administration of faculty governance; it should also be accorded for able service to the community, state or nation. Contributions to student welfare, mentorship and to affirmative action efforts should be recognized. Periods of service on various committees should be dated.

As faculty advance in rank and step, expectations for engagement in meaningful service increase proportionally. Non-tenured faculty should be cautioned against undertaking too many committee assignments, since these may interfere with the two main areas for promotion, research and teaching. Most service at both the Assistant Professor/Lecturer PSOE and Associate Professor/Lecturer SOE rank should be at the departmental level, however

Associate Professors/Lecturers SOE may begin to take on broader campus service. At the Professor/Sr. Lecturer SOE rank, campus service, in addition to departmental service is important, particularly at the higher steps of the rank, and notably for advancement to and within Above Scale.

## **VI. CONFIDENTIALITY AND PERSONNEL SAFEGUARDS**

Our system of review depends upon impartial professional judgment, and confidentiality has always been essential to the effective functioning of the system. One reason for confidentiality is that it protects impartial judgments from pressures of other interested parties. At UC, confidentiality applies to the votes and analyses of individual department members; to the authorship of extramural letters of evaluation; and to the membership of ad hoc review committees.

Confidentiality, however, is consistent with the rights of candidates to understand the evidence and the criteria upon which they are judged. The details of a candidate's rights in this area are described in APM Sections 160 and 220 and are designed to assure that the use of confidential documents does not cloak abuse.

## **VII. DEPARTMENTAL VOTING ON PERSONNEL CASES**

Departmental voting rights in personnel cases are governed by **SENATE BY-LAW 55** (Santa Barbara Division By Law 240). Substantial differences among departments exist. *Departmental voting plans must be approved by the CAP and be on file in the Office of Academic Personnel.*

## **VIII. SELF-ASSESSMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO ADVANCING DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION (“DIVERSITY STATEMENT”)**

The UC system-wide policy regarding the appointment and advancement of its faculty (APM 210.1.d) states: "The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements." Providing a diversity statement as a part of the review process assists reviewing agencies in understanding and recognizing the range and extent of faculty efforts addressing diversity, equity and inclusion. Such work can often go unrecognized for faculty members, as it may involve activities that are difficult to 'count' or may seem indistinct from other areas of review without additional context. For example, a faculty member may be called upon to informally or unofficially mentor underrepresented, underserved, diverse students who seek-out that faculty member due to shared identities or experiences.

Although not a separate category in the personnel review process (which includes Research/Creative Activities, Teaching/Mentoring, Professional Activities, and Service) crediting efforts which advance diversity, equity, and inclusion can augment assessments in any one of the 4 areas of review. In these cases, such recognitions are meant to highlight diversity work that is above and beyond the normal and typical expectations for a faculty member. For example, mentoring a student from an underserved group is within the expected scope of duties and would not typically, in isolation, indicate efforts that warrant additional recognition. Similarly, including demographic variables that incorporate underrepresented populations in research studies does not suggest engagement exceeding normative expectations. There is no presumption that all faculty will engage with this opportunity, nor are diversity statements required, however, it is anticipated that many faculty will use such statements to articulate the diversity work they have been involved in at our increasingly inclusive University (as described in APM 210.1.d). Such descriptions should be sufficiently detailed and provide appropriate context for understanding how these efforts go beyond normative expectations. As with the teaching self-assessment, the diversity statement is an opportunity to provide context and evidence of impact or effectiveness towards a fuller understanding of those contributions. Simple enumeration of material evident in the file (e.g., lists of activities or students supervised) does not by itself substantially advance the review process in this area. Additionally, to be taken into consideration by reviewing agencies, all material listed in diversity statements should also be present on the bio-bib. Whenever possible, these efforts should be corroborated at various levels of the review process (faculty statement, department letter, letter from the Dean). Accuracy of the diversity statement is the responsibility of the faculty member, as is the case with the bio-bibliography information generally. The length of diversity statements will depend on the extent and complexity of contributions; an effort should be made to keep the statements succinct. Statements on diversity

contributions may also be woven throughout the candidate's teaching or research self-assessments, into review letters from the Department or Dean, or in a stand-alone statement.

II-25  
**DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR**  
**CONTINUING EDUCATORS**  
(Revised 9/20)

**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 and the level of the appointment clearly stated?
- Is the recommended salary on the published salary scale?
- Is the JPF# from UC Recruit included?

**II. Complete CV and UCSB Academic biography form**

- Is the CV up to date?
- Is the UCSB Academic biography form complete, signed and dated?
- Have all links to supporting documents been verified?

**III. Job Description**

- Does the job description address program scope and complexity, degree of independence, level of professional accomplishment required and scope of impact on the campus mission?

**IV. Letters of evaluation and list of evaluators**

**Letters**

- Have all letters been coded?
- 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 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?

**V. Supportive documentation**

- Has a representative sampling of supporting documentation been submitted?

Other considerations:

1. If a search was conducted, the search report must be approved in UC Recruit before the appointment is submitted. If no search was done, a waiver must have been approved.
2. 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.

**REAPPOINTMENTS**

**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 and the level of the appointment clearly stated?
- Is the recommended salary on the published salary scale?

**II. 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?

## MERITS

### 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 signed and dated?
- 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?

### 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?
- Have all links to supporting documents been verified?

### 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).**

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.

- Is it signed and dated?
- If there are no confidential documents (e.g. external letters, minority opinion report), box **6.D.** 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. **Supportive documentation**

- Has a representative sampling of supportive documentation been submitted, including a sampling of Continuing and Professional Education Programs developed, teaching evaluations or other one-of-a-kind items as appropriate?

III-9  
**DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR**  
**RESEARCH REVIEWS**  
(Revised 9/20)

All personnel review cases are submitted via 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 final departmental 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?**
- Have all links to supporting documents and one-of-a-kind items been verified?

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 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- 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 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 suggested, department suggested, or independently suggested by both?
- 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 advancing diversity, equity and inclusion.

VII. **Copies of publications.**

It is the responsibility of each candidate to maintain copies of published research or other creative work and reviews.

- Have all items included in Part I of the bio-bib for the current review period been submitted, including In Press and Submitted items?
- Has appropriate evidence been provided for In Press 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?
- Have links to electronically submitted items been verified?
- If items cannot be submitted electronically, have arrangements been made with the Academic Personnel office?
  
- 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-14  
**PROJECT SCIENTIST SERIES**  
(Revised ~~2/21~~)

**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. Represented employees in this series are governed by the applicable Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Article 22 of the MOU provides guidance specific to the Project Scientist series.

**II. Ranks and Steps**

- A. Assistant Project Scientist I – V (Step 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 are to be made based on the service limitations indicated in Red Binder III-1 and, for represented employees, in the MOU.
- B. There are no limits on service at any level in this series.

**V. Compensation**

- 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. In most cases, a Project Scientist appointment will be a salaried position. Without salary status may be appropriate for short periods of time, for example if the Project Scientist is self-funded as a PI or co-PI. A without salary appointment is not appropriate if the individual holds a primary affiliation with and is funded by another academic institution or outside agency.
- C. Salaries are subject to range adjustment.
- D. Each source which provides compensation for service in this series must permit research.
- E. 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 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 reappointment and modification module of AP Folio.

### Advancement: Merit and Promotion

Advancement cases are to be submitted via 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.

Requests for deferral of non-mandatory reviews must be submitted by the deadline established by the department. Appointees in the Project Scientist 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.

### **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 campus cut-off date of January 31, 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. 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 explained in the list of reviewers.** Reviewing agencies reserve the right to request that additional letters be solicited in any appointment or 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) is to be used, with the following wording inserted as appropriate:

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for (an appointment/promotion to) Associate Project Scientist/Project Scientist in the (department/unit). Appointment (or Promotion) to Associate Project Scientist/Project Scientist within the UC system 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. [Sample wording for evaluation request: e.g., I would greatly appreciate your evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_'s work.]

For promotion cases add: In assessing the academic record of the candidate, please keep in mind the significant disruptions the University experienced as a result of COVID-19. In March of 2020, just as the Winter Quarter was ending, the UCSB campus was closed and our faculty rapidly transitioned to remote work. All campus research facilities including labs and libraries were closed; travel was halted; access to external facilities and archives ceased; and opportunities for professional engagement and visibility were restricted.

At the same time, many employees had to provide fulltime childcare or dependent care, as our local daycares and other facilities closed. Some had to work and teach in home environments that presented significant technical and logistical obstacles.

It is our expectation that these unprecedented circumstances be taken into consideration in the evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_'s contributions since Winter 2020. Although our standards for quality and excellence have not changed, we wish to be realistic about the constraints that employees experienced during this difficult time, and the impacts and consequences of these limitations on research, even after a return to more normal activities

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.

## **VII. Approval Authority**

Action

Authority

All actions

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

V-2  
**DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR**  
**ACADEMIC COORDINATORS**  
(Revised 9/20)

*All appointments and advancements are to be submitted via 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?
- Have all links to supporting documents been verified?

**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. Supportive documentation**

- Has a representative sampling of supporting documentation been submitted?

Other considerations:

1. If a search was conducted, the search report must be approved in UC Recruit before the appointment is submitted. If no search was done, a waiver must have been approved.
2. 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.
3. 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.

**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?
- Have all links to supporting documents been verified?

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. **Supportive documentation**

- Has a representative sampling of supportive documentation been submitted?

VI-1  
**LEAVES OF ABSENCE**  
(Revised 9/20)

Policies on Leaves of Absence for both academic-year and fiscal-year appointees are outlined in APM 700 – 760 and the applicable memorandum of understanding for represented employees. 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:
- Sabbatical Leave (APM 740)
  - Sick Leave (APM 710)
  - Family and Medical Leave (APM 715)
  - Vacation (APM 730)
  - Holidays (APM 720)
  - Leave to attend Professional Meetings (APM 752)
  - Miscellaneous Leaves (APM 750, 751, 758, 759)
  - Parental Leave, Childbearing and Active Service Modified Duties (APM 760)
  - *Bereavement Leave (APM 758)*
  - *Jury Duty Leave (APM 758)*
- 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. All faculty (Senate and non-senate) must submit their leave request 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~~) require approval by the Dean or Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel *with the exception of the following, which may be approved at the departmental level:*
- *Vacation and non-FMLA use of sick leave for those in accruing titles*
  - *Bereavement Leave*
  - *Jury Duty Leave*
- 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. Senate faculty requesting a leave that will involve category I outside professional activities (Red Binder I-29) must also request prior approval of the category I activities via OATS.
- F. Senate faculty or other academic employees who serve as a PI must contact their Sponsored Projects Officer prior to any planned leave to address any impact to their sponsored projects.
- G. 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, or memorandum of understanding article for information concerning coordination of University policy and State and Federal Law. FML will normally run concurrently with other approved leave.
- H. All leave requests by academic employees (other than academic student employees) are initiated via the on-line leave request module in AP Folio.

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

- A. Childbearing, Parental Leave or a combination of both, of one quarter or more 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 within one quarter of the completion 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 from the clock and the employee should not be expected to produce any additional materials/ publications because of the lengthening of the probationary period. Any materials/publications that are produced, however, should be considered in the next appropriate review.
- B. Periods of Active Service-Modified Duties are included as service toward the eight-year probationary period.
- C. 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.
- D. 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. Approval Authority

### Faculty (Senate and Non-Senate)

|  |                           |
|--|---------------------------|
| Medical leaves within APM policy                   | Dean                      |
| All other leaves for up to one year, within policy | Dean                      |
| Active Service Modified Duties                     | Dean                      |
| Exceptions to policy                               | Associate Vice Chancellor |
| Leaves beyond one year                             | Associate Vice Chancellor |

### Senate Faculty

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| Sabbatical within policy                                  | Dean                      |
| Sabbatical - exceptions, negative rec., 5 years no-change | Associate Vice Chancellor |

### All other Academic Appointees

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Leaves covered by vacation and/or sick leave | Department Chair or Director |
|--|------------------------------|

Active Service Modified Duties  
Leaves not covered by vacation and/or sick leave  
Exceptions to policy

Associate Vice Chancellor  
Associate Vice Chancellor  
Associate Vice Chancellor



VI-4  
CHILD BEARING LEAVE AND PARENTAL LEAVE  
(Revised 2/21)

- A. Academic appointees are eligible for childbearing and parental leave as guaranteed by applicable state and federal law, including but not limited to, the Federal Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), the California Family Rights Act (CFRA), and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA). In addition, the University provides leave benefits as follows:
- B. An academic appointee who accrues sick or vacation leave shall be granted childbearing leave with full pay to the extent of her sick or vacation leave balance. Childbearing leave may be may also be covered as a Family and Medical Leave (APM 715). Family and Medical leave, if applicable, will normally run concurrently with approved childbearing leave.
- C. An academic appointee who does not accrue sick leave and who has served in ~~her~~ *their*-title or any faculty title for at least one year will receive full pay for up to 6 8 weeks during the period of time ~~she is~~ *they are* unable to assume ~~her~~ *their* normal University obligations due to the birth of a child.
- D. An academic appointee who does not accrue sick or vacation leave and who has served in ~~her~~ *their* title for less than one year will receive full pay for approximately the period that would be accrued during the appointment in accordance with the accrual rates in APM 710-18. If additional time is needed, leave without pay will be granted for the necessary period. However, members of the Academic Senate will be covered by C) above, regardless of length of service.
- E. *Academic appointees are eligible for Pay for Family Care and Bonding (PFCB) for up to eight weeks at 70% pay. To have PFCB applied, approved leaves must meet eligibility criteria and be formally designated under FMLA and/or CFRA..*
- F. Academic appointees are eligible for parental leave for purposes of carrying out childbearing and/or childrearing responsibilities. Whenever possible, parental leaves should be requested at least three months in advance. Parental leave without pay may be granted for up to one year to any academic appointee for the purpose of caring for a child. Normally, this unpaid leave, when combined with childbearing leave and/or Active Service Modified Duties, shall not exceed one year for each birth or adoption. A leave cannot be approved beyond the end date of the appointment.
- G. Requests for childbearing leave or parental leave must be submitted via the on-line leave module in AP Folio and are subject to approval by the Dean or Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel. A childbearing leave request should include a statement of the projected delivery date. The period of the leave may be adjusted as necessary after approval.
- H. Represented academic employees are eligible for childbearing leave to the extent allowed in the appropriate memorandum of understanding and applicable state and federal law.
- I. Graduate Student Researchers are eligible for up to six weeks of paid leave for pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions for the period prior to, during, and after childbirth and up to two additional weeks of unpaid leave for baby bonding. The total period of combined paid pregnancy, childbirth, medical, and sick leave (Red Binder VI-3 H) may not exceed six-weeks within an academic year.

VI-7  
**OTHER LEAVES**  
(Revised 2/21)

- A. An academic appointee may be granted a leave with or without pay to attend a professional meeting or for University business. If the leave is for seven calendar days or less, APM 752 or applicable memorandum of understanding articles apply and the Department Chair or Director has authority. If the leave is without pay, the leave must be entered into the payroll system.
- B. Leaves of 8 or more calendar days are covered by APM 758 and 759 and applicable memorandum of understanding articles. *With the exception of bereavement and jury duty,* leaves not covered by vacation or sick time require approval of the appropriate Dean or the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel. Applications for such leave are made via the on-line leave module in AP Folio. Leaves of more than 30 calendar days must be entered into the payroll system. *See APM-758 or applicable MOU for jury or bereavement leave.*
- C. Academic employees may be granted up to a one-year leave of absence without salary for professional development or personal reasons upon approval of the appropriate Dean or the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel.
- D. Extension of a leave of absence beyond one year, whether with or without pay is not automatic and is granted only when there is a clear benefit to the campus. If an academic employee member accepts an academic or professional position elsewhere, the presumption is that additional leave will not be granted. Leaves that extend beyond one year require approval of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel.
- E. Special Research leaves may be granted to allow a faculty member to accept a fellowship from an external agency. Such fellowships normally require a full release from Professorial responsibilities. In situations where the funding agency pays the faculty member directly, the faculty member will be put on a leave without salary. In situations where the funding is administered through UCSB the faculty member will be placed on a leave with partial pay reflecting the percentage of pay supported by the fellowship, funded from the appropriate source.

If the faculty member is receiving a supplement to the leave in exchange for sabbatical leave credits, that portion of pay will be reflected on the Professorial appointment as sabbatical leave in the payroll system. Faculty should be aware that not all fellowships include funding for benefits and should consult with the College prior to the period of the fellowship to determine the best options for their situation. The College providing the supplement may require a return to UCSB service, similar to the return to UC service required for sabbatical leaves.

VI-14  
**EXTRAMURALLY FUNDED RESEARCH**  
(Revised 9/18)

Payment During the Academic Year

During the academic year a faculty member may not use grant funds to earn in excess of his or her regular 100% salary. The faculty member may, however, with the permission of the Chair and Dean, use the grant funds in place of a portion, or all, of his or her regular state funded salary for a limited amount of time. This is called a release to grant, it is **not additional compensation**. *If the release is for 50% time or more*, the salary being paid from the grant funding must be paid under a Professional Research title, rather than the Professor title. Payments are made on the same basis and at the same pay rate as the Professor appointment (9/12). The earn code used is REG. *A release for less than 50% time may be managed via a funding change in the Professorial position in UCPath.*

A faculty member may be paid from a fellowship administered through UCSB. Payments during the academic year are considered leaves with pay (see Red Binder VI-7F).

Payment during the summer:

During the summer a faculty member may earn additional compensation from extramural contracts and grants (Red Binder VI-10.) The payments are made using the Professional Researcher- 1/9<sup>th</sup> title code and pay rate, and the earn code **ACR**. Additional research compensation during the summer period is calculated using the Daily Factors 19-day Chart. The chart is used to determine the percentage of time and effort equivalent to the number of summer days worked. The total percent time for each day in the summer may not exceed 100%. However, total earnings in a calendar month may exceed 100% as indicated on the Daily Factors 19 day chart. (Red Binder VI- 12) Payment is to be issued at the pay rate in effect at the time of the service.

Funding restrictions:

While faculty are in general allowed to receive up to a maximum of 3/9ths summer pay, some funding sources may contain restrictions that further limit the allowable total. Faculty and departmental staff must observe these limitations.

For example, faculty earning summer compensation from NIH sources, the NIH salary cap must be observed. If the NIH cap figure is lower than the faculty member's annual salary rate, it will not be possible to earn a full 3/9ths from the NIH grant. The NIH cap figure must be used as the annual rate for the summer payments, and the 19-day chart and the maximum of 57 days must still be observed. Funds subject to the NIH cap are paid out using the earn code of **ARC with a pay rate equal to or less than the NIH cap figure**.

It is possible for the faculty member to receive summer compensation from other sources as long as the total does not exceed 3/9ths. Additional sources may include; summer session teaching, chair stipends or payment of an NIH salary supplement (title code 3998). The salary supplement may not be paid from contract or grant funds. Acceptable supplement sources include gift or endowed chair funds or other unrestricted funds. NIH salary supplements are paid on a flat rate basis using the earn code of **AAC**.

VII-4  
**PROCEDURES FOR RECRUITMENT OF  
SENATE FACULTY AND OTHER PERMANENT ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS**  
(Revised 9/18)

Before initiating a search, the department chair should review Red Binder I-14 Faculty Appointments, and I-13 Retention of Academic FTE. The department must have an allocated FTE and prior approval from the Executive Vice Chancellor to recruit for the position. For other permanent academic positions (i.e. Librarians) appropriate approval for the use of the FTE must have taken place.

The following steps are to be taken by the Department:

**A. Recruiting**

1. Form a search committee. ~~The committee must include one faculty member designated as the departmental equity/diversity advisor.~~
2. Determines the length of the recruitment period.
3. Determines the publications or recruitment sources to be used. Advertising through the JobElephant service is highly recommended to assure Labor Certification requirements are met should the eventual hire be a non-US citizen. If JobElephant is not used, the department should consult with the Office of International Students and Scholars at [oiss@sa.ucsb.edu](mailto:oiss@sa.ucsb.edu) to assure current Labor Certification requirements are met.
4. Sets a realistic deadline for applications so that campus Equal Opportunity & Affirmative Action policy and procedures can be carried out without undue pressures. The advertising period should be long enough to provide the opportunity to attract a reasonable number of applicants and a diverse pool. Permanent positions must be advertised for at least 30 days.
5. Follows established departmental and campus procedures and review criteria for the application process.
6. Completes the Recruitment Plan in UC Recruit. The Recruitment Plan contains all relevant information on how the position will be advertised, how the applicants will be evaluated, and the efforts that will be made to ensure equal employment opportunity and to reach a diverse applicant pool in which women and minorities are represented.
7. Submits the Recruitment Plan in UC Recruit for review and approval by the Department Chair, the Office of Equal Opportunity & Discrimination Prevention, the Dean, and Academic Personnel.
8. Publishes the recruitment in UC Recruit after the Recruitment Plan is approved.
9. Places any additional approved advertisements for the position. Retains all copies of advertisements as they appear in publications and on-line, including the duration of advertisements.
10. Performs all other good faith recruitment efforts to increase the diversity of the pool.

**B. Processing Applications and Interviewing**

1. After the close date, reviews the quality of application materials. When an applicant pool does not contain sufficiently qualified people to fill a vacancy, it may become necessary to extend or reopen a search. The department is responsible for repeating the requisite steps as necessary.
2. Consults with the Dean's office to schedule the Dean review of the applicants. College requirements may vary.
3. Generates the Short List Report in UC Recruit and submits for approval in UC Recruit by the Department Chair, Equal Opportunity & Discrimination Prevention, and the Dean.

4. Upon receiving the approval of the Short List Report, contacts prospective candidates and invites them to campus for an interview. Additionally, ensures that the proposed interview schedule is appropriate and that it is applied uniformly to all candidates. Departments may reimburse candidates for interview travel and related expenses in accord with IRS regulations and University travel policies. Under exceptional circumstances, if funding is available, a candidate who has accepted an offer may be reimbursed for a single house hunting trip in accord with IRS regulations and University travel policies.

### **C. Search Report and Hiring Proposal**

1. Once a potential hire has been identified, completes the sections labeled "Search Report" in UC Recruit.
2. Updates applicant's status in UC Recruit and enters disposition reasons for all applicants including those who were interviewed but were not selected for the position.
3. Generates Search Report in UC Recruit and submits for approval by the Chair, Dean, and Equal Opportunity & Discrimination Prevention.