

February 12, 2024

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

FROM: Helly Kwee, Interim Director  
Academic Personnel

RE: Issuance of Red Binder updates

A number of final revisions to the Red Binder, the campus Academic Personnel policy and procedure manual, have been posted on the Academic Personnel website, with an effective date of February 2024. 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

II-9, II-11	Clarification of letter requirements for Unit 18 reviews
II-31	Correction of honoraria signature authority
III-1	Clarification of appointment duration for temporary research appointments
III-7, III-9	Update of document requirements checklist for research appointments & reviews
III-12	Clarification for solicitation template; deletion of UC familiar letters requirement for Professional Researcher series
III-16	Update of appointment criteria for Specialist series
VI-1, VI-7	Addition of Reproductive Loss Leave entitlement
VI-3	Clarification of sick leave usage; designated person technical update
VI-10	Technical update for APM references
VII-7	Vaccine policy update for academic job postings
VIII-8	Hellman Fellows program eligibility and award clarification

II-9  
**EXCELLENCE REVIEWS**  
(As of 2/23)

This section outlines the requirements for the Excellence Review, which determines a Unit 18 faculty's Continuing Status. See Article 7B and Article 43 of the MOU.

### **I. Eligibility**

A Unit 18 faculty member shall be eligible for Excellence Review when:

1. The Unit 18 faculty is appointed for an 18<sup>th</sup> quarter of service in the same department and
2. Instructional need as defined in Article 7B.B exists in the 19<sup>th</sup> quarter

Excellence Reviews will be conducted by the department in response to the annual call issued by the Office of Academic Personnel. Excellence Reviews are to be submitted to the Dean's office based on the schedule provided by Academic Personnel so that the campus review process may be completed by the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> quarter of service.

The department shall notify the eligible Unit 18 faculty in writing no less than 45 days prior to the date by which the review materials must be submitted. The notification requirements are outlined in [Article 43.B.2](#) and the [notice template](#) on the AP website should be used.

### **II. Criteria**

The standard for continuing status is demonstrated excellence in teaching, academic responsibility per Article 3 of the MOU, and other assigned duties.

Per [Article 43](#), instructional performance shall be evaluated according to the following criteria, as demonstrated by the materials in the review file:

- Dedication to and engagement with teaching;
- Command of the subject matter and continued growth in mastering new topics;
- Organizing and presenting course content effectively and with demonstrated learning outcomes;
- Setting pedagogical objectives appropriate to the course topic, level, and format;
- Responding to student work in ways commensurate with student performance, course topic, level, and format;
- Awakening in students an awareness of the importance of the subject matter;
- Inspiring interest in beginning students and stimulating advanced students to do complex work;
- Developing pedagogically effective assignments, lecture slides, lesson plans, exams, and/or other course materials and/or prompts for student work

### **III. Documentation of Performance**

The following review materials are required:

- Current CV or bio-bibliography
- A self-reflection/self-statement/self-evaluation of the candidate's performance, teaching objectives, and teaching activities
- ESCIs and written student evaluations
- Term-by-term enumeration of the number and types of courses taught
- Solicited, confidential extramural letters of evaluation (see Section IV below)

See [Article 43.C](#) for other, optional review materials that may be submitted and used in the review.

### **IV. Extramural Evaluations**

As part of the review file for the Excellence Review, departments must submit five or more letters of recommendation. *Departments should strive to ensure that at least half the letters submitted with the case come from references chosen by the Chair in consultation with the department, but independent of feedback from the candidate and without consulting the candidate.* These letters may be of two types:

1. Letters from extramural referees with knowledge of the candidate's professional status and teaching record including former students and graduates who have achieved notable professional success since leaving the university, reviewers who can comment on the candidate's command of the subject and continuous growth in the subject field, or any appropriate referee with knowledge of the candidate's performance.
2. Letters from UCSB Senate faculty or Continuing Lecturers, external to the department, who have conducted peer review of the candidate's teaching. Peer evaluation may include such things as classroom visits or videotaping, commentary on course syllabi, reading assignments, and examinations. Qualitative descriptions and opinions are preferable to quantitative ratings or comparative rankings in peer evaluation of teaching.

Both types of letters are subject to the same redaction and confidentiality policies as extramural letters.

The candidate must be given the opportunity to suggest the names of persons who could be solicited for letters of evaluation, and also to indicate in writing the names of persons who, in the candidate's view, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications or performance for any reason (which may include "personal reasons"). The candidate should know that a request to exclude certain potential evaluators will become part of the review file and that such requests are made regularly and should in no way jeopardize the candidate's case. Furthermore, such requests are generally honored to the extent possible unless they interfere with proper evaluation.

The sample solicitation letter and confidentiality statement must be used when soliciting letters of evaluation (Red Binder I-49 and I-50). Additional wording may be added describing the criteria that are relevant in a particular candidate's case. If wording is added or changed, Academic Personnel must be consulted regarding the revised language prior to sending the solicitation letter.

## **V. Review Procedure**

Excellence Reviews will be conducted by a departmental committee composed of academic appointees with sufficient knowledge in the field of expertise of the candidate. In addition, the department will make reasonable efforts to ensure that a qualified Unit 18 faculty member will participate in such review committees. All such service will be voluntary. If the review is conducted by an ad hoc committee rather than a standing departmental committee, the individual under review will be consulted concerning the Unit 18 faculty representation. If it is not practical to form a review committee within a department, the committee will be formed at the college level following established procedures.

Once all materials are assembled, and before the departmental review committee evaluates the file, the candidate will be provided an opportunity to inspect all non-confidential materials in the file, pursuant to [Article 10](#). The candidate may also, at this time, request redacted copies of the confidential materials in the file. The candidate will then have 5 days from the date materials are received, to submit an optional written statement in response to or commenting upon the materials. This statement would be added to the review file.

The departmental review committee evaluates the case file and makes a preliminary recommendation. This preliminary recommendation should accurately reflect all committee views, including those of dissenting members. The review committee will present its recommendation to the eligible Senate faculty within the department (voting faculty, as defined by the department's by-laws). The voting faculty will review the case file, discuss the committee's recommendation, vote on supporting the committee's recommendation, and provide additional analysis as appropriate. These comprise the department's final recommendation. Once the final department recommendation is complete, the candidate should be advised of the outcome and, upon request, provided a copy of the department letter. The candidate will have 5 days to submit an optional written statement in response to the departmental recommendation, which will be added to the file. The candidate will sign the Safeguard Statement within AP Folio, and the complete case file is sent to the office of the appropriate Dean.

The Dean of the appropriate college makes an analysis and recommendation based on the materials and recommendation submitted by the department. The case is then forwarded to the Associate Vice Chancellor (AVC) for Academic Personnel.

The AVC has approval authority for Excellence Review cases, and if they determine that additional review is necessary for proper evaluation, they may request that the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) review the case.

The final decision is based on the documentation presented in the departmental file, as well as the recommendations of the Dean and CAP (in those cases where CAP is asked to review).

If the candidate's performance is deemed excellent and they achieve Continuing status, they will first be moved to the salary point on Table 16 that corresponds to their current pre-six salary. A minimum of 2 salary points shall be awarded from there as a merit increase.

Requests for reconsideration of a final decision will be governed by Red Binder I-10.

II-11  
**PROMOTION TO SENIOR CONTINUING LECTURER**  
(As of 2/23)

This section outlines the requirements for the Promotion Review of a Continuing Unit 18 Lecturer to Senior Continuing Lecturer. See Article 7D and Article 43 of the MOU.

### **I. Eligibility**

In order to be eligible for promotion to Senior Continuing Lecturer, a Continuing Lecturer must have received at least 2 consecutive positive merit reviews as a Continuing Lecturer in the same department. Upon the third normative merit review (minimum of 9 years after achieving Continuing status), a Continuing Lecturer may request a promotional review. This request must be submitted *in writing* to the department chair or equivalent.

### **II. Criteria**

The standard for promotion to Senior Continuing Lecturer is demonstrated exceptional performance in assigned instructional duties, academic responsibility per Article 3 of the MOU, and other assigned duties. Evaluation of academic qualifications for promotion will be based on the candidate's broad-ranging instructional contributions and how they have greatly enhanced the academic mission of the University.

Length of service and continued excellent performance as a Continuing Lecturer alone are not justification enough for promotion.

Per [Article 43](#), instructional performance shall be evaluated according to the following criteria, as demonstrated by the materials in the review file:

- Dedication to and engagement with teaching;
- Command of the subject matter and continued growth in mastering new topics;
- Organizing and presenting course content effectively and with demonstrated learning outcomes;
- Setting pedagogical objectives appropriate to the course topic, level, and format;
- Responding to student work in ways commensurate with student performance, course topic, level, and format;
- Awakening in students an awareness of the importance of the subject matter;
- Inspiring interest in beginning students and stimulating advanced students to do complex work;
- Developing pedagogically effective assignments, lecture slides, lesson plans, exams, and/or other course materials and/or prompts for student work; and
- Exceptional instructional performance would include introducing new teaching practices into the course(s)

### **III. Documentation of Performance**

Once a Continuing Lecturer provides their written request to be considered for promotion, the department shall notify the candidate in writing, no less than 45 days prior to the date by which the candidate's review materials must be submitted to the department. The notification requirements are outlined in [Article 43.B.2](#) and the [notice template](#) on the AP website should be used.

The following review materials are required:

- Current CV or bio-bibliography
- A self-reflection/self-statement/self-evaluation of the candidate's performance, teaching objectives, and teaching activities
- ESCIs and written student evaluations
- Term-by-term enumeration of the number and types of courses taught
- Solicited, confidential extramural letters of evaluation (see Section IV below)

See [Article 43.C](#) for other, optional review materials that may be submitted and used in the review.

The Senior Continuing promotional review will be based on performance since achieving Continuing Lecturer status.

#### IV. Extramural Evaluations

As part of the review file for promotion to Senior Continuing Lecturer, departments must submit five or more letters of recommendation. *Departments should strive to ensure that at least half the letters submitted with the case come from references chosen by the Chair in consultation with the department, but independent of feedback from the candidate and without consulting the candidate.* These letters may be of two types:

1. Letters from extramural referees with knowledge of the candidate's professional status and teaching record including former students and graduates who have achieved notable professional success since leaving the university, reviewers who can comment on the candidate's command of the subject and continuous growth in the subject field, or any appropriate referee with knowledge of the candidate's performance.
2. Letters from UCSB Senate faculty or Continuing Lecturers, external to the department, who have conducted peer review of the candidate's teaching. Peer evaluation may include such things as classroom visits or videotaping, commentary on course syllabi, reading assignments, and examinations. Qualitative descriptions and opinions are preferable to quantitative ratings or comparative rankings in peer evaluation of teaching.

Both types of letters are subject to the same redaction and confidentiality policies as extramural letters.

The candidate must be given the opportunity to suggest the names of persons who could be solicited for letters of evaluation, and also to indicate in writing the names of persons who, in the candidate's view, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications or performance for any reason (which may include "personal reasons"). The candidate should know that a request to exclude certain potential evaluators will become part of the review file and that such requests are made regularly and should in no way jeopardize the candidate's case. Furthermore, such requests are generally honored to the extent possible unless they interfere with proper evaluation.

The sample solicitation letter and confidentiality statement must be used when soliciting letters of evaluation (Red Binder I-49 and I-50). Additional wording may be added describing the criteria that are relevant in a particular candidate's case. If wording is added or changed, Academic Personnel must be consulted regarding the revised language prior to sending the solicitation letter.

#### V. Review Procedure

Once all materials are assembled, and before the departmental review committee evaluates the file, the candidate will be provided an opportunity to inspect all non-confidential materials in the file, pursuant to [Article 10](#). The candidate may also, at this time, request redacted copies of the confidential materials in the file. The candidate will then have 5 days from the date materials are received, to submit an optional written statement in response to or commenting upon the materials. This statement would be added to the review file.

The departmental review committee evaluates the case file and makes a preliminary recommendation. This preliminary recommendation should accurately reflect all committee views, including those of dissenting members. The review committee will present its recommendation to the eligible Senate faculty within the department (voting faculty, as defined by the department's by-laws). The voting faculty will review the case file, discuss the committee's recommendation, vote on supporting the committee's recommendation, and provide additional analysis as appropriate. These comprise the department's final recommendation. Once the final department recommendation is complete, the candidate should be advised of the outcome and, upon request, provided a copy of the department letter. The candidate will have 5 days to submit an optional written statement in response to the departmental recommendation, which will be added to the file. The candidate will sign the Safeguard Statement within AP Folio, and the complete case file is sent to the office of the appropriate Dean.

The Dean of the appropriate college makes an analysis and recommendation based on the materials and recommendation submitted by the department. The case is then forwarded to the Associate Vice Chancellor (AVC) for Academic Personnel.

The AVC has approval authority for Senior Continuing Lecturer promotion cases, and if they determine that additional review is necessary for proper evaluation, they may request that the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) review the case.

The final decision is based on the documentation presented in the departmental file, as well as the recommendations of the Dean and CAP (in those cases where CAP is asked to review).

If a Continuing Lecturer is promoted to Senior Continuing Lecturer, a minimum of 3 salary points will be awarded. Once promoted, a Senior Continuing Lecturer will be eligible for merit review at least once every three years, and will continue to be reviewed under the standard of “exceptional”.

If a Continuing Lecturer is not promoted to Senior Continuing Lecturer, the candidate will still be assessed for merit as a Continuing Lecturer under the standard of “excellent”. A Continuing Lecturer may request another promotional review at their next normative merit review.

Requests for reconsideration of a final decision will be governed by Red Binder I-10.

II-31  
**SHORT TERM TEACHING**  
(Revised 9/18)

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

**Guest Lecturers not employed by UC**

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

Foreign visitors must have the proper visa if any form of financial payment is to be made to them. A J1, HI and F1 visa, issued by this campus, will allow payment of payroll and non-payroll expenses. A B1 will allow the payment of travel and subsistence only (i.e., university per diem rate and airfare expenses). A B2 will not allow reimbursement or payment of any kind. Questions regarding these matters should be directed to the Office of International Students and Scholars.

**Guest Lecturers from another UC campus**

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

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

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



III-1  
**TEMPORARY RESEARCH APPOINTMENTS**  
**General Information**  
(Revised 2/23)

Titles in this section are to be used for individuals involved in research and do not have formal teaching responsibilities. Questions concerning the use of staff titles for individuals involved in research should be directed to Human Resources.

Policies

The campus policies for Discipline and Dismissal (Red Binder IX-20), Non-Senate Academic Grievances (Red Binder IX-25), and Layoff and Involuntary Reduction in Time (Red Binder IX-30) are applicable to non-represented appointees in this section. Represented appointees in these series are governed by the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the University and the UAW (Academic Researchers Unit, RA) articles on Corrective Action and Dismissal (Article 6), Grievance and Arbitration Procedures (Article 7) and Layoff and Reduction in Time (Article 11).

The campus policy and procedures for recruitment are set forth in Red Binder Section VII.

Deadlines for submission of merit/promotion requests

All merits and promotions for individuals in the Professional Research, Specialist, and Project Scientist series will be effective July 1.

Requests for advancement must be submitted according to the following schedule:

<u>Series</u>	<u>Submit to:</u>	<u>Due Date</u>
Professional Research Academic Departments ORUs	Dean's Office Academic Personnel	March 1 March 1
Project Scientist; Asst, Assoc, Full Specialist	Academic Personnel	April 1

Service limitations and Appointment lengths

For all series, six months or more of service, with or without salary, in any fiscal year counts as one full year of service for advancement eligibility purposes.

Initial appointments and reappointments prior to the effective date of the first advancement review for represented employees must be for a minimum of one-year, unless a shorter term may be justified based on the work, funding, or programmatic need. Reappointments for represented employees before following the first advancement review must be for a minimum of one-year terms. Reappointments for represented employees following the first advancement review must be for a minimum of the normative time at rank and step.

Junior Specialists may not be appointed at this rank for more than three years.

For non-represented employees, appointments or reappointments are normally made for one year at a time.

All appointments are term appointments with a stated end date.

Appointees in research series may be placed on Short Work Break in accord with Red Binder VI-18 and the MOU.

No further notice of non-reappointment is necessary for appointments at less than 50% for any period of time, or for appointment of less than eight consecutive years in the same title or series.

Notice of non-reappointment must be given if the employee has served at 50% or more for eight or more consecutive years in the same title or series (APM 137-30) and Articles 21, 22, and 26 of the MOU. Written Notice of Intent not to reappoint must be given at least 60 days prior to the appointment's specified end date. The notice must state (1) the intended non-reappointment and the proposed effective date; (2) the basis for non-reappointment including copies of any supporting documentation; and (3) the employees right to respond within 14 days and the name of the person to whom they should respond. Within 30 days of the Notice of Intent, and after review of any response, the University will issue a written Notice of Action to the employee. Pay in lieu of notice may be given.

Recall appointments in any temporary research title may not exceed 43% time, alone or in combination with other recall appointments. Appointments are requested using the [Academic Recall Appointment Form](#). Recall appointments are to be entered into UCPATH using the Recall Non-Faculty Academic title (3802 or 3812).

Titles not specifically discussed in the Red Binder may not be used without prior approval by the Academic Personnel Office and will be subject to campus practice and APM policy.

III-7  
**DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR**  
**RESEARCH APPOINTMENTS**  
(Revised 9/20)

All appointment cases are to be submitted via AP Folio.

- I. **Department Letter:** Accurate and analytical letters of recommendation from the department are essential in the review process. See Red Binder I-35 for further detail of content of departmental recommendations
- ☐ Are the dates of the appointment, rank and step all clearly stated?
  - ☐ Is the recommended salary on the published salary scale?
  - ☐ If a request is being made to use the Engineering scale in a non-Engineering unit (RB III-12 V, A, 2 and RB III-14 V, A, 2)) is appropriate justification provided?
  - ☐ Is the off-scale supplement correct (if applicable), per off-scale general policies (RB I-8)?
  - ☐ If the salary is off-scale or above scale is it rounded to the nearest \$100 for the Research and Project Scientist series?
  - ☐ If a vote was taken, is the 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?
  - ☐ Does the departmental letter, provide thorough description of the duties to be performed as justification for the rank, requested?
  - ☐ Does the departmental letter provide an accurate, extensive, and **analytical** representation of the candidate's qualifications, justifying the proposed step and salary?
  - ☐ If the case contains extramural letters, are letter writers identified **only** by coded list, with no identifying statements?
- II. **Extramural letters of evaluation and list of evaluators** for appointment at the Associate and full level **as appropriate** for the series (See Red Binder III-12, III-14, III-16)
- Extramural Letters**
- ☐ Are the required number of letters included, including letters from UC or UC familiar referees **when appropriate** (See RB III-12, III-14, III-16)?
  - ☐ Are at least half of the letters from references chosen by the Chair/Dept independent of the candidate?
  - ☐ Have all letters been coded, on all copies?
  - ☐ If the letters were sent via email, is a copy of the email and any attachment included?
  - ☐ Are any anomalies in the composition of reviewers 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, III-12, III-14, III-16)
  - ☐ Is a list of all informational items sent to referees (e.g. CV, Bio-Bib, publications sent, etc, per RB I-51) included? Is a copy of each item included as either part of the case or a one-of-a-kind item?
  - ☐ If different versions of either the letter or the materials went out, is a sample of each included?
- List of Referees, including brief Biography and indicating who selected referees** (RB I-46-V)
- ☐ Do the codes on the letters match the codes on the list and the codes used in the departmental letter?
  - ☐ Does the list clearly indicate if the referees were candidate 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?
- III. **Complete CV and UCSB Academic biography form.**
- ☐ Is the CV up to date?
  - ☐ Is the UCSB Academic biography form complete, signed and dated?
- IV. **Copies of publications**
- ☐ Has a representative sampling of publications been submitted?
  - ☐ Have links to electronically submitted items been verified?
  - ☐ If items cannot be submitted electronically, have arrangements been made with the Academic Personnel Office?

V. **Supervisor Duties form**

- ☐ Has page 1 been completed indicating if the employee will be a supervisor?
- ☐ If the employee will be a supervisor, is the checklist filled out and included?

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.

III-9  
**DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR**  
**RESEARCH REVIEWS**  
(Revised 9/21)

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-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?
- ☐ 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)** *for promotion to the Associate and full level as appropriate for the series (See RB III-12, III-14, III-16)*

**Extramural Letters**

- ☐ Are the required number of letters included, *including letters from UC or UC familiar referees when appropriate (See 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-12  
**PROFESSIONAL RESEARCH SERIES**  
(Revised 2/22)

**I. Definition**

The titles in this series are given only to those who engage in independent research equivalent to that required for the Professor series. Individuals whose duties are defined as making significant and creative contributions to a research project, or to providing technical assistance to research activity should not be appointed in this series. For use of the Visiting prefix with this series, see Red Binder III-23. Represented employees in this series are governed by the applicable Memorandum of Understanding (MOU.) Article 21 of the MOU provides guidance specific to the Professional Research series.

**II. Ranks and Steps**

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

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

**III. Appointment and Advancement Criteria**

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

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

An individual who currently holds a Research series appointment at UCSB and participates in research 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 host department or program will be required to provide a statement of activities to be carried out under the affiliated status. The affiliated status may be for a specific time period or may be indefinite, as long as the primary paid appointment is active.
- b. The chair/director of both the home and host department must endorse the request.
- c. Affiliated status appointments are not entered into the payroll system, but will be tracked in AP Folio.

**IV. Term of Appointment**

- A. Service as Assistant Researcher is limited to eight years of service. Six months or more of service within any fiscal year, either paid or without salary, as an Assistant Researcher or Visiting Assistant Researcher counts towards the eight-year limit.
- B. Appointments or reappointments are to be made based on the service limitations indicated in Red

Binder III-1 and, for represented employees, in the MOU.

## **V. Compensation**

- A. Individuals appointed to this series are compensated on the salary scales established for the Professional Research series on a fiscal year (11 months) basis. The Economics/ Engineering Professional Research salary scales 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 Research series appointment will be a salaried position. Without salary status may be appropriate for short periods of time, for example if the Researcher is self-funded as a PI or co-PI. A without salary appointment in this series 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, Reappointment, 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 Departmental letter provides justification demonstrating the equivalence of the requested position to the same level faculty position, and an analytical evaluation of the candidate and his or her accomplishments.

### Reappointment

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

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

Requests for deferral of non-mandatory reviews must be submitted by the deadline established by the department. Appointees in the Research series must undergo a performance review at least once every five



years, including an evaluation of the researcher's record in all review areas. This review may not be deferred. If the candidate does not turn in materials by the departmental due date, the department will conduct the review based on the materials available in the department as of the due date.

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

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

The Chair/Director's letter of recommendation for appointment or advancement should include an evaluation of the candidate's record in all review areas (see III Appointment and Advancement criteria, above). The evaluation is expected to meet the standards set forth in APM 310 which prescribes that candidates for appointment or advancement in the Research series have research qualifications equivalent to those of the corresponding ladder faculty rank. Each unit should establish set procedures for evaluation of Research appointments and advancements and development of the letter of recommendation. While a full review completed by a departmental committee knowledgeable of the candidate's field is preferred, in cases where this is not appropriate, a review done solely by the Chair, Director or P.I. is acceptable. If a committee is not formed, an explanation should be provided in the letter of recommendation. Red Binder I-35 provides additional guidance on developing the letter of recommendation.

### **Bio-Bibliography**

It is the responsibility of each Researcher to maintain an up to date bio-bibliography (bio-bib). The bio-bib should contain information ending at the campus cut-off date of December 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 will be required in cases of: appointment as Associate Researcher, appointment as Researcher, promotion to Associate Researcher, promotion to Researcher, and merit to Researcher Above Scale. A minimum of 4 letters must be included for appointment or promotion to the Associate level. A minimum of 6 letters must be included for appointment or promotion to the Full Researcher level, or for advancement to Above Scale. At least half of the letters submitted with the case should come from references chosen by the Department or *Unit Program* independent of the candidate. *Letters from faculty or researchers at other UC campuses are essential for appointment to Research VI or higher, or advancement to Above scale, preferably from individuals already at the senior ranks.* — Solicitations of extramural evaluations should not merely ask for opinions regarding the suitability of the candidate for promotion, but should invite analytical evaluations of the candidate's research with respect to quality and significance. Reviewing agencies reserve the right to request letters be solicited in any advancement case if it is determined that more information is necessary to support the proposed action.

In all cases of solicitation of outside letters, the sample letter for solicitation of extramural letters (Red Binder I-49) is to be used, *with the following wording inserted as appropriate.*

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

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

For promotion 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

[When appropriate in promotion to Associate Researcher cases, add: UCSB considers extensions of the eight-year service limitation under circumstances that could interfere significantly with development of the qualifications necessary for advancement. Examples of such circumstances may include birth or adoption of a child, extended illness, care of an ill family member, or COVID-19 related hardship. In such cases, University of California policy requires that the file be evaluated without prejudice as if the work were done in the normative period of service.]

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

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

For 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

For appointment to Researcher, Step VI through Step IX, the following wording should be inserted as appropriate:

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for an appointment to Researcher [specify step] in the (dept/unit). In the UC system there are 9 steps within the rank of Researcher. The normal period of service is three years in each of the first five steps. Service at Research, Step V, may be of indefinite duration. Appointment at Step VI will be granted on evidence of highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellence in research, and in addition, great distinction recognized nationally or internationally, in research. [Sample wording for evaluation request: e.g., I would greatly appreciate your evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_'s work]

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

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for (an appointment as/ advancement to) Researcher Above

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

For merit 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 achieves 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

**VII. Approval Authority**

Action

Authority

All actions

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

III-16  
**SPECIALIST SERIES**  
(Revised 2/23)

**I. Definition**

The Specialist series is used for academic appointees who engage in specialized research, professional activity, and University and/or public service, and who do not have any teaching responsibilities. See APM 330 for System Wide policy on Specialists. Represented employees in this series are governed by the applicable Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Article 26 of the MOU provides guidance specific to the Specialist series.

**II. Ranks and Steps**

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

**III. Appointment and Advancement Criteria**

Appointees to the Specialist series are expected to use their professional expertise to make scientific and scholarly contributions to the research enterprise of the University and to achieve recognition in the professional and scientific community. Specialists may participate in University and/or public service depending upon funding source and the duties of the position.

The following qualifications are general guidelines for each rank:

**Junior Specialist:** Appointees should possess a baccalaureate degree (or equivalent degree) or have equivalent research experience. Appointees at this level enable research as part of a team

**Assistant Specialist:** Appointees should possess expertise consistent with four to six years of training and/or experience in the relevant specialization. Appropriate qualifications would include possession of a master's degree (or equivalent degree) in a relevant discipline, or possession of a relevant baccalaureate degree (or equivalent degree) plus or have three or more five years of research experience, demonstrating expertise in the relevant specialization. Appointees at this level enable research as part of a team and may provide some independent input into the planning and execution of the research.

**Associate Specialist:** Appointees should possess a master's degree (or equivalent degree) or have five to ten years of experience demonstrating expertise in the relevant specialization. Appointees normally provide considerable independent input into the planning and execution of the research, have a record of academic accomplishments, including contributions to published research in the field, and a demonstrated record of University and/or public service.

**Specialist:** Appointees should possess a terminal degree (or equivalent degree) or have ten or more years of experience demonstrating expertise in the relevant specialization. Appointees normally provide considerable independent input into the planning and execution of the research, have a significant record of academic accomplishments, including contributions to published research in the field, and a demonstrated record of University and/or public service.

Specialists appointed into the series prior to July 1, 2015 are not subject to the degree and experience requirements listed above.

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

- 1. Performance in research in the defined area of expertise and specialization.
- 2. Professional competence and activity.
- 3. University and public service

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

- A. Represented Junior Specialists may not be appointed at this rank for more than three years. There are no other limits on service at any other level in this series.
- B. 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.

#### **V. Compensation**

- A. Individuals appointed to this series are compensated on the salary scales established for the Specialist Series on a fiscal year (11 month) basis.  
  
Without salary appointments in this series will occur rarely and will require evidence of external funding. Individuals who hold a primary affiliation with and are funded by another academic institution or outside agency may more appropriately be appointed as Research Associate or Research Fellow (Red Binder III-20.)
- B. Off-scale salaries are allowed within the same limits and policies as ladder faculty off-scale salaries. (Red Binder I-8)
- C. Salaries are subject to range adjustment.
- D. Each source that provides compensation for service in this series must permit research.

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

##### Appointment

Appointment cases are to be submitted via 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.

##### The following applies to Junior Specialists only:

Junior Specialists are normally appointed for a term not to exceed one year. Reappointment of up to one additional year is possible where warranted. An additional third year may be requested by exception, but under no circumstances may a Junior Specialist be appointed in the rank more than three years.

Junior Specialists do not undergo merit reviews. Automatic movement to Junior Specialist Step II will occur after one year at step I. Normal advancement will occur after one year at step II for promotion to Assistant Specialist.

##### 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 two years at step at the Assistant and Associate level and after three years at the Full Specialist level, steps I-IX, and after four years at step IX and within Above Scale. Any advancement requested prior to that time will be considered an acceleration and must be justified as such. Merits are based on the academic record since the time of last review while promotions are based on the career academic record. Advancement to Above Scale status involves an overall career review and requires work of sustained and continued excellence with national or international recognition, outstanding professional achievement, and highly meritorious service. See Red Binder I-43 for further

guidance regarding Above Scale status.

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

### **Bio-Bibliography**

It is the responsibility of each Specialist to maintain an up to date bio-bibliography (bio-bib). The bio-bib should contain information ending at the 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**

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

\_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for (an appointment/promotion to) Associate Specialist/Specialist in the (department/unit). Appointment (or Promotion) to Associate Specialist/Specialist within the UC system requires evaluation in the areas of: 1) specialized research, 2) professional competence and activity, 3) university and public service. [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.

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

**VII. Approval Authority**

Action

All actions

Authority

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

VI-1  
**LEAVES OF ABSENCE**  
(Revised 9/24)

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)
  - *Reproductive Loss 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 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-3  
**SICK LEAVE**  
(Revised 4/23)

Academic appointees do not accrue sick leave credit with the exception of certain groups listed below, in APM 710-14, or the applicable Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for represented academic employees. Academic appointees who accrue sick leave shall maintain proper records to show accrual and usage of sick leave credit. In the case of illness of faculty (as defined in APM 110 F (15) who do not accrue sick leave, leave with pay up to the maximums described in APM 710-11 a and b may be approved by the Dean. Leaves in excess of the APM maximums require approval of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel.

A. The following are eligible to accrue sick leave credit provided the appointment is at fifty percent or more time:

- Professional research series
- Specialist series
- Project Scientist series
- Librarian series
- Associate and Assistant University Librarians
- Continuing Educator
- Academic Coordinator

B. Appointees who accrue sick leave accrue at the rate of one working day per month for full-time service, including periods of leave with pay other than terminal vacation. Accrual for part time employees is based on the percent time on pay status during the month. See RB VI-8 for accrual codes.

C. ~~Accrued sick~~ Sick leave is to be used in keeping with normally approved purposes ~~related to~~ including personal illness; medical appointments, childbearing and childrearing (see APM 715 and 760), or disability, ~~or family member illness and medical care~~ as defined in APM 710-20, or the applicable MOU.

D. Faculty who do not accrue sick leave may apply for medical leave as follows.

If appointed for one year or more the appointee may apply for up to one quarter of leave with pay due to personal illness at a time. A physician's statement assessing the prognosis for return to duty may be requested prior to approval of the leave. Should the illness require an extension beyond the initial quarter of leave with pay, a physician's statement must be provided with the request for extension. Exceptions beyond the APM maximums will be considered on an individual basis. At no time may paid medical leave exceed three consecutive quarters.

If appointed for less than one year, the appointee may apply for paid leave due to personal illness for approximately the period that would be accrued during the appointment in accord with the accrual rates in APM 710-18.

E. Accrued sick leave may also be used ~~for medical appointments or~~ to care for ~~an ill family member an appointee's ill child, parent, spouse, domestic partner, sibling, grandparent, grandchild, or designated person,~~ as defined in APM 710-20, ~~APM 715-0,~~ or the applicable MOU. Faculty who do not accrue sick leave may request up to one quarter of leave with pay for the care of a family member ~~or other designated person~~ as defined in APM 710-20.

F. Sick leave that is granted for a serious health problem, or to care for a parent (including parent-in-law), child, spouse, domestic partner, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, or other designated person with a serious health problem may also be covered as a Family and Medical Leave (FML) and/or under California Family Rights Act (CFRA), as applicable (see APM 715 or the applicable MOU.) Family and Medical leave will normally run concurrently with approved sick leave.

G. Represented academic employees are eligible for medical leave to the extent allowed in the appropriate MOU and applicable state and federal law.

VI-7  
**OTHER LEAVES**  
(Revised 2/23)

- 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, *Reproductive Loss Leave*, 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, *or Reproductive Loss* leave. *Academic appointees may use available paid leave options during an approved bereavement or Reproductive Loss 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. The approval process for such a leave shall take into consideration the impact of the leave on the teaching, research, and service obligations of a department. 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. Leaves of absence which are of less than one year in duration and involve non-sequential quarters but repeat in multiple years must be approved by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel after the third quarter.
- E. In addition to complying with University policies on conflict of commitment and outside activities (APM 025), academic appointees on an approved leave of absence without pay must also comply with all University policies involving University intellectual property, conflict of interest, and the use of University resources. See APM 759, Appendix A for a list of other relevant University policies.
- F. 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-10  
**ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION**  
(Revised 6/20)

**General Policies**

Reference: **APM 661-667 660**

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

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

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

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

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

Other than the specific types of service covered by policy and applicable bargaining agreements, Academic appointees may not be employed beyond 100%.

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

Summer additional compensation may only be earned during the designated summer period. This is the time period from the day following the last day of final exams in the spring, through the last day before classes start in the fall. The dates represent the available days in each month of the summer period. This information will be updated on an annual basis. For transactional purposes the service days are converted to a percentage spread over the coinciding pay period. Because available service dates may exceed 19 in a given month, service days beyond 19 in a month may be paid on a secondary position/job up to the maximum allowable percentage of time in the service month. The specific dates for each summer period are posted annually on the Academic Personnel web site on the Compensation and Benefits tab <https://ap.ucsb.edu/compensation.and.benefits/>

VII- 7  
**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION ON ACADEMIC ADVERTISING**  
(Revised 4/23)

**I. General**

The Office of Equal Opportunity & Discrimination Prevention, whether the advertising source is free or for a fee, must approve all academic advertisements.

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

All academic position advertisements are posted on UC Recruit.

**II. Basic Elements of an Advertisement**

1. Name of campus department and the academic program where the vacancy is located
2. Job Number–Assigned by UC Recruit at the time the search plan for the position is created.
3. Expected recruitment type (external or internal search)
4. Expected hire type (single, multiple, or pooled recruitment)
5. The level of the position if determined (e.g., Assistant, Associate, Open). For Senate faculty positions the level of the position listed in the ad must reflect the approved level of the provision.
6. The area of specialization/research–Preference or emphasis for a particular area of specialization can also be included. For Senate faculty positions the area must reflect the approved area of the provision.
7. The expected start date of the position (e.g., effective July 1, 2022; or effective 2022-23)
8. The expected salary or budgeted range that the department reasonably expects to pay, per newly updated SB 1162 guidelines – see [Guidelines for the Application of SB 1162 and AB 168](#) on AP website.
9. Requirements–List any educational or other academic degree requirements if applicable. Care should be taken to clearly identify required basic qualifications from additional or preferred qualifications for the position.
10. Specify what constitutes a complete application. Departments may wish to request items such as the following:
  - a curriculum vita
  - statement of research interests
  - samples of published work
  - number of references required and the manner by which a letter of recommendation is obtained.
11. Specify a deadline for receiving applications. Whenever possible, Senate faculty searches should set an application deadline between November 15 and December 31. Application deadlines later than February 1 should be avoided when anticipating a July 1 start date. Departments should be mindful of the Intercampus deadline of April 1 (APM 510).
12. The following must be included in each ad:
  - The pay scale the department reasonably expects to pay (\$X-\$Y) must be included in all job postings in UC Recruit and shared with any third parties engaged to assist with job postings, as applicable.
  - “The University is especially interested in candidates who can contribute to the diversity and excellence of the academic community through research, teaching and service as appropriate to the position.” In addition, the advertisement must end with: “The University of California is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action

Employer. All qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, disability status, protected veteran status, or any other characteristic protected by law.”

- *As a condition of employment, you will be required to comply with the [University of California Policy on Vaccination Programs](#), as may be amended or revised from time to time. Federal, state, or local public health directives may impose additional requirements.*
- ~~“As a condition of employment, you will be required to comply with the [University of California Policy on Vaccination Programs](#) [With Updated Interim Amendments](#). All Covered Individuals under the policy must provide proof of receiving the COVID-19 Vaccine Primary Series or, if applicable, submit a request for Exception (based on Medical Exemption, Disability, Religious Objection, and/or Deferral based on pregnancy or recent COVID-19 diagnosis and/or treatment) no later than the applicable deadline. All Covered Individuals must also provide proof of receiving the most recent CDC recommended COVID-19 booster or properly decline such booster no later than the applicable deadline. New University of California employees should refer to [Exhibit 2](#), Section II.C. of the [SARS CoV-2 \(COVID-19\) Vaccination Program Attachment](#) for applicable deadlines. All Covered Individuals must also provide proof of being Up To Date on seasonal influenza vaccination or properly decline such vaccination no later than the applicable deadline. Please refer to the [Seasonal Influenza Vaccination Program Attachment](#). (Capitalized terms in this paragraph are defined in the policy.) Federal, state, or local public health directives may impose additional requirements.”~~

VIII-3  
HELLMAN FELLOWS PROGRAM  
(4/15)

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

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

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

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

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

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