

April 1, 2024

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

From: Dana Mastro, Associate Vice Chancellor for 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 April 1, 2024. A summary of changes is appended.

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/>. Revisions to the advancement methodology and review categories are delineated in the attached summary, along with both technical updates and policy clarifications.

These changes include final versions of proposed revisions to Red Binder policies pertaining to the faculty merit and advancement process that were first circulated on February 1, 2024, for campus review and comment. The proposals were developed after extensive consultation with faculty and Senate leadership, senior administrators, and Academic Personnel staff, following analyses of campus and system-wide merit and promotion procedures (see [Fall 2023 AP Newsletter](#)). The revisions were part of an effort to improve the efficiency and transparency of our existing review practices and better align with APM guidance, while maintaining the reward structure at the core of our ongoing commitment to supporting faculty excellence at all stages of their careers.

Faculty and staff from all divisions, colleges, and schools submitted comments on the proposed revisions, and these comments led to further consideration and emendation, based on extensive, additional consultation with faculty, staff, and leadership at all levels. The finalized changes to policy, issued today and effective April 1, 2024, are the result of these discussions.

Cases under review during the current 2023-2024 case cycle will follow the policies and procedures in place at the commencement of the review. Cases in the 2024-2025 case cycle will follow the revised Red Binder provisions.

Academic Personnel will offer workshops throughout the spring, summer, and fall to support the transition to these new policies and practices. Faculty and Departmental AP staff are encouraged to attend to prepare for the next merit cycle. Please register for these sessions on the [Training and Workshop Registration](#) tab on the AP website. Workshops will be held at the times noted below.

- Tuesday, April 30, from 1:00-2:30 pm
- Thursday, May 16, from 1:30-3:00 pm
- Monday, July 15, from 2:00-3:30 pm
- Tuesday, October 1, from 1:00-2:30 pm

In addition, faculty and staff are always welcome to attend any of the weekly Academic Personnel [Zoom Office Hours](#) on Mondays from 1:00-2:00, to ask questions about these policies.

Thank you.

Section	Title	Summary of changes
I-2	Deadline Dates	Change of materials & bio-bib cut-off to August 31
I-4	Eligibility, Deferral & Mandatory Review	Overlapping steps normalized. Assoc V and Asst IV added
I-6	Career Equity Reviews	Clarify role of ad hoc committee
I-8	Off-Scale Salaries	Increments of .5 for advancements
I-10	Reconsiderations	Original review policies used apply in reconsiderations
I-14	Faculty appointments	New wording for soft-offers from dept. or Dean
I-27	Instructions for creation of the bio-bib	Move to new bio-bib system, changes in review categories for faculty series
I-30	Dean's Authority Cases	Include overlapping step increases in deans authority
I-31	Documents to be Submitted, Dean's Auth	Eliminates manual bio-bib action
I-33	Expanded Reviews	Eliminate special steps cases. Clarify acceleration authority
I-34	Documents to be Submitted, Expanded	Eliminates manual bio-bib action
I-35	How to write a Department Letter	Updates to reflect changes in advancement methodology
I-36	Merit Advancements	Change title to Merit Advancements. New advancement methodology
I-37	Overlapping steps	Change from special to overlapping, add new steps, clarify usage
I-40	Promotion to Tenure/SOE	Add reference to sections I-36 and I-37
I-41	Promotion to Professor	Add reference to sections I-36 and I-37
I-42	Merit to Step VI	Add reference to sections I-36 and I-37
I-43	Merit to Above	Add reference to section I-37. Update criteria based on new methodology
I-50	Wording for Solicitation Letters	Remove professional activities as a separate review criteria
I-56	Teaching Professor series	Update title, new language to describe series
I-75	Appointment and Advancement	Reflect new methodology and application

Technical changes only: Use of Teaching Professor series working title, elimination of gendered language

I-3	Priority Designations
I-11	Acting Asst Prof and Acting Assistant Teaching Professor
I-12	Teaching Load
I-13	Retention of FTE
I-17	New Faculty Commitments
I-22	Checklist for Advancement
I-29	Conflict of Commitment
I-38	Formal Appraisal
I-39	Terminal Appointment and Decisions to Deny Promotion
I-46	Guidelines for Letters of Evaluation
I-49	Sample Letter to Extramural Evaluators
I-51	Materials to External Reviewers
I-70	Procedures for Recall
II-1	Unit 18 Faculty
VI-I	Leaves
VI-2	Sabbatical
VI-10	Additional Compensation
VI-26	Separations
VII-1	Policies on Open Recruitment
VIII-1	Career Development Awards

I-2
DEADLINE DATES
(Revised 4/15 3/24)

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

September 30
Assistant Professor deferral requests

2nd Monday in November
Dean's Authority cases: ~~2nd Monday in November~~
~~Assistant Professor Deferral Requests:~~

2nd Monday in December
Expanded Review cases: ~~2nd Monday in December~~
(See Red Binder I-33 for definition of Expanded Review)

Completed cases must be submitted to the office of the appropriate Dean by the appropriate deadline date. Cases received after the due date will be returned to the Department and will not be processed. A missed deadline may not be used as justification for retroactivity in a future review. Recommendations must be based on materials available before September 15 August 31 except for extramural letters delayed by circumstances beyond the department's control. Departments may institute earlier cut-off dates. Both the Dean and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel must be notified if the department plans to change its existing cut-off date. It may *also* be appropriate in some promotion to tenure *SOE* cases to add materials available after ~~September 15~~ *August 31*.

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

I-3
PRIORITY DESIGNATIONS
(Revised ~~4/15~~ 3/24)

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

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

I-4
ELIGIBILITY, DEFERRAL AND MANDATORY REVIEW
(Revised 4/23 3/24)

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 advancement in cases of exceptional merit nor does it preclude less rapid advancement. Service as an Assistant Professor or ~~Lecturer with Potential SOE~~ **Assistant Teaching Professor** (including time as an Acting or Visiting Assistant Professor) is limited to 8 years. Service at the Associate Professor/~~Lecturer SOE~~ **Associate Teaching Professor** and Professor/~~Sr. Lecturer SOE~~ **Teaching Professor** levels is unlimited.

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

Under specific circumstances, an Assistant Professor, ~~Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment~~ **Assistant Teaching Professor**, 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 **(with the exception of COVID related extensions)** and requests may not be made after the tenure/SOE/Associate Researcher review has begun. Requests 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 be made when the employee's ability to pursue **his or her their** 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 their** 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 their** research activities. Supporting documentation must be provided with the request for extension.

When an extension of the tenure/**SOE** 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/**SOE** 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/**SOE** 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 Assistant Teaching Professor** rank contains steps I-VI, although steps ~~I and VI are is~~ not used at UCSB. The Associate Professor/~~Lecturer SOE~~ **Associate Teaching Professor** rank contains steps I-V, ~~although step V is not used at UCSB~~. The normal time of service at each step within the Assistant/~~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~~ **Associate Teaching Professor IV and V** (Red Binder I-37). The Professor/~~Sr. Lecturer SOE~~ **Teaching Professor** rank contains steps I-IX as well as Above Scale. Normal service at steps I-IV is 3 years. Service at step V and above may be for an indefinite time; however, normal service is 3 years at steps V through VIII and 4 years at step IX or Above Scale. **Steps V+ and IX+ act as overlapping steps (Red Binder I-37.)** Eligibility for normal advancement occurs after the normal

time of service at each step. Early advancements abbreviating normative time of review are only permitted at the rank of Assistant Professor/~~LPSOE~~ *Assistant Teaching Professor* in cases of promotion (see RB I-36 for guidance on expectations for acceleration) *or in cases of lateral promotion from the overlapping steps as well as at the special steps* of Assistant Professor/~~LPSOE V~~ *Assistant Teaching Professor V and VI* and Associate Professor/~~LSOE IV~~ *Associate Teaching Professor IV and V* (see RB I-37 for important parameters governing advancement at the *special/overlapping* steps).

If the outcome of a merit review is no change in rank, step, or off-scale, the candidate will continue to be eligible for advancement in rank or step each year until the advancement in rank or step occurs. *If advanced within step, further advancement within step or in rank/step will only be allowed when the normative number of years at step since previous advancement in off scale 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 ~~SOE~~ 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~~ *Assistant Teaching Professors* must be accompanied by a letter of recommendation from the Chairperson that explains the reasons for the deferral and describes the progress that will be expected prior to the next review. Review for promotion to tenure or Security of Employment will normally take place by the end of the 6th year of service but may be deferred until the 7th year. The faculty member's deferral request along with the Chairperson's letter of recommendation must be submitted via AP Folio. Deferral beyond the 7th year will not be considered. The Formal Appraisal review may not be deferred, except in cases of extension of the tenure ~~SOE~~ clock.

I-6
CAREER EQUITY REVIEW
(Revised 2/21 3/24)

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

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

Procedure:

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

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

A CER may be initiated in the following ways:

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

will then form a confidential ad hoc committee to oversee the assembly of materials for a career review. The Dean will also assure that all appropriate procedures concerning safeguards and access occur as outlined in the Red Binder. The committee will include members of the School or Division, and at the Dean's discretion may contain members of the Department and/or representatives from outside the School or from other UC campuses. The committee will ~~not evaluate the concurrent merit/promotion action but will~~ have access to the departmental letter of recommendation for the ~~concurrent merit/promotion pending action, but will only make a~~ *recommendation concerning the CER, and will not evaluate or recommend on the concurrent merit/promotion action.* The committee may request additional information from the candidate. The committee will provide an analysis of the CER equivalent in depth to that of a Department letter. The ad hoc committee's dossier, and their letter analyzing the case, will be forwarded to the department for consideration, analysis, and vote. The CER case will then be forwarded along with the merit or promotion case to the Dean and continue through the normal review process for an Expanded Review case.

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

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

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

I-8
OFF-SCALE SALARIES
(Revised 4/23/24)

I. 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.

II. Off-Scale Advancements

Off-scale supplements are retained in on-time, normative advancements. *When properly justified an increment of off-scale equivalent to a one-half step increase as indicated on the published scale, may also be awarded as part of the advancement process.* ~~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 ~~warrants supports a within step~~ *the addition of a one-half 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 two increment advancement.~~

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-10
RECONSIDERATION
(Revised ~~10/17~~)

After a decision has been announced in a personnel case, the departmental Chairperson may request a reconsideration of the decision. This course of action may be pursued only when there is new documentation relating to accomplishments already in place prior to the deadline for submission of materials (Red Binder I-2), or when the department can make a compelling argument that reviewing agencies neglected important features of the case. Evidence for the latter ground for reconsideration is most often provided by the candidate, based on the copy of non-confidential documents and the redacted copy of the confidential academic review records contained in the personnel review file received pursuant to APM 220-80-i. Chairpersons should avoid "routine" or "automatic" resubmission of requests for reconsideration. On the other hand, when a compelling argument for reversal of the original decision can be documented, the Chairperson should carefully present the evidence for reconsideration. Reconsideration of a case must be requested and the review completed, prior to the submission of any subsequent personnel case.

Departmental practices are variable on the degree of consultation with the voting faculty necessary in a case for reconsideration. While a new vote on a case for reconsideration is desirable, it is not required. However, the voting faculty must be consulted, and the form of this consultation, as well as the comments expressed by voting faculty, are to be reported in the Chairperson's letter. The candidate has the same rights of access as in the original case. The Chair should ensure that any additional letter writers or faculty members expressing comments are not identified in the departmental letter except by means of a coded list appended to the departmental letter.

The reconsideration case will undergo the same review process as the original case, with the provision that no ad hoc committee review will take place during the reconsideration process. *The policies and procedures in place at the time of the original review will apply to the reconsideration case.*

Note: For guidelines concerning reconsideration of a terminal year appointment see Red Binder I-39.

I. Procedure of Automatic Regularization

At the time of initial appointment the department may request that a candidate who has not yet completed the Ph.D. dissertation be appointed as Acting Assistant Professor or Acting *Teaching Professor* ~~Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment (PSOE)~~, with automatic regularization to Assistant Professor or ~~Lecturer PSOE~~ *Assistant Teaching Professor*, at the same salary rate, upon receipt of the Ph.D. by a specified expected date.

If automatic regularization is not requested at the time of the initial appointment, a completely new review is necessary when the title is changed to Assistant Professor or ~~Lecturer PSOE~~ *Assistant Teaching Professor*.

When automatic regularization of an Acting Assistant Professor or Acting ~~Lecturer PSOE~~ *Assistant Teaching Professor* has been approved in conjunction with the initial appointment, the Department Chair must provide the Office of Academic Personnel with a letter from the graduate dean of the institution conferring the Ph.D. which indicates the date that the appointee completed all formal degree requirements. If this date precedes the beginning of the service period for the next quarter the change in title will be effective at the beginning of that quarter.

II. Procedure for Reappointment

Each appointment as Acting Assistant Professor or Acting ~~Lecturer PSOE~~ *Assistant Teaching Professor* shall be for a specified term, not to exceed one year. The total period of service with these titles is limited to two years. If the Ph.D. is not received by Winter Quarter in the initial year, and a second year in that title is sought, the department must submit by March 1 a request for reappointment which includes an explanation of the candidate's failure to complete the dissertation and an assessment of the likelihood of completion.

The request is reviewed by the Dean with the Associate Vice Chancellor taking authority for the final decision. The normal expectation is that the Ph.D. shall be completed, and regularization takes place, during the first year of service. Reappointment as an Acting Assistant Professor or Acting ~~Lecturer PSOE~~ *Assistant Teaching Professor* is not automatic.

If the candidate receives reappointment but does not finish the Ph.D. in the second year, the appointment is self-terminating. If the department wishes to rehire the candidate at a later date, it will be necessary to request retention of the FTE and to initiate an open search.

I-12
POLICY ON TEACHING LOADS
(Revised 4/19 3/24)

The campus has a small number of tenured Associate or Full Professors who are inactive in research, but are competent teachers. Department Chairs may be asked by a Dean to assign teaching responsibilities significantly greater than the departmental average to particular individuals in this category. Faculty members not involved in research should carry higher teaching loads, as long as this practice does not result in students having less contact with scholars active in research. This practice should not be used to reduce average loads for researchers; research cannot substitute for normal teaching responsibilities. Appointees in the ~~Lecturer Security of Employment~~ *Teaching Professor* series are expected to carry a heavier teaching load than Professorial series appointees. The teaching load of a ~~Lecturer SOE~~ *Teaching Professor* series appointee is expected to be lower than that of a temporary or continuing lecturer, in recognition of the additional responsibilities of a ~~Lecturer SOE~~ *Teaching Professor* series appointee, including professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, and University and public service.

There is an opportunity for steady salary progression for an excellent teacher inactive in research through a transfer to the ~~Lecturer SOE~~ *Teaching Professor* series. When it is appropriate, the Deans, the CAP, the Associate Vice Chancellor, and the Executive Vice Chancellor will encourage transfer to this series. Where it is not appropriate, the only alternative presently available is to remain on the professorial ladder with a heavier teaching assignment. In implementing this policy, consideration can be given to unusual levels of University service or for professional activities directly beneficial to the University.

Additional teaching assignments for a research-inactive tenured professorial series faculty member are best initiated through informal agreement between the faculty member and the Department Chair.

In implementing this policy it should be kept in mind that it is the Chair's responsibility to assign teaching responsibilities and to balance load equitably, taking into account supervision of graduate students and service to the department. This policy statement supports the Chair in encouraging adjustments to teaching loads for purposes of equity.

The proposed changes appropriate for faculty inactive in research should be discussed in advance with the Dean, as should any assignment involving a quarter or more without classroom teaching.

The above practices are not intended for those persons whose research goes slowly because of the difficulties of the field, or to those who are working productively but in an unfashionable area. It applies only to those faculty who are no longer devoting a reasonable portion of their energies to productive research, or to those whose accomplishments over an extended period of time are so minimal that it would appear to be a mistake for them to devote their energies to research.

I-13
RETENTION OF ACADEMIC FTE
(Revised 4/19)

All vacancies in Senate faculty FTE provisions resulting from death, resignation, retirement, transfer, or change in program, will be returned to the College's or School's Provision for Unallocated Academic Staff pending review of workload and program requirements. Please note that there are no exceptions to this procedure. In the case of a vacant FTE due to a terminal appointment of an Assistant Professor or ~~Lecturer~~ **PSOE Assistant Teaching Professor**, the FTE will normally be retained by the department.

A request to retain FTE should be made during the annual call for departmental FTE plans, normally in the fall quarter. The department should base the justification for the retention of the provision on the following concerns:

- a. Specific program needs related to the provision under review, and a statement as to how these needs fit within the programmatic structure of the department as a whole.
- b. Review of departmental workload over the previous five years. Each entity may request the FTE retention data available from the Budget and Planning office. Workload considerations specific to the position under review, such as graduate student supervision and undergraduate advising, should also be noted.
- c. A statement specifying the appropriate level at which the position should be replaced. (Note that vacated ladder faculty positions normally revert to Assistant Professor II. Recommendations for replacement at any higher level require specific justification.)
- d. A statement of anticipated impact on the department should the request for retention of the position be denied.
- e. A statement of anticipated costs associated with the desired appointment -- start-up costs, space and space modifications, removal costs, etc.

In consultation with the Counsel on Planning and Budget, and the Deans of the Schools and Colleges, retention requests will be reviewed as part of the annual budget review and the annual allocation of faculty FTE provisions.

I-14
SENATE FACULTY APPOINTMENTS
(Revised 4/23)

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~~ **they hold** 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~~ **their** 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~~ **they do** 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 an 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 **or Dean** may communicate to the candidate its intention to recommend an appointment.

The recommended wording for department **or Dean** 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.

I am pleased to confirm that the Department of _____ is proposing your appointment as _____, Step _____ with an annual (9-month) salary of \$_____ (100%-time). Following the policies and procedures at UC Santa Barbara, your appointment file will undergo review by the appropriate campus agencies, and the finalization of this offer is contingent upon their approval. Official offers of employment are extended by the Executive Vice Chancellor or Chancellor. On behalf of my colleagues, and with the enthusiastic support of the department, I would like to express our excitement at the prospect of your joining our faculty.

In advance of our formal offer, I am writing to supply additional information on your proposed appointment and confirm the following commitments that we would expect to make to support you in your transition to Santa Barbara and to assist you as you begin your career here. This memo serves as confirmation of the startup package commitments noted below.

IV. Intercampus Deadlines

Departments should be mindful of the Intercampus deadline of April 1. Please refer to APM 510.

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

I-17
NEW SENATE FACULTY COMMITMENTS
(Revised ~~2/23~~ 3/24)

A "start-up memo" addressing the equipment, space, housing and other start-up needs should be forwarded with the appointment packet. Note that one memo may be written to cover all of these issues. The Dean's New Senate Faculty Commitment Sheet will be prepared and endorsed by the Dean and then forwarded to the Associate Vice Chancellor.

At the time the Chancellor extends an offer of appointment to the candidate, a copy of the approved Commitment Sheet will be forwarded to the Dean indicating what recruitment commitments have been approved.

Please note: Revisions in recruitment commitments require approval by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel. Requests for revisions should be made in memo form to the appropriate Dean's office. For revisions being requested prior to the faculty member's start date, a revised commitment sheet will be completed by the College and forwarded to Academic Personnel for review. For revisions being requested after the faculty member's start date, the Dean may simply endorse the departmental request and forward it to Academic Personnel for review.

Housing

Mortgage Origination Program (MOP) loan commitments are made available for approximately a three-year period from the date of appointment. Extension beyond the expiration date may be possible depending upon financial conditions at the time of the extension request. The actual amount of the loan (up to the maximum specified by Office of the President) will be based on the individual qualification of the faculty member.

An offer may be extended for placement on the wait list for purchase of University owned housing at West Campus Point and Ocean Walk at North Campus. ~~Ladder faculty and Lecturers in the Security of Employment series~~ *Senate faculty* are eligible for placement on the primary housing wait list. Individuals are added to the wait list at the time of job offer. Under no circumstances may faculty names be added to the top of the list.

Rental of family student housing may be offered to Assistant Professors and ~~Lecturers with Potential Security of Employment~~ *Assistant Teaching Professors*. Rentals are on an "as available" basis and new faculty should be urged to contact the housing office as soon as possible, once an offer has been extended, if they will be exercising this option.

Faculty Recruitment allowance

The Faculty Recruitment Allowance (also known as a Relocation Allowance or Housing Allowance), is made available to help newly recruited faculty meet the costs associated with purchasing a home, usually the down payment or closing costs. It may also be used towards the initial deposit necessary for a rental. Uses beyond those specified here, such as those outlined in APM 190, are exceptional and are rarely approved at UCSB. The maximum allowable allocation is based on the rate on Table 40 of the published Salary Scale at the time of hire. Incoming faculty should be advised of the following to avoid unrealistic expectations about how and when they can get the money.

Faculty may not be issued their faculty recruitment allowance until they are employees and have been entered into the payroll system. Exceptions to this policy may not be made and the appointment start date may not be modified to accommodate payment. The faculty recruitment allowance is to be paid out as close as possible to the time it will be used (for example, upon entry into escrow), not at the time of initial employment. Faculty are encouraged to consult with their departments prior to entering escrow to assure that the payment may be issued during the escrow period. A Department or College may require proof of entry into escrow or other appropriate documentation prior to payment of the faculty recruitment allowance.

Faculty recruitment allowances are considered wages for Federal and State tax reporting and withholding and for Social Security taxes, workers' compensation, and unemployment insurance. Payment of the faculty recruitment allowance is made through UCPath as one-time additional pay. Request for payment of the faculty recruitment allowance should be made at least 30 days in advance of the date the money is needed.

I-22
DEPARTMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR ACADEMIC ADVANCEMENT
(Revised 4/23/24)

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

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

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

I. Notifying The Candidate

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

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

II. Developing The Recommendation

- _____ 9) **Solicit confidential extramural letters of evaluation** in cases of promotion to tenure ~~/SOE~~, promotion to Professor or ~~Sr. LSOE Teaching Professor~~, ~~and~~ merit ~~from~~ ~~to~~ Professor or ~~Sr. LSOE Teaching Professor~~ ~~IX~~ ~~to~~ Above Scale.
- _____ 10) **Include with the case a sample copy of the letter used to solicit extramural letters**, a list of the materials sent to the letter writers, and a copy of all items that were sent to the referees (e.g., C.V., bibliography, reprints, manuscripts, and so forth) if they are not already included with the case of one-of-a-kind materials.
- _____ 11) **Assemble all pertinent information** (publications, teaching evaluations, solicited letters, etc.) in accordance with instructions set forth in the Red Binder sections related to specific actions. Be sure to include the total record of accomplishments appropriate to the review period.
- _____ 12) **Provide the candidate with an opportunity to inspect all non-confidential documents included in the review file.** Candidates should be told that they have access to non-confidential material.
- _____ 13) **Provide the candidate with the opportunity to request a redacted copy of all confidential letters and documents included in the file without revealing the identity of the sources.** One set of the redacted material must also be included in the file.
- _____ 14) **Provide the candidate with an opportunity to include a written statement responding to or commenting upon material in the file.** This should be done in sufficient time to allow the candidate's response to be taken into account in the departmental letter.
- _____ 15) **Inform the candidate that, if at any later point new information is added to the file, ~~he/she~~ they will be informed and given an opportunity to comment.**
- _____ 16) If an ad hoc review committee will be employed, explain the role and selection of this committee and the candidate's three options (Red Binder I-60).
- _____ 17) **Inform the candidate of ~~his/her~~ their right to request a redaction of the ad hoc committee's letter and a copy of other reviewing agencies' reports** from the office of Academic Personnel at the conclusion of the review process.
- _____ 18) **Consult colleagues in accordance with departmental practice and the rules of voting rights and eligibility established in By-Law 55.**
(<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/manual/blpart1.html#bl55>)
- _____ 19) **Write a letter of recommendation** in accordance with APM 220-80-e. Note in particular the requirement to present both supporting and opposing views. Be sure the letter is dated and signed.
- _____ 20) **Make the letter available for inspection by all departmental members eligible to vote on the case** or by a departmental committee or group established in accordance with APM 220-80-e. At this point any eligible faculty member who voted with the minority may include a "minority opinion" letter if they feel that the Departmental letter does not adequately address the opinion of the minority vote. A minority opinion letter must be submitted by the end of the inspection period to assure its consideration in the review process. All eligible faculty must be provided full access to this document. Any unresolved issues between the minority and majority opinions should be addressed in a Chair's confidential letter (Red Binder I-35)

III. Forwarding The Case

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

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

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF THE BIO-BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Revised 4/23 3/24)

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 / August 31
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 historically excluded populations, or research that highlights alleviates structural inequalities.

Final bio-bibs are generated by the online bio-bib system and are tailored to the specific series (e.g., Professor, Teaching Professor, Specialist, etc.). Thus, the Professor series bio-bib contains information on Research/Creative Activity, Teaching/Mentoring, and Service, as well as professional achievements. The Teaching Professor bio-bib contains information on Teaching/Mentoring, Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity, and Service. Bio-bibs may be maintained in any format (word document, excel document, etc) but must conform to the format described below. A bio-bib template is available via the Forms section of the Academic Personnel website.

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 Teaching Professor series will include research/creative activity in the section 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 definitions:

- [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

When the final version of the bio-bib is generated for use in the review process, a line should will be automatically drawn inserted separating all new items from ones those 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 (e.g., from Work Submitted to In Press; from In Press to Published; change in title), 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 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. 2002-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 "The Beginning of Time" 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.

Other research/creative activity-related activities should be noted in the appropriate available categories (e.g., academic presentations, grants and contracts, research awards, etc.).

Teaching and Mentoring (For Senate Faculty only)

The bio-bib must contain an itemized, chronological (by quarter) list of workload since the last successful review, which will automatically be placed in chronological order (by quarter). 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 Notes may be added to indicate the transition from hard copy to on-line course evaluations.

A single link to student course evaluations and student written feedback can be inserted at the top of the teaching section of the bio-bib or individually for each course. 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.)

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.

Appointees to the Research series should list participation on PhD or MA committees as Professional Activity.

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.) Other teaching/mentoring-related activities should be noted in the appropriate available categories (e.g., undergraduate projects directed, teaching/mentoring awards, supervising postdocs, etc.).

Professional Activity

Appointees to the Lecturer SOE *Teaching Professor* series will typically use a single *include professional activity in the 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, invited talks, workshops, book reviews, professional memberships, extramural grants, refereeing for journals, consulting, and so forth) that have occurred since the last successful review.

Appointees to the Research series should list participation on PhD or MA committees as Professional Activity.

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, college, campus, system-wide, public 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.

In the Research series, mentoring of students that furthers diversity and equal opportunity should be listed as University service.

Other service-related activities should be noted in the appropriate available categories (e.g., reviewing and refereeing, service awards, special appointments, etc.).

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.

CONFLICT OF COMMITMENT AND OUTSIDE PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

(Revised 4/23/24)

General information

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

Faculty members holding the following titles are subject to APM 025:

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

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

A full-time faculty member on a nine-month appointment may not engage in outside professional activity for more than 39 days during the academic year. The 39-day limitation does not apply during periods of leave without pay, however prior approval of Category I activity and reporting of Category I and II activity are still required. Faculty on approved sabbatical or other leaves with pay are subject to disclosure, prior approval, and annual reporting requirements regardless of the funding source for salary.

Summer Months

There are no restrictions on the number of days of Category I and II activity for academic-year faculty during the summer months except during periods when receiving additional University compensation (i.e. Summer Session teaching or research compensation). The time limit on compensated and uncompensated outside professional activities is the equivalent of one day per week during the period in which University summer compensation is received.

Categories Of Outside Professional Activity

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

Category I activities are likely on their face to raise issues of conflict of commitment. Such activities are **not allowed without prior approval** from the Chancellor or designee, and when approved are subject to the 39-day limit, and must be reported on an annual basis. Prior approval is required even if the activity will take place during a period of leave without pay. Category I activities include current or pending acceptance of an honorary, visiting, adjunct, or other institutional appointment (either compensated or uncompensated) at an outside institution, or participation in or application to talent recruitment programs sponsored by a government agency of a nation other than the United States. Category I activities include but are not limited to:

- Teaching, research, or administration of a grant at an educational institution, trust, organization, government agency, foundation, or other entity outside of the University;
- Employment outside of the University
- Assuming an executive or managerial position in a for-profit or not-for-profit business.
- Assuming a founding or a co-founding role of a company.
- Other professional activity that common sense and good judgment would indicate are likely to raise issues of conflict of commitment.

Category II activities are typically shorter-term outside professional activities which have less potential to raise issues of conflict of commitment. They are allowed without prior approval up to the 39-day limit and must be reported on an annual basis. Such activities include but are not limited to:

- Teaching for Professional and Continuing Education (PaCE), or teaching for other continuing education programs run by the University, and self-supporting UC degree programs.
- Consulting or testifying as an expert or professional witness.
- Providing consulting services or engaging in professional practice as an individual, single- member professional corporation or sole proprietorship.
- Serving on the board of directors of an outside entity.
- Providing or presenting a workshop for industry.
- Providing outside consulting or compensated professional activities performed for entities such as the Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories (exception for Board of Governors- see APM 025).
- Other outside professional activity not mentioned in Category I or III that common sense and good judgment indicate are not likely to raise issues of conflict of commitment.

Category III activities are accepted as part of a faculty member's scholarly and creative work. Even if compensated they are allowed, and do not count towards the 39-day limit. Category III activities do not need prior approval except when the activity involves students (see APM 025-8-d). They must be reported annually by deans and faculty administrators whether compensated or uncompensated (see APM 240-20-c and APM-246-20-c). Category III activities include but are not limited to:

- Serving on government or professional panels or committees or as an officer or board member of a professional or scholarly society.
- Acting as a reviewer or editor for journal or book manuscripts.
- Attending and presenting talks at university/academic colloquia and conferences.
- Participating in or accepting a commission for an artistic performance or event not sponsored by the University other than activities under Category I.
- Developing scholarly communications, even when such activities result in financial gain.
- Accepting honoraria (other than those received for Category II activities) and prizes.

Prior approval requirements

Request for approval to: (1) engage in Category I activities, or (2) involve a graduate student in outside professional activity (see the campus [Policy on Conflict of Interest in Graduate Education](#) for guidelines for such activity) should be submitted in advance to the Department Chair by **June 30** for the upcoming academic year, or as soon as identified.

Requests **must** be approved prior to engaging in the activity and are submitted via OATS which may be accessed through the Academic Personnel website or directly at <https://ucsb.ucoats.org/>. The Department Chair will review the request within the context of departmental teaching demands, sabbatical leaves, other leaves, etc., and endorse or deny each request. The request will then be forwarded to the appropriate Dean for approval.

Reporting requirements

Faculty must file an annual APM 025 report for the prior fiscal year in the systemwide Outside Activities Tracking System (OATS), once functionality is made available in early July of each year. The annual report period is from July 1st to June 30th. Faculty undergoing advancement review must complete their reporting by September 15 of the calendar year. All other

faculty must complete certification by October 31 annually. Faculty may access OATS via the Academic Personnel website or directly at <https://ucsb.ucoats.org/>. The Chair must review and approve each report. The Dean will review and approve the report of the Chair. The reports are considered to be non-confidential in nature and are subject to public inspection.

I-30
DEAN'S AUTHORITY MERIT REVIEWS
(Revised ~~9/21~~ 3/24)

Deans have the approval authority for the following actions when the departmental recommendation is at normative time or longer:–

Assistant Professor and ~~Lecturer PSOE~~ Assistant Teaching Professor:

All one-step and one and one-half step merit advances from Step II to III, or from III to IV, with up to an additional ½ step in off scale supplement

Associate Professor and ~~Lecturer SOE~~ Associate Teaching Professor:

All one-step and one and one-half step merit advances from Step I to II or from II to III, with up to an additional ½ step in off scale supplement

Professor and ~~Sr. Lecturer SOE~~ Teaching Professor:

All one-step and one and one-half step merit advances from Step I to II, II to III, III to IV, IV to V, VI to VII, VII to VIII, VIII to IX, excluding advancement to Step VI and Above Scale.

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 ~~9/21~~ 3/24)

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~~ **the** 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 any no votes explained if the reason is known?**
- ☐ Are all ~~four~~ **appropriate** areas of review **and accomplishments** 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.

- ☐ **If a Chair's confidential letter is included is it** ~~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~~ **they have** 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** **documented?**
- ☐ Are all teaching evaluations listed as available in the Teaching section of the bio-bib included with the case?
- ☐ 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 *AP Folio upload screen*? ~~coversheet?~~
- ☐ ~~If a self-assessment of teaching was submitted, is it included with the case?~~

VI. **Self-assessment of *research, teaching or 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-accomplishments*, 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~~ *the research and creative activity section* 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 3/24)

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

Formal Appraisal

Terminal Appointments

Promotion to Associate Professor or Lecturer SOE Associate Teaching Professor

Promotion to Professor or Sr. Lecturer SOE Teaching Professor

Merit to a special step

Merit to Professor/Lecturer SOE Teaching Professor Step VI

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

Accelerated actions ~~greater than one and one-half step, 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/Teaching 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 4/23 3/24)

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~~ **the** 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? **Are any no votes explained if the reason is known?**
- ☐ 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 appropriate~~ areas of review **and accomplishments** covered?: **teaching, research, professional activity and university and public service?**
- ☐ Is the teaching load documented, per RB I-35?
- ☐ 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.

- ☐ **If a Chair's confidential letter is included is it** ~~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~~ **they have** 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 documented?**
- ☐ Are all teaching evaluations listed as available in the Teaching section of the bio-bib included with the case?

☐ 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?
- ☐ 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/they** 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-V) 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 **AP Folio upload screen?** **coversheet?**
- ☐ **If a self-assessment of teaching was submitted, is it included with the case?**

- VII. **Self-assessment of **research, teaching or 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 accomplishments,** 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 the research and creative activity section** 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 **SOE** 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?

HOW TO WRITE A DEPARTMENTAL LETTER

Appointments and Advancements

(Revised 4/23 3/24)

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

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

The Department letter should provide a comprehensive but concise assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in all areas of review, together with detailed evidence and context to support this evaluation (see Red Binder sections I-36 and I-75). The department letter should not recapitulate every item on the bio-bib, but should instead succinctly address if and how expectations were met in all areas and explain the basis for acceleration, when applicable. The letter should strive for balance and offer a complete professional evaluation (accurate and analytic), including both supportive and contrary evidence. Thus, the departmental letter should address both the positive and, when applicable, negative aspects of the case, especially if there is significant opposition to the recommendation. It should also, if indicated, include an assessment of the significance of particular extramural evaluations or judgments. At the same time the letter should prioritize brevity, clarity, and focus. Direct quotes and extended quotations from supporting documents (e.g. external letters, bio-bib) and rhetorical statements are to be avoided, since overly long letters are a burden to all reviewing agencies.

When an acceleration is recommended, an explicit justification for the acceleration must be clearly articulated in the department letter, including a reasoned argument for the specific degree of acceleration. In the case of a negative departmental recommendation, the basis of the recommendation should be documented as well. In all cases, the departmental letter must articulate how the requirements for a normal, one-step advancement have been met, taking into account all review areas, prior to addressing any recommendation for acceleration. See Red Binder I-36 for guidance on advancement recommendations and Red Binder I-75-VIII for information on areas of review, - criteria, and evidence in support of evaluations.

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

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

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

Teaching, research, professional and public service contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be encouraged and given due recognition in the evaluation of the candidate's record. Contributions to diversity and equal opportunity may include effort to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of diverse populations, or research in a scholar's area of expertise that **highlights helps to ameliorate** inequalities. Mentoring and advising of students and faculty members from underrepresented and underserved populations is within the scope of expected duties; however, highly significant efforts should also be given due recognition. **[see Red Binder I-75.VI]**

Suggested format for **departmental** letters of recommendation

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

A) Research/**Creative Activity (Professor series)**

~~Appointees to the Lecturer SOE series will be evaluated using a single category of Professional and/or Scholarly achievement and Activity rather than two separate categories of Research and Professional Activity.~~

*The Department letter should present a **succinct but** comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's research/creative activities record, indicating the significance of the overarching accomplishments and/or achievements of singular distinction. The department letter should articulate the grounds for advancement beyond simple numerical tabulations of the items produced. The impact, quality and **consequence** significance of the work is of the utmost importance. ~~with~~ **The letter should provide** sufficient context ~~provided~~ for the achievements to be understood by agencies outside of the department/discipline. 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. Similarly, when a candidate is listed as co-PI on a grant or contract, the departmental letter should clarify the candidate's share of the grant money and role in the project. If the contract or grant is listed as "continuing", any changes in the funding for the current review period should be provided. See Red Binder I-75, Section V, for additional information on identifying and assessing research/creative activities.*

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

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

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

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

B) Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement (Teaching Professor series)

Because "professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity" is a broad category, the Department letter should clearly articulate expectations for accomplishments related to the underlying discipline or to pedagogy, and provide clear evidence of achievement, leadership, and/or influence on the campus or beyond. The department letter should articulate the grounds for advancement beyond simply enumerating the accomplishments. The impact, quality, and significance of the professional, scholarly, or pedagogical activity is of the utmost importance, with sufficient context provided for the achievements to be understood by agencies outside of the department/discipline. 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. Similarly, when a candidate is listed as co-PI on a grant or contract, the departmental letter should clarify the candidate's share of the grant money and role in the project. If the contract or grant is listed as "continuing", any changes in the funding for the current review period should be provided. See Red Binder I-75, Section V, for additional information on identifying and assessing professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity.

B) C) Teaching and Mentoring

The department letter should include a statement of the normative teaching load and how the candidate's obligation was met for the review period. For example:

- The normal department teaching load is [X] courses per academic year. During the current review period, Professor [] taught [] (explain if partial credits) at the undergraduate level and [] (explain if partial credits) at the graduate level. This fulfilled the teaching requirement for the review period.

(If applicable, incorporate the following):

- As part of their expected teaching load, Professor [] additionally taught [course] during Summer [20__], which constitutes a core component of the curriculum of the department (only in cases when summer teaching is a required component of teaching load).
- During the review period, Professor [] had [] releases for [] (sabbatical, grant, overload previous cycle, etc.).
- [OR] This was an overload of [] that will/will not affect course load expectations in future cycles (explain if course reduction will occur in future cycle).
- [OR] This was [] course/s short of normative teaching expectations that will/will not be made up in the next review cycle.

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

The letter should include an evaluation of the candidate's teaching *and mentoring* performance, including an analytical evaluation of the *ESCI campus teaching evaluation* scores *and other evidence of teaching effectiveness, if provided*, and indicating the significance of the record. ~~The letter should clearly indicate which courses were evaluated on line and should take into consideration the possible impact of the change in methodology from paper to on line evaluation.~~ The analysis should include information on the number of graduate committees (MA and Ph.D. as reflected in the bio-bibliography). See Red Binder I-75, Section V for more information on judging the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching and mentoring.

C. Professional Activity

Appointees to the Lecturer SOE series will be evaluated using a single category of Professional and/or Scholarly achievement and Activity rather than two separate categories of Research and Professional Activity.

The departmental letter should include a full analysis of the candidate's performance, indicating the most prominent features of the record. The significance of honors, awards and extramural grants should be described. If a contract or grant is listed as "continuing", detail of any changes in the funding should be provided. When the candidate is listed as co-PI, the departmental letter should clarify the candidate's share of the grant money and role in the project.

D. C. University and Public Service

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

D. Other Achievements

The departmental letter should include an ~~full analysis~~ analytical assessment of ~~the candidate's performance and any other significant~~ accomplishments, ~~indicating the most prominent features of the record not otherwise evaluated in the letter.~~ The significance of honors, awards, and other distinctions or noteworthy activities contributing to DEI should be described in the relevant area of review.

3. Summary

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

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

Chair's Separate Confidential Letter

While this option is not often used, the Chair may, in accordance with APM 220-80e, submit a separate letter indicating ~~his/her their~~ own analysis and recommendation. This letter is not made available to other members of the faculty in the department. It should be noted that a Chair's separate letter is designed to be evaluative of the evidence available to the department; new evidence can be considered on the rare occasions when it could not be appropriately shared with the department. A Chair's confidential letter may also be used to address unresolved issues between majority and minority opinions related to a case, or to address a candidate's comments in response to the departmental review. When a Chair submits a confidential "Chair's separate letter", it should be clearly identified as such, and will become part of the personnel review file. The status of such a letter is considered to be non-departmental (as is a letter from a dean). It is not submitted to an ad hoc review committee when one is convened. As a "confidential academic review record" (as defined in APM 160-20-b), a Chair's letter will be made available to the candidate upon request along with other review agency reports at the end of the review process.

ACCELERATIONS
MERIT ADVANCEMENTS
 (Revised 4/23 3/24)

Accelerations in step and/or off scale may be proposed at or after normative time at step (see RB I 4 for unique circumstances). Departments should not hesitate to propose accelerated advancements to reward cases of superior performance where there is clear justification. Adjustments in salary via an increase in off scale supplement would primarily be proposed when the appropriate reward does not correspond to an advancement in step. 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, and not necessarily by advancement in step, as described in Red Binder I 8 and I 44.

In formulating justifications for accelerated advancements, the department and reviewing agencies must first provide evidence that the candidate has met the requirements for a normal, one step advancement 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 evidence of superior performance are noted below. It is possible to be accelerated on the basis of achievements that do not fit into the listed examples; however, this is expected to be rare and must be justified by compelling evidence.

- Professor series: Achievement well above disciplinary/field norms in research/creative activities coupled with excellent performance in all other areas.
- Lecturer with Security of Employment Series: Achievement well above the high campus standards in teaching coupled with excellent performance in all other areas.
- Extraordinary achievements in two or more areas of review, coupled with excellent performance in the other areas
- Prestigious new awards or other such evidence of peer recognition for the impact of past creative work or teaching.
- Extraordinary achievements and activities in DEI, exceeding normative expectations, within the areas of research/creative activities, teaching/mentoring, professional activities, and/or service.
- Extraordinary accomplishments in administrative service roles after the completion of a normative term (e.g., completion of 3 years as Department Chair; excluding career administrators), with significant leadership, activities, and achievements exceeding normative expectations for the role. Term of office and accomplishments should be documented in the case record. (See RB I 67 for more on Evaluation of Administrative Service)

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

Acceleration in step at the time of a career review may be based on the cumulative record.

The merit review process at UCSB (and across the UC system) is designed to reward meritorious performance with advancement in step and/or rank and the corresponding salary increment. This system of regular evaluation integrates faculty salary with specific levels of scholarly achievement, determined through peer review. The phrase “merit review” in the UC is used to refer to the review process to move up a step in the scales, which is directly linked to compensation.

Departments should define standards and expectations for their field and apply them consistently in the merit review process. Reasonable flexibility should be used in balancing heavier commitments in some areas against lighter ones in others, as appropriate for the candidate’s field, department, or division (per APM 210-1-d). Thus, the weighting of the three areas need not be equal in all cases. Likewise, accomplishments within a review period may be uneven across areas.

Merit increases are granted when performance meets or exceeds the high standards of the campus and discipline. The level of increase depends on the extent to which the record exceeds expectations. Criteria and principles for advancement are described below.

I. Normative, One-Step Advancement

A one-step advancement generally requires meeting departmental and campus standards of achievement, appropriate for rank and step, in all three areas of review. A balanced record appropriate for rank and step, is rewarded with a one step advancement. The overall record may not demonstrate equal strength in all areas of review, but at the very least, overall performance must meet departmental and campus expectations with no recurring deficiencies in any area of review. A normative advancement is appropriate either when the expectations for performance in all areas have been met or when heavier responsibilities in one area of review can justify a temporary reduction in the accomplishments in another area, for a single review period. Such flexibility does not suggest a relaxation of standards; instead it can be afforded to short-term circumstances in which patterns of work, which can be explained, depart from established expectations, not to ongoing deficiencies in performance.

For the Professor Series, pronounced strength in research may balance more limited accomplishments in teaching or service. Conversely, notable performance in service or teaching can compensate for a temporary decrease in scholarly activity on a one time basis. However, the distinctive strengths and impact of the service or teaching record must be clearly explained. Examples include winning a major award such as the campus Distinguished Teaching Award, substantial and highly impactful mentoring contributions, successful completion of a particularly difficult service assignment, or production of a major report with significant impact. Simply serving in a large number of different roles or devoting an exceptional amount of time to service or teaching does not by itself offset performance expectations for research.

For the Teaching Professor Series, pronounced strength in teaching may balance more limited accomplishments in service or professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity. Notable performance in service or professional/scholarly activity can compensate for a temporary decline in teaching accomplishments on a one time basis. However, the distinctive strengths and impact of the service record or professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity must be clearly explained. Examples include securing external funding (e.g., NIH, NSF) for the development of new pedagogical models or materials to improve learning outcomes, leadership activities in conjunction with the creation or advancement of a campus center focused on teaching and learning, senior authorship on scholarly publications, accomplished performances or other creative activities, or successful completion of a particularly difficult service assignment. Simply serving in a large number of different roles or devoting an exceptional amount of time to service or professional/scholarly activity does not by itself offset performance expectations for teaching.

II. Accelerated Advancements

When formulating justifications for advancements beyond one step, the department and reviewing agencies must first provide evidence that the candidate has met the requirements for a regular, one-step advancement prior to addressing any recommendation for acceleration. Because ongoing excellence is the expectation for merit advancements, a detailed analysis and justification, explaining the basis for any acceleration, must be provided. Extraordinary achievements in the record do not qualify a candidate for acceleration if performance in all areas does not meet expected standards. **In no case for accelerated advancement may deficiencies be evident in any area of review.**

The larger the acceleration, the greater the need for major accomplishments that distinguish the record. These achievements must be fully contextualized and justified. Accelerations at a more senior level require more evidence of exceptional performance than accelerations at a more junior level. Similarly, service duties are expected to increase as faculty advance in rank and step. What might justify an acceleration for an Assistant Professor/Assistant Teaching Professor might justify only a normative advancement for a Full Professor/Full Teaching Professor and might not meet expectations for a Professor/Teaching Professor at Above Scale.

For Professor Series faculty, the grounds for acceleration based on research must contain evidence beyond simple numerical tabulations of productivity; for example, an explanation of the considerable impact of the research or creative activity, the quality of publications, or the prominence of artistic venues. Extraordinary teaching and service may also warrant more than a routine advancement when accompanying a good record of research, but as with research, the basis for a larger than normal increase must clearly be documented. Extraordinary professional achievement may also warrant acceleration when evidenced by accomplishments such as prestigious new awards, election to national or international academies, or other such evidence of highly laudable peer recognition. DEI contributions can strengthen or augment assessments in any of the review areas when these efforts represent work that is above and beyond expectations. However, none of these achievements guarantee accelerated advancement if performance in other areas does not meet UCSB standards.

For Teaching Professors, the grounds for acceleration based on teaching must go beyond mere documentation of course load and numeric data from student assessments; for example, the development and implementation of new, innovative, and impactful evidence based pedagogical strategies; significant contributions to curricular

development; serving as a leader or resource for teaching; significant involvement in effective mentoring; and/or other substantial responsibilities contributing to the educational mission of the University. Extraordinary service may also warrant a larger than normal advancement, when accompanying a good record of teaching, but the basis for a larger than normal increase needs to be clearly documented. Extraordinary professional achievement may also warrant acceleration when evidenced by accomplishments such as prestigious new awards or other such evidence of highly significant peer recognition. DEI contributions can strengthen or augment any of the review areas when these efforts represent work that is above and beyond expectations. However, none of these achievements guarantee accelerated advancement if performance in other areas does not meet UCSB standards.

Accelerations are awarded in full step and/or one-half step increments (e.g., 1 ½ steps, 2 steps, 2 ½ steps, 3 steps, etc.). Typically accelerations will be expected to be awarded in step, except when the recommendation justifies a one-half step, which is conferred in off-scale (i.e., a one-half step equivalent in off-scale). In rare and unique cases, accelerations beyond one-half step may be granted when warranted based on appropriate circumstances and justification (such as at barrier steps). except when the recommendation justifies a one-half step increase, which is conferred in off-scale (i.e., a one-half step equivalent in off-scale). Acceleration at the time of a merit review must be based on activity during the period since the last review and calibrated based on expectations for that rank and step.

As the size of the acceleration increases, increasingly meritorious achievements are expected. Increases at the highest levels require evidence of identifiable extraordinary accomplishments and/or impact in both research/creative activity and teaching, as well as evidence of superior accomplishments and/or recognitions in other areas.

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

A variety of accomplishments founded in the overall record for the period and/or based on significant, specific achievements may form the basis for an acceleration. A non-exhaustive list of examples that may warrant acceleration are noted below. It is possible to be accelerated on the basis of achievements that are not listed here. The extent of acceleration must be justified by the level of performance/achievement.

- Professor series: Achievement well above disciplinary/field norms in research/creative activities coupled with excellent performance in all other areas.
- Teaching Professor Series: Achievement well above the high campus standards in teaching coupled with excellent performance in all other areas.
- Extraordinary achievements in two areas of review, coupled with excellent performance in the other areas
- Prestigious new awards or other such evidence of peer recognition for the impact of past creative work or teaching.
- Extraordinary achievements and activities in DEI, exceeding normative expectations, within the areas of review.
- Extraordinary accomplishments in administrative service roles after the completion of a normative term (e.g., completion of 3 years as Department Chair; excluding career administrators), with significant leadership, activities, and achievements exceeding normative expectations for the role. Term of office and accomplishments should be documented in the case record. (See RB I-67 for more on Evaluation of Administrative Service)

4. One and one half Step Advancement

An advancement of one and one-half steps (normative plus one-half step in off scale) may be warranted based on a variety of accomplishments founded in the overall record for the period and/or based on uniquely significant, specific accomplishments. A non-exhaustive set of examples follows:

For Professor Series faculty:

- Achievement well above disciplinary/field norms in research/creative activities coupled with excellent performance in all other areas.
- Extraordinary performance in both service and teaching/mentoring.

For Teaching Professor series faculty:

- Achievement well above the high campus standards in teaching/mentoring coupled with excellent performance in all other areas.
- Extraordinary performance in both service and professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity.

For faculty in either the Professor series or the Teaching Professor series:

- Extraordinary accomplishments in one area of review coupled with notable recognitions, awards, or achievements.
- Substantial and impactful service accomplishments alongside excellent performance in all other areas.
- Highly significant contributions to diversity, equity, inclusion, and equal opportunity together with excellent performance in all areas.

B. Two Step Advancement

Various compilations of achievements during the review period could warrant a two step advancement. Commonly, a two step advancement will be warranted when superior performance is demonstrated in all areas of review. The notable achievements must be clearly documented. Contributions in all areas that promote diversity, equity, inclusion, and equal opportunity should be given due recognition.

C. Two and one half Step Advancement

An advancement of two and one half steps could be justified based on various compilations of significant achievements in the record. Typically, a two and one half step advancement will require a superior overall record that exceeds the expected level of accomplishment in all areas of review for the relevant rank and step, together with additional achievements of marked distinction. Such achievements may include (but are not limited to): prestigious new awards, evidence of extraordinary peer recognition, or significant and impactful contributions through service.

D. Advances beyond Two and one half Steps

In unique and remarkable circumstances, cases that significantly exceed the very high standards for a two and one half step advancement will be considered. An advancement of three steps is expected to be extremely unusual. The record will require evidence of additional, identifiable extraordinary accomplishments and/or impact in both research/creative activity and teaching, as well as evidence of truly superior accomplishments and recognitions in other areas.

III. Decelerated Advancement

One-half Step advancement

In rare cases, when performance does not meet the standards required for a normative increase, a within-step increase of one-half step may be granted (i.e., a one-half step equivalent in off-scale only, without an advancement in step), when justified by a convincing explanation. Circumstances in which a one-half step advancement might be appropriate include cases in which a **consistent** shortcoming in the record exists in a single area, but with demonstrated achievements in other areas. In these cases, a normative advancement cannot be justified based on the ongoing deficiency, however, the accomplishments in other areas can be acknowledged.

Further advancement will be allowed only when the normative number of years at step since previous advancement in off-scale has passed. A faculty member may receive no more than two consecutive ½ step increases in the off-scale supplement; off-scale may not be used to bypass career reviews.

As with any on-time advancement, the individual's next eligibility date for academic review will be based on the effective date of the advancement, if an acceleration in step or off-scale occurs. If the outcome of a merit review is no change in step or off-scale, the faculty member remains eligible for review each year until advancement in rank, or step, or off-scale occurs. See Red Binder I-4-III for important parameters.

**"SPECIAL" OR
"OVERLAPPING" OVERLAPPING STEPS**
(Revised 4/23 3/24)

Steps V and VI of the Assistant Professors/Lecturer PSOE Assistant Teaching Professor rank and Steps IV and V of the Associate Professor/Lecturer SOE Associate Teaching Professor, and step V+ and IX+ of the Professor/Teaching Professor rank are overlapping steps. "special" steps; "special" in the sense that these steps may be utilized for advancement when a member of the faculty is eligible for promotion or career review, shows evidence of work that is likely to lead to promotion in the near future when completed, but whose established record of accomplishment has not yet attained sufficient strength to warrant the promotion or career review advancement. Placement on the overlapping steps may occur only when the expectations for a normative, one-step advancement (Red Binder I-36) have been met. In addition, the use of the special step of Assistant Professor V is appropriate for individuals who have accumulated a significant research record, but have not yet established an equivalent teaching record that would merit consideration for tenure. *Overlapping steps may not be used for new faculty appointments.*

Service at the special/overlapping steps is in lieu of service at the first step of the next rank, corresponding next normal rank or step progression. Once advanced to a special step, the normal progression is for promotion to the next rank. Upon advancement to a special overlapping step, the faculty member is eligible for review for promotion or career review each year until promoted or successful in the career review. If promoted the promotion or career review occurs earlier than the normative time at step (two years at Assistant Professor/Lecturer PSOE V and three years at Associate Professor/LSOE IV), the promotion or career advancement will should be lateral with no increase in salary. A lateral advancement indicates promotion to Step I at the higher rank, accompanied by the \$100 increase in salary associated with movement from the special step to Step I of the next rank. To move to Step II after advancement to the special step, a candidate is expected to serve the normative time at step or, in rare cases, meet the requirements for accelerated advancement without deficiencies in any area, based on expectations for normative time at step (see also RB I 4 III & RB I 36). After a lateral promotion or career review advancement, eligibility for review will be determined based on the combination of years at the special/overlapping step and years at Step I at the higher rank the new step. If promoted at the normative time at step, the "on time" advancement will be to Step II of the higher rank. The appropriate level of advancement in the case of promotion after more than the normative time at step will be dependent on the strength of the case and should not be determined simply based on time served at the special step.

Further advancement within the special overlapping steps, for example from Associate Professor IV to Associate Professor V, will not occur at less than the normative time at step. (two years at Assistant Professor/Lecturer PSOE V and three years at Associate Professor/LSOE IV) and will require evidence that promotion is likely to occur with the next review.

The Overlapping Step Advancement Matrix on the AP website provides a summary of advancement options for faculty at the overlapping steps and upon promotion in rank.

I-38
FORMAL APPRAISAL
(Revised 4/19 3/24)

Formal appraisals are made "in order to arrive at preliminary assessments of the prospects of candidates for eventual promotion to tenure rank as well as to identify appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence desired for continued membership in the faculty" (APM 220-83). For **Lecturers in the SOE the Teaching Professor** series, "security of employment" is substituted for "tenure."

A formal appraisal of an Assistant Professor/**Assistant Teaching Professor** **Lecturer-PSOE** will be conducted during the fourth year of service in that title, or in combination with this and other titles counted under the eight-year rule, as defined in APM 133-0 a and APM 133-0 b. Individuals appointed at the higher steps of the Assistant Professor/**Lecturer-PSOE** **Assistant Teaching Professor** rank may be promoted after less than four years of service, in which case an appraisal would not occur. The formal appraisal may be deferred, by request, if the faculty member has had time off the tenure **SOE** clock. The formal appraisal will not be conducted earlier than the fourth year, however, departments should be informally mentoring junior faculty throughout their Assistant Professor or **Lecturer-PSOE** **Assistant Teaching Professor** appointment.

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

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

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

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

Prior to a formal appraisal the Chair should inform the candidate of the criteria for advancement and the nature of the review process as set forth in APM 210-1 d and APM 220 or 285. This step would reasonably include a discussion of the relative value given to books versus journal articles, etc., the importance of research vis-à-vis teaching or University service, and the relative merits of long- and short-term research goals. The structure of the review process, including the responsibilities of various reviewing agencies, should also be explained fully. The candidate should be told that a formal appraisal cannot result in a promise of eventual tenure **SOE**. A final decision for Continued Candidacy, based as it is on an early sample of the record an Assistant Professor/**Lecturer-PSOE** **Assistant Teaching Professor** will present when later considered for tenure **SOE**, is only a tentative prognosis. Promotion to tenure **SOE** rank will require greater accomplishment in all review areas and receives a more extensive review that includes solicitation of extramural letters as well as the convening of an ad hoc review committee.

In all formal appraisal reviews the candidate will receive redacted copies of all reviewing agency reports. A decision for a Terminal Appointment shall be made only in accordance with APM 220-84 or APM 285-17.

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR & ~~LECTURER PSOE~~
ASSISTANT TEACHING PROFESSOR** TERMINAL
APPOINTMENTS
AND DECISIONS TO DENY PROMOTION
(Revised ~~4/19~~ 3/24)

A proposal not to reappoint an Assistant Professor/~~Lecturer PSOE~~ *Assistant Teaching Professor* may originate with the Department Chairperson as a result of departmental review during the consideration of reappointment. In this event, the case shall be reviewed in accordance with the provisions of APM 220-82 and 220-84.

In any case in which non-reappointment of an Assistant Professor/~~Lecturer PSOE~~ *Assistant Teaching Professor* is considered, there shall be review by the Committee on Academic Personnel. An ad hoc committee shall ~~also be appointed by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, if the Chancellor or the Committee on Academic Personnel requests it.~~

During a review of a reappointment, a formal appraisal, or a promotion of an Assistant Professor (~~or other appointee of equivalent rank~~) *or Assistant Teaching Professor*, if the Chancellor's (or designee's) preliminary assessment is to make a terminal appointment or to deny promotion the Department Chair and the candidate shall be notified of this in writing by the Chancellor (or designee). The candidate also shall be notified of the opportunity to request access to the records placed in the personnel review file subsequent to the departmental review in accordance with APM - 160-20 c. When the candidate is provided copies of such records, copies shall also be provided to the Department Chair. Copies of such records will also be provided to the Dean if the materials are used or referred to in the response of the candidate or Chair. The candidate and the Chair, after appropriate consultation within the department, shall then have the opportunity to respond in writing and to provide additional information and documentation. The candidate may respond either through the Department Chair or directly to the Chancellor (or designee). This response must be submitted within 10 working days of the date the candidate receives the reviewing agency reports. The personnel review file, as augmented by the added material, shall then be considered in any stage of the review process as designated by the Chancellor (or designee) before a final decision by the Chancellor is reached. The Chancellor's final decision to make a terminal appointment or to deny promotion requires the appropriate preliminary assessment notification process and opportunity to respond. ~~being provided to the candidate as specified herein.~~

In accordance with APM 220-80 i after the final decision, the candidate may request a copy of non-confidential documents and a redacted copy of confidential documents. Such requests should be made to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel.

The above notification procedure provides the opportunity for reconsideration and possible reversal of the preliminary assessment for a terminal appointment or denial of promotion. For this reason, reconsideration of a terminal appointment or denial of promotion will only take place when there is substantial evidence of significant improvement in the faculty member's record of scholarly achievement, particularly with respect to those elements of the record that have been previously identified as areas of weakness. When these conditions are met, a request for reconsideration of a terminal appointment or denial of promotion, justified by a brief review of the new evidence that supports the request, may be submitted by the department, to the Dean of the College/School/Division. If permission is granted by the Dean, the case may be re-submitted for reconsideration; however this will not extend the terminal appointment end-date. Any such request may include information only through ~~September~~ *August* 15-30 of the eighth year of service and must be submitted to the Deans office by the second Monday in November.

PROMOTION TO TENURE OR SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT

(Revised 4/193/24)

The principal criterion for promotion to tenure in the Professorial series is succinctly stated in the following passage from APM 210-1 d:

Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions.

The other criteria for review, namely professional activity and University service, must be given due consideration *in the Professor series*, but they can never be considered sufficient in and of themselves to justify promotion to tenure. Superior intellectual attainment in teaching and in research or other creative achievement as noted above are essential for promotion to tenure.

The principal criterion for promotion to security of employment in the ~~Lecturer SOE~~ *Teaching Professor* series is stated in ~~the~~ APM 210-3 c:

Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced particularly in excellent teaching (*and mentoring*) and secondarily in professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to security of employment.

Professional and/or scholarly achievement and University service must be given due consideration *in the Teaching Professor series*, but they can never be considered sufficient in and of themselves to justify promotion to ~~tenure~~ *security of employment*. Superior intellectual attainment in teaching is essential for promotion to security of employment.

In attempting to make the phrase "superior intellectual attainment" operational, it is to be recognized that a particular intellectual discipline or subject-area (in the case of interdisciplinary programs), as represented in a local department or program together with the larger national and/or international context of the discipline or area, provides the most informed evaluation of outstanding or superior performance. The most useful critical assessment of "superior intellectual attainment" in research or other creative achievement must come primarily from those who are established figures in the field, primarily from colleagues in the department as well as faculty in comparable departments and programs nationally and internationally. (In *making* this connection, departments may wish to provide an operational interpretation of the phrase "superior intellectual attainment" which they consider appropriate to the particular discipline or subject-area). Candid, thorough, *well-documented* and concise assessment on this level is clearly essential if reviewing agencies are to perform their proper analytical and evaluative task. Furthermore, it is essential that a candidate's performance be measured by the highest standards of excellence that are currently recognized by a given intellectual discipline or subject-area.

The most useful critical assessment of "superior intellectual attainment" in teaching must come primarily from those familiar with the methods and approaches in teaching that are appropriate in a given candidate's area of expertise. In many instances, the assessment of a candidate's performance in teaching is most satisfactorily carried out and documented by the Chairperson of the department in consultation with other faculty departmental colleagues, utilizing course evaluations, peer evaluation, extramural letters from former students, reports ~~of~~ *from* colleagues concerning a candidate's performance in public lecture contexts, seminar discussions, and documentation of new substantive developments in the field or new and effective techniques of instruction. Further evidence of teaching performance may be obtained from extramural assessments, based on analyses of a candidate's performance in seminars or panels at national or regional professional meetings. Again, it is essential that a candidate's performance be measured by the highest standards of excellence that are currently recognized by a given intellectual discipline or subject-area in the area of teaching. *See Red Binder I-75 section V, for additional information on evidence in support of assessment of teaching and mentoring.*

It must also be stressed that the department's responsibility in the matter of promotion to tenure or security of employment begins long before the final assessment and recommendation. This is to say, in the normal course of events, a working environment that provides opportunity for developing a high quality program of research and teaching should be cultivated by the department. In addition, the teaching assignments of junior faculty should provide opportunity for a candidate to demonstrate how ~~his or her~~ *their* expertise will contribute in significant ways to the department's graduate and undergraduate educational programs. It is also the department's responsibility to apprise junior faculty early (and regularly) of the standards for qualification for tenure or security of employment and the bases for assessment.

When the time arrives for final evaluation for promotion to tenure or security of employment, it should be remembered that the recommendation should be based primarily on academic grounds as have been specified above. Such matters as resource limitations should not be at issue in making such a recommendation. If, after rigorous review (department and extramural), significant and credible doubts about a candidate's academic performance persist, then a candidate should not be recommended for promotion to tenure ~~SOE~~.

In view of this policy which stresses the highest standards of intellectual excellence that can be attained only by candidates of unquestioned ability, an important corollary should be set forth. If, after careful academic review, a department should choose not to recommend a candidate for promotion to tenure ~~SOE~~; and if that recommendation is sustained, the FTE vacated because of the termination will normally be retained by the department.

Promotion to tenure or security of employment review will normally take place by the end of the 6th year of service or after two years of service at Assistant Professor/~~Lecturer~~ ~~PSOE~~ *Assistant Teaching Professor* IV. The review may occur sooner if justified by the record. The review may also be deferred into the 7th year. Deferral beyond the 7th year will not be considered.

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR OR *TEACHING PROFESSOR***~~SENIOR LECTURER SOE~~**

(Revised 4/193/24)

Promotion to *the rank of* Professor requires an accomplished record of research that is judged to be excellent within the larger discipline or field. Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for advancement to Professor. Sustained excellence in all four areas of review; ~~research or other creative activity, teaching, University and public service as well as professional activity~~ is expected for promotion to the Professor rank.

Promotion to ~~Senior Lecturer SOE~~ *Teaching Professor* requires sustained excellence in effective teaching and demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to teaching in the particular subject. Sustained excellence in all three areas of review, teaching, professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, and University and public service is expected for promotion to the ~~Senior Lecturer SOE~~ *Teaching Professor* rank.

Promotion advancements may be rewarded in increments of steps and one-half step of off scale as described in Red Binder I-36, Merits and Accelerations. Promotion from an overlapping step may be a lateral change in rank without an increase in salary if the promotion occurs prior to the normative time at rank or step. See Red Binder I-37.

Promotion is a career review and therefore is based on a review of the individual's entire academic career. *Acceleration at the time of promotion may be based on the cumulative record.*

**MERIT TO PROFESSOR OR ~~SENIOR LECTURER~~
SOE ~~TEACHING PROFESSOR~~ STEP VI**
(Revised 4/23/24)

Advancement to **Professor** Step VI **or Teaching Professor Step VI** is a career review and therefore is based on a review of the individual's entire academic career. Although a career review, external letters are not included.

Advancement to Professor VI is based on evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in each of the following categories: (1) scholarship or creative achievement, (2) University teaching **and mentoring**, and (3) University and public service, **and (4) professional activity**. In addition, great distinction, recognized nationally (or internationally) in scholarly or creative achievement **or in teaching** is required for merit to Professor VI.

Because external letters of evaluation are not included in advancements to Professor Step VI, a candidate's national (or international) reputation, recognition and impact must be established based on the academic record. The department letter and case should describe the evidence used to make this determination. Examples include, but are not limited to: leadership in a professional capacity at national levels, awards, fellowships, honors, plenary or keynote talks at national conferences or institutions, appointment to editorial boards and advisory boards or other forms of national and international recognition. Appropriate context to establish the influence, distinctiveness, significance, stature, etc. of accomplishments should be provided. Information regarding the prestige and competitiveness of publications or presentation venues, quantitative measures of citations, reprints and translations may also be helpful in establishing the national impact of the research, or creative activity. Submission of the candidate's curriculum vitae is strongly recommended.

Advancement to ~~Senior Lecturer SOE~~ **Teaching Professor** VI is based on evidence of sustained and continued excellence in each of the three review categories: (1) **University** teaching/**mentoring** and teaching related responsibilities, (2) professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity; and (3) University and public service, with teaching excellence receiving primary consideration. Sustained and continued excellence must be established based on the academic record, with a focus on the teaching accomplishments and impact. The department letter and case should describe the evidence used to make this determination. Examples include, but are not limited to: **ESCI**s and student **teaching evaluations and** comments, peer evaluation, documentation of new substantive developments in the field or of new and effective techniques of instruction, success as a positive role model or effective mentor for students at all levels, awards or other such acknowledgements of excellent teaching. **See Red Binder I-75 section V, for additional information on evidence in support of assessment of teaching and mentoring.** Submission of the candidate's curriculum vitae is strongly recommended.

Merit to Step VI may be rewarded in increments of steps and one-half step of off scale as described in Red Binder I-36, Merits and Accelerations. Merit from the overlapping step of V+ may be a lateral change in step without an increase in salary if the advancement occurs prior to the normative time at step. See Red Binder I-37.

MERIT TO, OR WITHIN, PROFESSOR OR ~~SENIOR LECTURER SOE~~ TEACHING PROFESSOR ABOVE SCALE

(Revised 4/23 3/24)

Advancement to Professor Above Scale is reserved for scholars and teachers of the **very** highest distinction (1) whose **work research/creative activity and professional achievement** is of sustained and continuing excellence **and** has attained national and international recognition (2) whose University teaching performance is excellent, and (3) whose University and public service is highly meritorious **and (4) whose professional activity is judged to be excellent.**

Advancement to **Sr. Lecturer SOE Teaching Professor** Above Scale is reserved for teachers of the highest distinction (1) whose contributions to University teaching and education outcomes are excellent; (2) whose work of sustained and continuing excellence has attained national or international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact on education within the discipline; and (3) whose service is highly meritorious.

Advancement to Above Scale may occur after at least four years of service at step IX with the individual's complete academic career being reviewed. Further advancement within Above Scale may occur after four years of service.-
Early advancement to or within Above Scale is not permitted.

Normal, on-time advancement requires continued performance at levels commensurate with the expectations for an Above Scale faculty member in all areas of review and must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction appropriate to this highest level of the rank.

The level of performance required for merit increases is significantly higher at Above Scale than for advancement within the steps. When performance at Above Scale, or going to Above Scale, meets or exceeds these high standards increases will be awarded in **one, one and one half, and two** increment-**based** amounts **consistent with those described in Red Binder I-36.** Normal, one-increment advancement requires continued performance at levels commensurate with the expectations for an Above Scale Professor in all areas of review **and must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction appropriate to this highest level of the professoriate, and will not occur if there are deficiencies in any area of review.** One and one half increment advancement requires continued performance at levels commensurate with the expectations for an Above Scale Professor, accompanied by extraordinary achievement beyond the already high level, in two or more areas of review. In most cases, one of those areas will be scholarly and creative activity. Two increment advancement will be exceptionally rare and will require continued performance at levels commensurate with the expectations for an Above Scale Professor, supported by extraordinary achievement beyond the expected level in all areas of review. In rare circumstances, when performance at Above Scale does not meet the high standards listed above for a one increment increase, an increase of one half increment may be granted, when justified by a convincing explanation. Such increases will only be considered when extraordinary achievement beyond the expected levels exist in multiple areas of review.

The Above Scale advancement increment is equivalent to 10% of the on-scale rate for step IX on the applicable salary scale, rounded to the 100's.

Merit from the overlapping step of IX+ may be a lateral change in step without an increase in salary if the advancement occurs prior to the normative time at step. See Red Binder I-37.

Professorial appointees who have attained Above Scale status may use the title "Distinguished Professor" as an honorary title. **Sr. Lecturer SOE Teaching Professor** appointees who have attained Above Scale status may use the title "Distinguished Teaching Professor" as an honorary title. Because these titles are honorific, they may not be used on legal documents such as contract and grant applications that require an official employment title. The title may be used for such purposes as correspondence, CV, or website listings. Faculty who retire at Above Scale status may use the title Distinguished Professor or Distinguished Teaching Professor emeritus/a.

I-46
GUIDELINES FOR LETTERS OF EVALUATION
(Revised 4/23/24)

I. Solicited letters

When letters of evaluation are solicited, the models on the following pages should be used. These letters may be modified slightly; for example, the confidentiality statement may be listed on a separate sheet as an attachment referenced in the body of the letter: "Please see the attached University of California statement on confidentiality." Although the content may be rearranged, none should be deleted, nor should substantive information be added or modified, without prior approval by the Office of Academic Personnel. Departments may choose to use a two-stage solicitation process whereby individuals are first asked, by memo or e-mail, if they would be willing to provide a letter. Those who agree will then be sent materials for review. Those who decline or do not respond, including those who were not sent materials, should be identified on the coded list with an explanation provided (when offered).

II. Unsolicited letters

When unsolicited letters of evaluation are received from an individual or institution, a response should be sent which explains the University's position on the confidentiality of such records. See sample wording N (Red Binder I-50), "Sample thank you letter for unsolicited comments." Unsolicited letter writers should be listed on the list of extramural letter writers and a copy of the thank you letter must be included with the case.

III. Letters for Assistant Professor/~~Lecturer~~ PSOE *Assistant Teaching Professor* Appointments and Restricted letters

Restricted letters may be used in Assistant Professor/~~Lecturer~~ PSOE *Assistant Teaching Professor* appointment cases of candidates who have not held prior academic positions post-terminal degree. Appointments requested at the Assistant Professor IV, *V, or VI or V* level, or for candidates who have held prior academic positions post-terminal degree, should preferably contain evaluator letters solicited by the department or submitted as part of the applicant file. Appointment files at the Assistant Professor/~~Lecturer~~ PSOE *Assistant Teaching Professor* level will normally contain at least three external letters and may consist of external letters submitted as part of the application materials (e.g., via UC Recruit).

When letters of evaluation are received from individuals or institutions that have restrictions placed on the use of the materials forwarded, the sending individual must be notified that under applicable University policy and legal standards the department cannot accept and use evaluations under such restricted conditions. There are two reasons:

1. When a candidate is appointed, evaluations considered at the time of appointment become part of his/her permanent academic personnel record.
2. The University is legally required to maintain, for at least two years, documentary materials pertaining to all applicants in a completed search.

In addition, such material may be relevant in litigation in which discrimination in the appointment process is alleged, or in federal or state agency proceedings that inquire into compliance with applicable governmental affirmative action standards. Therefore, when a department receives a file with such limitations on use, the sending individual should be informed that the Department cannot accept the material under the conditions stated. Sample wording O, "Restricted Material" in RB I-50 may be used in these circumstances. If the sending individual requests that the file not be used, the evaluatory material in the file cannot be considered by the department.

IV. Letters for tenured *SOE* appointments and career advancements where letters are accepted

Letters should come from tenured faculty at distinguished institutions, preferably from full professors.

At least half of the letters submitted with the case should come from references chosen by the Chair in consultation with the department but independent of feedback from the candidate and without consulting the candidate's list. The letters solicited, whether selected from the department's recommendations or the candidate's recommendations, should be non-conflicted. Although other relationships may also constitute a conflict, some examples include: advisors/mentors at any level; substantive collaboration in the last 4 years including co-authorship, grant collaboration, co-teaching, or co-editorial work on publications; student/advisee; close personal or family relationship; direct financial relationship; current UCSB employment (except as appropriate in LSOE cases). On the other hand, non-conflicted relationships might include members of the candidate's graduate school, service as

department colleagues at a previous institution, serving together on an editorial board or committee. A minimum of six analytic letters is required. Typically, more than six letters will have to be solicited in order to achieve this minimum.

1. **Appointment cases:** When the department is unsure of the exact rank or step to be proposed, the sample solicitation wording for multiple levels may be used. External letters submitted as part of the application materials (e.g., via UC Recruit) may be included, but may not constitute more than half of the letters in appointments with tenure **SOE** and must acknowledge the appropriate rank of the recommended appointment. In appointment cases only, letters submitted with the application materials that do not meet the standards of non-conflict may be included.
2. **Advancement cases:** Faculty undergoing a review for promotion or for advancement to Above Scale have the right to suggest names of potential external evaluators (Red Binder I-22, 7) The candidate should be advised of the parameters governing the mix of external evaluators. It will be helpful for the candidate to know that a request not to use certain potential evaluators will be made part of the review file and, while such requests may be disregarded (if proper evaluation requires such action), they are made and honored regularly and that a reasonable request should in no way jeopardize the candidate's case. An effort should also be made not to contact individuals who have contributed letters for prior reviews of the same candidate
3. **Lecturer SOE Teaching Professor series:** In the **Lecturer SOE Teaching Professor** series letters of evaluation may come from UCSB Senate faculty, external to the department, who have conducted a peer review of the candidate's teaching. Peer evaluation may include classroom visits or **recordings of lectures videotaping**, commentary on course syllabi, reading assignments, and examinations. In some cases, for **LSOE Teaching Professor series appointees** faculty whose instruction is focused on professional practice (e.g., secondary teacher education, performance), experts in distinguished professional roles or with distinctive practical expertise may be suitable alternatives to full professors at top universities, given appropriate justification on the coded list. In exceptional circumstances and with appropriate justification, these practical expertise referees may include former students with distinguishing qualifications who have had no relationship with the candidate in at least the past 4 years. Non-conflicted evaluators are expected.

Any relationship between the candidate and the external letter writer or deviation from the above requirements (e.g. an uneven mix between department and candidate nominated letters) should be fully explained by the department in the coded list of evaluators.

Any reviewing agency may request, through the Office of Academic Personnel, that the file be augmented by additional extramural letters if the letters supplied with the case are viewed as inadequate for proper evaluation of the case. Since such requests delay the review of the case, it is important that the letters supplied by the department meet the above requirements.

V. List of evaluators

The Chair must submit a coded list of all persons from whom an extramural letter was solicited (Red Binder I-48). The list must indicate which names were submitted by the candidate and which were submitted by the department. In the case where a suggested name overlaps, the letter is considered to be department-suggested. In addition, the list must contain the following information for individuals who provide letters: name, position/title, institution, area of expertise, past collaborative relationship with the candidate, and, in rare cases, any past reviews for which the letter writer also contributed a letter (which must be justified in the coded list). Similar information must be provided for any unsolicited letters included in the file. Since it is expected to contain contextual information for reviewing agencies, this list should be prepared by the department review committee, Chair, etc., rather than by departmental staff. Special attention should be given to describing the qualifications and stature of the extramural referees. For individuals who either did not respond to the initial request to write or declined to write, only their name and home institution need be included on the list **with an explanation for the declination if provided**. The list should be accompanied by a master copy of the letter requesting evaluation, a list of the materials sent to the letter writers, and a copy of all items that were sent to the referees (e.g., C.V., **bio**-bibliography, reprints, manuscripts, and so forth) if they are not already included with the case of one-of-a-kind materials. The manner in which referees were selected should be described (e.g., "by departmental ad hoc committee", "by Chair in consultation with three senior colleagues", and so forth). The Chair should ensure that individuals who have provided confidential letters of evaluation are not identified (e.g., name, title, identifying leadership roles, identifying background or expertise, institution, etc.) in the departmental letter, except by means of a coded list uploaded appropriately with the case.

VI. Additional Information

If letters are solicited, but the decision by the department is to not forward an advancement case, the letters must be maintained by the department and be included in the next advancement case along with any new letters solicited. However, if the letters are not used within three years, they may be destroyed.

If electronic mail is used to solicit or receive letters of recommendation the sample letter format must be followed, and a ~~printed~~ copy must be retained. Redaction of electronic responses should eliminate all headers and footers that would identify the sender. If the response is sent as an e-mail attachment, the e-mail and the attachment must both be included in the case, both properly redacted.

Letters for appointment cases that are received via UC Recruit should be noted as such on the list of evaluators. The solicitation letter and confidentiality statement are generated automatically by UC Recruit and do not have to be included in the case.

When an individual holds appointments in more than one department (joint appointments), the departments may solicit letters jointly, if appropriate.

Contact between the Chair and individuals from whom letters are being solicited is permissible in order to encourage response, but great care must be taken to not bias or influence the judgment of the referee.

I-49
**SAMPLE LETTER FOR SOLICITATION
OF EXTRAMURAL EVALUATION**
(Revised 2/21/24)

Current Date

Name
Department
University

Dear Dr. _____,

[Opening remarks: e.g., I am writing to ask for your assistance in an important matter.]

INSERT APPROPRIATE PARAGRAPH FROM SAMPLES THAT FOLLOW:

- A. Appointment to Assistant Professor
- B. Appointment or Promotion to Associate Professor
- C. Appointment to Professor I-V
- D. Promotion to Professor
- E. Appointment at Professor VI- IX
- F. Appointment or Merit to Professor Above Scale
- G. Appointment to ~~Lecturer~~ *PSOE Assistant Teaching Professor*
- H. Appointment or ~~Promotion to Lecturer~~ *PSOE Associate Teaching Professor*
- I. Appointment or ~~Promotion to Sr. Lecturer~~ *PSOE Teaching Professor*
- J. Appointment to ~~Sr. Lecturer~~ *PSOE VI Teaching Professor*
- K. Appointment or Merit to ~~Sr. Lecturer~~ *PSOE Teaching Professor* Above Scale
- L. Continuing Lecturer Excellence review
- M. Continuing Lecturer promotion to Sr. Lecturer
- N. Thank You Letter for Unsolicited Comments
- O. Restricted Materials (Non-UC Placement Files)
- P. To Letter Writers from a Prior Review for Amendment or New Letter

[Sample wording for evaluation request: e.g. I would greatly appreciate your evaluation of _____'s work.] While you may not be familiar with all aspects of the record, we appreciate your comments related to those areas with which you are familiar. Please also indicate whether or not you would support the recommended action based on your knowledge of _____ and ~~his/her~~ *their* record.

Although the contents of your letter may be passed on to the candidate at prescribed stages of the review process, your identity will be held in confidence to the extent possible. The material made available will lack the letterhead, the signature block, and relational information material below the latter. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.

[Closing remarks: e.g., I realize what an imposition on your time these requests are. I want to thank you in advance for your willingness to assist in this matter.]

Sincerely,

Department Chair

WORDING FOR SOLICITATION LETTERS BY PROPOSED ACTION

(Revised 2/23/24)

Professor series**A. Appointment to Assistant Professor**

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

B. Appointment or Promotion to Associate Professor

_____ is being considered for (an appointment as/ promotion to) Associate Professor in the Department of _____. Appointment (or promotion) to Associate Professor within the UC system includes tenure. The record of performance in (a) teaching, (b) research or other creative work, ~~(c) professional activity,~~ and ~~(d)~~ University and public service is carefully assessed. Reasonable flexibility is used in making personnel judgments, but flexibility does not entail the relaxation of high standards. Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment (promotion) to tenure positions.

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 instruction. 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 faculty 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 faculty experienced during this difficult time, and the impacts and consequences of these limitations on faculty research, even after a return to more normal activities.

[When appropriate in promotion cases add: UCSB encourages its faculty members to consider extensions of the pre-tenure period under circumstances that could interfere significantly with development of the qualifications necessary for tenure. Examples of such circumstances may include birth or adoption of a child, extended illness, - 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.]

C. Appointment to Professor I-V

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

D. Promotion to Professor

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

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 instruction. 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 faculty 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 faculty experienced during this difficult time, and the impacts and consequences of these limitations on faculty research, even after a return to more normal activities

E. Appointment at Professor VI- IX

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

F. Appointment or Merit to Professor Above Scale

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

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 instruction. 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 faculty 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 faculty experienced during this difficult time, and the impacts and consequences of these limitations on faculty research, even after a return to more normal activities

Lecturer SOE Teaching Professor series

G. Appointment to Lecturer PSOE Assistant Teaching Professor

_____ is being considered for an appointment as a **Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment (PSOE) an Assistant Teaching Professor** in the Department of _____. Appointment to **Lecturer PSOE Assistant Teaching Professor** within the UC System requires clear evidence of potential excellence in teaching and promise of productive and creative contributions to professional and/or scholarly activity that would support excellent teaching.

H Appointment or promotion to Lecturer SOE Associate Teaching Professor

_____ is being considered for (an appointment as/ promotion to) **Lecturer with Security of Employment (SOE) Associate Teaching Professor** in the Department of _____. Appointment (or promotion) to **Lecturer SOE Associate Teaching Professor** includes assessment of the record of performance in (a) teaching, (b) professional and/or scholarly activity, and (c) University and public service. Consistent and sustained excellence in teaching is an indispensable qualification for appointment (promotion) to **Lecturer SOE Associate Teaching Professor** and is the primary factor for evaluation.

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 instruction. 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 faculty 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 faculty experienced during this difficult time, and the impacts and consequences of these limitations on faculty research, even after a return to more normal activities

[When appropriate in promotion cases add: UCSB encourages its faculty members to consider extensions of the pre-tenure period under circumstances that could interfere significantly with development of the qualifications necessary for tenure. Examples of such circumstances may include birth or adoption of a child, extended illness, - 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.]

I. Appointment or promotion to Sr. Lecturer SOE Teaching Professor

_____ is being considered for (an appointment as/ promotion to) **Sr. Lecturer with Security of Employment (SOE) Teaching Professor** in the Department of _____. Appointment/promotion to **Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment Teaching Professor** within the UC System includes assessment of the record of performance in (a) teaching, (b) professional and/or scholarly activity, and (c) University and public service. Consistent and sustained excellence in effective teaching and demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to teaching the particular subject are indispensable qualification for appointment (promotion) to **Sr. Lecturer SOE Teaching Professor** and are the primary factors for evaluation.

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 instruction. 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 faculty 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 faculty experienced during this difficult time, and the impacts and consequences of these limitations on faculty research, even after a return to more normal activities

J. Appointment to ~~Sr. Lecturer SOE~~ Teaching Professor VI

_____ is being considered for an appointment as ~~Sr. Lecturer with Security of Employment (SOE)~~ Teaching Professor [specify step] in the Department of _____. In the University of California, there are nine steps within the rank of ~~Sr. Lecturer SOE~~ Teaching Professor. The normal period of service is three years in each of the first five steps. Service at ~~Sr. Lecturer SOE Teaching Professor~~, Step V, may be of indefinite duration. Appointment at Step VI, or higher, involves an evaluation of the candidate's entire career and calls for evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in each of the following categories: (a) teaching, (b) professional and/or scholarly activity, and (c) University and public service. Consistent and sustained excellence in effective teaching and demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to teaching the particular subject are indispensable qualification for appointment as ~~Sr. Lecturer~~ Teaching Professor VI.

K. Appointment or Merit to ~~Sr. Lecturer SOE~~ Teaching Professor Above Scale

_____ is being considered for (an appointment as/ advancement to) Distinguished Teaching Professor (~~Sr. Lecturer with Security of employment (SOE)~~ Teaching Professor Above Scale) in the Department of _____. In the University of California, there are nine steps within the rank of ~~Sr. Lecturer SOE~~ Teaching Professor (steps I-IX). Steps VI, VII, VIII, and IX are reserved for highly distinguished teachers. There is one further rank beyond Step IX, Distinguished Teaching Professor. Distinguished Teaching Professor is the highest rank attainable by an appointee to the ~~Lecturer SOE~~ Teaching Professor series in the University of California system. (Appointment/advancement) to an Above Scale salary is reserved for the most highly distinguished faculty (a) whose contributions to University teaching and education outcomes are excellent; (b) whose work of sustained and continuing excellence has attained national or international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact on education within the discipline; and (c) whose service is highly meritorious

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 instruction. 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 faculty 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 faculty experienced during this difficult time, and the impacts and consequences of these limitations on faculty research, even after a return to more normal activities

Continuing Lecturers

L. Continuing Lecturer Excellence review

_____ is being considered for review to be appointed as Lecturer, Continuing Appointment in the Department of _____. Appointment beyond six years as a Lecturer within the UC system includes the right to a Continuing Appointment so long as the University determines that the instructional need exists and that the

instructional performance of the lecturer is excellent. The record of performance in teaching is carefully assessed and the standard of excellence is an indispensable qualification for appointment beyond six years.

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 instruction. 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 faculty 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 faculty experienced during this difficult time, and the impacts and consequences of these limitations on faculty research, even after a return to more normal activities

M. Continuing Lecturer promotion to Sr. Lecturer

_____ is being considered for a promotion to Senior Lecturer, Continuing Appointment in the Department of _____. Appointment beyond six years as a Lecturer within the UC system includes the right to a Continuing Appointment so long as the University determines that the instructional need exists and that the instructional performance of the lecturer is excellent. The record of performance in teaching is carefully assessed and the standard of excellence is an indispensable qualification for appointment beyond six years. _____ completed a review for Lecturer, Continuing Appointment in _____ and is now being considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer, Continuing Appointment. Achieving Senior Continuing Lecturer status is based on demonstrated exceptional performance based on assigned instructional duties, academic responsibility, and other assigned duties. Instructional contributions that are broad ranging and/or greatly enhance the academic mission of the University, may be considered exceptional.

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 instruction. 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 faculty 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 faculty experienced during this difficult time, and the impacts and consequences of these limitations on faculty research, even after a return to more normal activities

All series

N. Sample Thank You Letter for Unsolicited Comments

Use the sample letter, modifying as follows:

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

[Confidentiality paragraph]

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

maintained in our files.

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

Use the sample letter, modifying as follows:

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

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

[Confidentiality paragraph here]

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

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

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

I-51
MATERIALS TO EXTERNAL REVIEWERS
(Revised ~~4/23~~ 3/24)

In cases where external letters of recommendation are required, materials are traditionally provided to the external evaluators to assist them in their evaluation. Although departments maintain a degree of flexibility concerning what is sent, the following guidelines must be observed:

For professor series faculty, reviewers must, at a minimum, be provided with a copy of the candidate's CV (or bio-bibliography) and access to copies of publications. Although departments may choose to send copies of publications with the letter requesting evaluation, they may also ask that the reviewer inform them if they do not have access to the publications, at which time they will be provided. Documents may be provided via online links or copied and sent to the evaluators if appropriate (See RB I-27 for bio-bib instructions). Although the CV is recommended (as it is a cumulative document), if a bio-bib is instead sent to external reviewers, it must be a version that excludes links to materials other than those for the research and creative activities section. Whether a CV or bio-bib is sent to external reviewers, the content must adhere to the appropriate publication cut-off dates. The CV must also be uploaded with the case if it differs from the case bio-bib.

Depending upon its practice and applied consistently as described below, a department may choose to send other materials to external reviewers such as a self-statement covering one or more of the review areas. Departments should use caution in providing documents beyond these usual items. Teaching evaluations, correspondence, and materials from past cases are examples of items that should not be sent to evaluators, and any links to such documents must be removed from the bio-bib or CV if it is provided.

For **LSOE Teaching Professor** series faculty it is also recommended that the CV, which is cumulative, be sent to external reviewers. To demonstrate teaching effectiveness, ability, and diligence, as expected in APM 210, the following types of materials may also be chosen to send to external reviewers: a teaching statement describing the teaching philosophy and goals; a list of courses taught including enrollments and descriptions (e.g., details of content, evaluative procedures, methods, learning objectives); number of undergraduate and graduate advisees and advising role; syllabi; assignments and exams; examples of class content; summary of efforts to improve instruction; descriptive account of student feedback on teaching.

Any materials beyond the CV/bio-bib and publications (for professor series faculty) that are sent to external reviewers must be consistent among all employees within any given series undergoing the same type of review. Requirements for letters in each series are included in the corresponding Red Binder sections.

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

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

LECTURER SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT**TEACHING PROFESSOR SERIES**

(Revised 4/19 3/24)

Security of Employment

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

Working Title

Appointees in the SOE series may use the working titles of Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, or Teaching Professor as appropriate to the rank within the SOE scale.

Implementation of October 1, 2018 APM changes to review criteria

Appointees to the SOE series with a hire date into the series of July 1, 2019 or earlier will continue to be evaluated under the criteria set forth in APM policy effective September 1, 2018. The transition to the October 1, 2018, criteria will take place as follows:

- In April 2019, all SOE series appointees will be asked to elect to be evaluated by the new criteria, the old criteria, or to delay their decision by one year. Individuals being reviewed for advancement effective July 1, 2020 will be reviewed based on the criteria selected.
- In April 2020, and April 2021, all SOE series appointees who have not yet transitioned to the new criteria will be asked to elect to be evaluated by the new criteria, the old criteria, or to delay their decision by one year.
- In April 2022, any SOE series appointees who remain under the old criteria will be transitioned to the new criteria, for reviews effective July 1, 2023. A campus process for exceptions to this deadline (permanent grandfathering) will be established prior to April 2022.
- The decision to move to the new criteria is irrevocable.
- Use of either the old or new criteria may not in and of itself be used as the basis for reconsideration of a final advancement decision.

APM and Red Binder policies in place effective September 1, 2018 will remain available via the Academic Personnel web site at <https://ap.ucsb.edu/resources-for-department-analysts/lecturer-SOE-series-transition/> until April 2022. For SOE appointees who elect to permanently grandfather, the criteria will be incorporated into the individual memorandum of understanding established at that time.

An appointee in the **Lecturer Security of Employment (SOE) Professor of Teaching** series is an Academic Senate faculty member appointed to help meet "the long-term instructional needs of the University that cannot be best fulfilled by an appointee in the professorial series" (APM 285-0). Appointments as Lecturer SOE and Senior Lecturer SOE confer Security of Employment, in accord with Regents' Bylaw 40. An appointment with Security of Employment may not be terminated except for good cause after a hearing before the appropriate committee of the Academic Senate

Appointees in the series may use the campus working title of Teaching Professor appropriate to their rank.

The primary responsibilities for faculty in the Teaching Professor Series are teaching/mentoring and teaching-related activities (APM 285-4), such as working with other faculty in the department to lead teaching-focused initiatives or activities. They carry a heavier teaching load than faculty in the Professor Series. Teaching Professors are expected to fulfill leadership expectations as teachers and as facilitators and initiators of instructional development, curriculum

design, course structure, teaching methods, mentorship practices, new technologies, and/or coordinating a spectrum of teaching and mentoring activities. They play a leadership role in teaching in the departments and their disciplines. Appointment to this series is reserved for faculty whose contributions to teaching are exceptional and invaluable.

In addition, faculty in the Teaching Professor Series are responsible for professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity (which may include research/creative activity related to instruction and pedagogy or to the underlying discipline) as well as for University and public service.

Teaching Professors can be assigned to teach courses at any level, including graduate courses (APM 285-20). As with all faculty, adjustments to teaching load may be made at the discretion of the Department Chair or Dean if justified by other responsibilities contributing to the educational mission of the university. However, the expected teaching responsibilities and contributions for Teaching Professors should be clearly communicated by the Department and should allow for time to be devoted to professional/scholarly activity and service.

Teaching Professors who have attained Above Scale status may use the title “Distinguished Teaching Professor” as an honorary title. Because these titles are honorific, they may not be used on legal documents such as contract and grant applications that require an official employment title. The title may be used for such purposes as correspondence, CV, or website listings.

PROCEDURE FOR RECALL OF SENATE FACULTY

(Revised 9/21/24)

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. 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 Professor of Teaching Emeriti	1621	
Lecturer SOE Associate Professor of Teaching 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 4/23 3/24)

This compilation is intended as an aid for the use of Departmental Chairs, *reviewing agencies*, 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 and the application of criteria in reviews. 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 *Office of the* President of the University *of California*. UCSB campus policies and procedures are contained in the *Red Binder*.² The *Office of the* President also issues an annual list of salary scales. These documents are available for reference at <https://ap.ucsb.edu/>

CONTENTS	Section
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 <i>for Evaluations</i>	V
<i>Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Contributions</i>	<i>VI</i>
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 *concerns* the faculty in the ~~professional and lecturer security of employment (SOE)~~ *Professor and Teaching Professor series* ranks: Assistant Professor/~~Lecturer~~ *PSOE Assistant Teaching Professor*, Associate Professor/~~Lecturer~~ *SOE Associate Teaching Professor*, and Professor/~~Sr. Lecturer~~ *SOE Teaching Professor*.

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

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. *Advancement in rank and/or step* ~~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~~ *does not meet* normal *expectations* (a deceleration).

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR		ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR		PROFESSOR	
(8 year limit, non-tenured/PSOE)		(6 years normal, tenured/SOE)		(indefinite, tenured/SOE)	
Step	Normal period of service	Step	Normal period of service	Step	Normal period of service
I	2 (not used at UCSB)				
II	2				
III	2				
IV	2				
V	2 (overlapping step)	I	2		
VI	2 (overlapping step)	II	2		
		III	2		
		IV	3 (overlapping step)	I	3
		V	3 (overlapping step)	II	3
				III	3
				IV	3
				V	3
				VI	3
				VII	3
				VIII	3
				IX	4
				Above Scale	4
					V+ 3 (overlapping step)
					IX+ 4 (overlapping step)

REGULAR RANKS, STEPS, NORMAL PERIODS OF SERVICE

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
LECTURER PSOE
(8 year limit, non-tenured)

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
LECTURER SOE
(6 years normal, tenured)

PROFESSOR
SR. LECTURER SOE
(indefinite, tenured)

Step	Normal period of service	Step	Normal period of service	Step	Normal period of service
I	2 (not used at UCSB)				
II	2				
III	2				
IV	2				
V	2 (overlapping step)	I	2		
VI	2 (not used at UCSB)	II	2		
		III	2		
		IV	3 (overlapping 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 VI*, and Associate Professor IV *and V*, and Professor V+ *and IX+* are **special overlapping** 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. *See Red Binder I-37 for further information on the use of overlapping steps at UCSB.* Normal advancement **in rank** 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** at the Professorship rank. *Senate faculty members will be formally evaluated at least once every five years (a mandatory review).*

In addition to the regular steps, some appointments or advancements may be made **at the** Above Scale **level**, 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 durations. Everyone Senate faculty members 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 rate** at the assigned step. A recommendation for such a salary increase must be **in accordance with Red Binder guidance and** 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 **merit** 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, **including working links to publications and other creative works. (Red Binder I-27)** (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 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. 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. (Red Binder I-46)

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. (Red Binder I-35) (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. *Electronic links in the bio-bib to all A complete set of publications covering in the review period. "Review period" in cases for appointment and promotion means the complete record of the candidate. (in 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 it is not possible to submit items via links, 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 office provides departments with 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 and Campus deadlines to allow timely processing of cases. 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.
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. The letter should provide a rigorous but succinct 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 concise but 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. In career review cases 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. See Red Binder I-35 for more details on writing a Department letter.
7. This letter is available for inspection, amendment, or rebuttal by all eligible department members. 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.

8. A candidate for advancement is given an oral summary or written copy of the departmental recommendation and provided the opportunity to comment. *The Chair communicates the outcome of the case evaluation 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 and the candidate is provided the opportunity to comment.*
9. The candidate completes the Safeguard Statement.
10. 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.
11. ~~The department letter, along with all publications, teaching evidence and other materials pertaining to this review (the "dossier") is sent forward to the Dean.~~ *The case, including the department letter and other required materials, is uploaded into AP Folio and is sent forward to the Dean. 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.*
12. In cases where the Dean does not have final authority, the ~~dossier~~ *case*, 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~~ *two* members, usually from as similar a field as possible, *to serve as primary reviewers and to lead the discussion with the full committee.* (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.)
13. In appointments and promotion to tenure, terminations, and advancements to Above Scale, an ad hoc review committee is appointed by the ~~Chancellor's designee~~ *Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel* on nomination from CAP. CAP may elect to serve as their own internal ad hoc except in the case of a terminal appointment recommendation. *If a separate ad hoc committee is formed, the ad hoc that 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.*
14. 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. *CAP has access to the analyses and recommendations of all other reviewing agencies, and to previous recommendations concerning the candidate.* 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.
15. CAP's recommendation is forwarded to the Office of Academic Personnel for the final decision. *The final decision may be made by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, the Executive Vice Chancellor or the Chancellor, according to the delegation of authority. (Red Binder I-33)* If the Chancellor's (or designee's) tentative decision differs from CAP's and/or the Dean's recommendation by ~~1~~ *one* 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~~ *one-half step increment*, the Chancellor (or designee) will not be required to consult further.
16. 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 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 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.

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 *that was* 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 accordance 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.~~ *If promotion to Associate Professor occurs at year 4 or earlier, an appraisal will not occur.*

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 *review will often occur at the same time as a merit review*. *The two actions may be addressed in a single case, but both actions need to be separately addressed in the departmental letter* ~~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. **No Change Recommendations.** 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. **Deferral Requests.** 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 *in their deferral request* is accurate and should briefly review the available evidence in their letter. The request *and Chair's letter are* ~~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. *The candidate may also elect to have copies of the reviewing agency reports provided to the Department Chair.*

V. **CRITERIA FOR EVALUATIONS**

All Academic Senate faculty members are eligible for regular advancement based on academic performance, at scheduled intervals. In assessing cases for advancement, reviewing agencies should exercise flexibility in applying advancement criteria, taking contextual factors into account, and communicate those criteria to those being reviewed. Recommendations from reviewing agencies should stem from a comprehensive *but concise* analysis of the record within the pillars of faculty research/*creative activity*, teaching/*mentoring*, and service; with consideration of the body of accomplishments as a whole, rather than a tally of activities, and with consideration of the expectations and standards specific to the field or discipline. The goal should be to *clarify/convey* the justification for advancement without relying solely on quantitative assessments.

*Accordingly, Chairs and reviewing agencies should be encouraged to articulate the grounds for advancement beyond simple numerical tabulations of papers/*creative works*, citations, courses, and committees: for example, by describing the special impact or significance of the scholarly work, the significance of prizes, fellowships, or professional recognition, or the scale and scope of campus or university service. In all cases, the departmental letter must articulate how the requirements for a normal, one-step advancement have been met, taking into account all review areas, prior to addressing any recommendation for acceleration. Departments should define standards and expectations for their field and apply them consistently.*

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

- (1) Teaching *and Mentoring*
- (2) Research and other Professional Creative Work
- ~~(3) Professional Competence, Activity, and Recognition~~
- (4) ~~(3)~~ University and Public Service

The criteria for promotion and advancement in the ~~Lecturer SOE~~ *Teaching Professor* series are:

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

The weighting of the three areas need not be equal in all cases.

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~~ *Teaching Professor* 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 *and accomplishments*. An individual may not be arbitrarily disadvantaged if ~~he or she~~ *they* elected to take a childbearing or parental leave, to stop the clock, or to defer a personnel review.

Evidence of Teaching *and Mentoring* (Professorial series and ~~Lecturer SOE~~ *Teaching Professor* 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 Professor series, "Clearly demonstrated evidence of high quality in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion" (APM 210-1-d-1). Effective teaching is an essential criterion for appointment or advancement. This includes both formal coursework instruction as well as mentoring of students and University-affiliated trainees, such as postdoctoral scholars. Mentoring focused on scholarly activity is considered Teaching, whereas mentoring activities focused on non-scholarly support (e.g., life skills, social-emotional development) as well as mentoring of faculty are considered Service.

It is expected that faculty in the Professor series will create an instructional environment that, among other things (APM 210-1-d-1) is open and encouraging to all students, including students from historically excluded groups; provides expertise in the subject matter; is presented in an effective manner that promotes student learning, critical thinking, and growth; and encourages high standards and inspires creative work.

*In the **Teaching Professor** series, demonstrated teaching of truly exceptional quality is a fundamental expectation for advancement. Effective mentoring focused on disciplinary expertise is also expected. Faculty in the Teaching Professor Series are also typically expected to provide educational leadership and contributions to instruction-related activities (e.g., discipline-specific pedagogical development, curriculum development, TA training, development of instructional materials/multimedia, etc.).*

*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.*

How should teaching and mentoring be evaluated?

In judging the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching and mentoring, multiple dimensions should be considered. Possible areas for consideration include: ~~the following should be considered:~~ the candidate's command of the subject; continuous growth in the subject field; *current expertise in the subject*; ability to organize material and to present it *in a manner that effectively promotes student learning with force and logic*; *capacity to relate the subject matter in one course to other fields*; *awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge*; fostering of student independence and capability to *think critically*; *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* *inspire* advanced students to *research and* 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; *use of evidence-based teaching practices for course design and delivery*; *engagement in professional development for teaching, or involvement in specific departmental or campus-wide educational equity or student success initiatives*. 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))

Variations in expectations based on disciplines, departments, the type of teaching and mentoring, and the level of the candidate all should be taken into consideration when evaluating teaching and mentoring performance; with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities. (APM 210-1-d-1). Departments should clearly specify these expectations, as well as expectations for teaching load and mentoring load.

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 UCSB's campus course surveys of student opinions** **evaluations** are **essential required** for all classes taught by the candidate. These evaluations must be part of the record **and must be supplied for each course taught**. The departmental letter must compare

the candidate's scores with departmental scores for comparable classes *and provide necessary context.* 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 *the accompanying* a 1-5 scale, *from: with 1 high, with the following description explicitly stated on the form:* (1 5) Excellent; (2 4) Very Good; (3) Good; (4 2) Fair; (5 1) 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. Typically the expectation is that, at minimum, the written student feedback from campus wide course evaluations will be provided.*

Many forms of evidence may be used to evaluate teaching practices and accomplishments. Although no single form of evidence should be expected to be sufficient or appropriate to demonstrate teaching excellence, it is also unnecessary to draw upon every form of evidence. Assessment tools that may be used to evaluate teaching practices include but are not limited to:

Suggestions:

- *Student/TA evaluations: when viewed in appropriately taken into context.* Open-ended questions asked of graduating seniors, graduate students, or alumni *can be* 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.* *Peer evaluations conducted by faculty familiar with discipline and/or pedagogy.* 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.*
- *Self-statement: statement of teaching philosophy, course learning goals and outcomes, tools used to achieve goals, efforts to address ongoing challenges, engagement in professional development of teaching and reflection on growth toward improved teaching practices. Department Chairs should encourage the submission of teaching self-statements.*
- *Evidence of teaching and/or mentoring with a demonstrated impact on learning and productivity of students*
- *Evidence of external impact (e.g., textbooks)*

- Number of students and mentees in guided research and teaching alongside evidence of achievement of learning outcomes
- Materials pertaining to the development of new and effective instructional techniques, technologies, or modalities of instruction
- Significant awards for teaching or mentoring: including description of nomination/selection practice, intramural, extramural
- Other evidence: consisting of individual items and/or an organized teaching portfolio that supports the reflective teaching statement or showcases undertakings and practices that support excellence in teaching. For example:
 - annotated course syllabi
 - examples of assignments or teaching tools
 - materials pertaining to the development of new and effective instructional techniques
 - evidence of student learning gains

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):

As addressed in APM 210-1-d-2, it is expected that faculty in the Professor series will be "continuously and effectively engaged in [research or] creative activity of high quality and significance." The activities that constitute research and creative work may vary, for example, by department, discipline, or even a candidate's specialty. Irrespective of these variations, most activities that count toward research/creative activity will typically meet all of the following criteria:

- (a) Represent new knowledge, innovation, and/or analysis in the discipline/field, as judged by peer or other external review
- (b) Be published/disseminated in publicly accessible forums beyond the University
- (c) Have impact and influence on the field, the academy, communities outside the academy and/or the wider community/society

What types of achievements and activities constitute research/creative activity?

Both core research/creative works as well as professional activities related to scholarly endeavors may meet all three these criteria and, accordingly, would be recognized in the review process. These Examples of research/creative activity include, but are not limited to: peer-reviewed scholarly publications or externally reviewed publications of creative writing (e.g., journal articles, books, essays, chapters, conference proceedings, poetry, etc.); art curation or media exhibits at galleries or important venues; film and media production; academic reports in the discipline; policy papers and reports, submitted to agencies and generally accessible to the public; expert commentary in the press or online publications community-based participatory research products; blogs that fulfill obligations to non-academic community partners; public presentations at professional societies or conferences; invited seminars or lectures at other institutions or professional societies; grants to support scholarly relevant activities; scholarly awards or prizes; development of software tools; patents; visibility as an expert/leader

in research/creative activity; and/or evidence of external impact (e.g., adoption of research findings).

How should research/creative activities be evaluated?

Although numerous scholarly and professional accomplishments can be considered research/creative activities, this does not imply that all activities hold equal weight or warrant equal recognition. As such, achievements that meet the above criteria (a, b, & c) or otherwise constitute research or creative work should not merely be enumerated. Instead, assessments of the record should consider factors such as: (i) discipline-associated or other important indicators of quality and productivity (e.g., selectivity of peer reviewed journals or conferences, prestigious of artistic venues); (ii) discipline-associated or other metrics of impact and/or influence; (iii) evaluation of quality and impact by external experts especially in cases of career review; and (iv) development of a cohesive body of scholarly work. For example, presentations at meetings of disciplinary associations and talks at peer universities, while meaningful research-related professional activities, would not be equivalent to articles appearing in peer-reviewed journals or monographs published by scholarly presses. Similarly, non-peer-reviewed reports or policy papers would typically not be treated with the same weight as peer-reviewed contributions. At the same time, when taken together, this body of activities suggests a profile of a faculty member who is both productive in knowledge-generation and active in the field and/or community. Accordingly, Departments must make clear the range and types of accomplishments that are recognized, the value of these activities, and the expected balance between core scholarly-research/creative activities and scholarly professional activities. Although professional accomplishments in the field/discipline cannot permanently replace expectations for scholarly publications and creative activity, such efforts can reasonably account for variations in typical expectations for principal research/creative activities in the short term. Similarly, core research and creative activities cannot consistently substitute for engagement with and leadership in one's discipline but can explain short-term variations in broader professional service.

Classifying works is not always easy, but identification this specification 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 and significance should be made as clear and helpful as possible.

When published work is jointly authored or when creative work is a product of joint effort, the role/contribution of the candidate should be clearly established. Textbooks are normally considered evidence of teaching ability in the Professor series. 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)).

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).

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.

Expectations for visibility, impact, and quantity of research and creative activities is expected to be commensurate with rank, with greater expectations at higher ranks/steps.

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 case must present the publication record for the current review period according to the following delineation format outlined in Red Binder I-27: [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 *in the departmental letter or candidate’s self-assessment*, the department must define them carefully and state how they relate to the four categories above. Not doing this may prevent a candidate from receiving proper credit or cause other anomalies in the review process.

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)).

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 Teaching Professor series)

Professional and/or scholarly activities may be related to the underlying discipline itself or to pedagogy, including activities that reflect the faculty member's growth in content knowledge or pedagogical content knowledge. Because faculty in the Teaching Professor Series are expected to maintain currency in the profession and pedagogy, professional and/or scholarly activities should provide evidence of achievement, leadership, and/or influence on the campus or beyond. Evidence may include:

- *Pedagogically-related administrative work (e.g., of learning centers and teaching programs) or community outreach.*
- *Creative activities or participation in scholarly activities designed to enhance scholarly expertise in relevant fields.*
- *Evidence-based design and evaluation of educational curricula or pedagogy*
- *Development of pedagogical innovations that support and enable teaching or learning in the discipline*
- *Writing textbooks or ancillary materials*
- *Securing external grants for educational/instructional initiatives or scholarly activities*
- *Accomplishments/activities that represent new knowledge, innovation, and/or analysis in the discipline or in pedagogy, as evidenced by peer or external review or by other metrics which reflect the impact of the work. e.g.:*
 - *First, senior, or collaborative authorship of scholarly or professional publications in leading journals/outlets*
 - *Presentations of seminars or lectures at other institutions or professional societies*
 - *Publication/dissemination and public accessibility of work beyond the university*
 - *Accomplished performance, artistic, or literary creation with visibility outside of UCSB*
- *Leadership, impact, influence on and service to the field, the academy, or the wider society. e.g.:*
 - *Participation and/or leadership in professional organizations*
 - *Professional reviewing of scholarly work and editorial board membership*
 - *Review of grants for funding agencies*

- *Develop novel course materials which are submitted to a peer reviewed process leading to adoption at other universities.*

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 series and ~~Lecturer~~ SOE-Teaching Professor series):

"The faculty plays an important role in the administration of the University and in the formulation of its policies" (APM 210-1-d-4). Therefore, effective and high-quality Service is expected of all Senate faculty. Service activities vary in kind and significance, with the degree, scope, and impact of service expected to increase with rank and step. Scope may range from the level of the department to the division/college/school; to the broader campus and Senate; to disciplinary/professional service; to efforts in service of the local community, state, nation, or international community. In addition, Teaching Professors frequently specialize in service roles related to teaching and pedagogy, such as committees related to undergraduate or graduate education.

Teaching Professors frequently specialize in service roles related to teaching and pedagogy, such as committees related to undergraduate or graduate education. Service activities and roles associated with professional or scholarly organizations will typically be considered Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity for Teaching Professors.

Additionally, mentoring activities that are non-scholarly in nature should be considered Service (e.g., mentoring other faculty members, helping trainees with general life issues, responding to requests outside of the faculty member's scholarly area). Impact may be measured by effectiveness, influence, quality, structural improvement, and/or transformational outcome, among others.

Examples of service to the university or the public may include (among others):

- *Participation in and/or leadership on department, campus, and/or Academic Senate committees and initiatives*
- *Service to student organizations*
- *Reviewing for journals or presses*
- *Service to scholarly associations such as leadership roles or membership on committees*

- Conference planning for scholarly associations
- Expert consultation to a governmental agency or non-profit
- Administration of a teaching program or a learning center
- Service related to the improvement of elementary and secondary education
- Developing and conducting workshops or trainings related to teaching, pedagogy, teaching innovation, instructional technology
- Operational responsibilities to important student-serving programs that fall outside the standard departmental teaching obligations
- Leadership or participation in outreach programs for student recruitment
- Administrative roles at the department, college, university, or system level
- Leading significant positive changes in policy and or practice, particularly as they relate to matters of teaching, mentorship, student success, and issues of particular impact to instructional faculty.
- Mentoring other faculty

Maintaining an appropriate level of service activity without overburdening faculty requires thoughtful choices and sensible time management at each stage of a faculty member's career. Assistant Professors should be careful not to overcommit unduly to such activities. Some meaningful service at the early stages of one's career is desirable, and typically consists of Department-level activities and disciplinary engagement, but should not occur at the expense of a faculty member's research and teaching responsibilities. ~~Because~~ However, it is not uncommon for women and members of historically excluded groups to experience numerous and time-consuming requests for service. To help mitigate this issue, departments and committees should take responsibility for ensuring equity in faculty workloads and Assistant Professors should be careful not to overcommit to such activities. Given the importance of such activity to the campus, faculty should be duly acknowledged for this work. ~~they, and all faculty, should be acknowledged for this work and should also be prudent in assessing their valuable input on service activities in relation to other demands on their time.~~

How is service evaluated?

In general, service to UCSB carries greater weight than professional or public service although there are notable exceptions in which such service contributes significantly to the goals and mission of the University. Disciplinary service aimed at developing and maintaining a national/international scholarly profile, such as reviewing for journals or presses, holding committee or leadership positions in professional associations, etc., cannot consistently replace service to the campus; however, significant professional service can reasonably account for decreases in campus-level service on a temporary basis. Similarly, time-intensive and impactful campus service cannot permanently substitute for engagement with and leadership in one's discipline. Appropriate flexibility should be applied, taking contextual features into consideration, when accounting for variations in typical expectations for service in the short term.

Certain mentoring activity that is non-scholarly in nature and outside of the faculty member's scholarly area can be considered Service, including activities that contribute to colleagues', trainees', or community members' well-being, professional progress, and/or career development such as providing institutional knowledge, coaching to impact professional growth, or sponsoring professional opportunities, among others.

Departments should clearly communicate expectations for breadth, quality and impact of service activities, corresponding to the level of the professoriate. Meaningful service at the campus and/or on Senate councils and/or committees is an expectation for faculty at more advanced steps at the rank of Professor.

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. CONTRIBUTIONS TO DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION

Substantial and impactful efforts and activities that advance diversity, equity, inclusion, justice, and belonging and/or that improve the academic success of students from historically excluded identities within the context of faculty areas of responsibility, are also valued considerations in the review process, reflecting a commitment to the mission of the University and UC System. As articulated in APM 210-1-d, "Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote diversity, equity, inclusion, and equal opportunity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. These contributions to diversity, equity, inclusion, and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of California's diverse population, or research in a scholar's area of expertise that highlights inequalities."

Although not a separate area of review, contributions to DEI that exceed expectations in any of the three pillars of review (research/creative activity, teaching/mentoring, & service), or across these areas, can be the impetus for acceleration. The extent of DEI recognition will depend on the assessment of impact, in keeping with general merit and promotion practices. Publishing scholarship that reports on the context of DEI issues, or research on minoritized communities in and of itself, would typically fall within expected activities for research/creative activity. Examples of research or professional service that might surpass normative standards include (but are not limited to) activities that: improve and/or advance the outcomes or experiences of historically excluded or marginalized groups; engage socially/historically structured inequities with a demonstrable impact on the community or a transformative impact on the field/discipline; and/or help to understand how structural inequities are reproduced and remedy these barriers to success for members of historically excluded identities. Similarly, teaching that fosters equity and inclusion and that incorporates strategies for the educational advancement of students from various underrepresented groups are examples of activities that reflect normative expectations of teaching effectiveness. Examples of teaching and mentoring related activities that go beyond the norm might include (but are not limited to): designing and implementing significant pedagogical or curricular reforms to support DEI or other program-building initiatives in a department; the development of evidence-based practices that produce more equitable graduate admissions; significant engagement in culturally responsive mentoring at all levels. In terms of service, participating on a committee that addresses DEI or on a number of committees in this domain, falls within expected activities. Service that might surpass normative expectations includes, but is not limited to: efforts that result in structural or transformative improvements for marginalized groups; work that establishes or transforms policies or practices that apply beyond the original context; and/or work that creates new conditions for the advancement of historically excluded communities.

Contributions to DEI typically pertain to dimensions of diversity that result from different identities, such as ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, racial, gender, sexual orientation, and disability. Most often, DEI activities are highlighted in a Diversity Statement submitted by the faculty, as these efforts may otherwise go unrecognized. Such self-assessments should provide context and documentation of the nature of the work and evidence of impact, possibly including, but not limited to:

- Detailed description of the faculty member's role and/or leadership in the activities
- Detailed description and evidence of impact and/or outcomes, within a given field/discipline or in society.
- Documentation of consistent track record that spans many years.
- Articulation of the challenges in the context of the DEI activity, faced by minoritized individuals, including those whose identities intersect multiple minoritized groups.
- Discussion of the underrepresentation and/or marginalization of specific groups and the consequences for education, the profession, or the public good.
- Effectiveness in facilitating institutional, structural change.
- Efforts to leverage the activity to broaden dissemination and impact.

VII. ~~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.

VIII. ~~VII.~~ DEPARTMENTAL VOTING ON PERSONNEL CASES

Departmental voting rights in personnel cases are governed by **SENATE BY-LAW 55** (Santa Barbara Division **By-Law Bylaw** 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.*

IX. — 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-1
UNIT 18 Faculty and Supervisor of Teacher Education Series
(Revised 2/23 3/24)

I. Definition

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

Policies and procedures regarding terms and conditions of appointments in these titles are governed by the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the Non-Senate Instructional Unit (Unit 18).

II. Ranks and Steps

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer:

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

Individuals who have full or shared responsibility for instruction of assigned courses for a specified period of time may be appointed to the title Lecturer.

Supervisor of Teacher Education:

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

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

III. Appointment Criteria

Initial appointment to these titles requires demonstrated competence in the individual's field.

IV. Term of Appointment

- A. RB II-2 defines initial appointment and reappointment terms. Qualifying service is service in any Unit 18 title at any positive percentage of time in the same department. Without salary appointments and Summer Session appointments do not count as Unit 18 quarters of service, *except where noted in Article 23 in the MOU*. Requests for one-time credit of service as defined by Article 7A.B.1 must be endorsed by the Department Chair and Dean and require approval by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel.

The employee must also be informed in writing of specific terms and conditions of the position as outlined in Article 7A C.5: This information will normally be included in the offer letter.

- B. Subsequent to a positive Excellence Review, a reappointment which commences after 18 or more quarters of service within the same department at UCSB will be a Continuing Appointment (See Red Binder II-8 and II-9).
- C. All assignments must conform to the Workload Statement approved for the Department.

V. Compensation

- A. The source that provides compensation for service under these titles must permit teaching.
- B. During the first 18 quarters of service, individuals appointed as Lecturer are compensated at a rate within the published salary scale in Table 15. Determination of rate at initial appointment is based on professional qualifications. Appointees to the Supervisor of Teacher Education title are compensated at a rate from the published salary scale in Table 32.
- C. An appointee who is reviewed for a Continuing Appointment (an Excellence Review) shall be reviewed for a merit increase in accordance with the guidelines in Red Binder II-9. Subsequent merit reviews will be conducted every three years to be effective July 1—see Red Binder II-10. Continuing Appointees are compensated at rates from the published salary scale in Table 16.

- D. Appointments of a full academic year (three quarters) will be made on a 9/12 basis effective July 1.
- E. Appointments for only one or two quarters are made on a 9/9 basis and are effective October 1 for fall quarter, January 1 for winter quarter and April 1 for spring quarter. If the Lecturer concurrently holds another appointment at UCSB, or at another UC campus, it may affect how the appointment is entered in payroll. Departments are strongly encouraged to consult with the College or Academic Personnel Analysts in these situations.
- F. Lecturers may be placed on Short Work Break in accord with Red Binder VI-18.

VI. Appointment Averaging

Appointments of a full academic year (three quarters) will be made on a 9/12 basis effective July 1. If the appointment is at a variable percentage of time in each quarter, payroll entry will be averaged across quarters in accordance with Article 6.

Concurrent Unit 18 appointments in a different department and/or any supplemental assignments may impact how the original 9/12 appointment is averaged. There may also be impacts to how the concurrent appointment or supplemental assignment is averaged, even if the appointment/assignment is 9/9.

See the Appointment Averaging [slides](#) for more information and consult with your Dean's analyst for additional guidance.

VII. Reappointment and Advancement

- A. Reappointment that commences prior to completion of 18 quarters of service in the same department.

A reappointment to one of these titles requires an evaluation of the performance of the individual in accord with Article 7A. Evaluations are to be made on the basis of teaching effectiveness per Article 7A.G.2, academic responsibility per Article 3, and other assigned duties. See Red Binder II-2, II-3, and II-4 for procedural guidelines.
- B. Appointments and reappointments that commence after 18 or more quarters of service in the same department.

See Red Binder II-8 for procedures to be followed with respect to establishing the Continuing Appointment base FTE and Red Binder II-9 for procedures to be followed in the Personnel Review process.

The department must submit annual workload requests for all Continuing Lecturers and Supervisors of Teacher Education to the Dean for approval. The statement must clearly identify any temporary or permanent increases in FTE.
- C. Department Chairpersons have responsibility for administering departmental consideration of personnel actions regarding positions with titles in this series. Departmental evaluations and recommendations regarding appointments and reappointments shall be made pursuant to departmental procedures and in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding.

VIII. Restrictions and other considerations

- A. Graduate level courses may be taught by appointees to these titles with the approval of the Graduate Council.
- B. Registered UC graduate students may not be appointed to these titles. Degree candidates who are not currently registered may be appointed as lecturer by exception. Such appointment requires prior approval of the Graduate Division.

- C. Recall appointments of a Lecturer may not exceed 43% time, alone or in combination with other recall appointments. Appointments are requested using the [Academic Recall Appointment Form](#). Recall appointments are to be entered into UCPath using the Recall: Teaching title (1700).
- D. A current search waiver or search report must be approved in UC Recruit before an appointment is submitted. If there has been a break in service (due to non-reappointment) of one year or more in a given department, the individual must re-apply to and complete the recruitment requirements of a current open search, prior to consideration for reappointment in the same department.
- E. 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 and Article 10 of the MOU.
- F. 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.

IX. Non-reappointment, Reduction of Time, and Layoff

Notice of non-reappointment beyond the scheduled appointment end date is required except as provided for in Article 7A.J. Termination or reduction in time prior to the scheduled end date must be in compliance with MOU Article 17 E.

X. Approval Authority

<u>Action</u>	<u>Authority</u>
Workload	Dean
Appointments and reappointments	Dean
Pre-Six Assessments	Department
Pre-Six Academic Reviews	Department
Excellence Review	AVC
Promotion to Sr. Continuing Lecturer	AVC
Continuing appointment merits	Dean
Recall appointments	Dean

VI-1
LEAVES OF ABSENCE
(Revised ~~2/23~~ 3/23)

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 Assistant Teaching Professor, 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 Assistant Teaching Professor, or Assistant Researcher) must inform the Department Chair in writing within one quarter of the completion of the leave, if ~~he/she wishes~~ *they wish* 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-2
Sabbatical Leave (APM 740)
(Revised 7/19 3/24)

Please refer to APM 740 for statement of purpose, definition, concepts, types, qualifying service, exceptions, eligibility, restrictions, compensation, and special appendices. Sabbatical leaves are granted to enable eligible Senate faculty to be engaged in intensive programs of research and/or study, thus to become more effective teachers and scholars and to enhance their services to the University. There are two types of sabbatical leave:

- a) Regular sabbatical leave is leave from all regular duties to enable the individual to devote full-time to research and/or study. 9 sabbatical leave credits are required for each quarter of regular sabbatical leave at full salary. 6 sabbatical leave credits are required for each quarter of regular sabbatical leave at 2/3 salary.
- b) In Residence sabbatical leave is leave during which the faculty member is in physical residence during the quarter(s) and continues to teach at UCSB. Appointees in the Professorial series will teach a regularly scheduled class that meets at least three hours per week (this requirement is not fulfilled by a 599 class taught to one's own doctoral/masters students). Appointees in the ~~Lecturer-SOE~~ Teaching Professor series will teach a reduced load based on the overall teaching workload. In exceptional cases significant University service may be substituted for all or part of the instructional requirement. Service must be at the campus-wide or University-wide level and must require a time commitment of equivalent to teaching a regularly scheduled class as described above. Such exceptions require prior approval by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel. 6 sabbatical leave credits are required for each quarter of in residence sabbatical at full salary.

Credit toward eligibility to apply for sabbatical leave is earned through service in the University during each quarter of half-time or more in a ladder rank faculty title. Credit is earned during service as an Acting or Visiting ladder rank faculty if the service is immediately followed by service in the regular ladder rank title. Refer to APM 740-11 for information concerning service in other academic series, fiscal year appointments or periods during which credit does not accrue. Note that deferral of sabbatical leave credits is automatic and no maximum accrual amount is imposed at UCSB.

A faculty member is required to return to University service immediately following a sabbatical leave for a period of time at least equal to the period of the leave. Failure to return to regular service will create an obligation on the part of the faculty member to refund the entire salary received during the leave to the University. Transfer to another UC immediately following a sabbatical does not require repayment of salary. APM 740-16 through 740-19 discusses other restrictions and limitations of sabbatical leaves; and Colleges may have separate restrictions governing obligations following special leaves.

- A. Requests for sabbatical leave are submitted via the on-line leave module in AP Folio. The faculty member must provide a statement providing information outlined in APM 740-94 and an indication of the number of credits to be used to support the leave and the balance remaining after the leave.

If five or more years have passed since the last academic advancement the request must also include an updated bio-bibliography and copies of reports from any sabbatical leaves taken since the last advancement.

The department Chair will review the request and provide a list of other faculty with approved leaves during the academic year of the requested leave.

- B. The application must be initiated no later than three months prior to the begin date of the pay period of the proposed leave. The department will receive a copy of the approval letter sent to the faculty member as notification of approval of the leave.
- C. Within ninety calendar days following return from leave, the recipient of a sabbatical leave shall submit to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel a report of the results of the leave. Information to be included in this report is contained in APM 740-97 and includes:
 - 1. Account of activities during the leave, including travel itineraries, institutions and locations visited, persons with whom there was extensive consultation or collaboration, and any formal lectures delivered.

2. Statement of progress made on the project as proposed in the application.
3. Explanation of any significant changes made in the project.
4. Appraisal of the relationship between the results anticipated in the leave project statement and those actually achieved.
5. Statement of future activity related to the project, including plans for completion of the project and publication of results.

The report will become a part of the supporting materials submitted with any proposal for subsequent promotion or merit increase.

VI-10
ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION
(Revised 2/24-3/24)

General Policies

Reference: *APM 661-667*

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~~ **Senate** faculty, as well as those in the Visiting Professors, ~~and~~ Adjunct Professors, ~~and Lecturer SOE Teaching Professor~~ 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/>

VI-26
SEPARATIONS FROM THE UNIVERSITY
(Revised 2/23)

Resignation or Retirement

Senate Faculty

A faculty member may only resign or retire as of the end of an academic quarter (pay end date of October 31, February 28 or June 30). Faculty should strive to notify the department as far in advance as possible of the separation. It is preferable that the notification be done in writing. The department must provide notice of the separation to the appropriate Dean's office and to Academic Personnel.

In cases of resignation, the voluntary termination transaction must be initiated in UCPATH by the department. In cases of retirement of an Associate or full Professor or ~~Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer with Security of Employment~~ *Associate or full Teaching Professor*, the faculty member attains emeriti status immediately upon retirement. The retirement transaction and establishment into emeriti status should be initiated by the department following the instructions in Resources for Department Analysts > UCPATH on the Academic Personnel website at <http://ap.ucsb.edu/>.

All other academic employees

Academic year employees may only resign or retire as of the end of an academic quarter, using the appropriate pay period end dates dependent on the employee's 9/9 or 9/12 status. Fiscal year employees may resign or retire at any time. The department is responsible for entering the termination of the job or the separation from the University into the payroll system.

Death

When a current academic employee or emeritus faculty member dies, the department should notify the appropriate offices in a timely manner following the procedures below. This insures proper dispersal of benefits to survivors and it enables agencies to keep their records up-to-date. It also allows the Chancellor to publicly recognize the individual's service to the campus, and in memory of service, the campus flag will be lowered.

Procedures:

1. Notify the Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel and the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services and supply a brief biography which includes:
 - a. Full name, title, and department
 - b. Date of birth
 - c. Date of death
 - d. Name and address of next of kin
 - e. Length of service to the university
2. The department initiates the UCPATH involuntary termination transaction.

VII-1
POLICIES ON OPEN RECRUITMENT FOR ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS
(Revised 4/23/24)

It is the policy of the University of California not to engage in discrimination against any person seeking employment with the University. In addition, it is the policy of the University to undertake affirmative action, consistent with its obligations as a Federal contractor. Conducting open searches for employment positions supports the University of California in fulfilling its requirements under federal and state laws. The University of California Affirmative Action Guidelines for Recruitment and Retention of Faculty, Office of the President, Academic Advancement, are available at: <http://policy.ucop.edu/doc/4000376/NondiscrimAffirmAct>

An open recruitment is required for all academic positions unless the recruitment is exempt under the specific criteria listed in section II below.

These laws expand pay equity and pay transparency by requiring California employers to disclose pay scales and prohibiting employers from seeking or relying on applicants' salary history information, including compensation and benefits, in the recruitment process. These laws further safeguard the right of all persons to obtain and hold employment without discrimination based on specified characteristics or status, and they are intended to address inequity in pay practices based on gender, race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability, age, protected veteran status, gender identity, or sexual orientation.

I. Recruitment types and requirements

As appropriate, a Department will recruit both within and outside the workforce to obtain diverse pools of qualified applicants. For Senate faculty the level of position advertised is based on the level of search approved by the Executive Vice Chancellor. Non-Senate searches may be at a specific rank or at open rank.

External Recruitments are open to all applicants and are listed in various off-campus publications and the UC Recruit job board. Typically, external recruitments generate the largest and most diverse applicant pools consistent with the campus commitment to equal opportunity and diversity.

In some unique situations, an internal recruitment may be utilized so long as it is consistent with equal employment and affirmative action objectives and results in a diverse pool of qualified applicants. Internal recruitment requests require consultation, prior to the beginning of the recruitment, with the Office of Equal Opportunity & Discrimination Prevention and Academic Personnel.

Recruitments may be conducted in the following ways:

One-time recruitment: The recruitment is advertised for the duration of the recruitment for a specific position or positions. Most often the one-time recruitment will be for a single hire, however occasionally a single recruitment may yield multiple hires. This may be either the result of multiple positions being available at the beginning of the search, or may occur through a special request to make multiple hires. Requests to make multiple hires from a Senate Faculty search originally designated as a single hire will be initiated by the Department Chair and submitted to the Executive Vice Chancellor via the Dean. The Dean will be asked to provide additional information concerning the FTE to be used for the additional hire, and the Executive Vice Chancellor will consult with the Academic Senate as appropriate. Requests to make multiple hires from a non-senate search originally designated as a single hire are to be addressed to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel.

Standing pool recruitment: A standing pool recruitment may be used to fill multiple positions at various times for research or teaching positions.

- Pre-six Unit 18 Lecturer standing pool recruitment advertisements must be terminated on March 31, annually. New advertisements may begin after April 1 of each year.
- Researcher title standing pool recruitment advertisements may be set to open on any date but must have a final date no longer than one year (365 days) from the open date. New advertisements may begin after the close of the previous pooled search.

- Departments are encouraged to initiate their replacement search plans in advance of their existing pool closure dates to allow for adequate processing time.
- These search time limits help to ensure compliance with federal data reporting requirements.

II. Exemptions from Open Recruitment Policies

- Appointment to temporary academic administrator positions by individuals already holding an academic appointment
- Recall appointments
- Visiting appointments in the Professor, Researcher, Specialist, or Project Scientist series. The individual must be a “true visitor” i.e. on leave from (or for the Professorial series only, retired from) an equivalent position at another academic institution.
- Appointees within Unit 18, who have previously undergone open recruitment in the same department for a Unit 18 position without a break in service due to non-reappointment. See RB II-1.
- Positions requiring student status, e.g. teaching assistant, graduate student researchers or trainee status, e.g. Postdoctoral Scholars.
- A modification of the current position from the Professorial series to the ~~Lecturer SOE~~ *Teaching Professor* series or one non-senate research series to another (e.g. Project Scientist to Researcher) assuming the original appointment had either an open search, an approved waiver or is exempt from search due to without salary status.
- Without salary appointments.

Although open recruitment is not required in the above situations, a department may choose to conduct a search. When a search is conducted, all appropriate policies and procedures must be followed.

III. Search waivers

An open recruitment, available to all qualified applicants, is a preferred hiring mechanism since it provides substantial assurance of compliance with University policy and the quality of the individual offered a position. However, special circumstances may on occasion justify a waiver of the search requirement.

A. Non-Senate Titles

- Emergency Hire: Unexpected circumstances result in insufficient time to recruit: (e.g., unexpected illness, leave of absence of faculty, emergency research need.) Waivers will be granted with a specific end date.
- Spousal or Domestic Partner Hire: the hire of a spouse or domestic partner in order to initially hire or retain a Senate faculty member. Waivers will be granted for the duration of employment in the job series.
- PI/Co-PI/Leadership Status: the proposed appointee is the principal investigator, co-principal investigator of a grant/contract, or has been named in the grant/contract for a specific leadership role. Supporting documentation must be available in the departmental file and may be requested as necessary. Waivers will be granted for the duration of the contract or grant.
- Continuation of Training: the proposed appointee is currently a graduate student researcher or postdoctoral scholar at UCSB and will remain for a short period to complete a research project begun while in the current status. Waivers may not be granted for longer than one year.

5. Research Team: the proposed appointee is part of an existing research team of a new faculty member relocating from another academic institution and will be continuing in the same capacity in the lab. The waiver is valid for the duration of appointment in the same title within the same team.

Consistency with the criteria above does not guarantee a waiver will be granted.

Search waiver requests are initiated by the department through UC Recruit using one of the appropriate categories as listed above.

The Director of Equal Opportunity & Discrimination Prevention will provide information regarding the impact of the proposed hire on affirmative action goals and the Campus Affirmative Action Plan. The request will then be reviewed by the Dean or Associate Vice Chancellor with approval authority for the requested action. If the request is approved, the department may then submit an appointment case. If the request is denied, an open search will be required.

An existing waiver with an end date may be extended if the appointment continues to meet the criteria under which the waiver was originally granted. The request to extend the waiver may be included with the reappointment request and must specify the new end date.

B. Senate Faculty

1. Partner Hire: the hire of a partner in order to initially hire or retain a Senate faculty member. In such cases, the partner should have a record and credentials that provide evidence **he or she** they would likely be among the top candidates if an open search had been conducted.
2. Exceptional Opportunity: an unusual opportunity to hire an individual who has qualifications that are so uniquely outstanding as to justify the waiver. In all these cases the candidate would be on the short list of top candidates if a full search were conducted, and the individual would be highly sought after by peer institutions. Examples would include an internationally recognized leader in a particular field (e.g., a Nobel Laureate or a Pulitzer Prize winner), an exceptional scholar who would make special contributions to diversity in a particular program or field; or a highly sought after individual who is on the market for a very limited time period. Exceptional Opportunity **hires** are normally expected to be at the Full Professor level, but under exceptional circumstances, justified by compelling reasons, they may be at a lower level.
3. President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Recipients: the proposed hire is a current or former recipient of a UC President's or Chancellor's Postdoctoral Fellowship.

Consistency with the criteria above does not guarantee a waiver will be granted.

Search waiver requests are initiated by the department through UC Recruit using the appropriate category of the three listed above. Departments may not select "Other."

The department memo must address the following:

- Which category of waiver is being requested.
- The departmental vote on the request for a waiver.
- A report of the departmental discussion of three major issues: 1) the candidate's qualifications; 2) the candidate's programmatic fit within the departmental academic plans; and 3) the source of the FTE and the impact of the appointment on the departmental FTE plan
- In the case of an Exceptional Opportunity request, an explanation why it is not possible to consider the candidate as an applicant in an open search (for example, the individual under consideration is available only for a limited period of time.)

Requests will be routed to the Dean for review. As part of their recommendation, the Dean should address the items outlined in #3 above, as well as the programmatic and budgetary impact within the department and on a divisional or

college wide basis. If the Department has not identified an FTE, the Dean must do so. The Executive Vice Chancellor will consult with the Director of Equal Opportunity & Discrimination Prevention, the Council on Planning and Budget, and the Committee on Academic Personnel prior to making a final decision. The Director of Equal Opportunity & Discrimination Prevention will provide information regarding the request in the context of the Campus Affirmative Action Plan and placement goals. The Council on Planning and Budget will provide guidance regarding resource allocation for the position. The Committee on Academic Personnel will provide an initial assessment of the candidate's qualifications for an academic senate position. If the request is approved, the department may submit an appointment case. If the request is denied, an open search will be required.

In recruitments that are limited to either the Assistant or Associate level, if a candidate is promoted to a higher level at their home institution while the search is in progress, or an appointment at a higher rank is justified by the need to make a competitive recruitment offer (such as a competing offer at a higher rank) the department may request permission to allow appointment at the next highest rank. The request will be forwarded from the department, via the Dean, and Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, to the Executive Vice Chancellor. If the request is approved, the department may then submit the appointment case with a request for the higher rank. Additional external evaluation may be required to support the higher rank appointment.

VIII-1
CAREER DEVELOPMENT AWARDS
(Revised 4/23 3/24)

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

1. FACULTY CAREER DEVELOPMENT AWARD (FCDA)

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

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

2. REGENTS' JUNIOR FACULTY FELLOWSHIP

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

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

3. REGENTS' HUMANITIES FACULTY FELLOWSHIP

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

Eligibility: The Humanities Fellowship Program is open to faculty members in the regular and acting Assistant and Associate professorial series, ~~and Lecturers with PSOE, and Lecturers with SOE~~ *Assistant and Associate Teaching Professors* regardless of department affiliation. However, awards are recommended only for those whose projects are clearly humanistic (i.e., studies in language, both modern and classical; religion; literature; jurisprudence; philosophy, archaeology, the history, criticism and theory of the arts; and those aspects of history, linguistics and the social sciences that have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods) or in the creative arts (painters, sculptors, composers, writers, poets, stage designers, performers and other artists in creative fields). A faculty member may receive one Regents' Humanities Faculty Fellowship during their career.

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

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

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

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

In addition, applications for FCDA award will also be evaluated for with particular consideration given for prior and current obstacles to the development of a record in research and creative work necessary for achievement of tenure and further advancement.

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

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