

October 10, 2024

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

FROM: Leesa Beck, Assistant 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 October 2024. A summary of all changes is listed below.

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

Summary of changes

I-6	Revisions to the Career Equity Review process
I-29	Provides resources to identify Foreign Talent Recruitment programs
I-31, I-34, III-7, III-9	Add appropriate RB references; clarify that only "In Press" items need to be accounted for in subsequent reviews.
I-49	Add research titles to the external letter solicitation template
I-50	Consolidate solicitation language for research titles
I-75	Clarify formal coursework instruction requirement
II-14	Add annual workload document requirement for Excellence Reviews
III-8	Clarify off-scale and within-step advancements
III-12, III-14	Update eligibility and overlapping steps; move out solicitation template language
III-16	Move out solicitation template language
IV-10	Update GSR Trainee and Fellow job codes
VI-4, VI-5	Add foster care placement as qualifying event
VI-18	Clarify SWB-eligible research titles, update SWB Matrix link
VII-1	Search waivers for employees currently in represented titles requires additional notice

I-6
CAREER EQUITY REVIEW
(Revised 4/24)

On extremely rare occasions, a Senate faculty member may be at a rank and/or step that is seriously inconsistent with their documented attainments. In such cases, ~~A~~ a Career Equity Review (CER) may be initiated by or on behalf of members of the Academic Senate who are tenured Professor/Teaching Professor series faculty (Associate and Full) ~~tenured ladder Professor Series faculty, and Associate Teaching, Professors, or 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 record~~ as assessed in the three areas of review 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. CER ~~R~~ recommendations and decisions will be based on the ~~review~~ criteria used for normal promotion and merit reviews, ~~but CERs will~~ and may consider the entire career record of the individual ~~up to the point of the previous merit review, 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 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~~ the procedures outlined below.

A CER must be submitted as a separate personnel action, outside of the year of the candidate's regular review cycle for advancement/promotion. CERs must be submitted by the deadline for Expanded Review cases. A CER may not be initiated during the year of a deferral.

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~~ significantly lower on the ladder ~~than achievements would dictate~~; 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 considerably~~ lower on the ladder ~~than merited by the record~~; 4) the faculty member's cumulative record warrants placement markedly 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~~

CER may be requested by an individual faculty member through their Department. The Department may also initiate a CER on behalf of an individual faculty member. A CER case must be initiated ~~by including a letter with the review file~~ outside of the candidate's normative merit review cycle. The Department must include a letter that identifies the justification for the reevaluation and provides solid evidence, documentation, and analysis to support the justifying reason. It must state the specific rank and step to which they believe the faculty member should be advanced alongside the results of the departmental vote. The CER case will then be forwarded to the Dean and continue through a normal review process for an Expanded Review case. ~~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~~ A CER may be requested by an individual faculty member through the Dean, ~~outside of the candidate's normative review cycle.~~ 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 ensure 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 have access to the departmental letter of recommendation for the concurrent merit/promotion 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 CER 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 a~~ 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 ~~in the following year, outside of the candidate's normative review cycle.~~ 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 and one based on the CER. If the CER decision leads to an adjustment of rank and step beyond the recommendation from 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. Should the outcome of a CER result in an adjustment in rank or step, the off-scale will remain unchanged.~~ 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-20
REMOVAL EXPENSES
(Revised 5/24)

Removal expenses may be provided for certain new appointees to academic positions (APM 560-14). For those eligible, removal expenses are paid and taxed in accordance with University and IRS regulations. New appointees are encouraged to consult with their tax advisor regarding the impact of removal reimbursement. Any exceptions to policy, including full removal expenses, must be requested at the time of appointment.

UC Policy (one-half of the total cost)

University policy allows for coverage of one-half of the total eligible costs associated with a single move from one physical location, including the following:

1. Packing, freight and insurance of normal household goods (see definition below), when properly supported by invoices and/or receipts, in accord with Section V of UC Policy BFB-G-13: Policy and Regulations Governing Moving and Relocation.
2. Air coach transportation for the appointee and members of the household or an equivalent amount for other travel in accordance with standard airline fare policies and University travel regulation.
3. Meals en route for the appointee and members of the household in accordance with University travel regulations. If travel is by automobile, the cost of meals is an allowable expense only to the extent that might have been necessary if travel had been by air coach.

An appointee may have the total cost of removal of their personal library covered, but only if the library is to be made generally available to students and faculty; otherwise coverage is one-half of the total cost. It will be necessary for the involved appointee to secure from their moving company a breakout of the shipping costs for the portion of the shipment that is for library-related materials. Without this estimate, only 50% coverage will be allowed.

Household goods include: personal property such as furniture, clothing, musical instruments, household appliances, and other items which are usual and necessary for the maintenance of a household.

Full Removal

An exception to allow for full removal coverage may be requested by the Department at the time the start-up commitment is request. If full removal is provided, all reasonable removal costs will be covered for a single move, in accord with UC Policy BFB-G-13: Policy and Regulations Governing Moving and Relocation and subject to the following conditions.

Appointees receiving 100% removal will have travel for themselves and members of the household made on the lesser of one-way coach fare, or actual expenses (airfare or mileage reimbursement, lodging, and meals en route) at UC allowable rates per G-28, Policy & Regulations Governing Travel and G-13, Policy & Regulations Governing Moving and Relocation. Receipts will be required. If, for personal reasons, an indirect route is traveled or the trip is extended, coverage shall be based only on such charges as would have been incurred by the usually traveled route. All appointees must purchase the least expensive air tickets to the Santa Barbara area.

Prospective employees should be aware that costs for the following cannot be covered:

- transport of trailers, boats, other motorized recreational vehicles, or more than two motor vehicles
- transport of belongings related to commercial enterprises engaged in by the employee

- transport of building materials
- transport of animals other than household pets
- assembly and disassembly of unusual items such as, but not limited to, satellite dishes, storage sheds or pool tables.
- Canned, frozen or bulk foodstuff.
- Plants

Advance approval will be required for coverage of costs associated with a move from more than one physical location (a staged move) or any other exception to policy.

CONFLICT OF COMMITMENT AND OUTSIDE PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

(Revised ~~4/24~~)

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 prefix

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;
- [Honorary, visiting, adjunct, or other institutional appointment \(either compensated or uncompensated\) at an outside institution](#)
- 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.
- Participation in or application to talent recruitment programs sponsored by a government agency of a nation other than the United States.
 - Please refer to this document: [How to Identify a Non-U.S. Talent Recruitment Program](#)
 - This [UCOP page](#) also has additional information on Foreign Talent Recruitment Programs

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 ~~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~~ **August 31** 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-31
DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR
DEAN'S AUTHORITY MERITS
(Revised ~~6/24~~)

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 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 appropriate areas of review and accomplishments covered?
- Are contributions to diversity and equal opportunity given appropriate recognition?
- Is all relevant information from the Departmental letter accurately entered on the case upload 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 clearly marked "Chair's Separate Confidential"?

III. Safeguard and Certification Statement.

The candidate must sign an online 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 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 (see Red Binder I-27 for further details)

- Have items previously listed as "In Press", ~~"Submitted"~~ been accounted for?
- Are all items, including "In Press" and, ~~"Submitted"~~ (as applicable), and ~~"In Progress"~~ properly 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. For Spring quarter 2024 and earlier ESCI summary sheets and scores for questions A and B are mandatory. For Summer 2024 and later, complete SET reports are mandatory

- If the B&P printout is used, is it noted which classes have ESCI's or SET surveys?
- If small courses do not have ESCIs or SET surveys is an explanation provided in the departmental letter and an alternate form of teaching evaluation included?
- Has the second source of teaching been clearly identified on the AP Folio upload screen?
- Have the courses that were counted toward the expected teaching load been clearly identified, with any deviations explained (see RB I-35)?

VI. **Self-assessment of research, teaching or other accomplishments and activity (optional).**

- If a self-assessment was submitted, is it included in the case? Self-statements may address research, teaching, professional 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.** (see [Red Binder I-27](#) for further details)

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 research and creative activity section the bio-bib for the current review period been submitted, including In Press and Submitted (as applicable) 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?

DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR
EXPANDED REVIEW CASES

(Revised ~~6/24~~)

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 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 appropriate areas of review and accomplishments covered?
- 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 clearly marked "Chair's Separate Confidential"?

III. Safeguard and Certification Statement

The candidate must sign an online 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 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 (see Red Binder I-27 for further details)

- Have items previously listed as "In Press", ~~"Submitted"~~ been accounted for?
- Are all items, including "In Press"; and "Submitted" (as applicable), and ~~"In Progress"~~ properly 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 they check box 7A on the Procedural Safeguards Statement?
- Are any anomalies in the composition of reviewers explained (e.g. less than six letters, letter writer who wrote in previous review, etc.)?

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 included (e.g. CV, bio-bib, publications sent, etc, per RB I-46-V)? 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. For Spring quarter 2024 and earlier ESCI summary sheets and scores for questions A and B are mandatory. For Summer 2024 and later, complete SET reports are mandatory

- If the B&P printout is used, is it noted which classes have ESCI's or SET surveys?
- If small courses do not have ESCIs or SET surveys is an explanation provided in the departmental letter and an alternate form of teaching evaluation included?
- Has the second source of teaching been clearly identified on the AP Folio upload screen?
- Have the courses that were counted toward the expected teaching load been clearly identified, with any deviations explained (see RB I-35)?

- VII. **Self-assessment of research, teaching or other accomplishments and activity (optional).**

- If a self-assessment was submitted, is it included in the case? Self-statements may address research, teaching, professional 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.** (see Red Binder I-27 for further details)

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 the research and creative activity section of the bio-bib for the current review period been submitted, including In Press and Submitted (as applicable) 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?

I-36
MERIT ADVANCEMENTS
(Revised ~~6/24~~)

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 on 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. The overall record may not demonstrate equal strength in all areas of review, but at the very least, overall performance must meet 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.

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. 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. Similarly, service duties are expected to increase as faculty advance in rank and step.

Accelerations are awarded in full step and/or one-half step increments (e.g., 1½ steps, 2 steps, 2½ steps, 3 steps, etc.). Typically, accelerations will be expected to be awarded in step, 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). In rare and unique cases, accelerations beyond one-half step in off-scale may be granted when warranted based on appropriate circumstances and justification (such as at barrier steps).

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 and calibrated based on expectations for that rank and step. 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 area.
- 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).

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, step, or off-scale occurs. See Red Binder I-4-III for important parameters.

I-37
OVERLAPPING STEPS
(Revised ~~4/24~~)

Steps V and VI of the Assistant Professors/Assistant Teaching Professor rank, Steps IV and V of the Associate Professor/Associate Teaching Professor, and steps V+ and IX+ of the Professor/Teaching Professor rank are overlapping steps in the sense that these steps may be utilized for advancement when a member of the faculty is eligible for promotion or career review, 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. Overlapping steps may not be used for new faculty appointments.

Service at the overlapping steps is in lieu of service at the corresponding next normal rank or step progression. Upon advancement to an 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 the promotion or career review occurs earlier than the normative time at step the promotion or career advancement will be lateral with no increase in salary. After a lateral promotion or career review advancement, eligibility for review will be determined based on the combination of years at the overlapping step and years at the new step.

Further advancement within the overlapping steps, for example from Associate Professor IV to Associate Professor V, will not occur at less than the normative time at step.

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.

For Professional Researchers and ~~Project~~ Project Scientists please refer to Red Binder III-8-V, III-12 and III-14.

I-49
SAMPLE LETTER FOR SOLICITATION
OF EXTRAMURAL EVALUATION

(Revised ~~4/24~~)

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 (see [RB I-50](#)):

- 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 Assistant Teaching Professor
- H. Appointment or [Promotion](#) to Associate Teaching Professor
- I. Appointment or [Promotion](#) to Teaching Professor I-V
- J. Appointment to Teaching Professor [VI-IX](#)
- K. Appointment or Merit to Teaching Professor Above Scale
- L. Continuing Lecturer Excellence review
- M. Continuing Lecturer promotion to Sr. Lecturer
- N. [Appointment or Promotion to Associate Researcher](#)
- O. ~~Promotion or~~ [Appointment or Promotion to full Researcher](#)
- P. [Appointment to Researcher, Step VI-IX](#)
- Q. [Appointment or Merit to Researcher Above Scale](#)
- R. [Appointment or Promotion to Associate Project Scientist/Project Scientist](#)
- ~~M.S.~~ [Appointment or Promotion to Associate Specialist/Specialist or Merit to Specialist Above Scale \(not required; see RB III-16-VI. External Evaluation\)](#)
- ~~N.T.~~ Thank You Letter for Unsolicited Comments
- ~~O.U.~~ Restricted Materials (Non-UC Placement Files)
- ~~P.V.~~ 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 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 6/24)

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 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, and (c) 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 full-time 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, and (c) 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 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, and (c) 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 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 full-time 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.

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 full-time 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

Teaching Professor series

G. Appointment to Assistant Teaching Professor

_____ is being considered for an appointment as an Assistant Teaching Professor in the Department of ___. In the UC system, Assistant Teaching Professors are members of the Senate faculty whose primary responsibilities are teaching and teaching-related activities. They are additionally expected to demonstrate promise of productive and creative contributions to professional and/or scholarly activity that would support excellent teaching and pedagogical leadership. Assistant Teaching Professors also have responsibility for University and public service.

H. Appointment or Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor

_____ is being considered for (an appointment as/ promotion to) Associate Teaching Professor in the Department of ___. In the UC system, Associate Teaching Professors are members of the Senate faculty whose primary responsibilities are teaching and teaching-related activities. They are additionally expected to demonstrate productive and creative contributions to professional and/or scholarly activity that would support excellent teaching and pedagogical leadership. Associate Teaching Professors also have responsibility for University and public service. Accordingly, appointment (or promotion) to Associate Teaching Professor includes assessment of the record of performance in (a) teaching/mentoring, (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 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 full-time 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 Teaching Professor [I-V](#)

_____ is being considered for (an appointment as/ promotion to) Teaching Professor in the Department of _____. In the UC system, Teaching Professors are members of the Senate faculty whose primary responsibilities are teaching and teaching-related activities. They are additionally expected to demonstrate productive and creative contributions to professional and/or scholarly activity that would support excellent teaching and pedagogical leadership. Teaching Professors also have responsibility for University and public service. Accordingly,

appointment/promotion to Teaching Professor within the UC System includes assessment of the record of performance in (a) teaching/mentoring, (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 qualifications for appointment (promotion) to 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 full-time 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 Teaching Professor VI-IX

_____ is being considered for an appointment as Teaching Professor [specify step] in the Department of _____. In the University of California, there are nine steps within the rank of Teaching Professor. The normal period of service is three years in each of the first five steps. Service at 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 qualifications for appointment as Teaching Professor VI.

K. Appointment or Merit to Teaching Professor Above Scale

_____ is being considered for (an appointment as/ advancement to) Distinguished Teaching Professor (Teaching Professor Above Scale) in the Department of _____. In the University of California, there are nine steps within the rank of 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 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 full-time 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 full-time 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 Senior Continuing 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 full-time 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

Research Titles/Series

N. Appointment or Promotion to Associate Researcher

_____ is being considered for (an appointment/promotion to) Associate Researcher in the (department/unit). Appointment (or promotion) to Associate Researcher within the UC system requires a research record equivalent to that of an Associate Professor. Superior intellectual attainment in research is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to Associate Researcher.

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

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

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

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

O. Appointment or Promotion to Full Researcher

_____ is being considered for (an appointment/promotion to) Researcher in the (department/unit). Appointment (or promotion) to Researcher within the UC system requires a research record equivalent to that of a Professor. A candidate for this position is expected to have an accomplished record of research that is judged to be excellent their peers within the larger discipline or field.

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

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

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

P. Appointment to Researcher VI-IX

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

Q. Appointment or Merit to Researcher Above Scale

_____ is being considered for (an appointment as/ advancement to) Researcher Above Scale in the Department of _____. In the University of California, there are nine steps within the rank of Researcher. Steps VI, VII, VIII, and IX are reserved for highly distinguished scholars. (Appointment/advancement) to an Above Scale salary is reserved for scholars of the highest distinction, whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed.

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

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

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

R. Appointment or Promotion to Associate Project Scientist/Project Scientist

_____ is being considered for (an appointment/promotion to) Associate Project Scientist/Project Scientist in the (department/unit). Appointment (or Promotion) to Associate Project Scientist/Project Scientist within the UC system requires evaluation in the areas of: 1) Demonstrated significant, original, and creative contributions to a research or creative program or project, 2) Professional competence and activity. [~~Sample wording for evaluation request: e.g., I would greatly appreciate your evaluation of _____'s work.~~]

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

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

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

S. Appointment or Promotion to Associate Specialist/Specialist or Merit to Specialist Above Scale (not required; see RB III-16-VI. External Evaluation)

_____ is being considered for (an appointment/promotion to) Associate Specialist/Specialist in the (department/unit). Appointment (or Promotion) to Associate Specialist/Specialist within the UC system requires evaluation in the areas of: 1) specialized research, 2) professional competence and activity, 3) university and public service. ~~[Sample wording for evaluation request: e.g., I would greatly appreciate your evaluation of _____'s work.]~~

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

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

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

All series

~~N.T.~~ 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.U.~~ 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.V. 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.

APPOINTMENT AND ADVANCEMENT

(Revised 6/24)

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~~ It provides a comprehensive overview of the policies and procedures governing appointment and advancement and the application of criteria in reviews.

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. 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 for Evaluations	V
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Contributions	VI
Confidentiality and Personnel Safeguards	VII
Departmental Voting on Personnel Cases	VIII

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

The information in this summary primarily concerns the faculty in Professor and Teaching Professor series: Assistant Professor/Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Professor/Associate Teaching Professor, and Professor/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) depends upon merit. Advancement in rank and/or step is never automatic, and it can be faster than normal in recognition of outstanding performance (an acceleration) or delayed when performance 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	V+ 3 (overlapping step)
				VII	3	
				VIII	3	
				IX	4	
				Above Scale	4	IX+ 4 (overlapping step)

Assistant Professor V and VI, Associate Professor IV and V, and Professor V+ and IX+ are 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 the Professor 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., above Professor IX. These salaries are reserved for scholars of the highest distinction, whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed.

Off-scale salary supplements

An individual may be given an off-scale salary, consisting of a salary supplement added to the 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. 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 (see 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 publications in the review period. Review period in cases for appointment and promotion means the complete record of the candidate. In cases where this is impractical, a complete record of the most recent work and a sample of other significant works may be submitted. For merit review cases review period means years at step. If 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 Academic Personnel office provides departments with 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.

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, a case supervisor, or the Chair. Deadlines for submission of materials to departments should be set in line with College 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. 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. 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 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 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 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 promotions to tenure, terminations, and advancements to Above Scale, an ad hoc review committee is appointed by the 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, 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 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 one step/increment or more (in salary or step), it is sent back to that agency for further comment. When the recommendation differs by a 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)

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. 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 (Section 220-83) 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.

This appraisal is normally made during the fourth year of the Assistant Professor's career at the University. 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 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.

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 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 convey the justification for advancement without relying solely on quantitative assessments.

Chairs and reviewing agencies should 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 Professor series are:

- (1) Teaching and Mentoring
- (2) Research and other Professional Creative Work
- (3) University and Public Service

The criteria for promotion and advancement in the Teaching Professor series are:

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

Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievements, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions in the Professor 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 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 they elected to take a childbearing or parental leave, to stop the clock, or to defer a personnel review.

Teaching and Mentoring (Professor series and 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. Hence, formal course instruction is expected in the record of every faculty member at the time of an advancement or promotion review (except in cases of formal leaves or full-time administrative appointments). While mentoring is a component of teaching, it does not replace the provision of formal course instruction (see APM 210).

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). 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; 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.).

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 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; capacity to relate the subject matter in one course to other fields; fostering of student independence and capability to think critically; ability to arouse curiosity in students, to encourage high standards, and to inspire students in research and creative work; extent and skill of the candidate's participation in the general guidance, outreach, 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; involvement in departmental or campus-wide educational equity or student success initiatives.

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 campus wide student survey items (see section b. i)
 - ii. Enumeration of the M.A. and Ph.D. candidates they are supervising or 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-bib.

- 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*: UCSB's campus course evaluations are 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.

For courses taught during Spring 2024 or earlier, 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 1-5 scale, from: (5) Excellent; (4) Very Good; (3) Good; (2) Fair; (1) Poor.

For courses taught during Summer 2024 or later, departments must include the full SET report. As part of their analysis the department may wish to do the following:

- Report the range of mean responses across all courses in the review period (from Part I) for the 7 items, for each type of class (i.e., undergraduate large, undergraduate small, graduate). For example, during the review period, for large undergraduate classes, the mean instructor evaluation for items 1-7 ranged from xx to xx.
- Compare these with the Department means in Part I and discuss if there is any deviation worth noting in either direction.
- Discuss if any of the 7 items are notably below department means and look to the feedback at the individual class level in Part II to analyze the situation.
- Review open ended comments and briefly address relevant patterns in responses.

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. 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:

- *Student/TA evaluations: when viewed in appropriate context.* Open-ended questions asked of graduating seniors, graduate students, or alumni can be 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 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.
- *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, etc.
- *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

Research and Creative Work (Professor 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 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 these criteria and, accordingly, would be recognized in the review process. 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 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 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 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. It will help reviewing agencies to accurately evaluate the record if departments comment upon the prestige and significance of journals, publishers, or exhibition or performance venues in particular fields, along with other accepted measures or impact in a discipline (such as citation indexes or reviews).

Textbooks 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)).

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.

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. The case must present the publication record for the current review period according to the following delineation outlined in Red Binder I-27: Published work; Work in press; Work submitted; 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.

Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity (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.

University and Public Service (Professor series and 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.

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 and 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. 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. 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.

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.

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. 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 ensure that the use of confidential documents does not cloak abuse.

VIII. DEPARTMENTAL VOTING ON PERSONNEL CASES

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

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

(Revised ~~6/24~~)

All personnel review cases are submitted via AP Folio

I. Departmental review committee letter of recommendation

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

- Are the effective date and recommended salary clearly stated?
- Is the letter an accurate, extensive, and **analytical** representation of the case?
- Is the final departmental vote included (e.g. 10(yes)-0(no)-0(abstentions)-3(not voting))? Is there an indication of how many were eligible to vote?
- If the case contains extramural letters, are letter writers identified **only** by coded list, with no identifying statements?
- Are all areas of review covered: performance in instructional duties, academic responsibility and other assigned duties?
- If there is a recommendation for an acceleration, are the reasons for the acceleration specifically stated?
- Is all relevant information from the Departmental letter accurately entered on the case up-load screen?
- For the initial Excellence Review: has the [Annual Instructor Workload Form](#) been filled out and included in the case?

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

- Have all letters been coded, on all copies?
- If the letters were sent via email, is a copy of the email and any attachment included?
- Was the proper wording used in the solicitation letter (Red Binder I-50)?
- If different versions of either the letter or the materials went out, is a sample of each included?
- Is a Coded list of referees, along with a brief biography of each included with the case?
- Do the codes on the letters match the codes on the list and the codes used in the departmental letter?
- Does the list clearly indicate if the referees were candidate suggested, department suggested, or independently suggested by both?
- Is a copy of the redacted letters given to the individual included?

III. Complete CV

- Is the CV up to date?
- Have all links to supporting documents and one-of-a-kind items been verified?

IV. Self-assessment of other accomplishments and activity

- Has the self-reflection/self-statement/self-evaluation of the candidate's performance, teaching objectives, and teaching activities been included in the case?

V. Safeguard Statement

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

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

VI. Evaluation of the teaching record.

At a minimum, two sources must be included in the case. For Spring quarter 2024 and earlier ESCI summary sheets and scores for questions A and B are mandatory. For Summer 2024 and later, complete SET reports are mandatory

- Is the B&P printout, or similar listing of classes included in the case?
- On the B&P printout, or similar listing of classes, is it noted which classes have ESCI's or SET surveys included with the case?
- Has the second source of teaching been clearly identified on the coversheet?
- If a self-assessment of teaching was submitted, is it included with the case?

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

- Are all materials identified as candidate submitted?
- Were all materials considered and evaluated as part of the departmental review?
- Have all links to supporting documents been verified?

III-1
TEMPORARY RESEARCH APPOINTMENTS
General Information
(Revised ~~2/24~~)

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

Policies

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

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

Deadlines for submission of merit/promotion requests

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

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

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

Service limitations and Appointment lengths

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

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

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

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

All appointments are term appointments with a stated end date.

Appointees in research series ([self-funded as a PI or Co-PI](#)) may be placed on Short Work Break in accord with Red Binder VI-18 and the MOU.

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

Notice of non-reappointment must be given if the employee has served at 50% or more for eight or more consecutive years in the same title or series (APM 137-30) and Articles 21, 22, and 26 of the MOU. Written Notice

of Intent not to reappoint must be given at least 60 days prior to the appointment's specified end date. The notice must state (1) the intended non-reappointment and the proposed effective date; (2) the basis for non-reappointment including copies of any supporting documentation; and (3) the employees right to respond within 14 days and the name of the person to whom they should respond. Within 30 days of the Notice of Intent, and after review of any response, the University will issue a written Notice of Action to the employee. Pay in lieu of notice may be given.

Recall appointments in any temporary research title may not exceed 43% time, alone or in combination with other recall appointments (see RB I-70). -Appointments are requested using the [Academic Recall Appointment Form](#). Recall appointments are to be entered into UCPath using the Recall Non-Faculty Academic title (3802 or 3812).

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

III-7
DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR
RESEARCH APPOINTMENTS
(Revised 2/24)

All appointment cases are to be submitted via AP Folio.

- I. **Department Letter:** Accurate and analytical letters of recommendation from the department are essential in the review process. See Red Binder I-35 for further detail of content of departmental recommendations
- Are the dates of the appointment, rank and step all clearly stated?
 - Is the recommended salary on the published salary scale?
 - If a request is being made to use the Engineering scale in a non-Engineering unit (RB III-12 V, A, 2 and RB III-14 V, A, 2) is appropriate justification provided?
 - Is the off-scale supplement correct (if applicable), per off-scale general policies (RB I-8-1)?
 - If the salary is off-scale or above scale is it rounded to the nearest \$100?
 - If a vote was taken, is the final departmental vote included (e.g. 10(yes)-0(no)-0(abstentions)-3(not voting))? Is there an indication of how many were eligible to vote?
 - If no vote was taken, is the review procedure (i.e., committee, chair/director review) explained?
 - Does the departmental letter, provide thorough description of the duties to be performed as justification for the rank, requested?
 - Does the departmental letter provide an accurate, extensive, and **analytical** representation of the candidate's qualifications, justifying the proposed step and salary?
 - If the case contains extramural letters, are letter writers identified **only** by coded list, with no identifying statements?
- II. **Extramural letters of evaluation and list of evaluators** for appointment at the Associate and full level as **appropriate** for the series (See Red Binder III-12, III-14, III-16)
- Extramural Letters**
- Are the required number of letters included, **when appropriate** (See RB III-12, III-14, III-16)?
 - Are at least half of the letters from references chosen by the Chair/Dept independent of the candidate?
 - Have all letters been coded, on all copies?
 - If the letters were sent via email, is a copy of the email and any attachment included?
 - Are any anomalies in the composition of reviewers explained?
- Sample Solicitation Letter(s) and/or thank you letter(s) for unsolicited letters**
- Was the proper wording used in the letter (RB I-49 to I-50), ~~III-12, III-14, III-16~~
 - Is a list of all informational items sent to referees (e.g. CV, Bio-Bib, publications sent, etc, per RB I-51) included? Is a copy of each item included as either part of the case or a one-of-a-kind item?
 - If different versions of either the letter or the materials went out, is a sample of each included?
- List of Referees, including brief Biography and indicating who selected referees** (RB I-46-V)
- Do the codes on the letters match the codes on the list and the codes used in the departmental letter?
 - Does the list clearly indicate if the referees were candidate suggested, department suggested, or independently suggested by both?
 - Are the names of everyone who was asked to write included? For those who did not respond is a reason for no response listed?
- III. **Complete CV and UCSB Academic biography form.**
- Is the CV up to date?
 - Is the UCSB Academic biography form complete, signed and dated?
- IV. **Copies of publications**
- Has a representative sampling of publications been submitted?
 - Have links to electronically submitted items been verified?
 - If items cannot be submitted electronically, have arrangements been made with the Academic Personnel Office?

Other considerations:

1. If a search was conducted, the search report must be approved in UC Recruit before the appointment is submitted. If no search was done, a waiver must have been approved.
2. The Procedural Safeguard Statement is not used for new appointments. However, candidates for appointment, once appointed, do have the right to inspect non-confidential documents in their files and to have a redacted copy of the confidential academic review records contained in the personnel review file received pursuant to APM 220-80-i.
3. When putting forward a case for a non-resident alien (i.e. not currently a US Citizen or a Permanent Resident), the department is strongly encouraged to consult with the Office of International Students and Scholars at the time the offer is being considered to be assured that labor certificate processing deadlines are met.

III-8
TYPES OF REVIEW
(Revised 5/24)

On-time merit advancement

A merit action is considered on-time when the departmental recommendation is for a normal advance in step that does not increase or decrease the off-scale salary supplement and does not involve an overlapping step or mandatory review.

For individuals paid at the UCSB minimum rate, on-schedule advancement will be to the next step at the UCSB minimum rate.

For individuals paid above the UCSB minimum rate, off-scale supplements are retained in on-time, normative advancements.

On-time merit advancement at the Assistant and Associate levels occurs after two years at step, and at the Full level after three years at step.

The Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel has approval authority for all advancement actions.

Other reviews

I. **Accelerated actions**

Departments should not hesitate to propose accelerated advancement in cases where there is clear evidence of superior performance. When warranted, acceleration will typically occur during an on-time review, though in special cases it may occur through early advancement to the next step or rank. At the time of normative review, an increase in the off-scale supplement may also be recommended if an additional full-step acceleration does not appropriately reward the record. The addition of, or an increase in, off-scale supplement will also be considered an acceleration. Departments should review candidates performing at a superior level in advance of their normal eligibility for merit increase or promotion. The level of acceleration depends on the extent to which the record exceeds expectations. **In no case for accelerated advancement may deficiencies be evident in any area of review.**

II. **Decelerated actions**

A case will be considered decelerated if the candidate has been at the current step for longer than the normal years at step. At the time of normative review, an increase in off-scale salary only will also be considered a decelerated action. The departmental letter should give an explanation for the deceleration.

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.

An academic researcher may receive no more than two within-step increases in the off-scale supplement.

III. **Promotion to the Associate level**

Professional Research Series:

The principal criterion for promotion to Associate Researcher is superior intellectual attainment in research or other creative achievement. The most useful critical assessment of "superior intellectual attainment" 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 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, 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 level of research independence expected for promotion to Associate Researcher is equivalent to the expectation of research independence for a ladder

faculty member being promoted to Associate Professor. Promotion to Associate Researcher will normally take place at the beginning of the seventh year of service and must occur no later than the end of the eighth year of service.

Project Scientist and Specialist Series:

Advancement from Assistant Project Scientist to Associate Project Scientist requires competency and an expanding level of independence. Advancement from Assistant Specialist to Associate Specialist requires the candidate to provide independent input into the planning and execution of the research and have a record of academic accomplishments.

IV. Promotion to Full

Professional Research Series:

Promotion to Researcher requires an accomplished record of research that is judged to be excellent within the larger discipline or field. Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for advancement to Researcher.

Project Scientist and Specialist Series:

Advancement to Project Scientist requires competency and an expanding level of independence. Advancement to Specialist requires the candidate to provide considerable independent input into the planning and execution of the research and have a significant record of academic accomplishments.

V. Merit to an overlapping step.

Assistant Researcher V, Associate Researcher IV, Assistant Project Scientist V and Associate Project Scientist IV are overlapping steps, [in the sense that these steps may be utilized for advancement when a candidate is eligible for promotion or career review, 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 have been met.](#) Service at an overlapping step is in lieu of service at the first step of the next rank. Once advanced to an overlapping step, the normal progression is for promotion to the next rank. Further advancement within the overlapping step will happen only in very rare and unusual circumstances. Upon advancement to an overlapping step, the candidate is eligible for promotion the following year. If promoted earlier than the normal years at step for Step I of the higher rank, promotion should be lateral and eligibility for future merit will be determined based on the combination of years at the overlapping step and years at Step I at the higher rank.

VI. Merit to or within Above Scale

Advancement to Above Scale is reserved for scholars of the highest distinction whose work has received international recognition. Advancement to Above Scale will normally occur after at least four years of service at the highest step within the full level rank of the series with the individual's complete academic career being reviewed. The guidelines for Senate Faculty increase to and above Scale (Red Binder I-43) apply to Researcher above scale actions. Criteria for Above Scale advancements for Project Scientists and Specialists shall be consistent with the criteria established for each series.

VII. Mandatory reviews

Appointees at all levels must undergo a performance review at least once every five years. This review may not be deferred. Non-submission of materials by the candidate will not constitute automatic deferral in the case of a mandatory review. If the appointee does not turn in materials by the departmental due date, the department will conduct the review based on the materials available in the department as of the due date.

Professional Research Series only:

VIII. Terminal Appointments

If, during a review of an Assistant Researcher, a preliminary decision is made for a terminal appointment, the procedures outlined in Red Binder I-39 must be followed. Appropriate notification and opportunity for response must be provided.

IX. **Merit to Researcher VI**

Advancement to Researcher VI is based on evidence of highly distinguished scholarship. In addition, great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally in scholarly or creative achievement is required for merit to Researcher VI. This is a career review and therefore is based on a review of the individual's entire academic career.

III-9
DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR
RESEARCH REVIEWS
(Revised 5/24)

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-35 for further detail of content of departmental recommendations.

For All Cases:

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

For Career Reviews:

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

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

See Red Binder I-35 for further information.

- If a Chair's confidential letter is included is it clearly marked "Chair's Separate Confidential"?

III. **Safeguard Statement=**

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

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

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

See Red Binder I-27 for further details.

- Have items previously listed as "In Press" ~~or "Submitted"~~ been accounted for?
- Are all items, including "In Press" **and** "Submitted" (as applicable) ~~and "In Progress"~~ properly documented?
 - Is the current review period and cumulative record accounted for appropriately in Part I. Research and Creative Activity, per RB I-27? Are publications identified as "refereed" when appropriate?**
- Have all links to supporting documents and one-of-a-kind items been verified?

V. **Extramural letters of evaluation and list of evaluators (RB I-46) for promotion to the Associate and full level as appropriate for the series (See RB III-12, III-14, III-16)**

Extramural Letters

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

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

- Was the proper wording used in the letter (RB I-49 to I-50), ~~III-12, III-14, III-16~~?
- Is a list of all informational items sent to referees (e.g. CV, bio-bib, publications sent, etc, per RB- 51) included? Is a copy of each item included as either part of the case or a one-of-a-kind item?
- If different versions of the letters or materials went out, is a sample of each included?

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

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

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

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

VII. **Copies of publications. See RB I-27 for further details.**

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

- Have all items included in Part I of the bio-bib for the current review period been submitted, including In Press and Submitted ([as applicable](#)) items?
- Has appropriate evidence been provided for In Press items?
- Do all of the titles on the actual publications match those listed on the bio-bib?
- For promotion to the Associate level, are all publications included?
- Have links to electronically submitted items been verified?
- If items cannot be submitted electronically, have arrangements been made with the Academic Personnel office?

- If any publications are missing from the file, is a note included noting which are missing and explaining why?
- For other career reviews (promotion to Full in any series, advancement to Researcher Step VI or Above Scale), are all publications since last review, and all or a representative sample of publications from the prior record included?

III-12
PROFESSIONAL RESEARCH SERIES
(Revised ~~5/24~~)

I. Definition

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

II. Ranks and Steps

- A. Assistant Research _____ I – V (Steps V is an overlapping step)
- B. Associate Research _____ I – IV (Step IV is an overlapping step)
- C. Research _____ I – IX

The normal time of service at each step within the Assistant and Associate rank is 2 years, except for service at the overlapping step of Associate Researcher IV (~~Red Binder I 4, II~~). Within the Researcher rank normal service at Steps I-IV is 3 years. Service at Step V and above may be for an indefinite time; however, normal service is 3 years at Steps V through VIII and 4 years at Step IX and within Above Scale. Eligibility for normal advancement occurs after the normal time of service at each step. If ~~the outcome of a merit review is no change in rank, step, or off-scale, not advanced in step at that time,~~ the candidate will continue to be eligible ~~for advancement in rank or step~~ each year until the advancement in rank or step occurs.

~~Overlapping steps may not be used for new appointments.~~

III. Appointment and Advancement Criteria

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

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

An individual who currently holds a Research series appointment at UCSB and participates in research activities in a department or program in which they do not hold a salaried appointment may receive affiliated status in the host department or program.

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

IV. Term of Appointment

- A. Service as Assistant Researcher is limited to eight years of service (Red Binder I-4-II). Six months or more of service within any fiscal year, either paid or without salary, as an Assistant Researcher or Visiting Assistant Researcher counts towards the eight-year limit.
- B. Appointments or reappointments are to be made based on the service limitations indicated in Red Binder III-1 and, for represented employees, in the MOU.

V. Compensation

- A. Individuals appointed to this series are compensated on the salary scales established for the Professional Research series on a fiscal year (11 months) basis. The Economics/ Engineering Professional Research salary scales will be used when either:
 - 1. The unit is an Engineering unit (departments and research units reporting to the Dean of Engineering) or the Department of Economics
or:
 - 2. The unit is multi or interdisciplinary and includes both engineering or economics and other disciplinary activity (for example: CNSI, ICB, MATP). In this case two additional criteria must be met: a) The individual's background and training is in engineering or economics, and b) The project with which the individual is associated is an engineering or economics project.

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

- B. In most cases, a Research series appointment will be a salaried position. Without salary status may be appropriate for short periods of time, for example if the Researcher is self-funded as a PI or Ceo-PI. A without salary appointment in this series is not appropriate if the individual holds a primary affiliation with and is funded by another academic institution or outside agency.
- C. Salaries are subject to range adjustment.
- D. Each source which provides compensation for service in this series must permit research.
- E. Off-scale salaries are allowed within the same limits and policies as ladder faculty off-scale salaries. (Red Binder I-8-I)

VI. Requests for Appointment, Reappointment, and Advancement

Appointment

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

Reappointment

Reappointments are to be submitted via the reappointment and modification module of AP Folio.

Advancement: Merit and Promotion

Advancement cases are to be submitted via AP Folio and using the checklist of documents to be submitted by the chair for research reviews (Red Binder III-9). Red Binder I-22, Departmental Checklist for

Academic Advancement may also be used as a guideline for departmental review. All advancement actions are based on the individual's achievements. Normal advancement will occur after 2 years at step at the Assistant or Associate level and after 3 years at the Full Research level steps I-VIII, and after 4 years at step IX or within Above Scale. Any advancement requested prior to that time will be considered an acceleration and must be justified as such (Red Binder III-8-I).-- Merit increases are based on the academic record since the time of last review while promotions, merit to Researcher VI and merit to Researcher Above Scale are based on the career academic record.

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

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

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

Chair/Director Letters of Recommendation

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

Bio-Bibliography

It is the responsibility of each Researcher to maintain an up to date bio-bibliography (bio-bib). The bio-bib should contain information ending at the campus cut-off date of December 31, or the date established by the candidate's department if an earlier date has been established. Information that falls beyond that date will not be considered in the review. Final bio-bibs are generated by the online bio-bib system and are tailored to the specific series.

External Evaluation

External letters of evaluation will be required in cases of: appointment as Associate Researcher, appointment as Researcher, promotion to Associate Researcher, promotion to Researcher, and merit to Researcher Above Scale. A minimum of 4 letters must be included for appointment or promotion to the Associate level. A minimum of 6 letters must be included for appointment or promotion to the Full Researcher level, or for advancement to Above Scale. At least half of the letters submitted with the case should come from references chosen by the Department or Unit independent of the candidate. Solicitations of extramural evaluations should not merely ask for opinions regarding the suitability of the candidate for promotion, but should invite analytical evaluations of the candidate's research with respect to quality and significance. Reviewing agencies reserve the right to request letters be solicited in any advancement case if it is determined that more information is necessary to support the proposed action.

In all cases of solicitation of outside letters, the sample letter for solicitation of extramural letters (Red Binder I-49) is to be used, with the following wording from Red Binder I-50 inserted as appropriate. Also, see Red Binder I-51 Materials To External Reviewers.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VII. Approval Authority

Action

_____ Authority

All actions

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

III-14
PROJECT SCIENTIST SERIES
(Revised ~~5/24~~)

I. Definition

The titles in this series are given only to those who make significant and creative contributions to a research or creative project. Appointees may be ongoing members of a research team, or may contribute high-level skills to a specific project for a limited time. Demonstrated capacity for fully independent research or research leadership as required in the Researcher series are not required in this series. However, a broad range of knowledge and competency and a higher level of independence than appointees in the Specialist series are expected. See APM 311 for System Wide policy on Project Scientists. See Red Binder III-23 for procedures for Visiting appointments in this series. Represented employees in this series are governed by the applicable Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Article 22 of the MOU provides guidance specific to the Project Scientist series.

II. Ranks and Steps

- A. Assistant Project Scientist I – V (Step V is an overlapping step)
- B. Associate Project Scientist I – IV (Step IV is an overlapping step)
- C. Project Scientist I –IX

The normal time of service at each step within the Assistant and Associate rank is 2 years, except for service at the overlapping step of Associate Project Scientist IV. Within the Project Scientist rank normal service at Steps I-IV is 3 years. Service at Step V and above may be for an indefinite time; however, normal service is 3 years at Steps V through VIII and 4 years at Step IX and within Above Scale. Eligibility for normal advancement occurs after the normal time of service at each step. If **the outcome of a merit review is no change in rank, step, or off-scale,**~~not advanced in step at that time,~~ the candidate will continue to be eligible **for advancement in rank or step** each year until **the** advancement in **rank or step** occurs.

Overlapping steps may not be used for new appointments.

III. Appointment and Advancement Criteria

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

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

University and public service are encouraged but not required.

IV. Term of Appointment

- A. Appointments or reappointments are to be made based on the service limitations indicated in Red Binder III-1 and, for represented employees, in the MOU.
- B. There are no limits on service at any level in this series.

V. Compensation

A. Individuals appointed to this series are compensated on the salary scales established for the Project Scientist series on a fiscal year (11 months) basis. The Economics/Project Scientist salary scale will be used when either:

1. The unit is an Engineering unit (departments and research units reporting to the Dean of Engineering) or the Department of Economics
or:

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

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

- B. In most cases, a Project Scientist appointment will be a salaried position. Without salary status may be appropriate for short periods of time, for example if the Project Scientist is self-funded as a PI or co-PI. A without salary appointment is not appropriate if the individual holds a primary affiliation with and is funded by another academic institution or outside agency.
- C. Salaries are subject to range adjustment.
- D. Each source which provides compensation for service in this series must permit research.
- E. Off-scale salaries are allowed within the same limits and policies as ladder faculty off-scale salaries. (Red Binder I-8-I)

VI. Requests for Appointment and Advancement

Appointment

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

Reappointment

Reappointments are to be submitted via the reappointment and modification module of AP Folio.

Advancement: Merit and Promotion

Advancement cases are to be submitted via AP Folio and using the checklist of documents to be submitted by the chair for research reviews (Red Binder III-9). All advancement actions are based on the individual's achievements. Normal advancement will occur after 2 years at step at the Assistant or Associate level and after 3 years at the Full Project Scientist level steps I-VIII and after 4 years at step IX or within Above Scale. Any advancement requested prior to that time will be considered an acceleration and must be justified as such (Red Binder III-8-I). Merit increases are based on the academic record since the time of last review while promotions are based on the career academic record.

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

Requests for deferral of non-mandatory reviews must be submitted by the deadline established by the department. Appointees in the Project Scientist series must undergo a performance review at least once every five years, including an evaluation of the record in all review areas. This review may not be deferred. If the candidate does not turn in materials by the departmental due date, the department will conduct the review based on the materials available in the department as of the due date.

Chair/Director Letters of Recommendation

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

Bio-Bibliography

It is the responsibility of each Project Scientist to maintain an up to date bio-bibliography (bio-bib). The bio-bib should contain information ending at the campus cut-off date of January 31, or the date established by the candidate's department if an earlier date has been established. Information that falls beyond that date will not be considered in the review. Final bio-bibs are generated by the online bio-bib system and are tailored to the specific series.

External Evaluation

External letters of evaluation are ~~normally~~ required in cases of: appointment as Associate Project Scientist, appointment as Project Scientist, promotion to Associate Project Scientist, and promotion to Project Scientist. A minimum of four letters at the Associate level, and six at the Full Project Scientist level should be included. Due to the nature of Project Scientist positions, it is possible that in some cases solicitation of internal letters of evaluation are more helpful. Internal evaluators are defined as external to the employing unit, but internal to UCSB. In these cases, the decision to solicit from internal sources should be clearly explained in the ~~List of Referees, reviewers.~~ Reviewing agencies reserve the right to request that additional letters be solicited in any appointment or advancement case if it is determined that more information is necessary to support the proposed action.

When letters are solicited either externally or internally, the sample letter for solicitation of extramural evaluators (Red Binder I-49) is to be used, with the ~~following~~ wording [from Red Binder I-50](#) inserted as appropriate. ~~Also, see Red Binder I-51 Materials To External Reviewers.~~

~~_____ is being considered for (an appointment/promotion to) Associate Project Scientist/Project Scientist in the (department/unit). Appointment (or Promotion) to Associate Project Scientist/Project Scientist within the UC system requires evaluation in the areas of: 1) Demonstrated significant, original, and creative contributions to a research or creative program or project, 2) Professional competence and activity. [Sample wording for evaluation request: e.g., I would greatly appreciate your evaluation of _____'s work.]~~

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

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

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

~~In rare circumstances it may be appropriate to waive the requirement for letters of evaluation. Requests to waive letters must be submitted to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel prior to submission of the appointment or promotion case.~~

VII. Approval Authority

Action

Authority

All actions

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

III-16
SPECIALIST SERIES
(Revised ~~5/24~~)

I. Definition

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

II. Ranks and Steps

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

III. Appointment and Advancement Criteria

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

The following qualifications are general guidelines for each rank:

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

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

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

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

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

In judging a candidate for appointment or promotion to a position in this series, the following

criteria are general guidelines: ~~following criteria are provided as guidelines and may be used flexibly where deemed necessary.~~

1. Performance in research in the defined area of expertise and specialization.
2. Professional competence and activity.
3. University and public service (expected at promotion to the Associate and full Specialist ranks)

IV. Term of Appointment

- A. Represented Junior Specialists may not be appointed at this rank for more than three years. There are no other limits on service at any other level in this series.
- B. Appointments or reappointments are to be made based on the service limitations indicated in Red Binder III-1 and, for represented employees, in the MOU.

V. Compensation

- A. Individuals appointed to this series are compensated on the salary scales established for the Specialist Series on a fiscal year (11 month) basis.

~~Without salary appointments in this series will occur rarely and will require evidence of external funding. Individuals who hold a primary affiliation with and are funded by another academic institution or outside agency may more appropriately be appointed as Research Associate or Research Fellow (Red Binder III 20.)~~

- B. Off-scale salaries are allowed within the same limits and policies as ladder faculty off-scale salaries. (Red Binder I-8-1)
- C. Salaries are subject to range adjustment.
- D. Each source that provides compensation for service in this series must permit research.

VI. Requests for Appointment and Advancement

Appointment

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

Reappointment

Reappointments are to be submitted via the reappointment and modification module of AP Folio.

The following applies to Junior Specialists only:

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

Junior Specialists do not undergo merit reviews. Automatic movement (on July 1st) to Junior Specialist Step II will occur after one year of service at Sstep I. Normal advancement will occur after one year at Sstep II for promotion to Assistant Specialist.

Advancement: Merit and Promotion

Advancement cases are to be submitted via AP Folio and using the checklist of documents to be submitted by the chair for research reviews (Red Binder III-9). All advancement actions are based on the individual's achievements. Normal advancement will occur after two years at step at the Assistant and Associate level and after three years at the Full Specialist level, steps I-IX, and after four years at step IX and within Above Scale. Any advancement requested prior to that time will be considered an acceleration and must be justified as such (Red Binder III-8-I). Merits are based on the academic record since the time of last review while promotions are based on the career academic record. Advancement to Above Scale status involves an overall career review and requires work of sustained and continued excellence with national or international recognition, outstanding professional achievement, and highly meritorious service. See Red Binder I-43 for further guidance regarding Above Scale status.

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

Requests for deferral of non-mandatory reviews must be submitted by the deadline established by the department. Appointees in the Specialist series must undergo a performance review at least once every five years, including an evaluation of the record in all review areas. This review may not be deferred. If the candidate does not turn in materials by the departmental due date, the department will conduct the review based on the materials available in the department as of the due date

Chair/Director Letters of Recommendation

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

Bio-Bibliography

It is the responsibility of each Specialist to maintain an up to date bio-bibliography (bio-bib). The bio-bib should contain information ending at the campus cut-off date of January 31, or the date established by the candidate's department if an earlier date has been established. Information that falls beyond that date will not be considered in the review. Final bio-bibs are generated by the online bio-bib system and are tailored to the specific series.

External Evaluation

While extramural letters of evaluation are **not required** for appointment, promotion, or advancement to Above Scale in the Specialist series they may, in some cases, be helpful in evaluating the candidate's record. When letters are solicited, the sample letter for solicitation of extramural evaluators (Red Binder I-49) is to be used, with the ~~following~~ wording from Red Binder I-50 inserted as appropriate. ~~Also, see Red Binder I-51 Materials To External Reviewers.~~

~~_____ is being considered for (an appointment/promotion to) Associate Specialist/Specialist in the (department/unit). Appointment (or Promotion) to Associate Specialist/Specialist within the UC system~~

~~requires evaluation in the areas of: 1) specialized research, 2) professional competence and activity, 3) university and public service. [Sample wording for evaluation request: e.g., I would greatly appreciate your evaluation of _____'s work.]~~

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

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

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

-

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

VII. Approval Authority

Action

All actions

Authority

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

III-17
POSTDOCTORAL SCHOLARS
(Revised ~~5/24~~)

I. Definition

Postdoctoral Scholar appointments are intended to provide a full-time (100%) training program of advanced academic preparation and research training under the mentorship of a faculty member (defined as ladder faculty or professional researcher). System-wide policies regarding Postdoctoral Scholars may be found in APM 390 and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the Postdoctoral Scholar unit.

II. Appointment Criteria

Appointment to a Postdoctoral Scholar title requires a doctorate (e.g. Ph.D., M.D.) or foreign equivalent at the time of appointment.

III. Titles

Postdoctoral Scholars may be appointed into the following titles:

- Postdoctoral Scholar- Employee (3252)
Used when (1) the agency funding the salary requires or permits the appointee to be an employee of the University, or (2) whenever General Funds, Opportunity Funds or other University discretionary funds are used to support the position. Payment for the appointment will be made via UCPATH. This title is also used to supplement Fellow or Paid-Direct appointments when the external funding amount is below the required salary level.
- Postdoctoral Scholar- Fellow (3253)
Used when the appointee has been awarded a fellowship or traineeship by an extramural funding agency that will be paid through a University account. The appointment in UCPATH may be with salary or without salary (funds paid as a stipend) depending on the fund source.
- Postdoctoral Scholar- Paid Direct (3254)
Used when the appointee is paid a fellowship or traineeship directly by the granting agency. Appointed without salary in UCPATH.
- Postdoctoral Scholar – Employee Non-Exempt (3255)
Used when the assigned appointment percentage (FTE%) is less than full-time and as a result the take-home salary falls below the FLSA overtime-exempt salary threshold. The appointment is non-exempt and the appointee is paid hourly on a bi-weekly basis. ([see FLSA FAQs](#))
- Interim Postdoctoral Scholar-Employee (3256)
Used when a UCSB graduate student has obtained their Ph.D. and needs a short-term appointment to complete an existing project from their degree program before moving on to other employment.

The [Chart Defining Postdoctoral Scholar Positions](#) may be helpful in determining if the candidate is appropriately appointed as a Postdoctoral Scholar, and if so, which of the Postdoctoral Scholar titles to use.

IV. Terms and Conditions of Employment

- A. Appointment must be made at 100% time. Exceptions may be granted by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel in the following circumstances

- a) Personal health
 - b) Family responsibilities
 - c) Employment external to the University
 - d) To accommodate a temporary teaching appointment or other University position at UCSB
- B. Postdoctoral Scholar appointments are temporary and have fixed end dates. The total duration of appointment in any combination of Postdoctoral Scholar titles, including prior postdoctoral service at other institutions (both domestic and foreign), may not exceed five years. Under unusual circumstances, the University may grant a sixth and final year of appointment.
- C. Appointments will be for the durations specified in the MOU as follows:
- 1. Postdoctoral Scholar- Employee
 - The initial appointment will be for a minimum of two years.
 - Subsequent reappointments will be for a minimum of one year.

Exceptions to the reappointment minimum will be granted if the programmatic work, work authorization or visa end date, or the five-year limit/sixth year exception on Postdoctoral appointments will occur prior to the reappointment minimum end date or if the Postdoctoral Scholar requests a short-term bridge to other employment.
 - 2. Postdoctoral Scholar- Fellow or Paid Direct
 - The appointment will be for the duration of the fellowship award or extramural funding.
 - 3. Interim Postdoctoral Scholar-Employee
 - The appointment will be for a minimum of three months at 100% FTE and a maximum of one year.
- D. Pursuant to [APM - 137-30-b](#), it is within the University's sole discretion not to reappoint a Postdoctoral Scholar

V. Requests for Appointment, Reappointment or Modification

- A. Appointments, reappointments, and modifications require submission of the completed and signed [Postdoctoral Scholars Appointment Form](#) along with the following documents:
- Initial Appointments
 - 1. UCSB Biography form
 - 2. An up-to-date Curriculum Vitae
 - 3. For a Postdoctoral Scholar Fellow or Paid Direct, a copy of the external funding agency's award letter and guidelines. The letter should include specific information regarding the salary support and the amount of funding available for coverage of health insurance and other required benefits. If the external agency will not provide funds for health insurance and other benefits, a departmental funding source must be provided.
 - Reappointments
 - 1. Annual evaluation form
 - 2. For a Postdoctoral Scholar Fellow or Paid Direct, an updated copy of the external funding agency's award letter and guidelines.
 - Modifications
 - 1. For a Postdoctoral Scholar Fellow or Paid Direct, an updated copy of the external funding agency's award letter and guidelines.

2. For a reduction in time, appropriate documentation supporting the reason for the reduction including the Postdoctoral Scholar's written request to the PI/Supervisor for a temporary reduction.
- B. The completed documents must be submitted to Academic Personnel at least 45 days prior to the start date of the appointment, reappointment or modification.
 - C. Upon notification of approval of the action from Academic Personnel, the Department must provide the Postdoctoral Scholar with the formal Written Notice of Appointment letter (WNA) along with appropriate attachments. Notification shall occur as soon as practical, but no later than seven calendar days following the start of appointment, or thirty calendar days prior to the start of reappointment.

The WNA may be extended to the candidate prior to the conferral of their Ph.D., however such offers are contingent on conferral of the Ph.D. prior to the start of the appointment.
 - D. The candidate must confirm their acceptance of the offer by signing and returning the WNA on or before the first day of employment. Upon receipt of the acceptance, the Department may enter the Postdoctoral Scholar into UCPath. A copy of the signed WNA must be forwarded to Academic Personnel.
 - E. The Hiring Department/Unit shall retain copies of the appointment, reappointment, and modification documents in the appointee's personnel file.

VI. Compensation

- A. All Postdoctoral Scholars must be paid at or higher than the minimum salary rate for their experience level, as indicated on the posted salary scale (Salary Scale 23/23N). If an extramural granting agency will provide less than the minimum salary for the experience level, the faculty mentor must arrange additional funding prior to the start of appointment in order to provide the minimum salary.
- B. When a Postdoctoral Scholar- Fellow or Paid Direct requires salary supplementation as described in A., the supplement will be paid using the Postdoctoral Scholar-Employee (3252) title.
- C. All months of prior postdoc service will be counted towards the placement of the Postdoctoral Scholar at their initial experience level. This includes prior postdoctoral service at other institutions (both domestic and foreign),
- D. Movement to the next experience level pay rate will occur based on the following time frames:
 - Postdoctoral Scholars with an initial start date between October 1 through April 1 will move to the next experience level on October 1 of each year.
 - Postdoctoral Scholars with an initial start date between April 2 through September 30 will move to the next experience level on April 1 of each year.
- E. Postdoctoral Scholars who are already above the new experience level rate shall receive either a 3% minimum salary increase or be placed on their next experience level minimum, whichever is the higher rate.
- F. Mid-year salary increases are allowed but do not negate the mandatory salary increase on the Postdoctoral Scholar's next experience level increase date.

VII. Benefits

- A. As a condition of appointment, Postdoctoral Scholars must have adequate health insurance coverage

for the duration of their appointment.

- B. Postdoctoral Scholars in all titles must have an appointment at 100% for a minimum of three months or at 50% or higher for twelve months to be eligible to participate in the Postdoctoral Scholar Benefit Plan (PSBP). NOTE: Postdoc Interim (3256) must have a 3-month appointment at 100% FTE to qualify for PSBP.

PSBP includes medical, vision, life AD&D, short-term disability, and voluntary long-term disability coverage.

- C. Postdoctoral Scholar Employees (3252) are required to contribute to the University of California Defined Contribution Plan (DCP) as Safe Harbor participants and pay Medicare taxes, and are not eligible for membership in the University of California Retirement Plan (UCRP). However, they are eligible to enroll and make contributions to any of the Voluntary University of California Savings Program plans.
- D. Postdoctoral Scholars in all titles may receive reimbursement of allowable child-care related expenses in accordance with the Childcare Article of the MOU.

For Fellows and Paid-Directs: Any childcare reimbursement provided by the extramural funding agency shall satisfy the requirements of the program and the amount shall be deducted from the annual maximum reimbursement amount. If the extramural funding agency provides for a greater childcare reimbursement amount than the MOU, the Fellow/Paid-Direct shall receive the full amount from the extramural funding agency and not have access to the childcare reimbursement program.

The Postdoctoral Scholar completes and submits the [Childcare Reimbursement Request Form \(UBEN 255\)](#) along with appropriate documentation to the hiring department for the reimbursement. Additional information regarding eligibility and the reimbursement process can be reviewed on the [Postdoc Childcare Reimbursement Program Factsheet](#)

VIII. Leaves

- A. Postdoctoral Scholars are eligible for 12 days of Sick Leave per twelve-month appointment period. All 12 days are available for use effective the first day of the appointment. Any balance remaining at the end of an appointment period is to be carried forward to any subsequent Postdoctoral appointment or other University appointment that provides sick leave. A Postdoctoral Scholar who is reemployed after a separation shall have part of or all sick leave accrual in accordance with Article 23, Section A.3. of the MOU.
- B. Postdoctoral Scholars are eligible for 24 days of Personal Time Off (PTO) per twelve-month appointment period. All 24 PTO days are available for use effective the first day of the appointment. Balances remaining at the end of an appointment do not carry forward to subsequent appointments.

For appointments longer than twelve-months: UCPath limits PTO accrual for a maximum of twelve months. Accruals will reset on the Postdoctoral Scholar's next anniversary date (every twelve-months from the initial start date of appointment).

Appointees with less than 12-month appointments are eligible for Sick Leave and Paid Time Off in proportion to the appointment period; at a rate of 2 PTO days and 1 Sick Leave Day per month.

- C. Sick Leave and Personal Time Off are both recorded in full day increments. Approved absences of less than one full work day do not require the use of personal time off or sick leave.
- D. Time off for Postdoctoral Scholar-Fellow and Postdoctoral Scholar-Paid Direct appointees may be paid

or unpaid, depending on the provisions of the funding agency agreement.

- E. Request to use Sick Leave and Personal Time Off must be communicated to the Postdoctoral Scholar's Supervisor ahead of time and may be required to be submitted in writing.
- F. Postdoctoral Scholars are also eligible for other leaves of absence as outlined in Article 12 of the MOU. Leaves of absence, other than use of personal time off or sick leave, require prior approval from the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel. Leave of Absence request process is located at: <https://ap.ucsb.edu/leave.of.absence/>.
- G. Postdoctoral Paid Family Leave (PPFL) provides a maximum of eight weeks of paid leave per calendar year for the care of a family member with a serious health condition, to bond with a new born or adopted child, to provide Military Caregiver Leave, or Qualifying Exigency Leave.

IX. Reviews and evaluations

- A. The Supervisor or PI who serves as the Postdoctoral Scholar's mentor must, within a reasonable time after the beginning of each appointment communicate to the Postdoctoral Scholar the mentor's research and progress expectations for the period of the appointment. The Postdoctoral Scholar may request that the expectations be provided in writing.
- B. Mentors shall conduct an annual written review of each Postdoctoral Scholar's performance. [The evaluation form](#) must be submitted every 12 months or at the end of the Postdoctoral Scholar's appointment, whichever comes first. A copy of the evaluation must be provided to the Postdoctoral Scholar upon request and a copy kept in the appointee's personnel file. In addition, mentors and Postdoctoral Scholars must periodically engage in informal oral progress assessments.
- C. A Postdoctoral Scholar may elect (in some cases be required) to develop an Individual Development Plan (IDP) that identifies the Postdoctoral Scholar's research goals as well as professional development and career objectives. The Postdoctoral Scholar's mentor should, upon request from the Postdoctoral Scholar, engage in the process of reviewing and discussing the IDP with the Postdoctoral Scholar.

X. Layoff

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

XI. Discipline and Dismissal

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

- A. Written warning informing the Postdoctoral Scholar of the nature of the problem, requirements for continuation of the appointment, and possible consequences if the problems are unresolved.
- B. Suspension from the training program, without pay, for a stated period of time. Unless otherwise stated, such suspension will include loss of other privileges such as parking, access to University property and library privileges.
- C. Dismissal from the Postdoctoral Scholar position.

Consultation with Academic Personnel and Labor Relations is required prior to initiating any disciplinary action.

XII. Approval Authority

Action
All actions

Authority
Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel

IV- 10
GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCHER
(Revised ~~5/24~~)

There is no APM section describing this title. Appointments into this title are governed by the Memorandum of Understanding between the University and the UAW. At UCSB, the application of this policy is outlined in the following:

I. Definition

A Graduate Student Researcher (GSR) is a registered UC graduate student in full-time residence (with exception for students approved for In Absentia status), who performs research related to the student's degree program in an academic department or research unit under the direction of a faculty member or Principal Investigator. GSRs are selected for high achievement and promise as creative scholars; they may collaborate in the publication of research results as determined by supervising faculty members. GSRs may not be assigned teaching, administrative or general assistance duties.

II. Appointment Criteria

- A. The basic criteria for appointment are embodied in the definition of the series. In addition, appointees to the Graduate Student Researcher title are subject to all eligibility requirements listed in Red Binder IV-1.
- B. Appointees must hold a BA/BS degree.
- C. Doctoral students must be within the Departmental and Graduate Council approved number of years for both advancement to candidacy and degree completion as specified in Academic Senate Regulation 350A.
- D. Master's students must be within the four-year time limit set for the master's degree as specified in Academic Senate Regulation 300A.
- E. The work performed may contribute to the educational objectives of the student; and/or
- F. The student functions as an active collaborator and/or fundamental contributor to the intellectual content of the research.

III. Titles

Graduate Student Researchers are appointed into the following titles:

- **Graduate Student Researcher (3284)**
Used when appointments are paid a salary from funding generated by the University in an academic department or research unit, provided that the graduate student is performing this funded searcher under the control of the University and under the specific direction of a faculty member or authorize Principal Investigator.
- **Graduate Student Researcher – Trainee (31551 – Fee remission/ ~~3150~~3153 —Paid-DirectNo Remission)**
Used when graduate students meet the definition of a GSR -3284 appointment and the funding source from which they receive remuneration deems that the money provided cannot be characterized as wages, the graduate student is an employee and the University will place the

graduate student employee in a new “Trainee” title code that reflects that the money provided is not subject to a W-2.

- **Graduate Student Researcher – Fellowship (31451- Fee Remission/ 31430 –Paid-Direct~~No Remission~~)**

Used when graduate students obtain individual fellowship(s) where receipt of the fellowship funding requires (i) the performance of a service for the University; and (ii) performs research in an academic department or research unit, provided that the graduate student is performing this fellowship research under the control of the University and under the specific direction of a faculty member or authorized Principal Investigator.

- **GSR Supplement (3160)**

Used to supplement GSR Trainee or Fellowship appointments when the external funding amount is less than the University established wage minimum in order to bring the total support up to the required salary levels.

[Consult with Academic Personnel and the Graduate Division on the use of the Trainee/Fellow Paid-Direct titles.](#)

IV. Terms and Conditions of Appointment

- A. Appointments as a Graduate Student Researcher are subject to the Employment Eligibility and Limitations on Service sections as described in Red Binder IV-1 General Information.
- B. Workload shall be commensurate with the appointment percentage.
- C. Workload assigned may be separate from the appointee’s own academic requirements associated with thesis/dissertation research, and/or academic progress required by their program that they must fulfill as graduate students.
- D. Trainees and Fellows may require different levels of effort as specified under the terms and conditions of the applicable grant or fellowship.

V. Compensation

- A. Individuals appointed to this title are generally compensated at an on-scale rate within the published Graduate Student Researcher Salary Scale (Table 22) at the fiscal year, 11/12 pay basis. Hiring Departments/Research Units may also provide salaries that exceed the maximum salary point.
- B. Trainees and Fellows with stipends issued at a rate less than the University-established wage minimums shall be provided additional funding to increase the wage rate to the next highest salary point on the GSR scale, if applicable. However, when the requirements of the sponsoring agency exceed the requirements of the MOU, the requirements of the sponsoring agency shall control all salary increase and adjustments to the individual GSR’s salary.
- C. Prior Experience for salary scale placement:
 - Effective October 1, 2023, a GSR with at least three quarters of experience at 25% FTE or higher at the same campus shall be placed at salary point 2 or higher
 - A GSR with at least six quarters of experience at 25% FTE or higher at the same campus shall be placed at salary point 3 or higher
 - Prior experience shall be determined by June 30, 2023 for the October 1, 2023 salary step placement, and by June 30, 2024 for the October 1, 2024 salary step placement.

- Trainees/Fellows' experience between January 1 2022 – June 30, 2023 shall be used for placement.
 - Excludes GSR appointments with other campuses and LBNL
- D. Hiring Departments/Units may establish their own criteria for assigning placement above the salary point minimum as long as the criteria is applied consistently to all GSRs appointments within the Hiring Department/Unit.
- E. Salaries are subject to an annual range adjustment as outlined in the MOU.
- F. A Graduate Student Researcher appointed at 25% - 34% during an eligible academic quarter will qualify for partial fee remission and payment of student health insurance, and 35% or higher for full fee remission.
- G. Trainees and Fellows shall be eligible for fee remission including NRST if the external granting agency requires that the University cover the tuition and fees rather than the external granting agency.

VI. Personal Time Off

- A. GSRs appointed at 25% minimum will accrue one Personal Time Off (PTO) day for every one full month of appointment. GSRs may accrues up to 12 PTO days for a full twelve-month period. Shorter appointments will be pro-rated based on the appointment duration.
- B. All eligible PTO days will be available for use at the start of appointment and will be communicated to the GSR on the written Notice of Appointment letter (WNA).
- C. PTO is taken in one-day increments regardless of the GSR's weekly work schedule.
- D. GSR must request time off in writing to their supervisor in advance of their leave.
- E. Unused PTO days do not carry over toward subsequent GSR appointments.
- F. Trainees and Fellows shall refer to the terms and conditions of the fellowship award for paid time off/leave options.

VII. Personnel Actions

- A. Appointment requests that include an exception to employment policy (see RB IV-1, IV) must include the Exception to Employment Policy Form endorsed by either the student's Home Academic Department or the Graduate Division.
- B. Appointments are established only by the issuance of the Written Notice of Appointment letter (WNA) per the Appointment Notification Article of the MOU. WNA templates are available at: <https://ap.ucsb.edu/resources.for.department.analysts/graduate.student.appointments/>
- C. Hiring Departments/Research Units shall issue the WNA and supplemental documentation no less than thirty calendar days before the start of appointment, or as soon as possible in cases in which positions become available following the start of the academic term.
- D. The graduate student employee must confirm their acceptance of the offer by signing and returning the WNA on or before the first day of employment or by the date specified by the department, if earlier. Upon receipt of the acceptance, the Hiring Department/Research Unit may enter the appointment in UCPath.

- E. The Hiring Department/Research Unit shall retain copies of the WNA and supplemental documents in the appointee's employment file.
- F. Any changes to the appointment must be communicated to the appointee in writing.

VIII. Approval Authority

Action

All normal actions

Exceptions under RB IV-1, IV.A

Exceptions under RB IV-I, IV.B

Authority

Chair, Hiring Department
Director, Research Unit

Chair, Home Academic Department

Dean, Graduate Division

VI-4
CHILDBEARING LEAVE AND PARENTAL LEAVE
(Revised ~~4/23~~)

- A. Academic appointees are eligible for childbearing and parental leave as guaranteed by applicable state and federal law, including but not limited to, the Federal Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), the California Family Rights Act (CFRA), and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA). In addition, the University provides leave benefits as follows:
- B. An academic appointee who accrues sick or vacation leave shall be granted childbearing leave with full pay to the extent of their sick or vacation leave balance. Childbearing leave may also be covered as a Family and Medical Leave (APM 715). Family and Medical leave, if applicable, will normally run concurrently with approved childbearing leave.
- C. An academic appointee who does not accrue sick leave and who has served in their title or any faculty title for at least one year will receive full pay for up to 8 weeks during the period of time they are unable to assume their normal University obligations due to pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions.
- D. An academic appointee who does not accrue sick or vacation leave and who has served in their title for less than one year will receive full pay for approximately the period that would be accrued during the appointment in accordance with the accrual rates in APM 710-18. If additional time is needed, leave without pay will be granted for the necessary period. However, members of the Academic Senate will be covered by C) above, regardless of length of service.
- E. Academic appointees are eligible for Pay for Family Care and Bonding (PFCB) for up to eight weeks at 100% pay. To have PFCB applied, approved leaves must meet eligibility criteria and be formally designated under FMLA and/or CFRA. Represented employees may be eligible for PFCB under different terms; check the appropriate memorandum of understanding.
- F. Academic appointees are eligible for parental leave for purposes of carrying out childbearing and/or childrearing responsibilities. Whenever possible, parental leaves should be requested at least three months in advance. Parental leave without pay may be granted for up to one year to any academic appointee for the purpose of caring for a child. Normally, this unpaid leave, when combined with childbearing leave and/or Active Service Modified Duties, shall not exceed one year for each birth, ~~or~~ adoption, or foster care placement. A leave cannot be approved beyond the end date of the appointment.
- G. Requests for childbearing leave or parental leave must be submitted via the on-line leave module in AP Folio and are subject to approval by the Dean or Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel. A childbearing leave request should include a statement of the projected delivery date. The period of the leave may be adjusted as necessary after approval.
- H. Represented academic employees are eligible for childbearing leave to the extent allowed in the appropriate memorandum of understanding and applicable state and federal law.

VI-5
ACTIVE SERVICE- MODIFIED DUTIES
(Revised ~~2/22~~)

- A. Periods of Active Service-Modified Duties, with pay, shall be granted on request to any academic appointee who is responsible for 50 percent or more of the care of an infant for the period before and/or immediately following a birth, ~~or~~ adoption of a child, or placement of foster care child in order that the parent can prepare and/or care for the infant or child. Active Service-Modified Duties is not a leave, but rather a reduction of duties. Eligibility for Active Service- Modified Duties will normally extend from 3 months prior to 12 months following the birth or placement. The period of Active Service-Modified Duties must be concluded within 12 months following the birth or placement. During this period normal duties shall be reduced. For represented non-senate faculty, the accommodation may involve the assignment of additional resources. Duties to be assumed during this period shall be arranged between the Department Chairperson and the appointee.
- B. For appointees who do not accrue sick leave, periods of Active Service-Modified Duties at full pay shall be granted upon request.
- C. For appointees who accrue sick leave, periods of Active Service-Modified Duties shall be granted upon request. Sick leave shall be used in proportion to the reduced work-load. If sick leave credit has been exhausted, there shall be an appropriate reduction in pay.
- D. Requests for periods of Active Service-Modified Duties are submitted online via the Leave module in AP Folio. The following must be included in the text box of the request:
 - a. A statement by the academic appointee certifying that they have 50 percent or more of the responsibility for the care of an infant or young child.
 - b. Specific detail regarding the duties to be performed and/or the duties from which will be released during the period of ASMD-
- E. An individual other than the childbearing appointee will be eligible for up to 12 weeks (fiscal year appointee) or one quarter (academic year appointee) of Active Service-Modified Duties for each ~~birth or adoption~~ birth, adoption, or foster care placement. The childbearing appointee will be eligible for up to 36 weeks (fiscal year appointee) or three quarters (academic year appointee) of Active Service-Modified Duties, or childbearing leave plus Active Service-Modified Duties.

VI-18
SHORT WORK BREAK
(Revised ~~2/23~~)

An employee may be put on Short Work Break (SWB) in specific situations where there is a break in paid service to the University. SWB should only be used when there is an intent for return to paid service within a specified period of time. The return does not necessarily have to be to the same job. SWB must be used in compliance with other Academic Personnel Manual, Red Binder, and applicable MOU policies.

SWB does not constitute an offer of future employment. Appropriate processes for future appointments must be followed according to the appropriate Red Binder and contractual policies.

During SWB the employee may not perform any duties for the University. SWB may be used in the following situations:

Academic Student employees (GSRs, TA, Associate, Reader, Remedial Tutor)

The employee may be put on SWB status during summer or during academic quarters in which there is no appointment. SWB is limited to four consecutive months and may only be used when there is an intent to return to student employment at the end of the SWB.

Lecturers (pre-six or Continuing)

The employee may be put on SWB in between quarters of active employment. For pre-six lecturers, this only applies during a 1-, 2-, or 3-year appointment term. The employee may or may not be eligible for a benefits bridge. For 9/9 pre-six appointments, the UCPath record must be terminated at the end of the 1, 2 or 3 year commitment. The effective date of the Termination transaction should be based on the pay period end date of the last quarter worked in that commitment term. See Article 7A.A.4.

Research ~~series~~appointments

The employee, who is self-funded as a PI or Co-PI, may be put on SWB during periods of an approved appointment when a break in funding occurs and no work is being performed. Research SWB is limited to four months.

At the end of a SWB the employee must either return to paid employment or the job must be ended.

The Short Work Break matrix, <https://ap.ucsb.edu/resources.for.department.analysts/ucpath/> <https://ap.ucsb.edu/resources.for.department.analysts/ucpath/short.work.break.matrix.pdf>, provides additional guidance regarding the use of SWB.

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

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 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.

If an individual being considered for a search waiver is already a current UC employee represented by a collective bargaining unit, please consult with Academic Personnel and Labor Relations before proceeding with a request.

A. Non-Senate Titles

1. 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.
2. 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.

3. **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.
4. **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 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 due to 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.