

August 4, 2025

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

FROM: Omar Saleh, Acting Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

RE: Issuance of Red Binder Updates

A number of final revisions to the Red Binder, the campus Academic Personnel policy and procedure manual, have been posted on the Academic Personnel website, with an effective date of August 2025. A summary of changes is appended.

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

These changes include final versions of proposed revisions to policies pertaining to the faculty merit and advancement process as part of an ongoing effort to improve the efficiency and consistency of our existing review practices. Faculty and staff from all divisions, colleges, and schools submitted comments on the proposed revisions, and these comments led to further consideration and amendments. The finalized changes to policy, issued today, are the result of these discussions.

Cases being prepared in the 2025-26 case cycle will follow the revised Red Binder provisions.

Summary of key changes:

I-14, I-27, I-46, I-75, VII-1, VII-4, VII-5, VIII-1, VIII-10, IX-18	Compliance with Executive Orders and UCOP recommendations
I-26, III-20, III-25	Minor technical corrections and additional links to relevant forms
I-31, I-34	Limits self-assessment to a single document of no more than 6 pages
I-36	Clarifies standards for advancement and acceleration
I-41	Clarifies salary change at lateral advancement from overlapping step
I-44	Clarifies that retentions are submitted via AP Folio
I-50	Minor updates to research titles solicitation language
I-70	Adds information about honorific Professor of Graduate Division title
I-75	Updated language on DEI; provides more guidance on self-assessments, including new page limits
II-2	Clarifies when temporary assignments become permanent
III-8, III-9, III-12, III-14, III-16	Updated guidelines on merit/promotion reviews for research titles
VII-1	Updates to search waiver and pooled recruitment processes
VII-12	Removed; refer to APM 035 instead
VIII-1	Expands allowable usage of the award funds

I-14
SENATE FACULTY APPOINTMENTS
(Revised ~~4/24~~)

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

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

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

I. Types of Appointments

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

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

3. Without salary appointments.

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

4. Affiliated status.

A Senate faculty member who participates in instructional activities in a department or program in which they do not hold a salaried appointment may receive affiliated status in the host department or program.

- a. The faculty member has no voting rights in the host department or program.

- b. The host department or program is not required to vote on the affiliated faculty member's personnel case, but may be asked to provide a statement of departmental activities carried out under the affiliated status.
- c. An affiliated appointment with an indefinite end date may be terminated on the recommendation of a majority of the voting members of the department or program.

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

Senate faculty from another UC campus may be given an affiliated appointment at UCSB. A request from the host department indicating the begin and end date of the appointment as well as the reason for the affiliation should be submitted to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, via the Dean.

Affiliated appointments are not entered into the payroll system.

5. Other "Professor" titles

For appointments of Adjunct or Visiting Professors refer to Red Binder V-17 and II-28. For Emeriti appointments refer to Red Binder I-70.

II. Appointment Criteria

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

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

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

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

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

Furthermore, it is strongly recommended that the Chair discuss the proposed rank, step, salary level, and start-up expenses of a new appointment with the Dean prior to submitting a recommendation for the appointment. A justification for the proposed salary should be provided in the appointment recommendation based on factors such as the qualifications of the individual as they relate to the position and their record of academic accomplishment.

Market forces can be relevant in new hires in competitive recruitments, but the salary of a recent departmental hire should not be used to determine the salary of a subsequent hire.

III. Letter to Prospective Senate Faculty Appointees

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

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

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

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

IV. Intercampus Deadlines

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

V. Offer Deadlines

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

VI. Other Deadlines

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

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

VII. Approval Authority

<u>Rank/Step</u>	<u>Authority</u>
Assistant Professor/Assistant Teaching Professor II and III Including Acting titles	Dean
Assistant Professor/Assistant Teaching Professor IV	Associate Vice Chancellor
Associate Professor/Associate Teaching Professor I, II, and III	Chancellor
Professor/Teaching Professor	Chancellor
Affiliated Appointments (0% or without salary)	Associate Vice Chancellor

I-26
**SENATE FACULTY ADVANCEMENT: PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARD AND
CERTIFICATION STATEMENT**
(Revised ~~4/25~~)

Informational only: all safeguards are to be completed via AP Folio. Please note that a separate Safeguard statement must be submitted for each department in which the candidate holds a non-zero percent time appointment.

PRIOR TO DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW:

1. I was informed that I was to be reviewed for this personnel action and of the process as described in APM 160, 210-1 and 220, and was informed of relevant deadlines for submission of materials.
2. I had the opportunity to ask questions, supply information and evidence, and add material to my file in preparation for the review.
3. I was informed whether or not letters of evaluation were to be sought as part of this personnel action.
4. If letters were sought (e.g., for promotion, review for advancement to Professor Above Scale)
 - A. I had an opportunity to suggest names of evaluators; and
 - B. I had the opportunity to submit, in writing, names of persons who, for reasons set forth by me, might not provide objective evaluations.
5. If an Academic Senate ad hoc committee is to be appointed, I understand that I will be contacted by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel regarding my right to utilize either of the two options listed in Red Binder I-60.
6. I was informed whether or not there were confidential documents (i.e. external letters, minority opinion reports) in my department review file and of my right to review a summary of any such documents.

☐ Yes, there are confidential documents in my file (proceed to #7)

☐ No, there are not any confidential documents in my file (proceed to #8)
7. If yes to #6, I was provided the contents of the confidential documents (i.e. external letters, minority opinion reports) in my file by means of:

☐ A. Redacted copy

☐ C. Chose not to receive contents

☐ B. Oral Summary
8. I had the opportunity to inspect all non-confidential documents in the review file.

9. I had the opportunity to provide a written statement in response to or comment upon all materials in the file.

FOLLOWING THE DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS:

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

☐

A. Copy of Departmental Recommendation

☐

B. Oral Summary

☐

C. Chose not to be informed

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

I HAVE SUBMITTED THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL MATERIALS:

☐

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

☐

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

☐

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

☐

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

☐

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

REVIEWING AGENCY REPORTS

☐

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

☐

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

CERTIFICATIONS

- I certify that I have filed annual reports on outside professional activities in accord with APM 025 for each year of the review period for this advancement action.
- ~~Reports for the 2017-18 year and earlier may be submitted via AP Folio at <https://ap.ucsb.edu/>~~
- Reports ~~for the 2018-19 year and later~~ may be submitted via OATS at <https://ucsb.ucoats.org/>
- I certify that my bio-bibliography update (bio-bib), [if submitted](#), is complete, accurate, up to date, and prepared in accord with Red Binder I-27 Instructions for Completion of the Bio-Bibliography.

SIGNED _____ DATED _____

PRINT NAME _____ DEPARTMENT _____

I-27
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF THE
BIO-BIBLIOGRAPHY
(Revised ~~6/24~~)

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

Senate Faculty	August 31
Research series	December 31
Project Scientist/Specialist	January 31

Departments may establish earlier submission dates if they desire. Information that falls beyond the cut-off date will not be considered in the review. Departments may require that the bio-bib be updated and submitted on an annual basis to assist the chair in the annual review of all Senate faculty (APM 220- 80 b).

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

Final bio-bibs are generated by the online bio-bib system and are tailored to the specific series (e.g., Professor, Teaching Professor, Specialist, etc.). Thus, the Professor series bio-bib contains information on Research/Creative Activity, Teaching/Mentoring, and Service. The Teaching Professor bio-bib contains information on Teaching/Mentoring, Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity, and Service.

Short Curriculum Vitae

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

Research and Creative Activity

Appointees to the Teaching Professor series will include research/creative activity in the section titled: *Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity*.

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

- Published work: work that has appeared in final, published format
- Work in press: work that has been formally accepted, completed, and is in the process of being published. In-Press work is counted toward advancement and evidence must be supplied documenting the In-Press status
- Work submitted: work that has been submitted but not yet accepted. If items are listed in this section, copies are required to be included in the case. It is not usually counted for the advancement, but it is used as evidence of continuing scholarly productivity.
- Work in progress: work that has not been completed and is available for review. Such work is not counted for the advancement, but it can be used as evidence of continuing research activity. Departmental practice will dictate if work in progress is included in the case.

When the final version of the bio-bib is generated for use in the review process, a line will be automatically inserted separating all new items from those which in one form or another were part of the review file underlying the last successful advancement and should be clearly identified with an explicit indication of their subsequent change in status (e.g., from Work Submitted to In Press; from In Press to Published; change in title).

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

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

Submission options:

1. Provide a separate link to each individual publication or creative work. Links may be to a locally maintained site or to an online publication site. The link must go directly to the specific item and must allow access to the full publication.
2. Provide a single link at the top of the Research and Creative Activities section of the bio-bib. A folder may be created that contains all publications and creative work. If this method is used, individual files within the folder must be labeled using the same formatting as the bio-bib, including the item number and title (e.g. 2002-1: "The Beginning of Time")

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

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

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

Teaching and Mentoring (For Senate Faculty only)

The bio-bib must contain an itemized list of workload since the last successful review, which will automatically be placed in chronological order (by quarter). This list should include: quarter and academic year, course number, course title, course format, unit value, enrollment, share of teaching assignment, and indicate if evaluations are available.

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

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

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

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

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

University and Public Service

The bio-bib must include an itemized list of various activities by categories or level (e.g., department, college, campus, system-wide, public) that have occurred since the last successful review. Mentoring and advising of faculty may be listed as University service.

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

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

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

I-31
DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR
DEAN'S AUTHORITY MERITS
(Revised ~~10/24~~)

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" -been accounted for?
- ☐ Are all items, including "In Press" and "Submitted" (as applicable), 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 and/or ~~other accomplishments and activity~~ service (optional).**

- ☐ If a self-assessment was submitted, is it included in the case? Self-statements may address research, teaching, professional accomplishments, or service, ~~or contributions to advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion~~ with significant contributions to inclusive excellence addressed within the relevant area of review.
- ☐ Is the self-assessment limited to 6 pages in length (12-point font, 1-inch margins)?

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?

I-34
DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR
EXPANDED REVIEW CASES
(Revised ~~10/24~~)

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" been accounted for?
- ☐ Are all items, including "In Press" and "Submitted" (as applicable) 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 and/or other accomplishments and activity service (optional).**

- ☐ If a self-assessment was submitted, is it included in the case? Self-statements may address research, teaching, professional accomplishments, or service, ~~or contributions to advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion~~ with significant contributions to inclusive excellence addressed within the relevant area of review.
- ☐ Is the self-assessment limited to 6 pages in length (12-point font, 1-inch margins)?
- ☐ If this is a career review, is the career summary self-assessment limited to 4 pages in length (12-point font, 1-inch margins)?

- 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 ~~10/24~~)

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, **specific to the candidate’s rank/step**, and apply ~~them~~ **these standards** 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 **for that rank/step**. 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 **calibrated to the rank/step of the candidate**, prior to addressing any recommendation for acceleration. Because ongoing excellence is the expectation for merit advancements, a ~~detailed~~ **clear** 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 **at that level**. **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).

Consistent with the associated movement up the ladder, a 1-step acceleration can be understood to indicate that the faculty member has not only exceeded the department/campus/disciplinary standards of excellence expected for a normative advancement, but that the level of achievement is broadly equivalent to the accomplishments of 2 full review periods, recognizing that there may be limited opportunities in some areas of review in a given time

period. As the size of the acceleration increases, increasingly meritorious achievements are expected that distinguish the record (e.g. a 2-step acceleration broadly connotes the equivalent of 3 review periods of accomplishments). These achievements must be contextualized and justified. –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 adjusted to the candidate's rank/step. The following are examples of possible evidence of superior performance:-

- 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, significant new awards or other such evidence of extraordinary peer recognition for the impact of past creative work or teaching.
- Extraordinary achievements and activities ~~in DEI~~ advancing inclusive excellence, 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.

IV. No Change

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-41
PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR OR TEACHING PROFESSOR
(Revised ~~4/24~~)

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

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

Promotion advancements may be rewarded in increments of steps and one-half step of off scale as described in Red Binder I-36, Merits Advancements. Promotion from an overlapping step may be a lateral change in rank ~~without~~ ~~an~~ with the associated \$100 increase ~~in salary on the ladder~~, if the promotion occurs prior to the normative time at rank or step. See Red Binder I-37.

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

I-44
RETENTIONS
(Revised ~~6/24~~)

Although not automatic, it is campus practice to match an active outside offer made by an equivalent or higher quality institution, contingent upon the usual review process. Request for salary increases based on retention will be awarded through increase in off-scale salary rather than an increase in rank or step. A retention may, however be coupled with a merit or promotion recommendation that is based on the individual's accomplishments and record. Retention requests are processed through the regular personnel review system, including review by the Dean and CAP, with final approval resting with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel or the Chancellor (RB I-33 for approval authority). Retention cases that involve an increase in off-scale salary only may be processed at any time and are not subject to the standard case submission deadlines. Cases coupled with a merit or promotion will be subject to the standard deadlines unless an exception is requested and approved by the Associate Vice Chancellor. Salary increases associated with retentions will be effective July 1. Note that recommendations related to individuals being recruited by other UC campuses must abide by APM limitations on intercampus recruitment (APM 510).

Required documents, [to be submitted via the merit/promotion case module in AP Folio](#):

Copy of external offer. A formal offer is preferable, however it is recognized that other institutions, particularly in industry or foreign countries may recruit without providing a "formal" offer at a time that would allow UC to try to retain the individual. If it is not possible to provide a copy of a formal offer, the department should clarify and explain the information provided in the informal offer, specifically whether a formal offer has been or is about to be made and who is making the offer.

Updated CV or bio-bibliography. While this is not mandatory, and may not be possible to submit in highly time-sensitive retentions, it is preferable to include an updated CV or bio-bib with the request. This allows reviewing agencies to see the level of productivity and activity up to the current date and can provide additional support to the department's request to retain the individual.

While a safeguard statement is not required for retentions (increase in off-scale only), the department is still required to provide the candidate with access to the departmental letter, and copies of reviewing agency reports may be requested by the candidate at the end of the review.

Departmental letter of recommendation. A departmental vote is required for any salary action, including an increase in off-scale in response to an outside offer. The departmental letter should provide information about the quality of the offer including the standing of the institution or department within the institution making the offer. If the salary being offered is on a different basis (i.e. fiscal year vs. academic year) or in foreign currency, the department should provide justification for its recommended "match" in salary. Fiscal year salaries are converted to Academic year salaries using a factor of 1.16.

I-46
GUIDELINES FOR LETTERS OF EVALUATION
(Revised ~~6/24~~)

I. Solicited letters

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

II. Unsolicited letters

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

III. Letters for Assistant Professor/Assistant Teaching Professor Appointments and Restricted letters

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

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

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

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

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

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

At least half of the letters submitted with the case should come from references chosen by the Chair in consultation with the department but independent of feedback from the candidate and without consulting the candidate's list. The letters solicited, whether selected from the department's recommendations or the candidate's recommendations, should be non-conflicted. Although other relationships may also constitute a conflict, some examples include:

advisors/mentors at any level; substantive collaboration in the last 4 years including co-authorship, grant collaboration, co-teaching, or co-editorial work on publications; student/advisee; close personal or family relationship; direct financial relationship; current UCSB employment (except as appropriate in Teaching Professor cases). On the other hand, non-conflicted relationships might include members of the candidate's graduate school, service as department colleagues at a previous institution, serving together on an editorial board or committee. A minimum of six analytic letters is required. Typically, more than six letters will have to be solicited in order to achieve this minimum.

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

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

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

V. List of evaluators

The Chair must submit a coded list of all persons from whom an extramural letter was solicited (Red Binder I-48). The list must indicate which names were submitted by the candidate and which were submitted by the department. In the case where a suggested name overlaps, the letter is considered to be department-suggested. In addition, the list must contain the following information for individuals who provide letters: name, position/title, institution, area of expertise, past collaborative relationship with the candidate, and, in rare cases, any past reviews for which the letter writer also contributed a letter (which must be justified in the coded list). Similar information must be provided for any unsolicited letters included in the file. Since it is expected to contain contextual information for reviewing agencies, this list should be prepared by the department review committee, Chair, etc., rather than by departmental staff. Special attention should be given to describing the qualifications and stature of the extramural referees. For individuals who either did not respond to the initial request to write or declined to write, only their name and home institution need be included on the list, with an explanation for the declination if provided. The list

should be accompanied by a master copy of the letter requesting evaluation, a list of the materials sent to the letter writers, and a copy of all items that were sent to the referees (e.g., C.V., bio-bibliography, reprints, manuscripts, and so forth) if they are not already included with the case of one-of-a-kind materials. The manner in which referees were selected should be described (e.g., “by departmental ad hoc committee”, “by Chair in consultation with three senior colleagues”, and so forth). The Chair should ensure that individuals who have provided confidential letters of evaluation are not identified (e.g., name, title, identifying leadership roles, identifying background or expertise, institution, etc.) in the departmental letter, except by means of a coded list uploaded appropriately with the case.

VI. Additional Information

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

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

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

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

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

I-50
WORDING FOR SOLICITATION LETTERS BY PROPOSED ACTION
(Revised ~~10/24~~)

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 ~~academic appointees~~ ~~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 by 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 ~~academic appointees~~ ~~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.

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 academic appointeesfaculty 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.

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.

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 academic appointeesfaculty 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.

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 ~~academic appointees~~ ~~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

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.

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.

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.

I-70
PROCEDURE FOR RECALL OF SENATE FACULTY
(Revised ~~4/25~~)

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

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

I. Teaching appointments

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

II. Research appointments

A retired Senate Faculty member who is recalled to serve in an extramurally funded research capacity may be appointed as a Research Professor. These are normally year-to-year appointments. Appointments may also be made for shorter periods of time. The terms and conditions of employment for a faculty member who is recalled for research parallel those of a faculty member who is recalled to teach. In the event that a Senate Faculty member is recalled both to teach and for extramurally funded research in the same department for the same time period, the Research Professor title will be used. Requests for appointment as Research Professor may be sent directly from the employing unit to Academic Personnel. Paid appointments as Research Professor are made on an 11/12 rate. ~~Without Salary Research Professor appointments will no longer be approved unless specifically required by a funding agency or similar.~~

The appropriate annual rate at the time of retirement, range adjusted forward, converted to an 11/12 basis (multiply the current 9/12 rate x 1.16). Appointments will be entered into UCPATH using the Recall Faculty title.

Without Salary Research Professor appointments will no longer be approved unless specifically required by a funding agency or similar. The honorary title of Professor of the Graduate Division may be appropriate in some situations. Please see [this document](#) for additional information on eligibility and appointment procedures.

III. Benefits

Starting July 1, 2025, retirees in recall appointments who meet eligibility criteria for medical benefits upon re-employment will have their UC retiree medical plan suspended, and will be offered [mid-level faculty/staff benefits coverage](#). This applies to all recalled academic appointments, including unpaid (0% time) appointments.

IV. Administrative appointments

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

V. Approval authority

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

APPOINTMENT AND ADVANCEMENT(Revised ~~10/24~~)

This compilation is intended as an aid for the use of Departmental Chairs, reviewing agencies, and Senate faculty. 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

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.

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 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 a self-assessment, award letters and other professional items. *If an optional self-assessment is submitted, it should comprise a single document that may address any or all areas of review. This document may not exceed 6 single spaced pages total (12 point font, 1-inch margins), and should provide context not evident elsewhere in the dossier. In career review cases, a separate career summary of no more than 4 pages total may additionally be provided.*
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, prestigiousness 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~~ ~~socioeconomically or academically underserved backgrounds~~, 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 equity and inclusion** that exceed expectations in any of the three pillars of review (research/creative ~~activity~~ work [Professor series], teaching/mentoring, ~~&~~ **University and public service, professional and/or scholarly activity** [Teaching Professor series]), 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.

APM 210 specifies that "*superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement*" is an "*indispensable qualification*" for appointment, advancement, and promotion. Recognition of contributions pertaining to equity and inclusion assumes and requires that a faculty member's accomplishments meet that standard. At the same time, not all areas of scholarly activity have direct relevance to equity and inclusion principles, and work uninflected by these values is not in any way at a disadvantage in the review process.

Research and Creative Work: Publishing scholarship that reports on the context of **DEI equity and inclusion** issues or research on ~~minoritized~~ **socioeconomically or academically underserved** communities in and of itself, would typically fall *within* expected activities for research/creative activity. Examples of research or professional ~~service~~ **activity** 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~~ **students from socioeconomically or academically underserved backgrounds**; 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~~ **socioeconomically or academically underserved backgrounds**; and/or helps to correct limitations in general knowledge that lead to innovation.

Teaching and Mentoring: Equity and inclusion are principles that should be applied across all teaching activities, but there is potential to recognize special efforts, and particularly significant achievement, in the pursuit of these goals. ~~Similarly~~ **Thus**, teaching that fosters equity and inclusion and that incorporates strategies ~~for the educational advancement of students from various underrepresented groups~~ **tailored to varied learning styles** 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 students from all learning backgrounds**; ~~or~~ other program-building initiatives in a department that improve persistence in the field among students from **socioeconomically or academically underserved backgrounds**; the development of evidence-based practices that produce more equitable **graduate admissions practices**; significant engagement in ~~culturally responsive mentoring at all levels~~ **mentoring that is attentive to the needs of each individual**.

University and Public Service: In terms of service, participating on a committee that addresses **DEI equity and inclusion**, or on a number of committees in this domain, falls *within* expected activities. **Serving in an equity role** (e.g., departmental equity committee) **is not significant in and of itself**. Service that might surpass normative expectations includes, but is not limited to: efforts that result in structural or transformative improvements for ~~marginalized groups~~ **socioeconomically or academically underserved communities**; 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~~ **socioeconomically or academically underserved communities**. In order to recognize this work, campus reviewing agencies need to know what exactly a faculty member accomplished, what innovations they implemented, and any special challenges confronted.

Because equity and inclusion efforts can often be invisible or go unrecognized, faculty may choose to highlight significant equity and inclusion activities ~~Most often, DEI equity and inclusion activities are highlighted in a Diversity Statement submitted by the faculty, as these efforts may otherwise go unrecognized in their optional self-assessment.~~ Such a self-assessment, if submitted, 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 ~~faced by socioeconomically or academically underserved communities,~~ in the context of the ~~DEI equity/inclusion-based activity, faced by minoritized individuals, including those whose identities intersect multiple minoritized groups.~~
- Discussion of the ~~underrepresentation and/or marginalization~~ lack of inclusion 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.

II-2 GUIDELINES FOR PRE-SIX REAPPOINTMENT (Revised ~~2/23~~)

I. Appointments & Reappointments

The term “initial appointment” refers to the first appointment of a Unit 18 faculty member in a department, program, or unit at UCSB. The initial appointment of a pre-six Unit 18 faculty shall cover a period of one (1) academic year of either continuous or intermittent service in the same department, program, or unit. The initial appointment may not exceed one (1) academic year.

The term “reappointment” refers to the subsequent appointment following an initial appointment of currently or previously appointed Unit 18 faculty in the same department, program, or unit at UCSB. The first reappointment of a pre-six Unit 18 faculty shall cover a period of two (2) academic years of either continuous or intermittent service in the same department, program, or unit. The second and all subsequent reappointments of a pre-six Unit 18 faculty shall cover a period of three (3) academic years of either continuous or intermittent service in the same department, program, or unit. The final pre-six reappointment may not extend beyond the 18th quarter, which may result in an appointment duration of less than three (3) years. During a two- or three-year reappointment, the minimum average academic year percentage shall be the same between year one of that appointment and all subsequent years of that same appointment, although the term-by-term percentage may vary. See Article 7A.D.5.

To summarize, the typical appointment/reappointment structure for Unit 18 appointee appointed to teach in every quarter during the academic year will be an initial 1-year appointment, followed by a 2-year appointment, followed by a 3-year appointment, then an Excellence Review. Individuals who do not teach every term, will continue to receive 3-year appointments until the time of the Excellence Review or other exception listed in Article 7A.E.4.

Exceptions to the two- or three-year reappointment term length and appointment percent time are discussed in Article 7A.E.4. and 7A.J.6.b:

The University may offer a reappointment for a term of less than two or three years in the same department, when the appointment is for any of the following reasons and the Unit 18 faculty member will be provided with a written explanation:

1. temporary replacement to teach courses that fulfill temporary academic need in lieu of an instructor who is on leave, sabbatical, withdraws from instruction, separated, or is otherwise unavailable;
2. the appointment or reappointment may not extend beyond the 18th quarter.

The decision not to reappoint or to reappoint at a lower overall appointment percentage shall be based on one or more of the following:

1. lack of work (unavailability of a course assignment for which the Unit 18 faculty is qualified, as determined by the University);
2. programmatic need or change (consistent with Article 7A) that results in a lack of work as defined in (1) above;
3. budgetary considerations (subject to Article 7A, Section K.4) that results in a lack of work as defined in (1) above;
4. assignment of course(s) to Senate Faculty that were previously taught by a Pre-Six Unit 18 faculty member that results in a lack of work as defined in (1) above;
5. assignment of course(s) to a graduate academic student employee or postdoctoral scholar that were previously taught by a Pre-Six Unit 18 faculty member that results in a lack of work as defined in (1) above;
6. assignment of course(s) to a Pre-Six Unit 18 faculty member on a time-limited or programmatic basis under Article 7A, Section E - Special Considerations;
7. the University determined at its sole discretion that another current Unit 18 faculty member is more qualified to teach the course(s) that results in a lack of work as defined in (1) above.

II. Evaluation and Reappointment Process

Pre-six appointees on an initial one-year appointment will undergo an assessment prior to reappointment. The outcome of the assessment will determine whether an individual demonstrated teaching competence. See RB II-3.

Appointees on a 2- or 3-year reappointment will undergo a Pre-Six Academic Review in the last year of a 2- or 3-year reappointment, barring an aforementioned exception. The outcome of the review will determine whether an individual demonstrated teaching effectiveness. See RB II-4.

Pre-six Unit 18 faculty shall be provided salary increases upon reappointment in accordance with the Unit 18 MOU.

III. Supplemental Notices

When the specific courses and other assigned duties are not fully known at the time the appointment/reappointment letter is issued, a supplemental notice will be issued, including specific course assignments, no later than 30 days prior to the start of the service period.

IV. Supplemental Assignments

Pre-six Unit 18 appointees appointed at less than 100% and/or for less than the full academic year may subsequently be offered additional courses/other assigned duties (i.e., supplemental assignments).

When a supplemental assignment is made for a third consecutive year, the supplemental appointment percentage will be added to the base annual appointment for the subsequent year (remainder of the current appointment term) and/or reappointment term. See RB II-12 for procedural details.

III-8
TYPES OF REVIEW
(Revised -)

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. 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. Criteria and principles for advancement are described below.

The Office of Academic Personnel annually publishes promotion and merit eligibility lists for each department. All merits and promotions will be effective July 1.

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.

Please see Red Binder III-9 Checklist for Research Reviews.

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.

VIII. **No Change**

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 academic appointee remains eligible for review each year until advancement in rank, step, or off-scale occurs.

Professional Research Series only:

~~IX.~~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 ~~10/24~~)

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 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.**

See Red Binder I-27 for further details.

- ☐ Have items previously listed as "In Press" been accounted for?
- ☐ Are all items, including "In Press" and "Submitted" (as applicable) properly documented?
- ☐ Is the current review period and cumulative record accounted for appropriately in Part I. Research and Creative Activity, per RB I-27?
- ☐ 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)?
- ☐ 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-aAssessment of research, and/or professional accomplishments, and/or service~~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 accomplishments, ~~activity~~, or service, ~~or contributions to advancing diversity, equity and inclusion~~ with significant contributions to inclusive excellence addressed within the relevant area of review.

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 ~~10/24~~)

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 (Step 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. 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, 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 Co-PI. A without salary appointment in this series is not appropriate if the individual holds a primary affiliation with and is funded by another academic institution or outside agency.
- C. Salaries are subject to range adjustment.
- D. Each source which provides compensation for service in this series must permit research.
- E. Off-scale salaries are allowed within the same limits and policies as ladder faculty off-scale salaries. (Red Binder I-8-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. [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 wording from Red Binder I-50 inserted as appropriate. Also, see Red Binder I-46 Guidelines For Letters of Evaluation and Red Binder I-51 Materials To External Reviewers.](#)

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 wording from Red-Binder I-50 inserted as appropriate. Also, see Red-Binder I-51 Materials To External Reviewers.~~

VII. Approval Authority

Action

All actions

Authority

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

III-14
PROJECT SCIENTIST SERIES
(Revised ~~10/24~~)

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, 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 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. [At least half of the letters submitted with the case should come from references chosen by the Department or Unit independent of the candidate.](#) 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. [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 wording from Red Binder I-50 inserted as appropriate. Also, see Red Binder I-46 Guidelines For Letters of Evaluation and Red Binder I-51 Materials To External 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 wording from Red Binder I-50 inserted as appropriate. Also, see Red Binder I-51 Materials To External Reviewers.~~

VII. Approval Authority

Action

All actions

Authority

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

III-16
SPECIALIST SERIES
(Revised ~~10/24~~)

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.

In judging a candidate for appointment or promotion to a position in this series, the following criteria are general guidelines:

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.
- B. Off-scale salaries are allowed within the same limits and policies as ladder faculty off-scale salaries. (Red Binder I-8-I)
- 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 Step I. Normal advancement will occur after one year at Step II for promotion to Assistant Specialist.

Advancement: Merit and Promotion

Advancement cases are to be submitted via AP Folio and using the checklist of documents to be submitted by the chair for research reviews (Red Binder III-9). All advancement actions are based on the individual's achievements. Normal advancement will occur after two years at step at the Assistant and Associate level and after three years at the Full Specialist level, steps I-IX, and after four years at step IX and within Above Scale. Any advancement requested prior to that time will be considered an acceleration and must be

justified as such (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 wording from Red Binder I-50 inserted as appropriate. Also, see [Red Binder 1-46 Guidelines For Letters of Evaluation](#) and Red Binder I-51 Materials To External Reviewers.

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-20
RESEARCH ASSOCIATE AND RESEARCH FELLOW
(Revised 4/25)

I. Definition

Research Associates and Research Fellows are non-salaried (without salary) appointments for scholars of distinction and visiting fellows whose main affiliation is elsewhere but who maintain a recognizable research affiliation with UCSB. Research Associates and Research Fellows may serve as Co-PI by exception. Please consult the Office of Research regarding the Co-PI exception process. See APM 355 for System Wide policy on Non-Salary Research Positions.

II. Appointment Criteria

Appointments may be made as:

Research Associate: Job code CWR 022

Research Fellow: Job code CWR 021

Appointees as Research Associate or Research Fellow must possess a Ph.D. or equivalent training in the field. [Equivalent training in the field \(in lieu of a Ph.D.\) must be justified with the appointment request.](#)

In addition:

- A. Appointees as Research Associate must have established a record of independent research.
- B. Appointees as Research Fellow need not have had experience as an independent researcher aside from the research done for the doctoral degree. Research Fellows will normally be visiting fellows from recognized fellowship programs or as traveling fellows from other universities.

In limited circumstances, an individual who is establishing a research relationship with UCSB but is not yet funded, and for whom UCSB is the main affiliate, may be appointed as Research Associate or Research Fellow.

The Research Associate title may also be used for Senate faculty who have resigned but will continue to have grant funding at UCSB for a short period of time.

III. Terms of Appointment

Appointments and reappointments to these titles are for specified terms, not to exceed three years per appointment. There is no limit on the total length of appointment in the series.

IV. Appointment Procedure

Appointments are processed by submitting the [Contingent Workers Appointment Form](#), a [Patent Acknowledgement Form](#), and an up to date [UCSB Biography Form](#) to the Academic Personnel office. Departments should also ensure the candidate has submitted the [Misconduct Disclosure Form](#) prior to appointment. All appointments are to be entered into UCPath by the department.

V. Reappointment Procedure

Reappointments are processed by submitting the [Contingent Workers Appointment Form](#) and an up to date UCSB Biography Form to the Academic Personnel office. All reappointments are to be entered into UCPath by the department.

VI. Approval authority

All actions Department Chair or Director with post-audit by Academic Personnel

III-25
WITHOUT SALARY VISITORS
(Revised 4/25)

I. Definition

A person on temporary leave from a non-UC academic appointment, other employment, or student enrollment at a non-UC institution or entity may be appointed as a Without Salary Visitor. Appointees to this title participate in short-term educational, research, or other academic projects under the supervision of an academic appointee.

See APM 430 for System Wide policy on Visiting Scholars and Other Visitors.

II. Appointment Criteria

A. Appointments may be made as:

Visiting Scholar: Job Code CWR015

Visitor (Graduate Student): Job Code CWR003

Visitor (Undergraduate): Job Code CWR016

B. A Visiting Scholar must possess an appropriate terminal degree (e.g., Ph.D.) or equivalent experience. [Equivalent experience \(in lieu of a Ph.D.\) must be justified with the appointment request.](#) A visitor (Graduate Student) and Visitor (Undergraduate) must be enrolled in a degree granting program or equivalent at a non-UC institution of higher education.

C. The appointment must serve an academic purpose for the unit in which the individual is appointed.

III. Terms of appointment

A. Appointments may be made for short periods not to exceed one year (12 months), and more typically, for six months or less, and are self-terminating. Because appointments are intended to be short-term, reappointments should be rare.

B. Service as a Visitor does not constitute employment status or student status at the University. Visitors are bound by all rules and policies of the University of California.

IV. Compensation

A. Appointees in these series are not eligible for compensation via the payroll system.

B. Visitors must be self-supporting, and should be asked to provide evidence, appropriate to the duration of the appointment, of adequate support from external sources.

C. Visitors are ineligible for salary or wages, but they may be eligible for reimbursement of expenses as outlined in the Business and Finance Bulletin G-28 or for supplementary support in the form of a cost of living allowance

V. Appointment Procedure

Appointments are processed by submitting a [Contingent Workers Appointment Form](#), a [Patent Acknowledgement Form](#), and an up to date [UCSB Biography Form](#) to the Academic Personnel office. Departments should also ensure the candidate has submitted the [Misconduct Disclosure Form](#) prior to appointment. All appointments are to be entered into UCPath by the department.

VI. Approval authority

Action

All Actions

Authority

Department Chair or Director with post-audit by Academic Personnel

VII-1 POLICIES ON OPEN RECRUITMENT FOR ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS (Revised ~~4/25~~)

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 actions~~, 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>~~ Anti-Discrimination policy is available at: <https://policy.ucop.edu/doc/1001004/Anti-Discrimination>

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 Equal Opportunity and Policy Compliance office 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 must be terminated by September 30 annually.~~ New advertisements may begin after ~~the close of the previous pooled search October 1 of each year.~~ 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 state and federal data reporting requirements.

II. Exemptions from Open Recruitment Policies

- A. Appointment to temporary academic administrator positions by individuals already holding an academic appointment
- B. Recall appointments
- C. 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.
- D. 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.
- E. Positions requiring student status, e.g. teaching assistant, graduate student researchers or trainee status, e.g. Postdoctoral Scholars.
- F. 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.
- G. 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 and may not extend beyond a few months’ time.

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 & Policy Compliance 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 ~~should~~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 & Policy Compliance~~, the Council on Planning and Budget, and the Committee on Academic Personnel prior to making a final decision. ~~The Director of Equal Opportunity & Policy Compliance 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. In certain cases, 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 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.

VII-4
**PROCEDURES FOR RECRUITMENT OF
SENATE FACULTY AND OTHER PERMANENT ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS**
(Revised ~~4/25~~)

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

The following steps are to be taken by the Department:

A. Recruiting

1. Form a search committee.
2. Determines the length of the recruitment period.
3. In consultation with appropriate control points, determines the expected salary or budgeted range that the department reasonably expects to pay – see Guidelines for the Application of SB 1162 and AB 168 on AP website.
4. Determines the publications or recruitment sources to be used. Advertising through the JobElephant service is highly recommended to assure Labor Certification requirements are met should the eventual hire be a non-US citizen. If JobElephant is not used, the department should consult with the Office of International Students and Scholars at ois@sa.ucsb.edu to assure current Labor Certification requirements are met.
5. Sets a realistic deadline for applications so that campus Equal Opportunity ~~& Affirmative Action~~ policy and procedures can be carried out without undue pressures. The advertising ~~and outreach~~ period should be long enough to provide the opportunity to attract a reasonable number of applicants ~~and a diverse pool~~. Permanent positions must be advertised for at least 30 days.
6. Follows established departmental and campus procedures and review criteria for the application process.
7. Completes the Recruitment Plan in UC Recruit. The Recruitment Plan contains all relevant information on how the position will be advertised, how the applicants will be evaluated, and the efforts that will be made to ensure equal employment opportunity and to reach a ~~diverse broad~~ applicant pool ~~in which women and minorities are represented~~.
8. Submits the Recruitment Plan in UC Recruit for review and approval by the Department Chair, the Equal Opportunity and Policy Compliance office, the Dean, and Academic Personnel.
9. Publishes the recruitment in UC Recruit after the Recruitment Plan is approved.
10. Places any additional approved advertisements for the position, including required EO/~~AA~~ and SB 1162 language, as specified in Red Binder VII-7. Retains all copies of advertisements as they appear in publications and on-line, including the duration of advertisements.
11. Performs all other good faith recruitment efforts ~~in accordance with state and federal equal opportunity and non-discrimination guidelines to increase the diversity of the pool~~.

B. Processing Applications and Interviewing

1. After the close date, reviews the quality of application materials. When an applicant pool does not contain sufficiently qualified people to fill a vacancy, it may become necessary to extend or reopen a search. The department is responsible for repeating the requisite steps as necessary.
2. Consults with the Dean's office to schedule the Dean review of the applicants. College requirements may vary.
3. Generates the Short List Report in UC Recruit and submits for approval in UC Recruit by the Department Chair, Equal Opportunity and Policy Compliance, and the Dean.
4. Upon receiving the approval of the Short List Report, contacts prospective candidates and invites them to campus for an interview. Additionally, ensures that the proposed interview schedule is appropriate and that it is applied uniformly to all candidates. Departments may reimburse candidates for interview travel and related expenses in accord with IRS regulations and University travel policies. Under exceptional circumstances, if funding is available, a candidate who has accepted an offer may be reimbursed for a single house hunting trip in accord with IRS regulations and University travel policies.

C. Search Report and Hiring Proposal

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

VII-5
**PROCEDURES FOR RECRUITMENT OF
TEMPORARY ACADEMIC POSITIONS**
(Revised ~~4/25~~)

The following steps are to be taken by the Department:

A. Recruiting

1. Form a search committee, if appropriate. If a committee is formed, it must include one academic employee designated as the departmental equity/~~diversity~~ advisor.
2. Determines the length of the recruitment period.
3. Determines the publications or ~~recruitment~~ advertising sources to be used.
4. In consultation with the appropriate control point, establishes the expected salary or budgeted range that the department reasonably expects to pay – see Guidelines for the Application of SB 1162 and AB 168 on AP website.
5. Sets a realistic deadline for receiving applications so that campus Equal Opportunity ~~& Affirmative Action~~ policy, and procedures may be carried out without undue pressures. The advertising period should be long enough to provide the opportunity to attract a reasonable number of applicants ~~and a diverse pool~~. In no case may a recruitment run less than two weeks.
6. Follows established departmental and campus procedures and review criteria for the application process.
7. Completes the ~~Recruitment Plan~~ in UC Recruit. The Recruitment Plan contains all relevant information on how the position will be advertised, how the applicants will be evaluated, ~~and~~ the efforts that will be made to ensure equal employment opportunity, and to reach a ~~diverse broad~~ applicant pool ~~in which women and minorities are represented~~.
8. Publishes the recruitment in UC Recruit after the Recruitment Plan is approved.
9. Places any additional approved advertisements for the position, including required EO/~~AA~~ and SB 1162 language, as specified in Red Binder VII-7. Retains all copies of advertisements as they appear in publications and online, including duration of advertisements.
10. Performs all other good faith recruitment efforts ~~to~~ ~~in accordance with state and federal equal opportunity and non-discrimination guidelines~~ ~~increase the diversity of the pool~~.

B. Processing Applications and Interviewing

1. When an applicant pool does not contain sufficiently qualified people to fill a vacancy, it may become necessary to extend or reopen a search. The department is responsible for repeating the requisite steps as necessary.
2. Updates the applicant's status in UC Recruit.
3. Contacts prospective candidates and invites them to campus for an interview. Additionally, ensures that the proposed interview schedule is appropriate and that it is applied uniformly to all candidates.

Departments may reimburse candidates for interview travel and related expenses in accord with IRS regulations and University travel policies. Under exceptional circumstances, if funding is available, a candidate who has accepted an offer may be reimbursed for a single house hunting trip in accord with IRS regulations and University travel policies.

C. Equal Opportunity Hiring Proposal

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

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
NONDISCRIMINATION AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY
REGARDING ACADEMIC AND STAFF EMPLOYMENT**

*University of California
Office of the President*

July 1, 2008

It is the policy of the University not to engage in discrimination against or harassment of any person employed or seeking employment with the University of California on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity, pregnancy,¹ physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer related or genetic characteristics), ancestry, marital status, age, sexual orientation, citizenship, or service in the uniformed services (as defined by the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994).² This policy applies to all employment practices, including recruitment, selection, promotion, transfer, merit increase, salary, training and development, demotion, and separation. This policy is intended to be consistent with the provisions of applicable State and Federal laws and University policies.

University policy also prohibits retaliation against any employee or person seeking employment for bringing a complaint of discrimination or harassment pursuant to this policy. This policy also prohibits retaliation against a person who assists someone with a complaint of discrimination or harassment, or participates in any manner in an investigation or resolution of a complaint of discrimination or harassment. Retaliation includes threats, intimidation, reprisals, and/or adverse actions related to employment.

In addition, it is the policy of the University to undertake affirmative action, consistent with its obligations as a Federal contractor, for minorities and women, for persons with disabilities, and for covered veterans.³ The University commits itself to apply every good faith effort to achieve prompt and full utilization of minorities and women in all segments of its workforce where deficiencies exist. These efforts conform to all current legal and regulatory requirements, and are consistent with University standards of quality and excellence.

In conformance with Federal regulations, written affirmative action plans shall be prepared and maintained by each campus of the University, by the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, by the Office of the President, and by the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources. Such plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Office of the President and the Office of the General Counsel before they are officially promulgated.

This policy supersedes the University of California Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policy Regarding Academic and Staff Employment, dated January 1, 2004.

¹ Pregnancy includes pregnancy, childbirth, and medical conditions related to the pregnancy or childbirth.

² Service in the uniformed services includes membership, application for membership, performance of service, application for service, or obligation for service in the uniformed services.

³ Covered veterans includes veterans with disabilities, recently separated veterans, Vietnam era veterans, veterans who served on active duty in the U.S. Military, Ground, Naval or Air Service during a war or in a campaign or expedition for which a campaign badge has been authorized, or Armed Forces service medal veterans.

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

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

1. FACULTY CAREER DEVELOPMENT AWARD (FCDA)

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

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

2. REGENTS' JUNIOR FACULTY FELLOWSHIP

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

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

3. REGENTS' HUMANITIES FACULTY FELLOWSHIP

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VIII-3
HELLMAN FELLOWS PROGRAM
(Revised ~~6/24~~)

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

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

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

Nature of Support: Awards may be used for such research-related expenses as research assistants, equipment, travel, [graduate student fellowships](#), or summer salary up to one ninth. All funds need not be spent in one year, but recipients must exhaust their funding by the end of the summer (9/30) in the academic year they come under tenure review. All expenditures must relate to the project proposed in the Hellman application.

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

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

VIII-10
PRESIDENT'S POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM
(Revised 05/10)

The President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program is intended to encourage outstanding candidates who are committed to careers in research, teaching, and service that will enhance the **inclusive excellence diversity** of the academic community at the University of California. Complete information about the program is available at <https://ppfp.ucop.edu/info/>

Eligibility: Applicants not already holding tenure-rank appointments and applicants who have not already had significant postdoctoral experience will be preferred. For fellowships in the Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, the program is particularly interested in research which considers issues such as race, ethnicity and gender as they relate to traditional academic fields. For fellowships in Physical Sciences and Engineering, the program will prefer individuals who have participated in teaching, mentoring or outreach programs that promote educational opportunities for under-represented students in higher education.

Evaluation Criteria: Candidates will be evaluated based on the record of scholarship and service and the extent to which these will contribute to **inclusive excellence**. ~~the diversity of the University~~. Special consideration will be given to applicants who demonstrated significant academic achievement by overcoming hardships such as economic, social or educational disadvantage.

Administration: The application and selection processes are administered by the Office of the President. Funding for the Fellowships is provided to the campus by the Office of the President.

Compensation: Fellows will be given awards in combination of stipend and/or research and travel funds. The stipend will be made through the payroll system with appointment as Postdoctoral Scholar, Employee, title code 3252. Appointments are made for one academic year, with the possibility of renewal for a second year.

IX-18
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL RECORDS RETENTION
(Revised ~~4/25~~)

The following guidelines are based on the University of California Records Disposition Schedule, available on-line at <http://www.policy.ucsb.edu/information/rec-mgmt/>

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

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

*Employment files and student academic files should be maintained separately.

I. Retention of files

Documents are to be maintained as follows:

Personnel files*:

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

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

*Items that are stored electronically in AP Folio and are accessible to the department or college do not need to be separately maintained in the department or college.

Applicant files

UC Recruit is the file of record for applicant files. Departments do not need to maintain hard copy of applicant files.

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

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

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

II. Equal Opportunity/~~Affirmative Action~~ Obligations

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

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