

I-22
DEPARTMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR ACADEMIC ADVANCEMENT
(Revised 4/25)

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

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

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

I. Notifying The Candidate

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

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

II. Developing The Recommendation

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

III. Forwarding the Case

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

- 21) **Inform the candidate orally or, if requested, in writing of the departmental recommendation, the**

departmental vote, and of the substance of the evaluations under each of the applicable review criteria. Bear in mind that it is especially helpful for junior faculty to understand concerns regarding some particular aspect of their performance even if there was a strong vote of approval.

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