

Department Chairs' Academic Personnel Handbook



Fall 2017

Department Chairs' Academic Personnel Handbook

<i>DEADLINE DATES</i>	3
<i>WHERE TO FIND WHAT IN THE RED BINDER</i>	4
<i>COLLEGE CONTACTS FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL CASES</i>	5
<i>CONTACTS IN THE OFFICE OF ACADEMIC PERSONNEL</i>	6
<i>COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL 2017-18</i>	7
<i>FACULTY CASE REVIEW PROCESS</i>	8
<i>TIPS ON PREPARATION OF APPOINTMENT FILES</i>	9
<i>TIPS ON PREPARATION OF MERIT AND PROMOTION FILES</i>	11
<i>DEAN APPROVAL VS. EXPANDED REVIEW FACULTY CASES</i>	13
<i>SUGGESTED TIME LINE FOR DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL REVIEWS OF FACULTY</i>	14
<i>SPECIFIC ISSUES</i>	16

Deadlines for Departmental Submission of Merits and Promotions

Senate Faculty
Dean's Authority: November 13
Expanded Review: December 11

Researchers March 1

Continuing Lecturer April 2

Project Scientist,
Specialist April 2

Academic Coordinator May 1

Deadlines for Faculty Appointment cases

UC Intercampus Recruitments April 1

AAU Recruitments April 30

The Red Binder is periodically revised. Please refer online at <https://ap.ucsb.edu/policies.and.procedures/red.binder> for the current versions of the sections listed below.

Section I: Ladder Rank Faculty and Other Academic Senate Titles

Section II: Temporary Teaching Titles

Section III: Temporary Research Titles

Section IV: Student Academic Titles

Section V: Other Academic Titles

Section VI: Leaves and Additional Compensation

Section VII: Academic Searches

Section VIII: Fellowships and Special Programs

Section IX: Policies on Access and Conduct

College Contacts for Academic Personnel Cases

College of Creative Studies

Kathy Foltz, Interim Dean
N.J. Kittle

x3827, kathy.foltz@ccs.ucsb.edu
x3759, nj.kittle@ccs.ucsb.edu

College of Engineering

Rod Alferness, Dean
Mira Lazaro

x3141, alferness@engineering.ucsb.edu
x3124, mira@engineering.ucsb.edu

College of Letters and Science

Division of Humanities and Fine Arts

John Majewski, Dean
Claudia Kashin

x4327, majewski@ltsc.ucsb.edu
x4198, ckashin@ltsc.ucsb.edu

Division of Mathematical, Life, and Physical Sciences

Pierre Wiltzius, Dean
Shawnee Oren

x5024, MLPSdean@ltsc.ucsb.edu
x8647, oren@ltsc.ucsb.edu

Division of Social Sciences

Leila Rupp, Interim Dean
Robin Rogers

x8354, lrupp@ltsc.ucsb.edu
x8268, rrogers@ltsc.ucsb.edu

Temporary appointments

Sendy Dang
Kathy Jenquin

x7598, sdang@ltsc.ucsb.edu
x6138, jenquin@ltsc.ucsb.edu

Donald Bren School of Environmental Science & Management

Steve Gaines, Dean
Doris Bleicher

x7363, gaines@bren.ucsb.edu
x7363, doris@bren.ucsb.edu

Gevirtz Graduate School of Education

Jeffrey Milem, Dean
Christina Wilburn

x3917, jmilem@education.ucsb.edu
x2502, cwilburn@ucsb.edu

Contacts in the Department of Academic Personnel

Alison Butler , Associate Vice Chancellor x2622, alison.butler@ucsb.edu

Cindy Doherty, Director x8332, cindy.doherty@ucsb.edu

June Betancourt, Associate Director x5728 june.betancourt@ucsb.edu
UCRecruit, Training, general policy questions

Helly Kwee, Sr. Personnel Analyst x5428, helly.kwee@ucsb.edu
Faculty appointments: Physical Sciences, Bren, Engineering

Karen Moreno, Sr. Personnel Analyst x5429, karen.moreno@ucsb.edu
Faculty appointments: Social Sciences, Creative Studies, Education, Academic
Programs, Humanities & Fine Arts

Joanna Kettmann, Personnel Analyst x5048, joanna.kettmann@ucsb.edu
Temporary research appointments and advancements

Billy Ko, Personnel Analyst x4441, billy.ko@ucsb.edu
Postdoctoral Scholars and graduate student employees

Andrea Dittman, x3445, andrea.dittman@ucsb.edu
PPS and general questions, additional compensation

Committee on Academic Personnel 2017-18

Jon Snyder, French & Italian, Chair

Kimberly Foster, Mechanical Engineering, Vice-Chair

Stanley Awramik, Earth Science

Michael Bowers, Chemistry & Biochemistry

Cheryl Briggs, EEMB, BMSE

Francis Dunn, Classics

Sabine Fruhstuck, East Asian Languages & Cultural Studies

Rodney Garratt, Economics

Bishnupriya Ghosh, English, Global Studies

Dana Mastro, Communication


John Mohr, Sociology

Benjamin Reese, Psychology & Brain Sciences

Francis Zok, Materials

Marlee Richter, x8732, marlee.richter@senate.ucsb.edu

Senate Faculty Case Review Process



Tips on Preparation of Senate Faculty Appointment Files

General

(Red Binder I-14 Faculty Appointments, and I-75 Appointments and Advancements)

- Begin academic recruitments as early as possible.
- Alert the Academic Personnel Office and the Dean's Office in advance of submission of the appointment case if any special handling will be required.
- Adhere to the UC deadline of April 1 and the AAU deadline of April 30 for offers effective in the upcoming academic year.

In the departmental letter:

(Red Binder I-35 How to Write a Department Letter)

- Enumerate the vote, e.g. "17 yes, 2 no, 3 abstentions."
- Account for any negative faculty votes or opinions.
- Discuss and include justification for the proposed salary.
- Avoid excessively quoting outside evaluators' comments. Reviewing agencies have access to the letters.
- Assess the candidate's contribution to any collaborative work, including the significance, if any, of the order of authorship.
- Recognize that few campus reviewers will have expertise in the candidate's field. Arguments advanced on behalf of the candidate must be made in plain English. Avoid disciplinary jargon.
- Discuss the significance of awards and honors, including their relative importance within the discipline.

External letters:

(Red Binder I-46 Guidelines for Letters of Evaluation)

- Placement files are appropriate for entry-level assistant professor appointments.
- Appointments at Assistant Professor IV should preferably also include independent letters solicited by the department.

- A minimum of six analytical letters is required for appointments to tenured positions; at least half should come from letter writers suggested by the department.
- The sample wording in the Red Binder for soliciting external letters must be used. Any modifications must have the prior approval of Academic Personnel.
- Chairs may contact external letter writers in order to urge them to respond, but great care must be taken to avoid biasing or influencing their judgment.

Tips on Preparation of Senate Faculty Merit and Promotion Files

General:

(Red Binder I-2 Deadline Dates, I-4 Eligibility, Deferral and Mandatory Review, and Review, and I-75 Appointment and Advancement)

- Notify faculty well in advance of their eligibility for advancement or promotion and of departmental deadlines for submission of materials.

In the departmental letter:

(Red Binder I-35, How to Write a Departmental Letter)

- Enumerate the vote, e.g. "17 yes, 2 no, 3 abstentions."
- Account for any negative faculty votes or opinions.
- Discuss and include justification for the proposed salary.
- Justify an acceleration or advancement to a special step.
- Avoid excessively quoting outside evaluators' comments. Reviewing agencies have access to the letters.
- Discuss teaching effectiveness (rather than merely listing courses taught). Acknowledge and discuss any problems related to teaching. Indicated which courses were evaluated on-line.
- Discuss any notable positive or negative changes in the research/professional trajectory.
- Assess the candidate's specific contribution to any collaborative work. Explain the significance, if any, of the order of authorship on collaborative works.
- Recognize that not all campus reviewers have expertise in the candidate's field. Write in plain English and avoid disciplinary jargon.
- Discuss the significance of awards and honors, including their relative importance within the discipline.
- Discuss contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity in all areas of review.

External letters:

(Red Binder I-46 Guidelines for Letters of Evaluation)

- The sample wording in the Red Binder for soliciting external letters must be used. Any modifications must have the prior approval of Academic Personnel.
- A minimum of six analytical letters is required.
- Letters from faculty at other UC campuses are necessary for all promotions and career reviews. If none are included, the departmental letter must explain why.
- At least half the letters included with the case should come from letter writers chosen by the department.
- Chairs may contact external letter writers in order to urge them to respond, but great care must be taken to avoid biasing or influencing their judgment.

Bio-bibliography:

(Red Binder I-27 Instructions for Completion of the Biobib)

- Proper formatting must be followed with respect to all updates made since the candidate's last review.
- Publications may be submitted via hard-copy or via an electronic link in the bio-bib.

Retention cases:

(Red Binder I-44 Retentions)

- Inform the Dean and AVC of potential retention cases as soon as possible.
- Include a copy of the outside-offer letter

Deans Authority and Expanded Review Cases

Dean's authority

- On-schedule merit advance to:
 - Assistant Professor III and IV
 - Associate Professor II and II
 - Professor II-V and VII-IX
 - Lecturer PSOE
 - Lecturer SOE
 - Sr. Lecturer SOE

- Decelerations of any of the above, including mandatory reviews
- Assistant Professor and Lecturer PSOE deferral requests

Expanded Review: (require CAP review, AVC or Chancellor authority)

- Formal Appraisal
- Terminal Appointments
- Promotion to Associate Professor or Lecturer SOE
- Promotion to Professor or Sr. Lecturer SOE
- Merit to a Special Step (Asst V or Assoc IV)
- Merit to Professor Step VI
- Merit to or within Professor Above Scale or Sr. Lecturer SOE Above Scale
- No change recommendations
- All accelerated actions
- Career Equity Reviews

Suggested Time Line for Departmental Personnel Reviews for Senate Faculty cases

Spring

- April 1: Eligibility List available to departments

Chairs and Analysts plan for coming cycle:

- Chairs talk with eligible colleagues
- Faculty update bio-bibs and provide copies of new publications, etc.
Departments are strongly encouraged to set Spring targets for bio-bib updates.
- Departmental ad hoc committees, case supervisors, etc., appointed according to dept. procedures
- Requests for extramural evaluation sent to potential reviewers
Career review cases require a minimum of six letters. At least three should come from referees chosen by department independently of candidate; letters from UC faculty required. External letters should be solicited in Spring.
- Fall personnel meetings scheduled and announced

Summer

- Candidate's materials sent to external reviewers:
Departments must require career-review candidates to provide materials for external reviewers in a timely fashion so that materials can be sent out in Summer.
- Suggested deadline for external reviewers: Oct 15 - Nov 1
Six to eight weeks should be sufficient for reviewers to provide evaluations, particularly if reviewers have been lined up in the Spring.

Fall

September 15

- Campus-wide cut-off date.
Bio-bib items submitted after Sept 15, the campus-wide default date, will count in next review period. Any department may establish an earlier deadline. Departments will assure faculty members who meet their responsibility to submit their personnel cases in a timely way that the Department will meet its responsibility to submit their cases on time.
- Automatic deferral by default for tenured faculty
An eligible tenured faculty member who has not submitted materials by September 15 AND whose department has not submitted a case by the Fall deadlines will be regarded as having deferred by default. The Chair will not have to secure a signed deferral statement.
- Assistant Professors and Lecturers PSOE must request deferral

September 15 – November 13: Dean's Authority cases completed

- Departmental review and vote on Dean's Authority cases.
- College Analysts work with departments to ensure that cases are complete when submitted.
Dean's Authority cases are indeed "routine" and the department letter may consist of a single page of succinct analysis so long as all four areas of review are dealt with. The department letter should not simply repeat information from the bio-bib. A comment on professional activity, for example, might consist of a single sentence noting that the bio-bib indicates excellent professional activity.

- November 13: Dean's Authority cases and list of deferrals due to colleges

November 14 – December 11: Expanded Review cases completed

- Outside letters analyzed in department
 - If one or more outside letters has not yet been received, the department may either proceed with the letters in hand or may request an extension for the purpose of securing a full complement of letters. Chairs should be able to demonstrate that the letters were requested in a timely fashion.*
- College Analysts work with departments to ensure that cases are complete when submitted.
- Departmental review and vote on Expanded Review cases
- December 11: Expanded Review cases due to colleges

Post December 11 tasks for departments:

- Respond to minor clean-up operations requested by college analysts
- Respond to any reviewing agency requests for more information

Specific Issues

Advancement within-step

Campus policy allows for a maximum of two within-step increases--that is, an increase in the off-scale supplement without a corresponding advancement in step (e.g. Prof I to Prof I o/s). Within-step increases may be justified in some circumstances, but chairs should take into account the impact of the increase when the time comes to recommend the next advancement in step. This is especially the case when advancement to the next step occurs soon after the last within-step increase. For example, a faculty member advanced from Prof IX to Prof IX o/s as of 7/1/15 and then to Above Scale as of 7/1/16 may be recommended for less than the normative percentage in the Above Scale action to account for the incremental increase as of 7/1/15. Within step advancement may not occur earlier than the normative time at step. For example, a faculty member advanced from Prof IX may not be advanced to Prof IX o/s before having spent 4 years at step.

Deferrals

An academic employee eligible for review who has not submitted the necessary review materials by the date set by the department and whose case is not submitted to reviewing agencies by the campus deadlines will be considered to have deferred by default. No signed statement of deferral is needed with the exception of Assistant Professors and Lecturers PSOE who are required to formally request deferral. Departments should forward to the deans a list of faculty deferrals shortly after September 15. Lists of deferrals for other academic employees should be forwarded to Academic Personnel by the applicable deadline dates.

Mandatory Reviews

If a Senate faculty member or other academic employee due for a mandatory, fifth-year review has not provided updated information by the established deadlines, the department will conduct the review with whatever information it has in hand.

Requests for Extensions

Requests for extension of the deadlines should be rare. They should be addressed by email to the AVC for Academic Personnel with copies to both the relevant dean and the college analyst. Requests should be made before deadlines arrive. They should make clear what circumstances require an extension to be granted and how and when these circumstances will be met. Any extension will be brief.

Requests for Reconsideration

Unsuccessful cases sometimes lead to requests for reconsideration. Such requests require either new documentation relating to accomplishments already in place before the cut-off date or evidence that the decision was not based on a fair evaluation of the materials submitted (RB I-10). Under no circumstances can a request for reconsideration and a new personnel action be pending simultaneously.

Faculty Retentions

The questions below are intended to stimulate thinking about the complicated issues that surround retentions. They should not be addressed point by point in the departmental recommendation

Record and Achievement

- 1) Does the faculty member's research program influence other research on campus (e.g., collaborations, interdisciplinary, and multidisciplinary research)?
- 2) Do the teaching, research, professional and public service contributions of the faculty member promote diversity and equal opportunity on campus?
- 3) In fields in which outside research funding is the norm, does the faculty member raise enough money to support his/her research program?
- 4) Has the faculty member displayed a pattern of accelerated advancements?
- 5) Does this faculty member frequently entertain outside offers? Is there reason to think a salary increase equivalent to the current outside offer will end the cycle of retention battles?

Potential and Estimate of Loss

- 1) What does the faculty member's scholarship contribute to the national and international standing of his/her discipline and to UC Santa Barbara's strengths? If the faculty member were to resign would you seek to replace him or her? Is he or she the only person on campus in the field?
- 2) In terms of importance to the campus, is the candidate for retention worth two or more junior faculty?
- 3) How would losing the faculty member affect recruiting graduate students? Would the loss of the faculty member tempt colleagues to leave?
- 4) How do you estimate the faculty member's potential in terms of research, teaching, and campus leadership?
- 5) Does the candidate meet the standards of "collegiality" set forth in the APM and the AAUP Statement of Ethics?

Analysis of Competing Offer

- 1) Is the offer from a peer institution? If not, what are the grounds for responding? Does the offer include or consist of an administrative position? Does the salary offer include a stipend or the equivalent for the administrative function?
- 2) Is the offer for a tenured or non-tenured position? Is the salary paid over a fiscal (12 months) or academic (9 months) year? The UC standard for converting from FY to AY is 86% of salary (multiply the FY salary by .86 to get the AY equivalent).
- 3) Is the offer from a non-academic institution or organization?
- 4) Is the offer from a non-U.S. institution? If so, consider the currency conversion rate and any other factors that might impact a "comparable" counter-offer.
- 5) Are there spousal or partner consequences for UCSB. For example, will the loss of the faculty member entail the loss of a faculty member in another department/program/school?