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Agenda

- Overview – career review cases
- Eligibility – departmental consultation, candidate preparation
- Deadlines – departmental, campus
- Case materials – biobibs, CVs, self-statements
- Extramural letters – name selection, solicitations, letter redaction, coded list
- Case preparation – departmental processing, voting, preparation of recommendation (department letter)
- Reviewing agencies – role in the review process
What is a “career review case?”

A career review is a personnel case during which a formal and comprehensive assessment of a candidate is performed. A career review case focuses on both the entire career and the achievements within the current review period.

Which personnel cases are career review cases?

Ladder faculty & research titles
(Researcher*, Proj Sci, Specialist)
  • Promotion from Asst to Assoc
  • Promotion from Assoc to Full
  • Merit to step VI*, Above Scale

Lecturer
Sr Lecturer
  • Promotion from LPSOE to LSOE
  • Promotion from LSOE to Sr LSOE
Eligibility Lists

- Look for campus announcements from AP
- Senate Faculty elig list available in early April
- Researchers, Proj Scientists, Specialists elig list available in early September
- Access lists by logging into AP Folio ➔ Eligibility Listing link under AP Folio heading

AP Folio

- Academic Personnel Recruiting
- Eligibility Listing
- Case Processing
  - Appointments
  - Merits & Promotions
  - Reappointments/Modifications
  - Personnel Files
- Reporting
- Outside Professional Activities (APM 025)

Eligibility and General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSISTANT PROFESSOR (if year at UCB all tenure)</th>
<th>ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (if year at UCB all tenure)</th>
<th>PROFESSOR (substantive, tenure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Normal period of service</td>
<td>Step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2 (not used at UCB)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>2 (non-lagging step)</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(not used at UCB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eligibility is based on normative time at step

⇒ See Red Binder I-75 for normative time

- General info on faculty Appointment and Advancements
  - Procedural items – materials, the review process, criteria, department voting, etc

- Also see Department Chair’s Handbook under Resources for Academic Employees on AP website
Department consultation

- **Accelerations/Deferrals, if appropriate**
- **Mandatory**
- **Above Scale Accelerations**

Red Binder I-43
Interval between salary increases for Above Scale must be a minimum of 4 years. Accelerations will not be approved except for the most superior cases.
Department & campus deadlines – Faculty

- Internal department deadlines:
  Candidate decisions, materials for outside letters (CV/biobib, publications, etc), reviewer names, evaluator letter deadlines
- Campus-wide cutoff date Sept 15 (senate faculty)
  Case must based upon materials available before Sept 15 (except letters); *departments may set earlier cutoff date*
- Dean’s Authority cases due 2nd Mon Nov
- Expanded Review cases due 2nd Mon Dec

Department & campus deadlines – Faculty (cont’d)

Red Binder I-2
Case must based upon materials available before Sept 15, except letters delayed outside of department’s control

**What if departments have an earlier cutoff date?**
- *example: department biobib cutoff date is June 30*
- *Outside letters are solicited in Aug. Evaluators sent candidate CVs updated through August – is this a problem?*
  YES – may result in evaluators reviewing items not on the biobib
Department & campus deadlines – General

Red Binder I-2
In promotion to tenure cases, exceptions to campus-wide Sept 15 cutoff date may be appropriate

What if the candidate wants to include future dates of events that are scheduled to occur after the department or campus cutoff date?
- do not include
- Research series cut-off: December 31
- Project Scientist/Specialist cut-off: January 31

Case Materials - Biobib

What is a Bio-bibliography or “biobib?” Why does the review process require a biobib instead of a Curriculum Vitae (CV)?

- The biobib contains information also found in a traditional curriculum vitae, but arranged in a specific format to ensure consistency and clarity
- Generally divided into:
  - Mini CV
  - Research
  - Teaching
  - Professional Activities
  - Service
Case Materials – Biobib (cont’d)

- Red Binder I-27 Instructions for Completion of the Bio-bibliography (biobib)
  - Word document template available on Forms page on AP website
  - Only Research section should be cumulative, even in a career review
    - Reviewing agencies have access to candidate’s complete record
  - Should be maintained by the faculty member, checked for accuracy and compared to prior case biobib, by department analyst
  - Teaching section omitted for research title reviews (more on this later)

Case Materials – Biobib (cont’d)

- Research/creative activity should be complete and accurate
  - Correct titles, complete citations, order of author names should be accurately reflected
  - Correctly categorized (peer-reviewed article, book, book chapter, conference proceedings, etc…)
- Electronic links to publications (if used) should function correctly from any computer; should link to the final version; should not require sign-in to access
  - Links are to be listed after Title and Author information
Case Materials – Biobib (cont’d)

- Works in press (B items) are “counted” in the current review; these are assigned a number on the next review, but appear below the line on the next biobib and include an *
- Submitted (C items) should be hard copy, not links
- If submitted, in-process (D items) should be hard copy as well
  - Not tracked, so often these are not included with the case materials

Case Materials – Self-assessments

- Self-statements may cover research, teaching, professional service, contributions to diversity and should be included in the case upload
- Especially in research title career reviews, self-assessments can be an appropriate place to list individualized teaching and mentoring (vs Service)
- Advancement criteria in research titles reviews: research/creative activities, professional activities, university and public service (see RB sections III-12, III-14 and III-16 for further details)
  - No teaching section on biobib
Extramural Letters – Evaluator Names

- At least six letters are required, including minimum of two UC-familiar
  - Refer to RB III-12 & RB III-14 for research title requirements
- Evaluators should be tenured faculty from distinguished institutions
  - Advancement to Above Scale should include international
- Department analyst should compare names of evaluators who wrote in candidate’s appointment and any prior cases and advise accordingly, before solicitations are sent out

Extramural Letters – Evaluator Names (cont’d)

Candidate provides names independently of the department’s list, then lists are compared.

If both suggest the same name, it is counted as a department-suggested name
Extramural Letters – Evaluator Names (cont’d)

- Deviations from requirements in RB I-46 should be explained in the coded list (not in the department letter)
- Repeat letter writers should generally be avoided
- Close associates should not be invited to write
  - collaborators in research, colleagues, advisors, personal friends
- LPSOE/LSOE letters can be extramural or from campus; see RB I-56
- Question: are more letters always better? If six letters are good in a tenure case, are twelve even better?

Extramural Letters – Solicitations

- Do not change prescribed wording from RB I-50 without AP approval
  - Use correct wording for the proposed action
  - RB I-49: sample letter & confidentiality statement
    - For research titles, refer to external evaluation sections RB III-12, III-14 & III-16
- Include a deadline for return of letters
  - Consider department timelines, e.g. fall faculty meeting schedules
  - Department chair contact to encourage response must be careful – free of bias/influence
Extramural Letters – Materials to External Reviewers

- Candidates should be treated equitably
  - Items sent to reviewers depend upon department culture and practice
- Curriculum Vitae (CV) versus Bio-bibliography (biobib)
  - Consider department cutoff dates versus “up-to-date” CV
    - Take care that external evaluators are not reviewing items that are not going to be on the candidate’s (campus) biobib OR that are not actually in the state of publication as represented
- Solicitation letter and any materials sent to reviewers that are not already in the case are uploaded to AP Folio
- No ESCIs or written student evaluations

---

Extramural Letters – *in the meantime* ...

Department analyst collects, reviews, prepares case materials as needed – see checklist RB I-34 (for research titles, RB III-9)

- Compare current biobib against previous case biobib, verify publication line & other info
- Collect ESCI reports and written student evaluations as needed
- Budget and Planning (BAP) teaching report
- Verify information between self-statements and biobib
- Sabbatical leave reports and APM 025 for review period
- Publications (hard copy or PDF links) from current period + representative career sampling, e.g. 6-10 (tenure case requires ALL publications)
Extramural Letters – Coded List

- Also known as the referee or external evaluators coded list
- Who prepares the coded list? Why?
  - Faculty with knowledge of the evaluators’ qualifications and context should prepare the list
- Discussion appropriate for the coded list often ends up on the department letter – do not make this mistake!
  - Risk of confidentiality breach
  - Candidate sees the department letter before the case is turned in to College – then it is too late to correct

Extramural Letters – Redacted Letters

- Should candidates receive redacted letters automatically?
  - No – offer of redacted copies should be made to candidates, but do not prepare redacted copies unless requested
  - Must be given in advance of internal department deadline to allow time for candidate response to be considered in department letter
  - Redact letterhead information from each page, plus signature block and any material below it
    - No redactions should be made within the body of letter
  - If provided, redacted versions must be uploaded to case – check that candidate reports this in safeguard statement
Case preparation

Once letters are received and case materials assembled, department processes case according to internal protocol, makes a recommendation, conducts faculty consultation (vote)

Departmental recommendation is prepared in accordance with APM 220-80-e; letter is then made available to eligible faculty per departmental protocol

Departmental Letter Guidelines

- Department letter should be concise, accurate and analytical – not a listing of items documented on the biobib
  - Accuracy of recommendation letter should be checked against all case materials including biobib, self-statements, ESCI scores, student evaluations, extramural letters, etc
  - Case materials provide detailed evidence to support the evaluation

- Department letters should not be overly long, even for career cases
  - should address all four areas of review – research, teaching, professional activity, service
Departmental Letter Guidelines (cont’d)

- Career reviews encompass the candidate’s career in addition to current review period; assessment should address career overview and recent achievements
  - overly long letters are a burden to all reviewing agencies
- Include departmental vote; explain any “no” votes (state if unknown) and indicate total number eligible to vote, for example:
  13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 2 not voting; 15 eligible total
- Acceleration recommendations ideally addressed via separate paragraph or in summary paragraph
  - acceleration justification that is “integrated throughout” letter = difficult to identify

Departmental Letter Guidelines (cont’d)

Context

- Explain the **CONTEXT** of research or creative activities
  - reviewing agencies are not well-versed in *every* discipline – department letters should be written to be accessible/understandable to layman
    - avoid using only specialized, technical, or esoteric language
- Explain the **CONTEXT** of awards or other accolades
  - Nobel Prize or election to NAS may be commonly understood, but discipline-specific or international awards should be put into context
Context

- Explain the **context** of teaching evaluations and ESCI scores
  - Don’t ignore negative teaching evaluations or substandard ESCI scores
  - Consider and integrate candidate’s comments teaching self-statements as appropriate
  - If ESCI scores A & B are not provided as required, explain why

- Explain the **context** of contributions to diversity as appropriate to four areas of review (research/creative activities, professional activities, teaching, service)

Departmental Letter Guidelines (cont’d)

- Departmental letter should not contain excessive quotes from self-statements, student evaluations, outside reviewers
  - Reviewing agencies have all of this documentation in full
  - Outside reviewer quotes should not be used in lieu of analysis, careful consideration and discussion of external evaluation letter content
Departmental Letter Guidelines (cont’d)

- Avoid evaluator discussions which identify the letter writer gender “her/him/she/he,” or that give identity clues, for example: “Referee A, a prominent faculty member at a top university in Germany who won the Kyoto Prize in 2016…”

- Avoid detail about solicitation process: “The department solicited three referees suggested by the candidate and three suggested by the department. All six agreed to write…”
  - If the candidate suggested only three names, letter writer identity has been revealed

Campus reviewing agencies

- Dean’s office, AP, CAP, Ad hoc committees, AVC, EVC, Chancellor
- College analysts review the case first
  - Respond to their requests for revisions/corrections promptly
- Additional information requests
  - Any reviewing agency can request add’l info
  - Not a negative reflection on the candidate
  - Candidate should be informed (APM, Section 220-80-h)
# Academic Personnel Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helly Kwee</td>
<td>Senate Faculty Math, Life, &amp; Physical Sciences; Engineering; ORUs; Bren</td>
<td>x5428</td>
<td><a href="mailto:helly.kwee@ucsb.edu">helly.kwee@ucsb.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Senate Faculty Social Sciences; Academic Programs; Creative Studies; Educ</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Kettmann</td>
<td>Research Series; Project Scientists; Specialists</td>
<td>X5048</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joanna.kettmann@ucsb.edu">joanna.kettmann@ucsb.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Betancourt</td>
<td>General AP policy</td>
<td>X5728</td>
<td><a href="mailto:june.betancourt@ucsb.edu">june.betancourt@ucsb.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Questions?

???