AGENDA

- Advancement eligibility review
- Types of cases/reviews
- Case preparation
REVIEW OF ELIGIBILITY ISSUES

• See salary scales and RB I-75 for normative timeframe
• Years at step vs.
  Years since last review vs.
  Years since last advancement/salary increase
• Prior Service, Start Dates, Leaves
• Overlapping/Special Steps
• Deferrals
• Mandatory Reviews
CASE TYPES

• Merit
  • Change in step, e.g. Professor II to Professor III

• Promotion
  • Change in rank, e.g. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

• Mandatory Review
  • Reviews must be done at least every 5 years

• Deferral
  • Automatic for tenured faculty
  • Requires deferral case submission for tenure-track faculty
DEFERRALS

• Assistant Professor - requires review
• Associate and Full Prof – notification or non-submission of materials
• These actions cannot be deferred:
  • Appraisal (unless the clock is extended)
  • Tenure review into 8th year
  • Mandatory review
• RB I-4
MANDATORY REVIEW

• A review must be conducted a minimum of once every 5 years
• Lack of candidate involvement
• Administrative exemption
• RB I-4
TYPES OF REVIEW

DEAN’S AUTHORITY AND EXPANDED REVIEW

APPRAISALS, MERITS, PROMOTIONS

OTHER REVIEW-RELATED ACTIONS
# REVIEW APPROVAL AUTHORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dean’s Authority</th>
<th>Expanded Review</th>
<th>Other Case Types (also Expanded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-time, one-step</td>
<td>Acceleration</td>
<td>Reconsideration (Appeal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decelerated one-step</td>
<td>Within-Step Increase</td>
<td>Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor Deferral</td>
<td>Overlapping (Special) Steps</td>
<td>Career Equity Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal Appraisal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion to Tenure/SOE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion to Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merit to Professor VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merit to or within Above Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEAN’S AUTHORITY REVIEWS

• Any one-step increase, on time or decelerated
• No external evaluation
• Expected, normative level of performance in all review areas
• RB I-30
EXPANDED REVIEWS

• Acceleration
• Career Reviews
• Appraisals
• Retentions, Reconsiderations, and CERs
• Overlapping (Special) Steps
• Within-Step Increases
• Explicit justification required for each
ACCELERATIONS

• Types of acceleration
  • In time (early)
  • In step (more than one step)
  • In salary (additional off-scale on top of step advancement)
  • Mixed/combination

• Explicit justification for acceleration must be provided
  • There are no “set” measures
APPRAISAL

• To assess progress towards tenure/ SOE
• Full career examined
• Done during 4th year as Assistant Professor/Lecturer PSOE
• Cannot be deferred, unless
  • Clock extension in place, or
  • Promotion being done during 4th year
• Options for recommendation
• Separate vote if done in conjunction with merit case
• RB I-38
PROMOTION TO TENURE/SOE

• “Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement” (APM 210-1d)
• “Up or out” review
• Timing of review
• Career review
• Recommendation to terminate or not promote
• RB I-40
## TENURE/SOE REVIEW TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Event and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020 – 21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initial Appointment (7/1/2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 – 22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 – 23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023 – 24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Appraisal (done Fall ‘23, effective 7/1/24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024 – 25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025 – 26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tenure Review (done in Fall ‘25, effective 7/1/26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026 – 27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>(new tenure case if F’25 tenure review fails)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027 – 28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Terminal year if tenure not achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR/SENIOR LSOE (RB I-41)

• Career Review

• “Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement... Sustained excellence in the areas of University and public service as well as professional activity is expected”

• “Sustained excellence in effective teaching and demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to teaching... sustained excellence in all three areas of review: teaching, professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, and University and public service is expected”
ADVANCEMENT TO PROF VI/SR. LSOE VI (RB I-42)

• Career review– merit action, not promotion
• “Sustained and continuing excellence in (1) scholarship or creative achievement, (2) University teaching, (3) University and public service, and (4) professional activity. In addition, great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally in scholarly or creative achievement or in teaching is required”
• “Sustained and continued excellence in (1) teaching and teaching-related responsibilities, (2) professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, and (3) University and public service”
• “Scholars and teachers of the highest distinction (1) whose work of sustained and continuing excellence has attained national and international recognition (2) whose University teaching performance is excellent, (3) whose University and public service is highly meritorious, and (4) whose professional activity is judged to be excellent.”

• “Teachers of the highest distinction (1) whose contributions to University teaching and education outcomes are excellent; (2) whose work of sustained and continuing excellence has attained national or international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact on education... and (3) whose service is highly meritorious”
ABOVE SCALE – CONT’D

• Normative advancement:
  • Continued performance at Above-Scale-expected levels in all areas
  • One increment = 10% of on-scale Step IX rate
  • $17,600 on general scale; $19,300 on B/E/E scale (based on 10/1/19 scale)

• Accelerations:
  • No longer permitted in time (min 4 years between advancements)
  • 1.5 increments: extraordinary achievement in 2+ areas of review
  • 2 increments: extraordinary achievements in ALL areas of review

• Within Step IX: limited to $ amount of one increment
RECONSIDERATIONS (APPEALS)

• Justification:
  • New documentation of material in the case prior to cut-off date
  • Evidence that reviewing agencies neglected important features of the case
• Recommendation remains the same as in original case
• Safeguard statement must be signed for this case, too
• Different standard for terminal appointment (RB I-39)
• RB I-10
RETENTIONS

• Salary match only
  • Change in rank/step only in conjunction with existing MP case
• Does not count towards “within-step merit” limit
• Not a “merit” action (where to draw the line?)
• Retentions other than salary advancement
• RB I-44
CAREER EQUITY REVIEW

• “To examine cases in which normal personnel actions from the initial hiring onward may have resulted in an inappropriate rank and/or step”
• Not an alternative to regular review process; must be done in conjunction with an advancement case
• Addresses equity in rank/step only, not in salary
• No reconsideration/appeal
• Initiated via the Department or via the Dean
• RB I-6
THE ADVANCEMENT CASE
FLOW AND APPROVAL AUTHORITY
CASE CONTENTS
DEADLINES AND IMPORTANT NOTES
ADVANCEMENT CASE REVIEW PROCESS
DEAN’S AUTHORITY CASES

- Department Prepares Case
- Dean Decides
- AVC Reviews
- Decision Letter (AVC or Chancellor)
ADVANCEMENT CASE REVIEW PROCESS
EXPANDED REVIEW CASES

Dept
Prepares Case

Dean
Reviews

CAP
Reviews

AVC
(reviews or decides)

EVC
(reviews or decides)

Chancellor
Decides
## ADVANCEMENT APPROVAL AUTHORITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Merits</th>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-schedule, normative merits</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decelerated one-step merits</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit to Professor VI, to and within Above Scale</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other merits</td>
<td>Associate Vice Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Appraisal</td>
<td>Associate Vice Chancellor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotions</th>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor, Professor</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer SOE, Sr. Lecturer SOE</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEADLINES

• Campus Cut-off Date (Sep 15)
• Departmental deadlines
• College deadlines:
  • Dean’s Authority: 2nd Monday in November
  • Expanded Review: 2nd Monday in December
• Internal: Dean to AP, AP to CAP
• All cases finalized by June 30
• RB I-2
CONTENTS OF A CASE

• Departmental Letter
• Bio-bib
• Safeguard Statements (includes Outside Activity reporting confirmation)
• External Letters and associated items (for career reviews)
• Self Statements
• Sabbatical Leave Reports
• Teaching Evaluations
• Publications
• Dean’s Authority Cases checklist: RB I-31
• Expanded Review Cases checklist: RB I-34
COVER SHEET – SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Status</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank &amp; Step</td>
<td>Total Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offscale Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effecive Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Above</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>7/1/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department Votes

Yes No Abstain Not Voting Total Eligible

Statement of Voting Method & Comments (Max 1500 characters):

Case Options

- Dean’s Authority
- Expanded Review (Check as appropriate)

- On schedule advancement to:
  - Assistant Professor III or IV
  - Associate Professor II or III
  - Professor II-V or VII-IX
  - Lecturer SOE (salary below Professor I)
  - Senior Lecturer SOE (salary below Professor V)

- Deceleration in time of any of the above

- Formal Appraisal
- Promotion
- Acceleration
- Professor VI
- To Professor Above Scale
- Within Professor Above Scale
- Special Step (e.g. Assistant V, Associate IV)
- Increase or Decrease in Off-Scale
- No Change
- Retention
- Career Equity Review
## COVER SHEET – REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

Required Documents - Note: A Dean may require some of the items listed as optional.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Document</th>
<th>Choose File</th>
<th>No file chosen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Letter of Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Bio-Bibliographical Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copies of Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td>One of a kind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation of Teaching:

- ESCI Score Tabulation, either of the following:
  - ESCI 5 Year Summary
  - Individual ESCI Forms
  - At least one of the following additional sources of evaluation:
    - Written Student Evaluations
    - Candidate’s Self-Assessment of Teaching
    - Instructional Consultation Report
    - Peer Evaluation or Other Teaching Reports
    - Additional Source(s) of Evaluation: [Choose File] No file chosen
    - [Choose File] No file chosen
    - [Choose File] No file chosen
    - [Choose File] No file chosen

### Sabbatical Leave Report (for the period, if any)

[Choose File] No file chosen
## COVER SHEET – OTHER DOCUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional Documents</th>
<th>Choose File</th>
<th>No file chosen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s Response to Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Offer Letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget &amp; Planning Teaching Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>One of a kind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Candidate’s Self-Assessment of Other Accomplishments and Activity**

- Check here if included in Self-Assessment of Teaching above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair’s Confidential Letter</th>
<th>Choose File</th>
<th>No file chosen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority Opinion Letter</th>
<th>Choose File</th>
<th>No file chosen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redacted Minority Opinion Letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Extramural Letters

- Number of extramural letters included: 
- Number of extramural letters suggested by department:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) List of Referees:</th>
<th>Choose File</th>
<th>No file chosen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Including brief biography and indicating who selected referees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2) Sample Solicitation Letter</th>
<th>Choose File</th>
<th>No file chosen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3) List of Items Sent to Reviewers:</td>
<td>Choose File</td>
<td>No file chosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include a copy of any items not already included in the case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redacted Extramural Letters, if provided to the candidate</th>
<th>Choose File</th>
<th>No file chosen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Vitae</th>
<th>Choose File</th>
<th>No file chosen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CER Committee Report</th>
<th>Choose File</th>
<th>No file chosen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

No Safeguard statement signed.
CASE DOCUMENTS

• Evaluation of teaching
  • ESCIs
  • Written student comments

• Publications
  • Appropriate for the review period
  • Linked in bio-bib

• Self statements
  • As required by department or college
  • Research and/or other activities, including contributions to diversity
CASE DOCUMENTS– CONT’D

• Sabbatical leave reports
• Other supporting documentation
  • Anything they want as long as not in conflict with policy or rights of others
• Bio-bib (more on next slide)
BIO-BIBLIOGRAPHY

• Must follow format in Red Binder– see template online
• Cut-off of 9/15 (or earlier if set by department)
• Research
  • Cumulative (line drawn since last review)
  • Oldest = lowest number
  • Do not change previous publication numbers!
  • Clearly denote changes since last review(s)
• Other areas should only include activity since last review(s)
• Double-check links to make sure they work after doc upload
• RB I-27
# PREVIOUS BIO-BIB VS CURRENT BIO-BIB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Pub Title #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Pub Title #8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work in Press:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Pub Title #9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Submitted:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Pub Title #10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Pub Title #11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Since Last Review:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Pub Title #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Pub Title #7A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Pub Title #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Pub Title #9 (B-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Pub Title #10 (C-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Pub Title #12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Previously listed as Work in Press

** Previously listed as Work Submitted

1 C-1 from previous bio-bib was withdrawn from submission

2 7a was left out of previous bio-bib and not counted
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

- Candidate and department suggested names- independently derived
- Candidate has right to receive redacted copies and make comments
- Sample solicitation letters – stick to the given RB wording
- Items sent to external reviewers
- Confidentiality statement
- List of evaluators
- *No identification or identifying information in Dept Letter!* ⚠️
- RB I-46 – I-51
WHAT NOT TO PUT IN DEPT LETTER

• Six outside letters were received from outstanding scientists and leaders in Professor Doe’s areas of research. Three of these were from Professor Doe’s list of possible letter writers and three were from the Department’s list of possible letter writers.

• The department solicited letters from 15 leaders in the field of underwater basket weaving. Of these, 7 writers responded; including professors within the University of California system who are well familiar with the requirements for the Professor Above Scale rank. Of the remaining 8 invited evaluators, 2 agreed to write a letter but never sent one, 1 declined (citing over-commitment), 1 was on medical leave, 3 were on sabbatical and 1 never responded to the invitation.
WHAT NOT TO PUT IN DEPT LETTER!

• Nine letters were solicited and seven were obtained. Three of the letter writers were taken from a list provided by Professor Smith (Reviewers A, C, and E) and four were selected by the department (Reviewers B, D, F, and G). Three of the seven letter writers are University of California faculty (A, B, and C), and two additional reviewers are UC familiar (F and G)... Five of the seven letter writers offered an assessment of whether Professor Smith would be granted tenure at their home institutions (Berkeley, Stanford, MIT, Columbia, and Yale)
EXTERNAL LETTERS– PROPER REDACTION

• Header & footer only
  • Any identifying info within the body of the letter remains
  • “Paper Cutter” approach

• Evaluative text must be within the body of the letter
  • What happens if they misunderstand our confidentiality statement and put their text below the signature line?

• Include letter codes on redacted letters, too
DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION

• Department Vote and Voting rights
  • Explain “no” votes!
• Evaluation of all applicable review areas
• Minority opinion letter
• Chair’s confidential letter
• Candidate’s right to respond
  • To the Chair/Department
  • To the Dean
• RB I-35
SAFEGUARD STATEMENT

• Ensures faculty rights and access to confidential documents
• Follows steps outlined in “Departmental Checklist for Academic Advancement” (RB I-22)
• Includes acknowledgment of:
  • OAR completion
  • Bio-bib accuracy and completion
• Can request reviewing agency reports at close of case
• Must be completed for every case, one for each department
• Completed online by the faculty member in AP Folio
• RB I-26
WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT?

- **Candidate:**
  - Supply accurate, up-to-date materials on time
  - Make requested corrections/updates in a timely manner
- **Department Chair:**
  - Provide original, analytical assessment of candidate’s qualifications
  - Justify proposed action
- **Department Analyst:**
  - Ensuring the above are in place and conform to policy
  - Accuracy of and consistency across materials, before submitting case
  - Actively work with faculty and Dept Chair on corrections/clarifications
ONCE A DECISION IS MADE

• Decision letter sent to faculty member from Chancellor or AVC

• Candidate and Department are happy?
  Move on to next review period

• Candidate or Department not happy?
  Reconsideration possible— if criteria apply
QUESTIONS?