

UC Davis Academic Personnel Manual

Appointment and Promotion

Section UCD-220, Academic Senate Review and Advancement

Date: 8/8/03, rev. 7/9/04, 5/18/05, 6/27/05, 1/6/06, 9/5/06

Supersedes: 10/1/99

Responsible Department: Academic Personnel

Source Document: UC APM-220

Exhibit A, Consultation and Voting Procedures on Academic Senate Personnel

Exhibit B, Language Required When Letters of Evaluation are Solicited or Received

Exhibit C, Guidelines for Preparation of Publication and Other Creative Efforts List

Exhibit D, Guidelines for Evaluation of Department Chairs (Instructions to the Deans)

Procedure 1, Appraisal, Merit, Promotion, and Preliminary Assessment

Procedure 2, Deferral Request

Procedure 3, Joint Appointments

Procedure 4, Five-Year Review

Procedure 5, Appeal

I. Purpose

This section summarizes the principles, policies, and procedures at UC Davis that govern the evaluation and review of academic performance (for appraisal, merit, or promotion) of members of the Academic Senate, as well as for appointees in two Academic Federation series. The information provided in this document also serves as a guide for the form and content of an employee's review file. Step-by-step procedures, checklists, guidelines, and forms are available in VII below.

Applicable Academic Senate title series:

- Acting Professor
- Lecturer/Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment
- Professor
- Professor In Residence
- Professor of Clinical ____

Applicable Academic Federation title series:

- Adjunct Professor
- Agronomist (____ in the Agricultural Experiment Station), when also appointed to Academic Senate title
- Professional Research, when also appointed to Academic Senate title

II. Eligibility for Advancement

There are established periods of service at each rank and step that indicate the normal intervals between advancement to the next step. Refer to IV below for detailed information. Note that although these time periods indicate the usual intervals between advancements, they do not preclude more rapid advancement in the case of exceptional merit, or more gradual advancement when warranted.

Departments should maintain accurate records for eligibility for advancement for their faculty members. The deans' offices also prepare an eligibility list for all academic employees that is used to determine the advancement actions that should occur in the next review cycle.

A. Deferral

Deferrals must be requested when a faculty member eligible for normal advancement is not considered for this advancement. Exception: Deferrals are not required for faculty members at Professor, Step V or above; Lecturer SOE, Step V; and Senior Lecturer, Step IV and V.

1. First- and second-year deferrals. The department chair prepares a brief letter explaining the reason for requesting a deferral, indicating that the chair and the faculty member have discussed the deferral and that the faculty member is aware of what needs to be done to advance further. The deferral materials are forwarded to the dean for review. After approval by the dean, the materials and any comments by the dean are forwarded to the Vice Provost--Academic Personnel for the faculty member's personnel file. College/division/school faculty personnel committees (FPC) do not review deferral requests.
2. Third-year deferrals: When a merit increase or promotion has previously been deferred for two years, the faculty member and the chair must work closely to develop a plan for progress. The plan for progress and the other deferral must be sent forward to the dean and the Vice Provost--Academic Personnel for review.

If the third-year deferral coincides with the fifth year since the faculty member has been reviewed, a five-year review must be done in lieu of the third-year deferral.

See the procedure and checklist for deferrals.

B. Five-year review

1. All faculty must be reviewed at least once every five years. This is applicable to the following title series:
 - Professor
 - Lecturer/Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment
 - Professor In Residence
 - Professor of Clinical ____
 - Adjunct Professor

In addition, this policy also applies to the following Academic Federation title series:

- Agronomist (____ in the Agricultural Experiment Station)
- Professional Research

The five-year review occurs during the fifth academic year since the last review. The five-year review policy ensures that the performance of every faculty member is appraised at a regular interval. A faculty member may not decline a five-year review. Requests from the chair for postponement or waiver of the review are considered only in exceptional circumstances (e.g., for a faculty member planning to retire within the year).

2. This policy applies to all titles listed above, including those who are at Step V or above. Typically, such members of the faculty are continuing a productive career, but have yet to meet the more stringent requirements for advancement to the next step, or to a higher salary level if above-scale.
3. Faculty who are below Professor, Step V, and have not been reviewed in the previous five

years (i.e., have deferred) are presumably less than fully productive. For this group, the purpose of the review is to assess their productivity since the last successful advancement and the plan submitted at their previous deferral and to identify what more needs to be accomplished for subsequent advancement.

4. The five-year review is conducted either by the department chair, or in accordance with department procedures on voting (Exhibit A), depending on the preference of the department chair. Refer to the procedure and checklist for five-year reviews for details on the process of review.
5. There are three possible results of a five-year review:
 - a. Advancement. When performance warrants advancement, a merit or promotion file is prepared in accordance with regular policies and procedures for merit or promotion.
 - b. No advancement, performance satisfactory. This conclusion is reached when the candidate's performance continues to meet the criteria for the current step, but does not warrant advancement. The chair's letter should identify what additional accomplishments are needed for advancement in the future.
 - c. No advancement, performance unsatisfactory. This conclusion is reached when some aspects of the performance are less than satisfactory for meeting the criteria that apply to the candidate's current step. When the department reaches this conclusion, the department chair and the faculty member must submit a plan for progress. The department chair monitors the performance of the faculty member according to the timetable included in the plan for progress that was prepared for the review. If no progress is evident, then the chair may reapportion a professor's duties, reassign space or facilities, or deny applications for sabbatical.
6. If a faculty member's performance is deemed unsatisfactory for an extended period of time, the department chair, in consultation with the Vice Provost--Academic Personnel, should consider recommending further action that is consistent with current UC policy (APM 075) that governs incompetent performance by a faculty member.

III. Access to Review Records

- A. The following are deemed "confidential academic review records" as defined in APM 160-20-b(1), and will be redacted for the candidate. See APM 160-20-c(4) for instructions on redacting letters.
 1. Extramural letters.
 2. Intramural letters by clinical supervisors and residents.
 3. The chair's confidential letter.
 4. Ad hoc committee reports, including reports by FPCs when serving as an ad hoc.
- B. The following are deemed "non-confidential academic review records" as defined in APM 160-20-b(2), and will be provided, without redaction, to the candidate if they are part of the review file.
 1. Departmental letter.
 2. Letters from directors, associate directors, and service chiefs in Veterinary Medicine.
 3. Dean's letter.
 4. Letter from Dean--Graduate Studies.

5. Comments by Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) Oversight Subcommittee.
 6. Comments by FPC.
 7. Letters from colleagues regarding peer review of teaching.
 8. Letters from chairs of Academic Senate committees.
- C. After the decision is made and announced on a proposed advancement action, the following items, if applicable, will be given to the candidate (note the confidential items that require redaction).
1. Chair's confidential letter (redacted).
 2. Ad hoc committee reports, including reports by FPC when acting as the ad hoc (redacted).
 3. Dean's letter (entirety).
 4. Comments from CAP (entirety).
 5. Comments by FPC (entirety).
 6. Comments by Vice Provost--Academic Personnel (entirety).
- D. Before the dossier leaves the department, candidates under review are required to sign and date the Candidate's Disclosure Certificate to indicate that the department has followed all required procedures and to show that the candidate has been consulted with regard to the contents of his/her review file.
- E. Chairs should write a letter informing candidates who are unavailable during the time of departmental review of the general nature of the department vote and provide them with an inventory of the non-confidential items in the file. A copy of this letter should be included in the review file.

IV. Advancement Actions

- A. Special notes
1. Overlapping steps
 - a. Steps V and VI of the assistant professorship, normally used only when initial appointment has been at Step II or higher and only if promotion advancement to Associate Professor can reasonably be expected. The salary levels for these steps overlap those of Associate Professor, Steps I and II. When and if promotion is ultimately achieved, the level of the appointment is normally such as to avoid loss of salary. Advancements to Assistant Professor, Steps V and VI, are not to be considered decelerations.
 - b. Similarly, Steps IV and V of the associate professorship overlap with Steps I and II of the full professorship. They are used infrequently, and typically when initial appointment or promotion has been at Associate Professor, Step II or III; or if overlapping steps have been used in the assistant professorship; and when subsequent advancement may require additional years at rank to establish a record appropriate to the title of full Professor.
 - c. Faculty who have served six years or more, from Associate Professor, Step I, through Associate Professor, Step III, should be considered next for promotion to full Professor rather than for advancement to Associate Professor, Step IV. In the event that advancement to full Professor is not approved, a merit to Associate Professor, Step IV, may be recommended if evidence in the file supports it. An example of such a case would be one in which reviewers recommend promotion

following the publication of a work just completed or in progress, or if reviewers suggest that works in progress promise to support promotion in the near future. Conversely, if reviewers and the record suggest that a faculty member is not moving toward promotion, no recommendation for a merit will be made.

Note that faculty who have received leave for childbearing or adoption during service at the rank of Associate are eligible for merit to an overlapping step if they are not ready for promotion.

All such cases described in b and c above are reviewed by CAP, not by its subcommittees (FPC) at the college/school/division level.

2. Advancement for joint appointees
 - a. All departments and colleges/divisions/schools in which a candidate holds salaried appointments take part in the review of the faculty member. The home department has primary responsibility for ensuring that the review file is complete and that all appropriate consultations are made. The home dean has responsibility for making the dean's decision or recommendation on the personnel action in consultation with the other deans involved.
 - b. Without-salary joint appointments are those where the faculty member has a salaried appointment in one department and one or more without-salary appointments in other departments. All departments in which a candidate holds a without-salary appointment must have input in the review process. The nature of that input is determined by the approved voting procedures of the without-salary department. The dean of the without-salary department will also comment on the file if that non-salaried appointment is in a different college/school/division.
 - c. When a candidate holds both Academic Senate and Academic Federation titles:
 - 1) For the Senate title, the policies and procedures outlined below should be followed; and
 - 2) For the Academic Federation title, see the Academic Federation supplement (in progress).

Exception: For appointees holding professorial and ___ in AES (Agronomist series) appointments, the entire review is conducted in accordance with the Senate title.

Refer to the procedure for joint appointments.

B. Appraisal

1. An appraisal is a detailed analysis and evaluation of an academic appointee's past achievement and normally occurs in the fourth year at the rank of assistant professor (or in combination with other eligible titles, see APM 133. The appraisal is intended to provide junior faculty members with their peers' and colleagues' frank and candid assessments of their performance and collegial recommendations for further career development. The appraisal is not an administrative judgment; rather, it is collegial advice. It is imperative that the department forward more than a discursive, noncommittal account of the academic appointee's performance; it should make as definite an appraisal as the evidence warrants of the achievement and promise of the candidate with regard to teaching, research or other creative work, University and public service, and professional status and activity. A clear statement regarding the appraisee's prospects for achieving or not achieving tenure in due course should also be included in departmental appraisals.
2. The period covered for the appraisal is from initial appointment to date. Appraisals may

occur earlier than the fourth year if requested by the candidate, department chair, dean, Chancellor, or personnel committee.

3. No appraisal shall be required if the Assistant Professor is being recommended for promotion to take effect within a year, has given written notice of resignation, or is under written notice, following proper review, that he or she will not be reappointed.
4. Except in cases where immediate termination is recommended, reappraisal may be requested by the candidate, department chair, dean, or personnel committee. Such reappraisal, if requested, must occur prior to the midpoint in the individual's sixth year of service.

See the procedure and checklist for appraisals.

C. Merit increase

1. A merit increase is advancement in step and salary within a specific rank of a title series (for example, from Assistant Professor, Step I, to Assistant Professor, Step II).
 - a. Accelerated merit increase: advancement at a rate faster than the period specified for normal advancement.
 - b. Decelerated merit increase: advancement at a rate slower than the period specified for normal advancement.
 - c. Upper level merit increase: merit increase to Professor VI, VII, VIII, IX, and above-scale. See 4, below.
2. Merit increases for academic appointments are based on academic attainment, experience, and performance; they are not automatic. The basic standard of superior intellectual attainment in teaching, research and/or other creative achievement, professional competence and activity, and University and public service is the indispensable prerequisite for advancement.
3. The period covered by the review for merit is as follows:
 - a. For Assistant Professor, Step I, through Professor, Step V: since advancement to the current step.
 - b. To Professor, Step VI: the entire period since advancement to the rank of full professor; does not usually occur before three years at Step V.
 - c. To Professor, Step VII, VIII, or IX: since advancement to the current step; does not usually occur until at least three years at each step (VI through VIII).
 - d. To above-scale: the period since advancement to Professor; does not usually occur before four years at Step IX.
 - e. Subsequent above-scale: since advancement to the current salary level; does not usually occur earlier than at four-year intervals.
4. Advancement to upper level steps
 - a. Advancement to Professor, Step VI, calls for "evidence of highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellent University teaching." In interpreting these criteria, there must be evidence of excellence and high merit in original scholarship or creative achievement, in teaching, and in service. In addition, advancement to Step VI requires evidence of great distinction and national or international recognition. The total career of the candidate must have distinction when considered as a unit, and his or her reputation and influence

should be continuing to grow. Many professors will not qualify for this advancement and will remain indefinitely at Step V.

- b. Advancement to Professor, Step VII, VIII, and IX, calls for "continuing great distinction, national or international recognition, highly meritorious service, and excellent teaching performance." The record should continue to show superior achievement in all the normal categories of performance (teaching, research, University and public service, and professional competence). Many professors will not qualify for further upper-level advancement and will remain indefinitely at a certain step.
- c. Advancement to Professor, above-scale, is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction, whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed. Mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not justification for further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step IX was based. The record should show superior achievement in all the normal categories of performance (teaching, research, University and public service, and professional competence). The total career of the candidate must have distinction when considered as a unit, and his or her reputation and influence should be continuing to grow.
- d. Further advancement in salary for a person already serving at an above-scale salary must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Mere continued good service is not an adequate justification. The criteria for advancement at the above-scale level are more demanding than those required for advancement from Professor, Step VI to VII, Step VII to VIII, and Step VIII to IX. Although the new evidence of merit and distinction may be somewhat less than that necessary for advancement from Professor, Step IX, to above-scale, it must be distinguished in its own right and commensurate with the very high standards required for above-scale service. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinitely long, and only in the most strongly justified cases will increases at intervals shorter than four years be approved.

See the procedure and checklist for merit increases.

D. Promotion

- 1. Promotion is advancement from one rank (in a specific title series) to a higher rank within the same academic title series (for example, from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor).
 - a. Normal promotion: promotion at the rate prescribed by Section APM 220-18-b.
 - b. Accelerated promotion: promotion at a rate faster than that prescribed by Section APM 220-18-b.
 - c. Decelerated promotion: promotion at a rate slower than the rate prescribed by Section APM 220-18-b.
- 2. Promotion from assistant to associate rank
Generally, appointees at the assistant rank may serve at that rank no more than a total of eight years. (See APM 133.)
- 3. Tenured associate and full ranks
Promotion beyond the rank of Associate Professor is based on continued demonstration

of superior intellectual attainment in all areas of the promotion criteria. Promotion, following normal progress, usually occurs after six years of service at the Associate rank or after two years at Step III of the rank.

4. The period of service covered by a review for promotion is as follows:
 - a. To Associate Professor: since acquisition of the terminal degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., D.V.M.) to date.
 - b. To Full Professor: since promotion to Associate Professor.
 - c. To Senior Lecturer SOE: since appointment to Lecturer SOE.See the procedure and checklist for promotions.

E. Evaluating academic performance

1. Criteria for merit, promotion, and appraisal

Reviewers shall:

- a. Evaluate the candidate with respect to the proposed rank and duties.
 - b. Consider the record of the candidate's performance in teaching and advising, research and creative work, professional activity, and University and public service.
 - c. Exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing (when the case requires) heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another; such flexibility does not entail relaxation of high standards.
 - d. Evaluate superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement. Continued superior intellectual attainment is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to associate/full rank.
2. Advancement to Professor, Step VI, or Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment, Step V
- a. Advancement will be granted on evidence of highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellent University teaching.
 - b. Reviewers should require evidence of excellence and high merit in original scholarship or creative achievement, teaching, and service, as well as great distinction, recognition nationally or internationally, in scholarly or creative achievement or in teaching. (APM 220-18-b(4).)

F. Conducting reviews for advancement

1. Initial consultation with candidate

- a. The department chairperson is responsible for:
 - 1) Advising the candidate about the process.
 - 2) Explaining rules and guidelines for the action under consideration.
 - 3) Soliciting information from the candidate.

Refer to APM 220-80-c and Chair's Sequential Checklist.

- b. For actions requiring an ad hoc review committee (see c, below) the chair should inform the candidate that he/she may provide names of persons who, in their view, and for reasons noted, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications or performance and hence should not be invited by the Vice Provost--Academic

Personnel to serve on their ad hoc committee. This request must be in writing and must indicate the basis for the candidate's view. The candidate shall be informed that any such information must be forwarded with the personnel review file. (APM 220-80-c.)

- c. Ad hoc committees generally are appointed for the following actions:
 - 1) Promotion to Associate Professor.
 - 2) Promotion to Professor.
 - 3) Advancement to Professor, Step VI.
 - 4) Initial advancement to Professor, above-scale.

2. Candidate's statement (optional)

Candidates are strongly encouraged to include a brief statement in the review file (no more than five pages) describing, and putting into perspective, their teaching, research and creative work, professional activity, and University and public service. The candidate's statement may:

- a. Systematically list accomplishments.
- b. Focus on particular areas of achievement, including honors and awards.
- c. Discuss the unique aspects or special significance of different career accomplishments.
- d. Not include attachments.
- e. Discuss teaching, which may include some or all of the following:
 - 1) Philosophy of teaching.
 - 2) Aims of specific courses.
 - 3) Choice of teaching strategies.
 - 4) Improvements that have been implemented.
 - 5) Reasons for problems that may have arisen in the candidate's teaching.
 - 6) Reasons for particular course formats.
 - 7) Criteria for selecting reading materials.
 - 8) Explanation of how student performance is assessed.
 - 9) Any other information related to teaching.

3. Letters of evaluation

- a. Extramural evaluators are required for:
 - 1) Promotions (including to Associate rank, full rank, and to Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment).
 - 2) Merits to Professor, Step VI, and Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment, Step V.
 - 3) Initial advancement to Professor, above-scale.
- b. Extramural letters are optional for appraisals.
- c. Solicitation of extramural letters (see Exhibit B for sample formats).
 - 1) All solicited letters must be included in the file.
 - 2) Normally, five to eight letters are adequate for the review file.
 - 3) Letters are to be obtained both from reviewers recommended by the candidate and from reviewers selected independently by the chair (with the advice of other colleagues).
 - 4) At least half of the extramural letters should be from the department's list

- rather than the candidate's list.
- 5) Each extramural letter must be marked "confidential."
 - 6) Each letter should be identified separately by a letter or number to ensure confidentiality of reviewers (APM 160).
 - 7) Signed facsimiles are acceptable.
 - 8) Email letters may be submitted with dossier, but **MUST** be followed up with signed, original letter or facsimile.
- d. Reviewers should be:
- 1) Selected from academic or research institutions with standards comparable to the University of California.
 - 2) Associate or full professors, or the equivalent.
 - 3) Familiar with the academic standards that are appropriate when making promotion decisions or who have the necessary expertise to make promotion decisions.
- Letters from mentors and collaborators, while valuable, should be supplemented by letters from sources without personal connections to the candidate (i.e., "arm-length" evaluations).
- e. Reviewer information must include:
- 1) Names of extramural reviewers to whom the solicitation letter was sent.
 - 2) Academic title and expertise of reviewers.
 - 3) Identification of reviewers that were suggested by candidate versus those suggested by the department.
- f. Intramural letters
- The only intramural letters accepted are those solicited by the department chair for providing:
- 1) Peer evaluation of teaching performance.
 - 2) Evaluation of clinical activities, if applicable.
 - 3) Input on the specific role of the candidate in collaborative research.
 - 4) Evaluation of graduate group chair service.
 - 5) Evaluation of Academic Senate committee service, if requested by candidate.
- Letters from departmental colleagues or from colleagues in other departments on campus (others than those above) should not be included in the candidate's file.
4. Voting requirements and consultation with department faculty
- a. Academic Senate Bylaw 55
- 1) Defines the rights of Academic Senate members to vote or consult on Senate personnel actions within the department.
 - 2) Mandates that only Academic Senate members can vote on Academic Senate faculty actions.
 - 3) Requires each department to develop its own voting procedures that must be reviewed and found acceptable by CAP prior to implementation.
 - 4) Requires that any changes be submitted to CAP for approval prior to implementation.
 - 5) Does not allow constraints to be placed on those eligible to vote (e.g., attendance at meetings).
 - 6) Provides that no voter may be denied the option to require a secret ballot.

b. Departmental letter

The departmental letter of evaluation must be made available to all members of the department eligible to vote. (APM 220-80-e.)

- 1) This does not diminish the authority of department chairs to make the final determination of the content of the departmental letter.
- 2) Chairs should not negotiate the content of the letter with department members or designated committees.
- 3) Departmental colleagues may suggest, but may not demand, changes in the departmental letter.
- 4) It is the chair's responsibility to report departmental opinion; unsolicited letters from other departmental colleagues will not be forwarded to review committees.

c. Reporting on the department vote

The process of consultation (APM 220-80-e) requires that the department chair report the consultative process used within the department in the departmental letter including:

- 1) Actual vote totals, even if the vote is unanimous, including numbers that were positive, negative, abstentions, and failures to vote.
- 2) Reasons for negative votes and any significant evidence and differences of opinion that would support a contrary recommendation.

5. Department letter of evaluation

The department letter should be a concise analytical evaluation of the candidate's performance in teaching, research, and service. This letter must be structured to include the following:

a. Summary. The letter should begin with a brief paragraph that provides:

- 1) Current rank and step.
- 2) Current title.
- 3) Candidate's department.
- 4) Details of recommended action, including:
 - a) Proposed rank and step (indicate if an acceleration).
 - b) Effective date.
 - c) Departmental vote on recommendation; ensuring that individual faculty members cannot be identified by the vote.

b. Teaching. The teaching section should comprehensively summarize the candidate's teaching and advising activities during the review period. The letter should then remark on the quality of teaching, referring to formal evaluations (both those included and those not included in the review file) and other available evidence as appropriate.

Note: For promotions, peer evaluation of teaching is required.

c. Research. The research section should concisely state the subject matter or subdisciplinary area of the candidate's main line(s) of research. It should:

- 1) Specify precisely the progress in the candidate's research record during the review period.
- 2) Discuss work published and accepted for publication during the review period.
- 3) Contain a thorough analysis and evaluation of the work, emphasizing its

impact.

- d. Professional activity and University and public service. This section should begin with a statement of the precise nature of such activity carried out during the review period. This should be followed by an evaluation of the quality of the contributions in these areas.

References may be made to the extramural letters (Letter A, Letter B, etc.), but chairs must not identify the individual writing the letter or their institution. Extensive quotations from the letters are inappropriate and unnecessary since the letters are included in the packet.

6. Chair's confidential letter (optional)

Department chairs are permitted to write a separate letter to make an independent evaluation and recommendation that may differ from the departmental recommendation. In accordance with APM 160-20(b), a letter from the chairperson (or equivalent officer) setting forth a personal recommendation in connection with an academic personnel action concerning the individual, such as promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment, non-reappointment, or terminal appointment, is classified as "confidential academic review record" and shall be accessible, upon request, in redacted form (APM 160-20-c(1)).

7. Candidate's access to file prior to department vote

Procedures for communicating with the candidate before the departmental recommendation is determined are outlined in APM 220-80-d and e. Prior to the faculty vote, the chair shall provide the candidate with an opportunity to inspect all non-confidential documents in the personnel review file (APM 160-20-b(2)) and shall provide a redacted copy of the confidential records. This is to allow the candidate the opportunity to correct any errors of fact.

- a. The candidate may comment on or refute the departmental recommendation as established by APM 220-80-e. The candidate's comments can be transmitted either to the chair, dean, or Vice Provost--Academic Personnel and will be included in the personnel file. The time limit for such comment is ten calendar days from the date that the candidate receives a copy of the departmental letter.
- b. Department chairs are not to negotiate the contents of departmental letters with candidates, but they should correct any errors of fact pointed out by the candidate.
- c. Since candidates have an opportunity to participate in the original selection of extramural referees, candidates do not have the privilege of requesting additional extramural letters after the entire review file has been compiled and the chair's letter has been written.

8. Assembly and submission of the dossier

- a. The order of assembly should adhere strictly to the order of the checklist for the appropriate action. Refer to the appropriate checklist in VII.B below.
- b. Departments are responsible for ensuring that all appropriate supporting documents are listed correctly and forwarded with each candidate's review file. On occasion, candidates may wish to submit valuable or irreplaceable books, art objects, recordings, etc., which will require special handling. These items should be clearly marked (i.e., a bright colored sticker) as inventory control items and a separate Inventory Control Receipt should accompany the item.

9. Late submission of material and departmental responsibility for review

- a. Submission of additional materials after the review file has been forwarded to the Office of the Provost is discouraged. In order to keep late submission of additional materials to a minimum, a deadline date of December 31 has been established for submitting additional materials for the review file. Materials will not be accepted after that date unless the person undergoing review is an Assistant Professor in his/her seventh year of service, and the information is critical to the review.
 - b. All late submissions should show that the candidate knows about the forwarding of the material by signing another Disclosure Certificate.
 - c. APM 220-80-h outlines the departmental role in adding information to the original recommendation.
 - 1) If, during Academic Senate or administrative review of a departmental recommendation, the review file is found to be incomplete or inadequate, additional information shall be solicited through the Vice Provost--Academic Personnel.
 - 2) Such new material shall be added to the review file, and the department shall be invited to comment on the new material.
 - 3) The candidate shall be informed by the chair of the substance of the new material that has been added to the review file (without disclosing the identities of sources of confidential documents), and shall be provided the opportunity to make a written statement of inclusion in the review file. A Candidate's Disclosure Certificate should be signed by the candidate at this time.
 - 4) The review shall then be based upon the review file as augmented.
10. Preliminary assessment (promotion to Associate rank only)
- A preliminary assessment is required if the Chancellor intends, after review of all recommendations in the dossier, to make a negative decision contrary to positive recommendations at the department or dean level. The preliminary assessment is designed to provide an opportunity to recommending units to determine if supporting documents might have been inadvertently omitted from the file or, if the file were complete, to identify points that reviewers appeared to have overlooked or that reviewers misunderstood.
- a. Preliminary assessments will be sent to departments only in cases of intended denial of promotion to Associate rank with resulting termination of appointment.
 - b. Candidates are provided with comments from reviewing bodies, APM 160-20-b and c.
 - c. Intramural letters (excluding those defined in 6, above) are not appropriate documents to be submitted in response to preliminary assessments.
- See the procedure for preliminary assessment.

V. Appeals

Appointees have the right to appeal a negative decision. An appeal must be initiated within 30 calendar days of notification of said decision. See the procedure for appeal.

Note: When administrative appeals have been exhausted, Academic Senate members have the right to appeal any questions regarding the review process directly to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

VI. Approval Authority

The authority to approve merits and promotions is outlined in the delegations of authority at <http://academicpersonnel.ucdavis.edu/delegations/index.cfm>.

VII. Procedures, Checklists, Exhibits, and Forms

A. Procedures:

- 1, Appraisal, Merit, Promotion, and Preliminary Assessment
- 2, Deferral Request
- 3, Joint Appointments
- 4, Five-Year Review
- 5, Appeal

B. Checklists:

- 1, Chair's Sequential Checklist for Personnel Actions
- 2, Merit Increase
- 3, Appraisal
- 4, Promotion
- 5, Deferral
- 6, Five-Year Review

C. Exhibits:

- A, Consultation and Voting Procedures on Academic Senate Personnel Actions
- B, Language Required When Letters of Evaluation Are Solicited or Received
- C, Guidelines for Preparation of Publication and Other Creative Efforts List
- D, Guidelines for Evaluation of Department Chairs (instructions to the deans)

D. Forms (available at <http://academicpersonnel.ucdavis.edu/forms/forms.cfm>):

- Candidate's Certification of Reviewers' Comments (for denied actions)
- Candidate's Disclosure Certificate
- Inventory Control Receipt
- Recommended Action Form
- Teaching, Advising, and Curricular Development Record