ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
MERIT & PROMOTION REMINDERS & HELPFUL HINTS
2015-16 Cycle, Effective July 1, 2016

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2015 – Dean’s Authority Case Deadline

MONDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2015 – Expanded Review Case Deadline

GENERAL INFORMATION:

- Cases received after the due date will be returned to the Department and will not be processed. A missed deadline may not be used as justification for retroactivity in a future review.

- Departmental Checklist for Academic Advancement (RB I-22): a copy of this checklist must be given to the candidate at the beginning of his or her review. The Department Chair has the responsibility to see that each of the steps is completed at the appropriate time.

- September 15th is the campus-wide default cut-off date for the Bio-Bib and other case materials; many departments have a much earlier cut-off date (e.g. June 30th) to ensure that case materials are collected in time to meet the hard deadlines. Reviews should only contain activity through September 15th. The only exception to this is tenure cases.

- Requests for extensions must come from the Department Chair and should be addressed by e-mail to the AVC for Academic Personnel with copies to the Dean and College Analyst. Requests should be specific, including how much time is needed, and should be made before the deadline has been reached. Requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

- USE THE CHECKLISTS in the Red Binder – I-30 (Dean’s Authority cases) and I-33 (Expanded Review cases). If the checklist has been responsibly completed, the case will most likely be complete when submitted to the College.

- Joint appointments – inform the College Analyst which department will be the “lead”; the lead department’s case must be submitted by the established deadline; the secondary department may have up to one additional month to submit their case. Please notify your College analyst if you will need the additional time. Both departments must use the same bio-bib. RB I-23 contains instructions for joint appointment reviews.

DEFERRALS:

- As soon as you know a faculty member will be deferring, please go to the Eligibility Report at the AP website and indicate “No Case.” Deferral requests for Assistant Professors require a thorough evaluation by the department and should be uploaded as soon as possible because they require approval by the Dean, but no later than the Dean’s Authority deadline (2nd Monday in November).
MERIT INFORMATION/CASE SUMMARY SHEET:

- If the proposed status is off-scale, make sure that there is an o/s indicator in the “Rank and Step” field.

- All ladder faculty salaries should be rounded to the nearest 100, i.e. $56,800, not $56,828. Salaries for LPSOE, LSOE, and Sr. LSOE should not be rounded and can be found on Table 10-B of the UCSB Salary Scales.

- The vote reported on the summary sheet should be the final vote; e.g.: 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions, 3 not voting; 18 eligible. Only Formal Appraisals & Career Equity Reviews should include more than one vote. AP Folio has space to record the second vote.

- Accelerations: When is it appropriate to check the “Acceleration” box on the summary sheet?
  - When recommending merit or promotion before normative time at step; for example, someone who has only been at Professor I for 2 years being recommended for merit to Professor II.
  - When recommending merit or promotion to a higher step than would be routine progression; for example, recommending merit from Professor I to Professor III.
  - When recommending the addition or increase of an off-scale supplement when you are also recommending changing the candidate’s rank or step; for example, recommending merit from Professor I to Professor II O/S.

- It is NOT an acceleration if you are recommending increasing or adding an off-scale only and the candidate is remaining at the same rank and step; for example, recommending merit from Professor I to Professor I O/S or Professor I O/S to Professor I O/S, increasing the o/s from $300 to $500. Please keep in mind that faculty are limited to two-within step merits increases and cannot receive a within step merit until normative time is reached from the most recent review.

- If there was a sabbatical taken during the current review period, be sure to upload the sabbatical report.

To make changes to the AP Folio Coversheet after submitting the case, use the “Maximize/Edit All Sections” link located at the top right of the Coversheet.

APM 025 (Appendix C) - REPORT OF OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES:

- APM 025 forms for each academic year within the current review period must be uploaded with the case. Staff submitting the case will need to manually “check” the boxes to have the reports uploaded. Faculty with appointments in multiple departments will only be required to complete the form once. RB I-29 provides a good source for explanation of the different categories of outside activities. All 025 forms must now be completed on-line.
DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION LETTERS:

- The department recommendation letter should be an **accurate, concise and analytical** representation of the case, and should contain a **clear recommendation for step, rank, and salary**. Per RB I-75, “**overly long letters are a burden to all reviewing agencies.**”

- For **career reviews** (promotion from Assistant to Associate, from Associate to Professor, or merit to Prof VI and to Professor Above Scale), the department letter **must provide an overview of career accomplishments as well as analysis of the achievements within the most recent review period**.

- Please put **page #’s** on the letter.

- Any **negative votes** should be **explained** whenever possible on the basis of the faculty discussion of the case, and acknowledged when they cannot be explained.

- The word “**promotion**” should only be used when going from **Assistant to Associate** Professor, or **Associate to Professor**. All others are “**merits**” or “**advancements.**”

- If the department is recommending an **acceleration** in either time or step, be sure that the word "acceleration" is used in the department letter, and that justification for the acceleration is clearly stated in a **separate paragraph**. Specifically, how does the record in each review area exceed (in quality and/or quantity) the expectations for the record in a routine review? Please refer to **RB I-36** for more information about what constitutes justification for acceleration.

- When external letters are solicited and cited in the department letter, check that reviewers are **not identified by gender, institution, or relationship to the candidate**, even if the reviewer does so in his/her own letter. Use “s/he” or “him/her” or other non-gender specific terms.

- **Avoid excessive quoting** from the self assessment, outside evaluators’ comments, or written student evaluations. The use of excessive quotation reflects poorly on the department, and decreases confidence in the overall analysis and future departmental recommendations.

BIO-BIBLIOGRAPHY:

The most common problems with cases involve the Bio-bib. Make sure the Bio-bib is **properly formatted**, per **Red Binder I-27**. The Biobib form is located on the AP website under “Forms.”

- Please put **page #’s** on the bio-bib.

- **Part I** (list of publications or other creative activities) of the Bio-Bib **must always be cumulative**, and there must be a line separating new items since the last review. If the last review was a retention or was not successful (i.e. did not result in a change in rank or step), there should be two lines.

- If publications are being **submitted via an electronic link**, the link must be listed at the end of the “Title and Author” information. The link must go directly to the specific item. Electronic links may **only be used for documents that are considered to be the final version**. In general, work
in press and published may be provided electronically while work submitted or in process should be submitted in hard copy format. All links should be verified prior to submission of the case.

- **Parts II-IV** of the Bio-Bib do not have to be cumulative, ever, even in a tenure or career review. However, if a department requires or permits faculty to submit Bio-Bibs that are cumulative in all sections, then all faculty in that department must do so, and there must be a line drawn in each section of the Bio-Bib separating new items since the last review.

- As straightforward as it seems, errors in counting are the most common error in academic personnel cases. Please double check any numbers cited in the department letter against the documentation in the Bio-Bib.

- **Counting publications**: Published (A) and Work in Press (B) items are counted toward advancement, and once counted for an advancement, cannot be counted again. Work Submitted (C) and Work in Progress (D) are not counted for the advancement, but are used as evidence of continuing research activity.

- If publications were listed as **In Press or Submitted in the prior review**, make sure that they are accounted for on the current Bio-Bib, e.g. “*” footnote = previously listed as In Press; “**” footnote = previously listed as Submitted. If a publication was withdrawn from submission, or rejected, or didn’t get published for some reason, it must be accounted for on the current bio-bib with a note. Works in Progress are not tracked from review to review.

- In the teaching section, be sure to include a statement of the department’s teaching workload as well as any course relief received. For all courses listed, please note if teaching evaluations are available with a “Y” or “N.” Many departments utilize and upload the Budget and Planning report (also known as the Class Instruction History Report). Please remember to note “Y” or “N” on it also. Yali Chen, Institutional Research Analyst, Budget & Planning, x7232, or Yali.chen@ucsb.edu

- All sections of the bio-bib should be listed, even if there is no activity in the review period.

**EXTERNAL LETTERS:**

- It is very important that reviewers are selected carefully. The guidelines can be found at RB I-46-IV, which I strongly urge all department chairs and ad hoc committees to read before soliciting letters. Two important points to consider: 1) avoid using reviewers that are close collaborators with the candidate, and 2) avoid using reviewers that have been used for previous cases for the candidate.

- If outside reviewers e-mailed their letter and an electronic signature is not present on the letter, you need to include a copy of the e-mail that the letter was attached to.

- The boilerplate wording for soliciting external review letters changes often and in subtle ways. Be sure to check the RB every year for the exact wording for the rank and step that the department is proposing (RB I-50), as well as for any changes in the confidentiality statement (I-49). Departments may rearrange content in their solicitation letters, but nothing should be added or deleted without prior approval of the Office of Academic Personnel.
The coded list of external reviewers should clearly indicate whether the reviewer was suggested by the department, by the candidate, or both, and if any letters were unsolicited comments. Note if a reviewer had written for a candidate’s previous career review(s). Reviewers’ Lists should also include names of any reviewers who were solicited but did not respond, as well as those who declined and their reason for declining, if known. Brief biographies are required for reviewers who write. These biographies are the responsibility of the department Chair or the academic personnel committee’s Chair.

Redacted copies of extramural letters need to be included with the case only when copies of redacted letters were given to the candidate. They should also be coded to match the original unredacted letters. Per RB I-22, if requested, redacted letters should be given to the faculty member before the department meets to discuss and vote on the case.

When redacting letters, do not delete/redact any information in the body of the letter, even if the author identifies him/herself.

PUBLICATIONS:

Make sure all publications from the current review period are included (A, B, and C items are mandatory; D items are the only optional items) with the case, and that they are numbered correctly. If one or more publications are not included, be sure to include a note to that effect on the bio-bib or include a note with the one of a kinds, e.g. “pubs 35 and 42 are not available.”

Verify that the titles on the hard copies of the publications match the titles on the Bio-Bib.

If this is a tenure case or formal appraisal, make sure all publications from the entire career are included with the case. D items, while not required are strongly encouraged. For appraisals they help reviewers determine how well on track a candidate is and for tenure cases it helps reviewers gain a sense of what is next on the candidate’s research agenda.

If this is a career review (promotion to Full Professor, merit to Step VI, merit to Above Scale, Career Equity Review), be sure to include all publications from the current review period and a representative sample of publications from the whole career.

TEACHING EVALUATIONS & REPORTS:

5-year ESCI Summary Instructor Reports are required. We also requirea line between courses taught in the current and previous review periods. Contact the ESCI Coordinator, x5278.

Written student comments should be submitted for each course in which they were done during the review period. They should not be typed; reviewing agencies prefer the raw data to preclude translation errors or editing. Do not send written comments from prior review periods.

Remember that the Instructional Consultation Reports are not the 5-year ESCI reports. Rather, these are written reports generated by the Instructional Development Office at the request of the faculty member, in order for them to improve their teaching abilities.

Contact Information: Teresa Everett, MLPS, x8647, teverett@ltsc.ucsb.edu
8/10/15