

**From:** Maureen Stanton  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 07, 2013 2:06 PM  
**Cc:** John R. Hall  
**Subject:** Advisory to Deans #AA2013-01\* - Incomplete dossiers

### [Advisory to Deans #AA2013-01](#)

## **DEANS, EXECUTIVE ASSOCIATE DEANS, ASSOCIATE DEANS, AND ACADEMIC ANALYSTS**

Dear Colleagues,

The members of CAP have asked me to communicate some of their concerns about incomplete promotion and high-level merit dossiers coming to them for review this year. They asked me to communicate those concerns to you, as they are likely to begin returning more of these incomplete dossiers to the deans' offices without review. Clearly, we all want to avoid the additional work and the delays that such returns entail. It is my hope that this memo will help to avoid the most common dossier deficiencies.

**1) Links to publications in MyInfoVault must be active and effective**—Careful evaluation of promotion and high-level merit actions requires review of actual publications, and not just abstracts. Accordingly, we ask that links provided to each publication during the review period be double-checked before sending the dossier forward to Academic Affairs. Clicking on the link should take the reviewer to the *full* publication. If no such link can be provided, please provide a paper copy of the publication for CAP review.

**2) Provide summary of teaching evaluations for the full promotion/high-level merit review period**—Please provide summaries of evaluations for all courses taught since **CAP's** last review of the candidate, not just since the previous merit action. I recognize that the system-wide [APM 210-1-d-1](#) may be interpreted differently on this point, but both the UCD APM and our UCD checklist make the requirement clear. To provide consistent review of teaching evaluation, please refer to [APM UCD 220-IV-F-5-b](#), which states: "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." We recognize that it may be too late to make this change for dossiers that are in the late stages of preparation right now. However, departments should make an effort to provide the complete set of summaries, if possible, and we will expect this for all CAP reviews next year. Academic Affairs will provide a reminder in the next Annual Call.

**3) Provide a substantive peer review of teaching for promotions**—Effective teaching is an expectation for these advancements. Accordingly, we require substantive peer evaluation for these actions (APM [UCD 220-IV-F-5-b](#)). A substantive peer evaluation by a departmental colleague should involve an analysis of classroom teaching, as well as an assessment of teaching materials such as exams, lecture notes, study guides and assigned readings.

Department Chairs need to plan for such evaluations at least a year in advance of an anticipated promotion.

Thank you all for your hard work in making our review process as fair, effective and efficient as possible.

\* Please note that Academic Affairs has implemented a new practice of assigning a tracking number to these kinds of advisories so we can more easily reference them going forward.

Best regards,

Maureen Stanton

\*\*\*\*\*

Maureen L. Stanton  
Vice Provost—Academic Affairs  
Professor of Evolution and Ecology  
University of California, Davis  
One Shields Avenue  
Davis, CA 95616-8558  
Phone: (530) 752-2072  
Fax: (530) 752-6359  
Email: [mlstanton@ucdavis.edu](mailto:mlstanton@ucdavis.edu)  
Web site: <http://academicpersonnel.ucdavis.edu/>