

June 21, 2013

**DEANS, EXECUTIVE ASSOCIATE DEANS, ASSOCIATE DEANS, ASSISTANT DEANS, VICE PROVOSTS,
VICE CHANCELLORS AND ACADEMIC PERSONNEL ANALYSTS**

**RE: 2013-2014 Call for Academic Personnel Advancement for Academic Senate and
Academic Federation Actions**

Dear Colleagues:

With this Annual Call for the 2013-14 academic year, I write to remind you of changes in policies, procedures, and interpretations that have taken place over the past year. These changes are in the process of being incorporated into the relevant UC Davis policy sections. They are summarized below.

We believe it would be beneficial to distribute the Annual Call to all academic appointees. Please distribute this document to the department chairs. We recommend that department chairs review the information and distribute to all academic appointees. We also encourage department chairs to discuss important new items and reminders with academic appointees at a department meeting.

I also want to remind you of our intent to adhere to the deadlines given in this document. Any request for extension of a deadline will require strong justification, and if granted, will not extend the deadline beyond a few days to a few weeks at most. Late actions for which an extension is not granted in advance will not be accepted. All actions that are normally delegated to the dean for approval that are not finalized by August 31, 2014 will need to come forward to this office for review and decision.

GENERAL INFORMATION

NEW

New – Recommended Language for Department Solicitation Letter to External Reviewers (include in all solicitation letters). We strongly recommend including the following language in the department solicitation letter to external reviewers for **all** advancement actions that require external letters. *“UC Davis encourages its faculty members to consider extensions of the (pre-tenure/review) period under circumstances that could interfere significantly with development of the qualifications necessary for (tenure/advancement). Examples of such circumstances may include birth or adoption of a child, extended illness, care of an ill family member, significant alterations in appointment. **Please note that under this policy the overall record of productivity and scholarly attainment forms the basis of your evaluation. Time since appointment is not a factor in this review.**”*

New – Streamlining Adopted as Campus Practice. Based on feedback, the successful streamlining pilots, Phase I (Academic Personnel – effective July 22, 2010 through July 1, 2013) and Phase II (Academic Senate/Academic Federation – effective August 24, 2010 through July 1, 2013), will be implemented as campus practice beginning July 1, 2013. A summary of streamlining efforts will be made available on the Academic Affairs website with changes to the Delegations of Authority and checklists for appointments and advancement actions beginning July 1, 2013. The streamlining table is included as Appendix A for your reference. Phase I and II streamlining documents are available on the Academic Affairs website.

New – UC Recruit. UC Recruit is an online application management system deployed at all 10 campuses in an effort to provide consistent data collection and reporting needs. As of 2013-14, UC Recruit is mandated for use in recruitments of all academic appointments. Campus users must be trained before access is granted. Please review Recruit information located on the Academic Affairs website.

New – Adjunct Professor Series Appointment and Review. APM 280-4 states, “Titles in this series may be assigned (1) to individuals who are predominantly engaged in research or other creative work and who participate in teaching, or (2) to individuals who contribute primarily to teaching and have a limited responsibility for research or other creative work; these individuals may be professional practitioners of appropriate distinction...” Due to the broad scope of this policy, we want to provide clarity and guidance for the Adjunct Professor series, which is reviewed by the Committee on Academic Personnel Oversight Committee (CAPOC). For candidates who are appointed and reviewed in the Adjunct Professor series, the department letter should clearly describe the balance of research versus teaching expected of the candidate.

New – Criteria of Scholarship. In 2002, CAPOC solicited Criteria of Scholarship documents from campus departments. The purpose of these documents is to provide disciplinary context for CAPOC to use during the review of actions for the departments which provide such criteria. The intent is not for these documents to be *approved* by CAPOC, nor do the criteria substitute for the APM. Rather, the information is viewed as additional context for the review committee. Departments are welcome to provide new or revised Criteria of Scholarship as deemed appropriate. If your department has formalized Criteria of Scholarship, that document should be included with the dossier (appended to the department letter), or at least referred to in the department letter.

New – Department Voting Clarification for Appraisals. In an effort to provide consistent data for CAPOC when reviewing an appraisal, department faculty votes should indicate the number of faculty who are voting for a “positive appraisal,” the number of faculty who are voting for a “guarded appraisal” and the number of faculty who are voting for a “negative appraisal.” The department votes should **not** be listed as “yes” or “no” on a positive appraisal.

New – Extramural Letters for Appointments in the Assistant Professor series. As disseminated in the *Vice Provost Advisory to Deans #AA2013-05* dated May 20, 2013, and revised June 5, 2013 for clarification, “arm’s length” letters for appointment in the Assistant Professor rank will not be required for the appointment dossier. In addition, the revised advisory indicates “... 4-6 letters are now expected for appointments at the upper Assistant Professor rank (Steps IV, V and VI).” The advisory in original and revised context is attached as **Appendix B**.

CLARIFICATION

Clarification – Advisory to the Deans #AA2013-01 – Incomplete Dossiers (Item #2). To alleviate confusion, we are providing clarification regarding *Advisory to the Deans #AA2013-01* dated February 7, 2013, item #2 “Provide summary of teaching evaluations for the full promotion/high-level merit review period.” Please note this paragraph does **not** apply to the Teaching, Advising, and Curricular Development Record. The paragraph **does** apply to the numerical summaries of student evaluations for the period of review. The advisory is attached as **Appendix C**.

Clarification – Documenting Progress When Advancing to Overlapping Steps.

When pursuing an overlapping step (e.g., merit to Asst 5 instead of promotion to Assoc 1), it is important to document progress on scholarly/creative works such as grant proposals or manuscripts that are in progress or submitted. Progress should clearly be described and discussed in the candidate’s statement(s) and the department letter.

REMINDERS

Reminder/Clarification – Pilot to Redelegate Merits to Associate Professor, Step IV and V. As a collaboration between Academic Affairs and CAPOC, 2013-14 will be the final year of a 2-year pilot program in which “regular” merits to Associate Professor, Step IV and V will be redelegated. In response to questions about several cases, we have simplified the criteria for redelegation as follows. Faculty appointed or promoted to the Associate Professor rank for 6 years or less will have their merits reviewed as a redelegated action, whereas, faculty who have been at the Associate rank for more than 6 years will have their merit actions reviewed as non-redelegated.

Reminder – Delegations to the Dean. Where recommendations and approvals have been redelegated to the dean, they may be redelegated to the associate dean, but no further.

Reminder – Labeling of Extramural Letters. To make the review of dossiers more efficient, each extramural review letter must be labeled with the following, additional information on the top right corner of the first page.

- First, each referee should be identified as being from either the “candidate list” or the “department list”.
- Second, each letter should be identified as being “arm’s length” or “**not** arm’s length”, according to the opinion of the department chair.

Reminder – Arm’s Length Letters. When extramural letters are required for a personnel action, a minimum of six letters should be included in the dossier (6-8 is ideal), at least three of which should clearly be “arm’s length”. In short, at least three of the letters included in the promotion or high-level merit dossier should be from individuals who are independent of the candidate, who are eminent scholars in the field, and who are able to provide objective, “arm’s length” assessment of the candidate’s work. Use of external referees whom the reviewers may not regard as objective or independent, either because they are too close to the appointee professionally (collaborators, thesis supervisors, personal friends, teachers, etc.) or because they have a personal relationship with the appointee, may be included if they shed light on collaborations, but these letters should clearly be indicated as not being “arm’s length” evaluations, as described above. Letters from mentors, thesis supervisors and collaborators are not “arm’s length”. An effort should be made to contact individuals who have not contributed letters for prior reviews for the same candidate. It is also desirable to have some referees who are familiar with the UC rank and step system, especially for Step VI, Professor Above Scale and accelerated promotions, since referees from within the University (outside UC Davis) can speak to the issue of the appropriateness of the step and magnitude of the acceleration.

Reminder – Confidentiality in Peer Review. A letter dated August 20, 2012, was sent by my office regarding the significance of confidentiality in peer review. The letter stated, “Peer review is critical to our academic personnel processes, and confidentiality is essential for meaningful and credible peer review.”

Confidentiality is imperative at every level, including review of candidate files, discussion during faculty meetings involving appointments, advancement or other personnel review actions, submission of internal letters of evaluation, and serving on *ad hoc*, college or campus personnel committees. The identities of those writing external letters, serving on *ad hoc* committees, and speaking during faculty discussions, as well as the contents of their evaluations, must be kept confidential if candid assessments are to occur. The complete letter is attached as **Appendix D**.

Reminder – Scholarly/Intellectual Leadership in Collaborative Work. Academic appointees are strongly urged to describe their roles thoroughly in each co-authored publication in the “Contributions to Jointly Authored Work” section of MIV. Many areas of science and engineering are increasingly collaborative, and this is often reflected in publications that have multiple authors. Independence can

be a problematic criterion to apply in research that requires substantial collaboration across disciplines and areas of expertise. Accordingly, faculty candidates should identify any leadership roles that they played in collaborations leading to co-authored publications. Examples of scholarly leadership include activities such as developing the conceptual framework for the project, inventing or applying novel analytic techniques, making key discoveries, changing the interpretation of findings, and writing substantial sections of the paper.

Faculty candidates can list all authors, but should only describe their own contributions to the work resulting in the co-authored publication, keeping in mind the importance of demonstrated intellectual leadership (see above). An estimate of the candidate's % contribution to the work should *not* be included.

Reminder – Consideration of Academic Collegiality* in the Merit and Promotion Process. The Academic Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T) examined the question of whether an individual's collegiality, or lack thereof, may be considered in merit and promotion actions. If collegiality becomes an issue in a personnel action, P&T asserted that the record forwarded should be particularly clear and factually well-supported. To that end, P&T recommended the following:

- “If non-collegiality is raised as an issue at the department level, the [department] letter to the dean must be specific about the nature of the allegations and should document examples of non-collegiality so that the individual under review can understand the allegations and respond accordingly. Specificity and substantiation in the [department] letter will help [reviewers] judge the merits of the allegation.
- If the departmental letter raises the issue of non-collegiality, the dean should fully explore and comment upon the allegations in [his/her] letter.”

*Academic Collegiality (or academic “citizenship” as it is sometimes called) is not a separate or additional area of performance for which the individual is to be evaluated but rather, falls within the context of the individual's record of teaching, research, professional competence and activity, and University and public service [see the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics (Appendix A in APM 210-1, <http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel/files/apm/apm-210.pdf>)].

Reminder – Approval Authority for Appeals. When the dean is the delegated authority on a merit proposal and the original decision is made before the end of August and thus is not retroactive, the dean will continue to hold authority for the final decision following any appeal of that decision, even if the appeal process does not come to a final resolution until after August 31.

Reminder – Ad Hoc Review Committees. Ad Hoc Committees are sometimes recommended and appointed during the review process. Ad Hoc Committees may be nominated by any Senate or Federation committee and are appointed by the Vice Provost. Per APM UCD 220 IV.F.b “...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...” The candidate should submit the names and reasons by separate letter to the Vice Provost's office, and the letter will be forwarded with the dossier.

Reminder – Advancement Proposals and Retention Issues. Retention issues should not be addressed in departmental and dean recommendation letters for merits and promotions.

MYINFOVAULT (MIV)

New – MyInfoVault (MIV), New Action Types. Effective with the 2013-2014 academic year, the majority of academic review types are available in MIV. This includes: Appointments via Change in Department/Title, Appraisals (if sole action), Deferrals, Department Chair 5-year Review for Reappointment, Emeritus Status, Endowed Chair/Professorship Appointments/Reappointments, Five-Year Reviews, and Unit 18 Initial Continuing Appointments. Appointments will be available in MIV in late Fall 2013. The ability to do more than one action at a time for any given academic appointee will not be available until the Spring of 2014. This means, if your academic appointee is pursuing a merit and appraisal, we recommend completing the merit in MIV and the appraisal via paper. This logic applies to Merit or Promotion with CER, as well as any other combination of reviews.

New – MyInfoVault (MIV), Position Description Upload. A position description upload is now available in MIV. Departments may scan and upload the signed position description, which means they no longer have to provide a signed paper copy in the box of supporting documentation.

New – MyInfoVault (MIV). Supporting Documentation. If there is a direct link on the publication list to the manuscript, it will not be necessary to provide a reprint in the backup documents. If the link sends you to a web page where a search for the article is necessary, you will need to provide a copy of the article in the supporting documents and remove the web link from MIV to avoid confusion regarding access to the article.

Online Supporting Documentation is MIV's highest priority after 2013-2014 development; however, this enhancement is anticipated to be delayed. The California Digital Library (CDL) is considering use of a tool called Symplectic that appears to be a possible solution for online supporting documentation related to the scholarly and creative activities of our academic appointees. Also, the Automated Course Evaluation (ACE) Steering Committee is making great progress towards an online course evaluation system that will share information with MIV. Given that these two very important potential solutions are on the horizon, we are proposing that the campus continue to submit supporting documentation via paper and/or use SmartSite as an interim electronic solution to the broken web link issues. A quick guide to using SmartSite for academic supporting documentation will be made available soon. However, the use of SmartSite is not required.

Reminder – MyInfoVault (MIV). Effective with the 2013-2014 actions, **all** merit and promotion actions must be submitted in MIV. Paper dossiers will not be accepted during the 2013-2014 cycle unless an exception is approved ahead of time.

Reminder – MyInfoVault (MIV), Actions Prepared in MIV. The following items, if written, need to be submitted in hard-copy with the supporting documentation.

- (1) Chair's Confidential Letter
- (2) Candidate's Rejoinder, if submitted beyond the department level directly to the dean.
Rejoinders submitted to the department may be uploaded into MIV.

Supporting documentation outside of MIV includes: copies of published or in-press manuscripts, copies of acceptance letters for the in-press items, and copies of student evaluations or other teaching materials. If you have any questions about other documentation, please contact your academic personnel analyst or email miv-help@ucdavis.edu.

Reminder – MyInfoVault (MIV), Candidate's Diversity Statement for Teaching, University & Public Service, and Scholarly & Creative Activities. MIV provides candidates with the ability to include an optional, separate statement in their dossier that describes contributions to diversity in teaching, university and public service, and scholarly and creative activities in accordance with APM 210.

Reminder – MyInfoVault (MIV), Most Significant Publications. We have heard from review committees, including the Committee on Academic Personnel Oversight Committee (CAPOC), that they would find it useful to have faculty indicate which publications are the most significant in terms of findings/impact, and in which the faculty member has had a significant role. This can be done by adding the “most significant works” footnote to the publication list in MIV, providing a statement in MIV regarding the “significance of research” which will appear on the “Contributions to Jointly Authored Works” list, providing the information to the Chair to include in the departmental letter, and/or including the information in the candidate’s statement. The works listed as “most significant” should be limited to five publications in a given review period.

NEW AND REVISED ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICIES OR PROCEDURES

Academic personnel policies issued during 2012-2013 consisted of technical and formatting changes. A complete list may be found at <http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel/academic-personnel-policy/policy-issuances-and-guidelines/policy-issuances-2010-present.html>.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation in continually improving the complex advancement process at UC Davis.

Sincerely,



Maureen Stanton
Vice Provost—Academic Affairs
Professor—Evolution and Ecology

DEADLINES FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL ACTIONS

Reminder – Deadline for Submitting Appointments to the Vice Provost. All proposed appointments effective July 1, 2014, that require the Vice Provost's approval, must be submitted to the Vice Provost office by May 12, 2014 to ensure they will be approved by the effective date. Any appointment dossier received after this date may not be approved by July 1st.

The following deadlines have been established for arrival of files in the Office of the Vice Provost – Academic Affairs.

Any retroactive action requires the review and approval of the Vice Provost – Academic Affairs, including actions normally redelegated to the dean for approval. An action is retroactive if the decision of the dean is more than 60 days after the effective date of the action.

Extensions must be requested prior to the due date of the action. No extensions for the submission of proposals for merits or promotions will be granted without strong justification.

November 12	Recommendations for promotion to Associate and Full Professor (or equivalent titles) and promotions for Federation titles
December 2	Recommendations for merit increases to Step VI and all above-scale advancements Recommendations for merit increases to Associate rank, Step IV and Step V that do not meet the redelegated pilot program
December 16	Recommendations for other non-redelegated merit increases, including <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Accelerations that skip a step2. Third action and beyond for department chairs3. Associate Deans
February 3	Establishment of an Endowed Chair/Professorship if the endowment is to be announced at the April donor dinner
February 7	Recommendations for accelerated merit increases and accelerated promotions for <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Academic Administrators2. Academic Coordinators3. Continuing Educators
March 3	Recommendations for merit increases and promotions for Librarian titles (including Law Librarian and Assistant, Associate University Librarian)
April 7	Appraisals from the deans' offices
May 12	Recommendations for appointments that require Vice Provost or Chancellor approval for actions effective July 1, 2014

Other deadlines/actions:

- Deferrals and 5-year reviews are due in the Office of the Vice Provost – Academic Affairs at the time the corresponding regular action would be due.