

## CHECKLIST FOR MERIT INCREASE

For Academic Senate series, Adjunct series and Health Sciences Clinical Professor series:

Professor  
Acting Professor of Law  
Professor In Residence  
Professor of Clinical \_\_\_\_  
Acting Professor  
Adjunct Professor  
Lecturer with Security of Employment  
Health Sciences Clinical Professor

Department will submit to the dean's office the information listed below through MyInfoVault (MIV).

\_\_\_ [Action Form](#).

\_\_\_ Departmental letter of recommendation:

- a. Report of the nature and extent of consultation and the vote of faculty members in the department. A separate department letter is required containing the vote and comments from eligible non-senate faculty for the Adjunct Professor and Health Sciences Clinical Professor series. Reasons for negative votes should be addressed in the department letter. Strongly recommend that all written comments be appended to the department letter.
- b. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness, including analysis of student evaluations as well as other types of evaluations as appropriate.
- c. Analysis of the quality of the research.
- d. Evaluation of service contributions.
- e. Evaluation of professional competence.
- f. For Adjunct Professors the letter should include the percent distribution of research and teaching responsibilities.

**NOTE:** OPTIONAL – If appropriate, the department's Criteria of Scholarship should be appended to the Department letter or referred to in the department letter.

\_\_\_ Signed [Candidate's Disclosure Certificate](#).

\_\_\_ Extramural letters: Letters are required for merit to first Above Scale only, and discouraged for all other merits. 6-8 letters are normally adequate. At least three should be "arm's-length." Include the following:

- a. List of all referees, including academic/professional title and expertise of each referee. Upload into MIV as a Non-Redacted letter.
  - i. This list must identify those nominated by candidate and those nominated by department. If the same name appears on both lists, they will be included on the department list.
  - ii. Indicate which referees are arm's-length.

"Arm's-length" letters are from external referees who are independent of the appointee, who are known scholars in the field, and who are able to provide an objective evaluation of the 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. 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 since referees from within the University (outside UC Davis) can speak to the issue of the appropriateness of the step.

**NOTE:** Review UCD 220 IV.F.3. for further information on determining “arm’s-length”.

- b. Example of the solicitation letter. Do not include the name and address of a referee in the example. Upload into MIV as a Non-Redacted letter.
- c. The following information should be marked on each of the extramural letters.
  - i. Stamp all letters “CONFIDENTIAL”
  - ii. Each letter must be identified separately by a letter or number that corresponds to the letter or number used in a. above, to ensure confidentiality of reviewers (APM 160).
  - iii. Each letter should be identified as being from either the “candidate list” or the “department list.”
  - iv. Indicate whether the letter is “arm’s-length” or “not arm’s-length”, according to the opinion of the department chair.

(See APM – 210; APM—220-80-c. and UCD 220 Exhibit B.)

**NOTE:** Upload the redacted and non-redacted versions of the extramural letters in MyInfoVault (MIV).

**NOTE:** Extramural letters are not required for Lecturers with Security of Employment and Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment being reviewed for advancement to the first Above Scale.

\_\_\_ If candidate is a graduate group chair, solicit evaluation from Dean--Graduate Studies.

\_\_\_ If this is the first merit following a third- or fourth-year deferral or five-year review, include an updated Plan for Progress developed by the candidate and department chair. Upload as Candidate’s Statement in MIV. Include all previous Plans for Progress since last positive advancement.

\_\_\_ For Adjunct Professor and Health Sciences Clinical Professor only: Include all forms for *Notification of advancement eligibility for an Academic Federation member* since last positive advancement. Upload as Candidate’s Statement in MIV.

\_\_\_ OPTIONAL — Candidate's statement (1-5 pages).

\_\_\_ OPTIONAL — Diversity statement

\_\_\_ List of all student evaluations submitted.

\_\_\_ [Teaching, Advising, and Curricular Development Record](#). (A complete set of teaching & advising records since advancement to full Professor is not required for merit increases to Professor, Step VI or Above Scale; submit since last advancement only.)

\_\_\_ DESII Report

\_\_\_ List of service activity.

\_\_\_ Complete list of publications and/or creative activities (UCD-220-[Exhibit C](#)):

- a. Indicate those materials that have been added since last approved action (draw a line).
- b. Indicate with an asterisk (\*) those publications included in the review period. (Note: these may appear above or below the line; e.g. delay in publication.)
- c. Indicate with a (X) the most significant publications.
- d. Indicate with a (+) major mentoring role publications.
- e. Indicate with a (@) refereed publications.
- f. In press items must have letters or emails indicating that items have been accepted for publication, unless the items are galley proofs. Attach the acceptance letters or emails to the manuscript in the supporting documents.

**NOTE:** The term "in press" designates works that have been accepted for publication without revision. Book contracts are not considered an "in press" item.

**NOTE:** If there is a link directly to the full publication (not an abstract), reprints do not need to be provided. Add the link to the article into the publication list(s) in MIV. Ensure all links are active or the dossier will be returned. If no such link can be provided, please provide a paper copy of the publication.

\_\_\_ List of contributions to jointly authored works (numbering corresponds with numbering on publications list). Identify the leadership role and contribution of the faculty member. Examples of leadership include activities such as developing the concept, inventing or applying novel analytic techniques, making key discoveries, changing the interpretation of findings and writing substantial sections of the paper. Do not describe the role of all authors. Percent of effort should not be included.

\_\_\_ List of honors, awards (if any)

\_\_\_ List of grants (if any)

#### SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION (will be returned to the department)

**Note:** If there are no physical supporting documents, the department should send an email to notify the Dean's office that the dossier is ready for review in MIV and there are no supporting documents. The same courtesy should be provided to the Senate Office and Academic Affairs when routing dossiers.

\_\_\_ For redelegated merits, accelerations, merits to Steps VII, VIII, IX, and subsequent Above Scale merits, one copy of all items published or "in press" since appointment or the last positive merit action; copies of submitted manuscripts may be included at the option of the candidate. "In press" items must have letters or emails indicating that items have been accepted for publication and attached to the manuscript, unless galley proofs are submitted. Identify each enclosed publication with the corresponding number on the publication list. (See UCD 220 IV.c.).

\_\_\_ For merit increases to Step VI, one copy of all items published or "in press" since appointment or promotion to Professor. Copies of submitted manuscripts may be included at the option of the candidate. "In press" items must have letters or emails indicating that items have been accepted for publication and attached to the manuscript, unless galley proofs are submitted. Identify each enclosed publication with the corresponding number on the publication list. (See UCD 220 IV.c.).

- \_\_\_ For the first merit advancement to Above Scale, the review period begins at promotion or appointment to full Professor. Campus reviewers must have access to one copy of all items published or in press since appointment or advancement to Professor, Step VI. Copies of submitted manuscripts may be included at the option of the candidate. "In press" items must have letters or emails indicating that items have been accepted for publication and attached to the manuscript, unless galley proofs are submitted. Identify each enclosed publication with the corresponding number on the publication list
  
- \_\_\_ Student evaluations (one complete set of original evaluations from two courses, preferably courses with the highest enrollment and preferably representing a range of courses taught, e.g., upper division and lower division).
  - a. Numerical summaries or percentages in each rating category for all courses taught during the review period should be included with student evaluations. The review period for redelegated merits and subsequent Above Scale merits is since appointment or the last positive merit. The review period for merits to Step VI and first Above Scale is since appointment or promotion to Professor.
  - b. Department should retain student evaluations for other courses taught during review period and have them available if requested by review committees.
  - c. If Lecturer SOE or Senior Lecturer SOE, submit student evaluations from all courses taught during the review period; also submit all numerical summaries or percentages in each rating category from all courses taught during the review period.

Dean's office will provide:

- \_\_\_ Dean's recommendation letter (if merit is redelegated, dean has approval authority; comments, if any). If the dean concurs with the department recommendation, the reviewing dean may opt to write a statement indicating that he/she has reviewed the dossier and agrees with the recommendation of the department in lieu of writing a detailed letter.