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The Step Plus system will be implemented effective July 1, 2014 and adopted immediately for personnel actions in the Senate titles of:

Professor

Professor in Residence

Professor of Clinical_

Acting Professor of Law

Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment

Senior Lecturer/Lecturer with Security of Employment
Overview of Step Plus System

• **Normative Schedule**
  All merits are considered on a fixed two-, three- or four-year schedule, as determined by normative time at their current rank and step. At every review, the individual may be considered for more than one step, i.e. 1.5 steps, 2 steps, etc.

• **Four categories of actions are allowed at any time**
  i. Accelerations in time are permitted for promotions to Associate Professor and Full Professor.
  ii. After a deferral, the individual may come up the next year.
  iii. After a denial, the individual may come up the next year.
  iv. After a five-year review, the individual may come up the next year if the five-year review did not result in advancement.
Step Plus Temporary Supplement

To compensate for salary loss due to eliminating accelerations in time, faculty members receiving an advancement of greater than one step will also receive a temporary salary supplement equal to 25% of the difference between their newly achieved full step and the next lower full step, for normative years at step.

- E.g. Prof 1 → Prof 2.5
- 0.25*(salary for P2 – salary for P1)

The supplement will end after normative time at the new step.
Phased Implementation

- Academic appointees have the option to request a merit that is an “acceleration in time” under the previous rules for their first action during the first three years of the Step Plus System.

- The 2016-2017 academic review cycle will be the last year of the phased implementation.

- A faculty member may not:
  - pursue a merit in 2014-2015 followed by an “acceleration in time” in 2015-2016 or 2016-2017, or
  - be considered for an “acceleration in time” that is evaluated under the Step Plus Criteria for Advancement.
A faculty member may request an “acceleration in time” from one whole step to another whole step (no half-steps).

If the faculty member pursues and receives an “acceleration in time” that skips a step to another whole step (i.e., from Step 2 to Step 4), the faculty member is not eligible for the supplement that would have been received if they had pursued the same action at normative time.
Key Features of Step Plus (1 of 3)

1. A 0.5 step is not an option for advancement.

2. Advancements of greater than 2 steps are permitted in Step Plus, although they are expected to be extremely rare.

3. New appointments will only be allowed at full steps.

4. Sabbatical and professional leaves count toward the normative time for advancement. Leaves without pay (LWOP) also count toward normative time, unless excluded from on-the-clock time based on our campus work-life policies.

5. Candidates may request a Career Equity Review (CER) coincident with a merit/promotion (and limited by other conditions imposed by CAP).
6. Following a denial or deferral, faculty at all ranks are allowed to come up as early as the following year.

7. Faculty may defer a normatively timed two-year merit twice and a normatively timed three-year merit once. In their fifth year they must seek a merit, a promotion or a “Five-Year Review.”

8. The home department reviews, votes on, and summarizes the merit case, subject to By-law 55 and Academic Personnel Manual (APM). Minimally, departments must vote on at least one action. Departments are encouraged to provide additional evaluation by peers.
10. Advancement requests of less than 2 steps are normally redelegated, unless the recommendation is a promotion or crosses a barrier step of Step VI or Above Scale. Actions equal to or greater than 2 steps will go to CAP for review and the Vice Provost- Academic Affairs for decision.

11. First actions since appointment or promotion may go directly to the Dean for decision without FPC review.

12. The Academic Senate will monitor the Step Plus system during its first 2-4 years to evaluate impacts on faculty progress, the possible need for a half step option, and any unanticipated consequences of the new system.
One-Step Advancement

All members of the Academic Senate are eligible for regular advancement at scheduled intervals. A balanced record, appropriate for rank and step, with evidence of good accomplishments in all areas of review is rewarded with normal advancement. All Academic Senate faculty can expect to advance at normal rates, unless a major flaw in their performance is evident. Service duties are expected to increase as faculty advance in rank and step.
One-and-One-Half-Step Advancement

A larger-than-normal, 1.5-step advancement requires a strong record with outstanding achievement in at least one area of review across research or creative work, teaching, and service.

However, outstanding achievement in one area may not qualify the candidate for 1.5-step advancement if performance in another area does not meet UC Davis standards.
Two-Step Advancement

A two-step advancement will require a strong record in all three areas of review, with outstanding performance in at least two areas. In most cases, one of those areas will be scholarly and creative activity, however, exceptional performance in two other areas (teaching, University and public service, professional competence and activities) might warrant such unusual advancement.

The two-step advancement should be considered for individuals who would have accelerated every year under the previous system to avoid disadvantage over progress under the step-plus system.
Advancements Beyond Two Steps

• These advancements will require an exceptionally strong and balanced record, highlighted by extraordinary levels of achievement in two areas (including research and creative activity), and excellent contributions in the third area.

• An advancement beyond 2.0 steps is expected to be extremely rare, and will go to CAP for review and the Vice Provost- Academic Affairs for decision, if proposed.
Step Plus Guidelines for Advancement (5 of 5)

Larger-than-normal Above Scale Increments

• The criteria for merit increases are steep at this high rank. Advancements of 1.5 steps require an exceptionally strong record of excellence in all three areas of review, with exceptional achievement in research and creative work, and outstanding performance in at least one additional area of review.

• All actions at Above Scale will go to CAP for review and the Vice Provost – Academic Affairs for decision.
Step Plus Toolkit

• Toolkit is available at:
  

• Toolkit includes:
  • All of the information we covered today
  • Step Plus System – Salary Tables
  • Instructions for documenting Step Plus actions in MyInfoVault (MIV), Academic Personnel History and Information Database (APHID), and PPS
  • Instructions for calculating the Step Plus Supplement
  • Sample Ballots
  • Frequently Asked Questions
  • Historical documentation
  • Guide for promotions and how to use overlapping steps
  • Guide for Above Scale merits in the Step Plus System
Discussion
Department Voting and Implicit Bias Issues
Suggestions on how to conduct voting

Step Plus offers an opportunity to evaluate peers for more than one step advancement, based on performance that exceeds normal expectations. Your department is encouraged to consider adopting or revising one of the sample ballots in the Step Plus Toolkit.

All voting procedures must accomplish the minimum requirement of a proposed action and a vote. However, using these ballots will allow the department to provide more information and unique insights for consideration of additional steps by other reviewing bodies and decision-makers.
Step Plus voting: Recommended process

- Candidate consults with the Chair and other knowledgeable peers to determine if there should be consideration of an action that is greater than a one-step increase.

- The candidate selects the proposed action(s) that is put forward by the department.

- Minimally, the department votes yes/no/abstain on the one-step action and on an alternative action, if proposed by the candidate. See possible templates in the Step Plus Toolkit.

- The department letter may include the distribution of votes and/or votes on actions different from that proposed.
Why should departments consider changes in their evaluative processes?

- **Implicit biases** reduce our ability to fairly evaluate non-majority candidates
  - Extramural referees
  - Student evaluators
  - Department peers
  - Review committees and administrators
- Recruitment of new faculty
- Evaluation of existing faculty for merits/promotions
Some things we know about implicit biases

- They impede objectivity—our evaluations are influenced by context and prior expectations.
- Few people recognize their own patterns of bias.
  - Those who rate their own objectivity highly are more prone to the effects of unconscious bias.
- Common unconscious biases are associated with
  - Gender “schemas”
  - Race/ethnicity/cultural variation
  - Family status... etc.
- Knowledge of bias patterns can reduce its impacts
- Using detailed evaluation criteria reduces impacts of bias
Best practices to reduce the impacts of implicit bias

- Recognize that implicit biases pose a potential problem
  - Raise awareness of patterns of implicit bias
  - Learn to recognize and call out biases when apparent

- Create and use more specific, structured evaluation criteria
  - When recruiting, identify, prioritize and use specific criteria for evaluation of applicants
  - When voting on merits or promotions, consider rating a faculty candidate’s performance in critical academic spheres
Rationale for more evaluative voting

- Under Step Plus, every dossier will be considered for multiple potential actions
- The availability of half-step intervals allows for more nuanced decisions and can benefit from more detailed information
- The use of more specific evaluation criteria has been shown to reduce impacts of implicit bias
- Departments, which often have the deepest knowledge of the candidate and discipline, can explicitly define their priorities and expectations for performance
- Voting “no” on a peer’s advancement can be hard. Rating performance in specific areas may result in more candid assessment
DRAFT Sample/Model Ballot C
Ballot Title: *Dr./Prof. [name] Merit from Professor, Step 1 to Professor, Step 2*

- YES, I vote in favor of the proposed action.
- NO, I oppose the proposed action. (Please provide comment below on reason for “No” vote.)
- ABSTAIN

**Comment on overall evaluation:**

(2) Would you support any of the following alternative actions? Check all that apply.
- Professor Step 2.5
- Professor Step 3.0
- NO, I do not support any of these alternative actions.

Comment on your alternative recommendation:

(3) Please choose one rating to indicate your overall evaluation of the following:

Comment (optional):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly/Creative Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEAD
Search Committee Training
Piloting Diversity Statements via UC RECRUIT

Phil Kass
Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Equity and Inclusion
Streamlining/Systems Update

Kelly Anders
Director, Academic Personnel & Systems
Extramural Letters

New 2014-2015 Extramural Letter Requirements

After careful review of all the streamlining efforts we have newly established extramural letter requirements for appointments, promotions, barrier merits, and other applicable actions. (see handout)

Extramural Letters for Merit to Step 6, effective in 2015-2016

As of the 2015-16 academic year, extramural letters of reference will no longer be required or recommended for advancement to Professor Step 6. The criteria for advancement to this upper step of the professorial series remain unchanged, and extramural letters for advancement to step 6 will still be required for next year.
In 2012-2013, UCD prepared and reviewed 1,664 academic performance reviews, which 1,205 were merit and promotion actions and could have been completed using MIV. Of those 1,205 actions, 934 (78%) were completed in MIV. A few of the other academic review types were conducted in MIV. Approximately 57% of all the actions were reviewed in MIV during 2012-2013. At this time, we are projecting approximately 80% of the 2013-2014 actions will be completed in MIV. The increased MIV usage since 2007 is shown here.

Figure 1: MIV usage since 2007-2008
Effective with the 2013-2014 actions, all merit and promotion actions were required to be submitted in MIV, with a few exceptions. The percentage of merit and promotion actions completed using paper, rather than MIV, is illustrated here.

Figure 2: Percentage of merit and promotion actions completed entirely using paper.
MyInfoVault (MIV), New Action Types. Effective for the 2013-2014 academic year, the majority of academic review types were made available in MIV, with the addition of New Appointments in February of 2014. Please note: Paper dossiers for merit and promotion actions will not be accepted during the 2014-2015 cycle. At their discretion, deans may require other actions in their units to be completed in MIV as well.

The following enhancements are scheduled for development in 2014-2015 to be available for the 2015-2016 academic review cycle. Until these enhancements are completed, some actions will still need to be submitted via paper.

• Ability to have multiple dossiers in progress at one time for any given academic appointee. For the 2014-2015 academic year, if your academic appointee is pursuing a merit and an endowed chair appointment, for example, we recommend completing the merit in MIV and the endowed chair appointment via paper.

• Ability to complete Merit actions with Appraisal and Merit or Promotion actions with a Career Equity Review. These actions are unique in that they are presented as one dossier but have two decision points. For 2014-2015, we recommend completing the merit or promotion in MIV and the appraisal or CER via paper.
## MyInfoVault (MIV) 13-14 Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIV: Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Enhancements</th>
<th>Delivery Status</th>
<th>Planned Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Action Types</strong>: Added 16 action types. Redesign Recommended Action Form</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deans/VP Signatures Updated Functionality</strong></td>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signature log</strong>: Disclosure certificate tracking</td>
<td>Sept. 2013</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event log</strong>: preparation for APHID integration</td>
<td>Sept. 2013</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointments, Phase 1</strong>: create appointments</td>
<td>Feb. 2014</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointments, Phase 2</strong>: without salary appointments, improved VP/Dean signature list</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provost/Chancellor electronic signature and updated VP recommendation functionality</strong></td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document permissions</strong>: add view restrictions based on dossier location</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MyInfoVault (MIV)
### Roadmap for the Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Action Form redesign: Adopt cleaner form developed for Appointments and require a new disclosure certificate if any changes are made to the dossier.</th>
<th>2014-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointments, Phase 3: Transition Appointee to Candidate</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Actions in progress at one time</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop action types Appraisal with Merit and Career Equity Reviews with Merit or Promotion</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>API Service for MIV: allows technology systems to talk to each other</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomcat 7 upgrade: Infrastructure upgrade that avoids end of support for the system</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Documentation: development and/or integration</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals: Long-term solution</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Academic roles in MIV: We need to add academic roles to handle separations</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete abandoned dossiers and archive incomplete actions for which we want to keep a record</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting module: analysis of potential external module</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online extramural letter solicitation: analysis of potential external module</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting module: development and/or integration</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online extramural letter solicitation: development and/or integration</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Action Tracking (ATS) was replaced with the Academic Personnel History & Information Database (APHID). APHID is an important tool used by staff members in the Deans’ Offices, Senate Office and Academic Affairs. Staff members in these offices enter data in APHID to track the step-by-step progress of a dossier (and its supporting documentation) for every academic personnel action. APHID is also used to track the advancement history of our academic appointees.

The goal is to provide department-level access to this online program/database for Department Chairs and department staff.
## APHID
### 13-14 Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhancement</th>
<th>Delivery Status</th>
<th>Planned Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Personnel History &amp; Information Database</strong></td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merged four frontends with different functionality into one system</strong></td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roles Administration</strong></td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewing permissions to final decisions</strong></td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to tag an action as Appealed with separate appeal recommendations</strong></td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Automated weekly process</strong></td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small improvements based on user feedback</strong></td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eligibility Analysis</strong></td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APHID: Roadmap for the Future</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step Plus Program</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off-scale database development</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Automate the Eligibility process phase 1 – merits &amp; promotions</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department-level access to APHID</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Automate the Eligibility process phase 2 – appraisals and endowed actions</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MyInfoVault Integration</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UC PATH migration</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Separate appeal final decision – analyze table access for Scrubber Doc</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All campuses and the Office of the President are using RECRUIT in 2013-2014. Recruit was the required method for academic recruitments at UC Davis starting in 2013-2014. 73 recruitments were conducted in RECRUIT in 2012-2013.  231 recruitments were conducted in RECRUIT in 2013-2014.

The enhancements for Recruit are gathered by the Academic Affairs/Personnel Office on each UC campus. A representative from each campus serves on the UC RECRUIT Governance Board. Kelly Anders is our representative. The Governance Board reviews/prioritizes the enhancements for RECRUIT. Details can be viewed at http://sites.uci.edu/ucrecruit/enhancement-requests/current-priorities/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UC RECRUIT: Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Enhancements</th>
<th>Delivery Status</th>
<th>Planned Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearer Applicant Statuses</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets minimum qualifications indicator</td>
<td>July 2013</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Review Date:</strong> also known as “open until filled”</td>
<td>July 2013</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity/Veteran Status updates to Applicant Diversity Survey</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Search: This enhancement will bring online the ability to review and approve search plans at all campuses, thus making the entire search process electronic. Mass-email functionality is also part of AP Search.</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-selection reasons (this is part of AP Search): Also known as, disposition or deselection reasons. Provide ability to specify reasons for non-selection so that the search committee may indicate why an applicant does not meet basic qualifications or the committee did not select an applicant for further consideration.</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## UC RECRUIT: Roadmap for the Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dossier Service Indicator:</strong> Allow the applicant to enter both a direct email address for their references and a dossier service email address.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Custom reporting:</strong> Give campuses ability to create customized/detailed reports.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant area of study/specialization field:</strong> For searches with large pools, and that are either interdisciplinary or open area, there is not currently a way to quickly sort candidates by topical expertise or research area for assignment to faculty reviewers with matching expertise.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customizable “how did you hear”:</strong> Customize the &quot;How did you hear about this position?&quot; answer options so that departments may track the value of advertising in specific journals. Also, give the applicant the ability to select more than one answer to account for all sources.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full export of Recruit data:</strong> Allow campuses to retrieve all data about the final candidate to support integrating UC Recruit with local campus appointment systems. Most data is already available; this enhancement would also make CV and other uploaded files available via web services (potential MIV integration point).</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manually add applicant diversity data:</strong> Provide diversity data on applicants who used a system other than Recruit to identify their gender and ethnicity.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant rating and labeling:</strong> As an applicant reviewer, I want to quickly label and rate applications and view other member's labels and ratings (including an average committee rating) so that we are not required to communicate and summarize this information outside the system. The new labels functionality would likely replace/supplement the existing flags functionality.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One account, multiple applications:</strong> Allow applicants to quickly apply for multiple positions at a campus so they may spend less time on applying.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Download all applicant bundles:</strong> Allow reviewers to download all applicant bundles for a recruitment without having to click the Download PDF Bundle link for each applicant.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity visuals:</strong> As a Diversity Data Viewer, want to see charts of applicant pool statistics compared with the availability data so that they may quickly determine if we align with diversity goals.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Announcements
Annual Call

• Merits to Associate IV & V

• Tenure Review for New Assistant Professors

• Extramural Letters for Assistant Professor Appointments

• Revised Offscale Policy
National and International Awards

Director Gloria Hayes

Building the UC Davis Awards Portfolio
I – Why awards?

- Thrive in today’s ever-competitive job and funding arenas and reap potential career benefits (honors received will be considered in merits/promos)

- Increase recognition of faculty at global scale

- Increase visibility and standing of individual units

- Increase visibility and standing of UC Davis
II – Building an awards portfolio at the dept. level

- Form a department awards committee
- Know which societies department members have joined and which honors they’ve received, then plot a continuing trajectory:
  - Create/maintain projection datasheet & track
    - Prof. org memberships/levels (leading to fellow nominations)
    - Foundational, discipline-specific and internal awards received or which to pursue next
    - Comprehensive nominations history
      - Monitor reference list
      - Track nominee’s eligible years & know re-nomination policies
II - Building an awards portfolio – cont.

- Harvest “ripe fruit” and cultivate growing seedlings; nominate at all career stages and keep detailed history
  - Encourage faculty (Academic, Federation, post-docs and students, too) to join/serve key prof. societies
  - Consider faculty readiness for awards at each stage carefully—*quality & timing* of nominations matter
III. Critical information

It’s **critical** to maintain updated records *and a great online professional presence*

- On the **Web** … And *anywhere else* you provide online info
  - Develop & maintain current, info-rich personal sites
  - Be thorough, i.e., list full titles, etc.
  - Update with each new publication, award, patent or promotion
Redesigned UCD Academic Affairs faculty honors web pages will provide:

- Links to all UCD academic units news pages and to UCD News outlets
- More information about award opportunities and how to pursue them
- A more dynamic presentation of recipients of top honors
V– Collaborating with Academic Affairs on premier external nominations

Successful nominations will result from our working together and being proactive.

- Establish a dept. awards calendar and set *recurring reminders for upcoming nomination openings* (chairs will receive awards list in email)

- Meet with the director at least once, to discuss opportunities and plot potential nominations

- Be *proactive*
  - Don’t await calls for nominations – rely on dept. awards calendar and jump on upcoming ops. 2-3 mos. prior to deadline
  - Contact Gloria Hayes to initiate process or with questions
V – Collaborating with Academic Affairs on premier external nominations

- Contact Gloria Hayes to initiate nomination process or with general questions about nominations

Gloria Hayes, Director
National and International Faculty Awards
Office of the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs
ghayes@ucdavis.edu
(530) 752-9748
Sexual Harassment Prevention Training for Academics
National Center for Faculty Diversity and Development (NCFDD)
Faculty Training/Workshops

- New Faculty Workshop – Monday, September 29, 2014
- Mandatory Two-day Workshop for Incoming Department Chairs – September 22-23, 2014
- Associate Professors – new brown bag series and networking sessions for 2014-15 Academic Year
Academic Federation: Research Titles and Their Treatment

(handouts in packet)