

## GUIDE TO PREPARING AND SUBMITTING ACADEMIC REVIEW FILES

### [Introduction](#)

### [Information resources](#)

### [Deadlines for file submission](#)

### [Soliciting external referee letters](#)

### [Preparing a review file](#)

- A. [Items included in a review file](#)
  - 1. [Academic Recommendation Summary form](#)
  - 2. [UC academic employment history](#)
  - 3. [Departmental recommendation letter](#)
  - 4. [Department chair's personal assessment](#)
  - 5. [Certification forms](#)
  - 6. [Departmental ad hoc committee report](#)
  - 7. [Appointee's personal statement](#)
  - 8. [Solicitation letter to external referees](#)
  - 9. [Identification and Qualifications of External Referees form](#)
  - 10. [External referee letters](#)
  - 11. [Unsolicited letters of evaluation](#)
  - 12. [Course Load and Student Direction form](#)
  - 13. [Teaching evaluations](#)
  - 14. [Other evidence of teaching effectiveness](#)
  - 15. [Level of Administrative Responsibility form](#)
  - 16. [Job description for Academic Administrators and Academic Coordinators](#)
  - 17. [UCSD Academic Biography and Bibliography form](#)
  - 18. [Sabbatical leave report](#)
  
- B. [Items that accompany the review file](#)
  - 1. [Publications \(or comparable items\)](#)
  - 2. [Raw teaching data \(in select cases\)](#)

### [Assembling and submitting a review file](#)

### [Review process after a file is submitted](#)

## **Introduction**

---

The instructions below assume that you are familiar with [UCSD Policy and Procedure Manual Section 230-28](#) (PPM 230-28), the UCSD policy on academic advancements and reappointments.

A review file is prepared when an appointee is due to be considered for one or more of the following:

- reappointment (for those whose appointments have specified ending dates)
- merit advancement (advancement from one step to the next within a rank, e.g., the Associate Professor rank)
- appraisal (assessment of an Assistant-level appointee's progress toward promotion)
- promotion (advancement from one rank to the next within a series, e.g., from Assistant to Associate Professor)

An appraisal is usually conducted at the time of a regularly scheduled review for advancement and/or reappointment, generally during the fourth year of appointment, but under certain circumstances it may be conducted separately. For details on the appraisal process, see PPM 230-28, Section VII.D. (Evaluation of Senate Assistant-Rank Appointees) and Section VII.E. (Evaluation of Non-Senate Assistant-Rank Appointees).

[Academic Personnel Data Queries](#) can be used to generate a list of employees who are expected to be due for review in a specified year. Basic and advanced query tutorials are available on the [Queries Menu](#) Web page.

**Retention files:** A review file must also be prepared if an appointee has received an offer of employment from another institution and the department wishes to counter the offer in an effort to retain the appointee. These files may be submitted at any time of year. Departments are encouraged to contact their divisional dean's office as soon as the need to submit a retention file arises to ensure its rapid review. Retention files are typically urgent and are given priority by Academic Personnel. If the appointee must respond to an outside offer by a particular date, the departmental recommendation letter should indicate this deadline. Retentions are addressed in PPM 230-28, Section IV.E.

**Career Equity Reviews:** An appointee in the Professor series may be eligible for a Career Equity Review (CER) to determine whether he or she is at the appropriate rank and step. Only faculty members at specified ranks and steps are eligible, and a CER may be conducted only at the time of a regular, on-cycle academic review. The decision to initiate a CER rests solely with the faculty member, who must submit a written request to the department chair or to the appropriate dean. If the request is submitted to the department chair, a copy should also be submitted to the dean. For details on the information a CER request should contain, how the department should determine its recommendation regarding both the regular action and the CER, how the departmental recommendation letter should be prepared, and other matters, please see PPM 230-28, Section VII.C.

**Deferrals:** An appointee may request deferral of the review if there is evidence that work in progress will come to fruition within the year and that having the additional year will make a difference in the result of the next review, or when circumstances beyond the appointee's control (e.g., illness) have impacted his or her productivity. In general, the following appointees are not eligible to defer academic reviews: Assistant-rank appointees (except when approved as a family accommodation; see PPM 230-15, Family Accommodation Policy); non-salaried Adjunct Professors, and appointees with established appointment ending dates (term appointments). Appointees may request a maximum of two consecutive deferrals. However, all academic appointees must be reviewed at least every five years. The appropriate dean has authority to approve the first deferral; the Senior Vice Chancellor must approve the second. Deferral requests must be submitted to the appointee's department(s) no later than October 15, and departments may set earlier deadlines. Deferrals are addressed in PPM 230-28, Section VII.B.1.

## **Information resources**

---

In addition to the UCSD Policy and Procedure Manual, other information resources are available under "[Academic Recruitment, Appointment and Review Process](#)" on the Academic Personnel Web site, including:

- Tips on preparing review files. These are pointers and reminders (updated annually) based on the

problems most commonly seen in review files. Tips are available for the [General Campus](#), the [School of Medicine](#), the [Scripps Institution of Oceanography](#), and [Organized Research Units](#).

- A [glossary](#) of academic personnel terms.
- Definitions of [off-scale salary terms](#). Market and bonus off-scale salary components are explained, and the circumstances under which they may be proposed, reset, increased, etc., are described.
- A [review worksheet](#). This is a handy checklist of items included in review files to aid you in preparation of files.

Academic Personnel also provides courses on preparation of review files and other topics. Information on academic personnel courses is available at [Enrollment Central](#) (see “Browse Course Catalog”).

If you need more detailed information or have questions regarding the preparation of individual review files, please contact your dean’s office.

## **Deadlines for file submission**

The standard campus file deadlines are listed below. These deadlines may vary slightly from year to year, depending on the dates upon which holidays and weekends fall; please check the [file deadline chart](#) posted on the Academic Personnel Web page for exact dates each year.

Deans’ offices must forward all files subject to campus-level review to the Academic Personnel office no later than the posted deadlines for actions effective July 1. Departments and deans have established earlier due dates in order to meet these campus deadlines. Contact your department chair’s office or dean’s office for further information. ***Files received after these deadlines will require an effective date of July 1 of the following year.***

OCT 15	Requests for reconsideration of termination decision
NOV 1	Requests for second consecutive deferral of review
DEC 1	Appraisals
	Advancements within Above Scale
	Reappointment/merit actions requiring campus review
	Actions for non-salaried appointees requiring campus review
	Contested no-change actions
JAN 15	Accelerated merit advancements
	New bonus off-scale salary components
	New, increased, or rejustified market off-scale salary components (with or without other review actions)
FEB 15	Promotions (career review)
	Advancement to/through Step VI (career review)
	Advancement to Above Scale (career review)
	Termination decisions
	Reconsideration of termination decisions
	Crossover merit advancements
	Initial continuing appointments (Unit 18)
MAY 1	Completed review actions for which deans have authority (due for post-audit by Academic Personnel)

## Soliciting external referee letters

Files for certain actions (promotions and merit advancements requiring career reviews, such as advancement to Professor, Step VI, or to Professor, Above Scale) must include evaluation letters from external referees, i.e., individuals outside of UCSD. *It is important to solicit external referee letters well in advance of preparing the review file so that delays in file submission can be avoided.* [Sample solicitation letters for review actions](#) are available on the Academic Personnel Web site.

A minimum of five external referee letters are required for promotion to the Associate level; a minimum of three external referee letters are required for promotion to the Full level and for other actions involving career reviews. In all other cases, external referee letters should not be solicited unless there is no department faculty member with sufficient expertise to evaluate the appointee.

Careful selection of external referees is very important. For detailed information, see [PPM 230-28](#), Section IV.B., External Referee Letters.

## Preparing a review file

### **A. Items included in a review file**

The documents listed below must be included in the review file, as required for the proposed action (e.g., external letters for promotions) or for the appointee's series (e.g., the Level of Administrative Responsibility form for the Academic Administrator and Academic Coordinator series). Documents should appear in the order listed. Downloadable versions of required forms and examples of other required documents are available in ["Forms and Examples"](#) on the Academic Personnel Web site.

All documents received and reviewed by departmental reviewers, including departmental ad hoc reports and all external referee letters, must be included in the file regardless of the ultimate departmental recommendation. For example, if a department is considering an appointee for promotion and solicits external letters, but after reviewing the letters decides to recommend a crossover merit advancement instead, the letters received and reviewed by departmental faculty must still be included in the file so that campus reviewers base their assessment on the same documentation.

#### 1. Academic Recommendation Summary

The appropriate Academic Recommendation Summary form ([General Campus](#), [SOM](#), [SIO](#), or [SSPPS](#)) must be placed at the front of each file to recap the departmental recommendation and to provide for the orderly processing of the file by reviewers.

Be certain the following information is included on the Academic Recommendation Summary.

- a. **Name:** Provide the appointee's full name, including middle name or initial.
- b. **Department:** List the department in which the appointment is held. If the appointee holds appointments in two or more departments, list the home department first, and number the departments—e.g., 1) History 2) Political Science.
- c. **Proposed action(s):** Indicate the action(s) recommended. Keep in mind that more than one may be applicable (e.g., merit, reappointment, and appraisal).
  - Indicate whether the proposed action is one requiring a career review (promotion, advancement to Step VI, or advancement to Above Scale). For these actions, external referee letters must be solicited.
  - If an accelerated promotion or accelerated merit advancement is recommended, indicate the degree of acceleration (e.g., "3-year") in the space provided.

- Indicate “Crossover” if the proposed action is a merit advancement to Step V or VI at the Assistant rank or to Step IV or V at the Associate rank.
  - Indicate whether reappointment is required. Reappointments are necessary for all appointees whose current appointments have specific ending dates. Reappointments must be completed before the current appointment ends.
  - If an appraisal or a readiness assessment has been conducted for an Assistant-level appointee, or if a terminal reappointment is recommended, be sure to indicate this. (For complete information on evaluations of Senate and non-Senate Assistant-level appointees, see [PPM 230-28](#), Section VII.D. and VII.E.)
  - Indicate “No Change” if no advancement is recommended.
  - If an off-scale salary component is being proposed, indicate the type (bonus or market). Also indicate the status for market off-scales that require campus review (new, increased, or reset.) For complete information, see [Off-Scale Salary Terms](#).
  - If the file is being submitted as a retention effort, be sure to indicate this, and if there is a deadline by which the appointee must respond to an outside offer, provide this date to help ensure timely completion of the review process.
  - If the appointee is eligible for and has requested a Career Equity Review in conjunction with a regularly scheduled review, this should be indicated.
- d. **Present status:** Provide current rank and step, title code, salary, percentage of time, basis for salary (academic year or fiscal year), and the number of years the appointee will have been at the current rank and step as of the next June 30. In the space in parentheses below the salary figure, indicate the salary scale on which the salary is based (e.g., 10/1/08 scale). If the appointee holds a split or joint appointment, provide all information for each appointment, numbered appropriately—e.g., for a joint appointment: 1) Associate Professor, Step II; 2) Associate Adjunct Professor, WOS. (The numbers should correspond to the numbered departments.)
- e. **Proposed status:** Provide proposed rank and step, title code, salary, percentage of time, salary scale, basis for salary, and the beginning and ending dates of the period of service. If there is an end date, it must be specified. If the appointee is tenured, enter “tenure” in lieu of an end date. If the position is not tenured, but the appointment period is indefinite, enter “indefinite” in lieu of an end date. If the appointee holds a split or joint appointment, provide all information for each appointment.
- f. **Vote:** If a faculty vote is required for the action proposed, indicate the number of faculty eligible to vote, and record the breakdown of the vote—i.e., indicate the number in favor, the number opposed, the number who abstained from voting, and the number absent. When a vote is required, the department’s recommendation must be supported by at least 50% of all those eligible to vote and in residence at the time of the vote.
- g. **Chair name/signature:** Fill in the chair’s name and the date and obtain his/her signature. If the appointee holds appointments in two or more departments, each department chair’s name should be listed and each should sign and date the Summary form.
- h. **Years toward 8-year limit:** The department should leave this blank. The dean’s office will indicate the date that an appraisal is expected for Assistant-level appointees.
2. UC Academic Employment History

The department should create a University of California [Academic Employment History](#) showing periods of service and the title, step, percentage of time, and department for each period. The employment history should cover the appointee’s entire employment history at the University of

California, not just at the UC San Diego campus. Include periods of leave without pay and periods of sabbatical leave. Any accelerated advancement should be indicated by an asterisk in the margin next to the period in which the acceleration took effect, and the degree of acceleration (e.g., three-year accelerated merit) should be indicated in a note below. **Note:** Salary information should not be included in the employment history.

### 3. Departmental recommendation letter

The departmental recommendation letter presents the department's justification for the action recommended. It should be based on an evaluation of the appointee by all eligible members of the department, and it should be addressed to the administrator with approval authority for the action proposed, as specified in the [Authority and Review Chart](#).

If the appointee holds appointments (salaried or non-salaried) in two or more departments, each department must evaluate the appointee and provide a recommendation letter. The home department, as identified in the Payroll Personnel System, prepares the file and provides a copy to the other department(s) for evaluation.

If the department chair and the appointee are near relatives (see [APM 520](#) for definition) or close collaborators, the chair should recuse him/herself, and the vice chair (or other senior faculty member) should prepare the review file and draft the departmental recommendation letter.

Department chairs may refer to [PPM 230-28](#), Section IV.A, Department Chair Responsibilities, and Section V., Evaluation of Performance, for guidance on the evaluation of appointees.

Departmental recommendation letters should include the following:

- a. An initial paragraph stating the proposed action and the proposed status of the appointee's off-scale salary component (if any); the appointee's current title, rank, step, and salary; the proposed title, rank, step, and salary; and the effective date.

Example: "On behalf of the Department of Marine Archaeology, I am pleased to recommend a three-year accelerated merit advancement with maintenance of the market off-scale salary component for Professor John Doe, from Professor, Step VI (OS), at an annual nine-month salary of \$XX,XXX, to Professor, Step VIII (OS), at an annual nine-month salary of \$XX,XXX effective July 1, 2008."

- b. Mention of any special element of the review, such as an appraisal, readiness assessment, career equity review, off-scale salary proposal requiring justification, or retention effort. Such elements should be noted near the beginning of the letter, although detailed discussion may be provided farther down.
- b. A report on the chair's consultation with department faculty members, including a statement specifying the degree of consultation (e.g., use of a departmental ad hoc committee, discussion at a faculty meeting) and any dissenting opinion. [Academic Senate Bylaw 55](#), regarding faculty voting rights, must be observed in all applicable cases. The letter must make clear who was consulted and the manner of consultation, verify that a complete file was presented to appropriate department members for consideration, and report the results of any vote taken, including the reasons, if known, for any negative votes. If the reason for negative votes is unknown because votes were cast by secret ballot, this should be stated in the letter.

The department is required to document the membership of the departmental ad hoc committee in the file (see item 6, below), but the departmental recommendation letter should not mention ad hoc committee members' names, since the appointee has the right to see the departmental letter and ad hoc committee members' names are confidential.

- c. A statement regarding any conflicts of interest in the file. If a department chair or any faculty member contributing to a file has a financial interest in a company employing the appointee under review, that information should be included in the letter, and such individuals should

recuse themselves from contributing to the file.

- d. A thorough evaluation of the appointee's performance and achievements in each area of responsibility to the University, as specified in the series criteria (see [PPM 230-28](#)). This may include one or more of the following, depending on the series:
    - A clear description and evaluation of the research and other creative activity conducted during the review period and the impact of that research and creative activity on the appointee's field. The letter also should explain the appointee's specific role in all collaborative and coauthored works, if the appointee is not first or senior author. Further, the letter should indicate the standing of journals and conference proceedings in which the appointee's publications appear, whether the journals are refereed, and their rates of acceptance/rejection. The chair should review the appointee's previous file to note which publications were considered for that review, as these publications cannot be counted again for subsequent advancement (except that they may be appropriately counted in full career reviews).
    - A clear statement describing the department's teaching requirements and how the appointee's teaching contributions met those requirements. The letter should note all formal and informal teaching efforts undertaken by the appointee during the review period. An evaluation of teaching effectiveness, as well as an explanation of unusually heavy or light teaching loads, should be provided. The letter should also address any problems in the area of teaching, measures taken during the review period to improve teaching, and specific plans to correct the problems.
    - A discussion of the appointee's service accomplishments. For example, if the appointee served on a committee, the committee responsibilities and workload should be described. If the appointee chaired the committee, this should also be noted. Exceptional service in a capacity such as department chair is generally cited and rewarded only after the completion of such service, not while it is in progress.
  - e. A brief summary of the opinions of external referees. The departmental recommendation letter should refer to external referees by code only (i.e., Referee A, Referee B, etc., as determined by their listing on the Referee I.D. form—see below). Comments that might identify external referees must not appear in the departmental letter, the text of which is available to the appointee in redacted form, or in the departmental ad hoc report, if any. Extensive quotations from these letters are redundant and therefore are discouraged.
  - f. Justification for the award of, or policy exception for, any bonus or market off-scale salary component. It is particularly important to provide justification for continuation of market off-scale components beyond the six-year limit (see PPM 230-28, Section VII.B.5., Appointee Recommended for an Off-Scale Salary Component).
4. Outside offer letter (if applicable)

Retention files must include a signed copy of the offer letter from the competing institution. (Alternatively, the institution may send the letter on institution letterhead as an e-mail attachment.) The offer should include all of the major terms of employment (rank, step, salary, effective date) and must be issued by a high-level administrator, such as a dean or provost.
  5. Department chair's personal assessment (optional)

If the department chair disagrees with the departmental recommendation, which must be based on evaluation of the appointee by all eligible members of the department, the chair may write an independent assessment to be included in the file. This is considered a confidential document. The chair's dissenting opinion should not be included in the departmental recommendation letter.
  6. Dissenting letters from faculty

If faculty members do not agree with the departmental recommendation, they can submit dissenting letters to be included in the file. Such letters are not confidential.

## 7. Certification forms

Certifications are obtained in order to ensure that appointees have been made aware of their rights and responsibilities during the review process and that the correct procedures have been followed. For this reason, it is important that certifications be signed only at the appropriate point in the review process, as described below.

### Certification A

At the beginning of the review process, the chair must inform the appointee of the nature of and procedures for the impending review and of his or her rights to provide information for the review. After the review file is assembled, the appointee is asked to certify that he or she had the opportunity to update the Biography and Bibliography packet; to inspect teaching evaluations and other non-confidential material in the review file; to receive, upon request, a redacted copy of the confidential materials in the file; and to submit for inclusion in the file a written statement in response to or commenting on the file. The appointee's signature on Certification A certifies that these procedures have been followed *prior to* departmental review of the file and determination of the departmental recommendation.

### Certification B

After the department has determined its recommendation, the appointee must be informed orally or, upon request, in writing, of the results of the departmental recommendation. If the chair provides this information in writing, a copy of the written statement must be included in the file. Upon request, the chair must provide the appointee a copy of the departmental recommendation letter. The appointee's signature on Certification B certifies that these procedures have been followed.

### Certification C

If new material (for example, an additional external referee letter) is added to the file after the file has been forwarded to the appropriate dean's office or to Academic Personnel, the department must inform the appointee of the new material and obtain the appointee's signature on Certification C to certify that this has been done.

Further information regarding certifications is available in [PPM 230-29](#), Policies and Procedures to Assure Fairness in the Academic Personnel Review Process.

## 8. Departmental ad hoc committee report

Although the department chair is responsible for documentation and presentation of the departmental recommendation, it may be advantageous to appoint a departmental ad hoc committee to advise the chair, particularly in the following cases:

- Promotion to Associate Professor and to Professor
- Advancement to Step VI of the Professor, Professor In Residence, Professor of Clinical X, Adjunct Professor, or Professional Research (Research Scientist) series
- Advancement to and within Above Scale
- Non-reappointment or termination of a Senate Assistant-rank appointee
- Accelerated merit advancement

If the department chair appoints a departmental ad hoc committee, the ad hoc committee report must be included in the file. Although the identity of all members is confidential, a list of members must be shown on the report, and the report should be signed at the bottom by all members. Ad hoc committees should be reminded to refer to external referees by code only (e.g., Referee A, Referee B, etc., corresponding to the Referee I.D. form). Upon request, the ad hoc report is available to the candidate in redacted form.

If a campus ad hoc committee is later convened to review the file, department members who contributed formally to the file at the departmental level normally are not recommended by the Committee on Academic Personnel or selected by the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to serve on the campus ad hoc committee.

#### 9. Appointee's personal statement

If the appointee provides a personal statement (which is optional) regarding his or her achievements and future plans, this document should be so titled, and it must be signed and dated. Appointees may wish to provide such statements in part to ensure that special efforts, such as development of a new class, or unusual service contributions, are fully recognized and credited.

#### 10. Solicitation letter to external referees

The chair's letter to external referees soliciting evaluations of the candidate must be included in the file. If different versions of the solicitation letter (e.g., with different dates or modified wording) are sent to different referees, all versions must be included in the file. Letters should be annotated to show which referees received them.

Solicitation letters must include appropriate wording describing the proposed action and explaining the nature of the proposed advancement and, if applicable, the degree of acceleration, so that referees may evaluate the appointee's achievements in relation to the University's criteria for advancement. Referees should be urged to provide an objective and analytical evaluation with specific comments about the appointee's abilities and accomplishments, rather than uncritical praise. Solicitation letters must also include the University's [confidentiality statement](#).

[Sample solicitation letters for review actions](#) are provided on the Academic Personnel Web site.

#### 11. Identification and Qualifications of External Referees form

The [Identification and Qualifications of External Referees](#) form (informally called the Referee I.D. form) is used to aid reviewers by identifying the external referees asked to provide letters of evaluation and explaining their qualifications to evaluate the appointee. All referees who are solicited should be listed on the form, whether or not they reply, and it should be indicated whether they were selected by the department, the appointee, or both. All other documents in the file (e.g., the ad hoc committee letter and the departmental recommendation letter) must refer to referees only by code (e.g., Referee A, Referee B, etc.) and must not describe or in any way identify referees. In addition, if the department solicits letters from referees who are not senior scholars or are not independent of the appointee, it must explain why these referees were considered the best qualified, and this must be done on the Referee I.D. form, not in the departmental or ad hoc recommendation letters.

#### 12. External referee letters

All responses from external referees should be included in the file (even those stating only that they do not have time to write an evaluation).

Letters should be coded to correspond to the Referee I.D. form (the letter from referee A on the list should have the letter "A" in the upper right-hand corner of all pages; the letter from referee B should be coded with "B," and so forth).

Handwritten letters should be typed by department staff; both the handwritten and typed versions of the letter must be included in the file.

Typed translations of letters written in foreign languages must be included in the file, along with the original, untranslated version. The translator must be identified by name and title at the end of the translation. Appointees may not serve as translators for letters solicited for their reviews.

### 13. Unsolicited letters of evaluation

Unsolicited letters of evaluation that are added to the file by the appointee are not considered confidential.

Unsolicited letters received by the department (and not added to the file by the appointee) may be included in the file at the department chair's discretion and are considered confidential. Before including an unsolicited letter in the appointment file, the department chair must send the University's confidentiality statement to the letter writer and obtain a signed or electronic authorization to use the unsolicited letter in the file. The authorization, the unsolicited letter, and the department chair's letter transmitting the confidentiality statement should be included in the file.

### 14. Course Load and Student Direction form

#### a. General Campus and Scripps Institution of Oceanography

This information is available in either electronic or printed format from the Campus Planning Office.

The appointee is responsible for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of the teaching record since the previous advancement. Contact hours per course per quarter are the hours actually spent by the faculty member on classroom instructional duties.

"Independent Study" contact hours are hours spent by the faculty member with the student in instruction related to the student's independent-study project.

Independent-study instruction (e.g., 195, 199, 299 and 500 courses) should be shown under "Individual Instruction."

For appointees who hold instructional titles in more than one department, a complete listing of all courses taught in each department should appear on the Course Load form.

The appointee should annotate the Course Load form to correct any errors, and the department should report these errors to [Institutional Research](#) in the Campus Planning Office.

#### b. School of Medicine

For assistance in completing the SOM teaching and patient caseload forms (Teaching Quantification and Patient Caseload form, Department of Medicine form, Dept of \_\_\_\_\_ form, or School of Medicine form), contact the office of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in the School of Medicine. These forms are available on the "[Forms and Examples](#)" page of the Academic Personnel Services Web site. Please note that use of the Teaching Quantification and Patient Caseload form will be required for actions effective July 1, 2011, and beyond.

### 15. Teaching evaluations

One form of evaluation each for undergraduate and graduate teaching is required. More than one form of evaluation is encouraged and may be particularly critical in career reviews. Evaluations should be arranged in reverse chronological order (most current evaluations first).

- [Course and Professor Evaluations](#) (CAPE), a student-run organization, conducts evaluations of undergraduate classes with enrollments of 15 or more students. CAPE sends statistical information on these evaluations to departments and professors within two weeks after final

grades are turned in. The original student comments are sent to departments at about the same time.

- Departments may conduct their own evaluations of graduate and undergraduate courses. Numerical ratings and individual student comments should be summarized in the departmental recommendation letter. Individual evaluations generally should not be included in the file; however, they must be maintained in the department and made available to reviewers if requested. If individual evaluations are submitted, they should be submitted in a folder separately from the review file.
- Scatter diagrams that provide a graphical presentation of each faculty member's teaching effectiveness as compared with others in the same department and for the same course are made available to departments by the office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education.

#### 16. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness

In addition to teaching evaluations, other evidence of teaching effectiveness may include a copy of the syllabus for each course taught, student testimonials, reports resulting from faculty observations of classes, written analyses of course materials, reports on interviews with students who did well in the courses, reporting of the grade distribution along with the CAPE results, and documentation of activities in curriculum development.

#### 17. Level of Administrative Responsibility form

The [Level of Administrative Responsibility](#) form is submitted only by Academic Administrators and Academic Coordinators and gives an overview of the budget, personnel, and space under the appointee's supervision.

#### 18. Job description for Academic Administrators and Academic Coordinators

A description of the appointee's position should be submitted for Academic Administrators and Academic Coordinators. Such a description may have been developed when the recruitment was conducted for the position, and this can serve as the basis for the job description included in the review file. The description should include the working title, if any (e.g., Executive Director – International Affairs), and a delineation of the responsibilities and scope of the job. Such job descriptions typically are one to two pages in length.

#### 19. Academic Biography and Bibliography form

The [Academic Biography and Bibliography](#) form ("biobib") must comply with the written instructions provided in the form and must be reviewed and signed by the appointee. If the appointee is unavailable for signature, the form should be so annotated, with the reason included below the space for the signature.

Please note that item II.f in the biography section asks for information regarding faculty contributions to promoting diversity. The Academic Senate Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) has provided [examples of diversity service](#) for use in filling out this section.

Although the appointee may delegate preparation of the biobib to an assistant, the appointee is responsible for its completeness and accuracy. By signing the biobib form, the appointee indicates his or her request to be assessed on the basis of the information contained in the form.

The requirements for organization of bibliographies were changed in 2002, but appointees were not required to reorganize pre-existing material. However, for proposed actions that require full career reviews, appointees are encouraged to bring the entire bibliography into compliance with the prescribed format.

## 20. Sabbatical leave report

If the appointee has taken a sabbatical leave since the last review, a copy of the sabbatical leave report must be included in the file. It should be placed, unattached, behind the Biography and Bibliography form.

### **B. Items that accompany the review file**

#### 1. Publications (or comparable materials)

For files that require review by the Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), all new items in Section A of the bibliography should be provided with the file. For normal merit review files, appointees may determine which Section A publications to submit. Assessment of the file will be based only on the information provided. Each publication provided should be numbered to correspond with the entry on the bibliography.

#### 2. Raw teaching data (in select cases)

In general, reviewers prefer that teaching data (from student evaluations) be summarized in the review file. Occasionally, however, a department may wish to include raw teaching data (e.g., all student evaluation forms for a particular course) in addition to a summary in order to clarify the teaching record. Such data should accompany the file in a separate, clearly labeled folder.

## **Assembling and submitting a review file**

---

All review files are submitted to the appropriate dean's office. Files for which the dean does not have final approval authority are forwarded to Academic Personnel after the dean has reviewed them. Files should be assembled as follows.

**Order of file assembly:** Items 1 – 18 (as required) should be clipped together in the upper left-hand corner and placed in the left-hand pocket of the folder. The pages of the Biography and Bibliography form (item 19) should be stapled together and placed behind these items. If there is a sabbatical leave report (item 20), it is placed behind the Biography and Bibliography form.

A curriculum vitae is not required for the review file, but if the appointee wishes to include a CV, the pages should be stapled, and it should be placed behind all the items above in the left-hand pocket of the file folder.

**Number of copies of file:** For personnel actions for which deans have final authority, submit the original file and one set of publications. For actions that are the Senior Vice Chancellor's authority and are reviewed by CAP only, submit the original file, a duplicate file, and one set of publications. For actions reviewed at the campus level by other reviewers in addition to CAP, submit the original file, a duplicate file, and one set of publications. Refer to the [Authority and Review Chart](#) to determine which campus reviewers see files.

**Color-coded file folders:** Review files are submitted in folders that are color-coded to indicate the type of action (e.g., orange for new appointments, teal for career reviews, green for duplicates, etc.). A [file folder color-coding chart](#) is available on the Academic Personnel Web site.

**Off-scale slip:** If the department proposes a new or continuing off-scale salary for an appointee, the appropriate off-scale slip (market off-scale, bonus off-scale, or combination) should be prepared and stapled to the front of the left pocket of both the original file folder and any duplicate. Some divisional deans' office prepare these slips, but some divisions expect departments to prepare them.

## **Review process after file is submitted**

---

Review files for which the dean is not the final authority are routed to campus reviewers by Academic Personnel, as indicated in the [Authority and Review Chart](#). Reviewers may include the college provost, the [Committee on](#)

[Academic Personnel](#) (CAP), the [Project Scientist and Specialist Review Panel](#) (PSSRP), the [Academic Administrator and Academic Coordinator Review Panel](#) (AARP) and others. The administrator with final approval authority is also indicated in the Authority and Review Chart.

During the review process, the department may receive the following from the office of the administrator with final authority for the review action:

- A request for additional information

The department chair may receive a request for additional information or clarification of information for a particular file. The request will indicate the date by which the department should respond (usually two or three weeks from the date of the request). The department should notify the administrator with final authority in writing if additional time is needed to respond to the request. The appointee must sign Certification C to acknowledge that new material has been added to the review file. Once the requested material has been added to the file and returned to Academic Personnel, the file is re-routed to reviewers for further evaluation and comment.

- A preliminary assessment

Reviewers and/or the administrator with final authority may disagree with the departmental recommendation. If reviewers recommend a lesser action, a preliminary assessment letter will be sent to the department by the administrator. This will indicate the date by which the department should respond (usually two or three weeks from the date of the letter). The department should notify the administrator in writing if additional time is needed to respond to the preliminary assessment. The department may accept the preliminary assessment or submit a rebuttal. In either case, the department must respond in writing, and the appointee must sign Certification C to acknowledge that this new material has been added to the review file. If the department rebuts the preliminary assessment, the file is rerouted to reviewers for reassessment.

If reviewers recommend a greater action (e.g., an accelerated advancement from Step II to Step IV vs. a normal advancement to Step III), Academic Personnel will contact the dean's office via phone or e-mail, and the dean will inform the department. The department will email its acceptance of the recommendation to the dean's office, and the dean will acknowledge the acceptance and forward it to Academic Personnel.

Once a final decision has been determined, the administrator with authority for the action will send the department a letter communicating that decision and notifying the department to implement the final action in the Payroll Personnel System (PPS).