

## CONTENTS

- A. Introduction
- B. Information Resources
- C. File Submission Deadlines
- D. Soliciting External Referee Letters
- E. Preparing a review file
  - A. Review File Items
    - 1. UCSD Academic Recommendation Summary
    - 2. UC Academic Employment History
    - 3. Department Recommendation Letter
    - 4. Department Standards for Advancement or Promotion **(Include in Dept. Letter)**
    - 5. Department Chair's Independent Letter **(If Applicable)**
    - 6. Dissenting Letters **(If Applicable)**
    - 7. Proof of Outside Offer **(If Applicable)**
    - 8. Certification Forms
    - 9. Departmental Ad Hoc Committee Report **(If Applicable)**
    - 10. Appointee's Personal Statement-Self Evaluation **(Optional)**
    - 11. Solicitation Letter to External Referees
    - 12. Referee I.D. List
    - 13. External Referee Letters
    - 14. Unsolicited Letters of Evaluation **(If Applicable)**
    - 15. Course Load and Student Direction Form
    - 16. Teaching Evaluations, Including Student Comments
    - 17. Other Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness
    - 18. Level of Administrative Responsibility Form **(If Applicable)**
    - 19. Job Description for Academic Administrators and Coordinators **(If Applicable)**
    - 20. UCSD Academic Biography and Bibliography Form
    - 21. Sabbatical Leave Report **(If Applicable)**
  - B. Accompanying Review File Items
    - 1. Publications or Comparable Items
    - 2. Raw Teaching Data **(If Applicable)**
- F. Assembling and Submitting a Review File
- G. Review Process After a File is Submitted

**UC SAN DIEGO-ACADEMIC PERSONNEL SERVICES**  
**GUIDE TO PREPARING AND SUBMITTING ACADEMIC REVIEW FILES**

**A. Introduction**

---

The instructions below assume that you are familiar with [UCSD Policy and Procedure Manual Section 230-28](#) (PPM 230-28), and 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 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)
- as required by policy (every five years)

For those appointed at the Assistant rank, 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 the year. Departments are encouraged to contact their divisional dean's office early in the process. Retention files are typically urgent and are given priority by Academic Personnel Services. If the appointee must respond to an outside offer by a particular date, the departmental recommendation letter should indicate this deadline and note it on the summary form. 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. 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) and candidate who have previously had two (2) consecutive no-change reviews due to insufficient contributions. 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 Executive Vice Chancellor is the approval authority for the second request. Deferral requests must be submitted to the appointee's department(s) no later than October 15; departments may set earlier deadlines. Deferrals are addressed in PPM 230-28, Section VII.B.1.

**UC SAN DIEGO-ACADEMIC PERSONNEL SERVICES**  
**GUIDE TO PREPARING AND SUBMITTING ACADEMIC REVIEW FILES**

**B. 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 Services Web site, including:

- 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 Services also provides courses on preparation of review files and other topics. Information on academic personnel courses is available at [UC Learning Center](#) (see “Search Catalog”).

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

**C. 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 Services Web page for exact dates each year.

Deans’ offices must forward all files subject to campus-level review to the Academic Personnel Services 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 may be deferred to the following year.***

OCT 15	Deferral
NOV 1	Requests for second consecutive deferral of review
DEC 1	Appraisals
	Advancements with Above Scale
	Reappointment/merit actions requiring campus review
	Actions for non-salaried appointees requiring campus review
	Contested no-change actions
	Second consecutive no-change action
JAN 15	Accelerated merit advancements
	New bonus off-scale salary components
FEB 15	Promotions (career review)
	Advancement to/through Step VI (career review)
	Advancement to Above Scale (career review)
	Termination decisions
	Reconsideration of termination decisions
	Initial continuing appointments (Unit 18)

**UC SAN DIEGO-ACADEMIC PERSONNEL SERVICES**  
**GUIDE TO PREPARING AND SUBMITTING ACADEMIC REVIEW FILES**  
**D. Soliciting External Referee Letters**

---

Files for certain actions (promotions and merit advancements requiring career reviews, such as advancement 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 Services Web site.

EXTERNAL REFEREE LETTER REQUIREMENTS	
Promotion to Associate level, Lecturer with Security of Employment	5 External Referee Letters
Promotion to full level, Sr. Lecturer with Security of Employment, Advancement to Above Scale, all others	3 External Referee Letters
Advancement to VI (Prof., Prof. in Res., Prof. of Clin. X, Adj. Prof., Res Sci.	Letters Optional

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

**E. 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 Services 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 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. UCSD Academic Recommendation Summary**

A current version of the appropriate [Academic Recommendation Summary Form](#) (General Campus, HS, SIO) 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 the 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.

## UC SAN DIEGO-ACADEMIC PERSONNEL SERVICES

### GUIDE TO PREPARING AND SUBMITTING ACADEMIC REVIEW FILES

- 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/through Step VI, or advancement to Above Scale). For all career actions (except for advancement to/through Step VI), 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 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 has been conducted for an Assistant-rank appointee, or if a terminal reappointment is recommended, be sure to indicate this. (For complete information on evaluations of Senate and non-Senate Assistant-rank 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 or increased). For complete information, see [Off-Scale Salary Terms](#).
  - If the file is being submitted as a retention or pre-emptive 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, percentage of time, salary, salary scale date, 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. 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, percentage of time, salary, salary scale date, 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 – e.g., 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.

## UC SAN DIEGO-ACADEMIC PERSONNEL SERVICES

### GUIDE TO PREPARING AND SUBMITTING ACADEMIC REVIEW FILES

- g. **Chair name/signature:** Fill in the chair(s) name(s) 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 and provide information on the candidate's probationary period.

## 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. Department Recommendation Letter

The department 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 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 academic year market off scale salary of \$XX,XXX, effective July 1, 20XX."

- b. Mention of any special element of the review, such as an appraisal, career equity review, off-scale salary proposal, or retention effort. Such elements should be noted near the beginning of the letter, although detailed discussion may be provided farther down.
- c. 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](#)

## UC SAN DIEGO-ACADEMIC PERSONNEL SERVICES

### GUIDE TO PREPARING AND SUBMITTING ACADEMIC REVIEW FILES

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.

- d. 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.

#### 4. Department Standards For Advancement or Promotion (Include in Dept. Letter)

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 proposed for reward only after the completion of such service, not while it is in progress.

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.

Justification for the award of, or policy exception for, any bonus or market off-scale salary component.

## UC SAN DIEGO-ACADEMIC PERSONNEL SERVICES

### GUIDE TO PREPARING AND SUBMITTING ACADEMIC REVIEW FILES

#### 5. Department Chair's Independent Letter (If Applicable)

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 and is not shared with the appointee until after the review has concluded.

#### 6. Dissenting Letters (If Applicable)

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. 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. If a pre-emptive retention, evidence of a credible threat from a comparable educational institution must be included. Offers from foreign educational institutions are presumed to be fiscal year and must be converted to USD as of the date of the foreign offer letter and converted to an academic year salary, if applicable.

#### 8. 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 Services, the



## UC SAN DIEGO-ACADEMIC PERSONNEL SERVICES

### GUIDE TO PREPARING AND SUBMITTING ACADEMIC REVIEW FILES

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.

#### 9. Departmental Ad Hoc Committee Report (If Applicable)

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, Professor, Lecturer with Security of Employment, or Sr. Lecturer with Security of Employment
- 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 with 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 appointee 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 Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to serve on the campus ad hoc committee.

#### 10. Appointee's Personal Statement-Self Evaluation (Optional)

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.

#### 11. Solicitation Letter to External Referees

The chair's letter to external referees soliciting evaluations of the appointee 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 Services Web site.

**UC SAN DIEGO-ACADEMIC PERSONNEL SERVICES**  
**GUIDE TO PREPARING AND SUBMITTING ACADEMIC REVIEW FILES**

If the department chair has collaborated with the candidate in the past five years and plans to recuse him/herself from preparing the departmental recommendation letter, then another senior faculty (vice chair, etc.) member should also prepare the solicitation letter.

**12. Referee I.D. List**

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.

**13. 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).

External letters may be solicited and received electronically, but they must be submitted with an e-mail from the referee as evidence of authenticity.

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

**14. Unsolicited Letters of Evaluation (If Applicable)**

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 review 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.

**15. Course Load and Student Direction Form**

- a. General Campus and Scripps Institution of Oceanography

This information is available in electronic format from the Institutional Research Office.

## UC SAN DIEGO-ACADEMIC PERSONNEL SERVICES

### GUIDE TO PREPARING AND SUBMITTING ACADEMIC REVIEW FILES

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 duties.

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 University Center 409.

#### b. Health Sciences

For assistance in completing the Teaching Quantification form, contact the office of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in Health Sciences. This form is available on the [“Forms and Examples”](#) page of the Academic Personnel Services Web site.

### 16. Teaching Evaluations, Including Student Comments

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. CAPE posts statistical information and student comments online for faculty access only within two weeks after final grades are turned in. Statistical data only is also posted online for student viewing.
- 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.

### 17. 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 (letters, emails, cards, etc.), 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.

## UC SAN DIEGO-ACADEMIC PERSONNEL SERVICES

### GUIDE TO PREPARING AND SUBMITTING ACADEMIC REVIEW FILES

#### 18. Level of Administrative Responsibility Form (If Applicable)

The [Level of Administrative Responsibility](#) (LAR) 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.

#### 19. Job description for Academic Administrators and Coordinators (If Applicable)

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 1-2 pages in length.

#### 20. UCSD Academic Biography and Bibliography form

The [Academic Biography and Bibliography form](#) ("biobib") must comply with the written instructions provided in the current 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 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 2015, thus appointees are encouraged to bring the entire bibliography into compliance with the prescribed format.

#### 21. Sabbatical Leave Report (If Applicable)

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, after the Biography and Bibliography form.

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

1. Approved Recruitment Report or Approved Waiver Request (**If Applicable**)
2. 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. In lieu of submitting copies of publications, appointees may choose to include an electronic hyperlink to their publications in the space provided on the form.

3. Raw Teaching Data (**If Applicable**)

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

## UC SAN DIEGO-ACADEMIC PERSONNEL SERVICES

### GUIDE TO PREPARING AND SUBMITTING ACADEMIC REVIEW FILES

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.

#### **F. 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 Services after the dean has reviewed them. Files that are prepared outside of the APOL Review application should be assembled as follows.

**Order of file assembly:** Items 1 – 22 (as required) should be bundled in order, together as one pdf file. A curriculum vitae (CV) is not required for the review file, but if the appointee wishes to include a CV, the pages should be placed after the biobib.

**Naming conventions for files:** See Attachment A

#### **G. Review Process After the File is Submitted**

---

Review files which require committee review are routed to campus reviewers by Academic Personnel Services, 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 number of days in which department should respond (usually 30 or 90 calendar days 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, and the reason for the extension. 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 Services, 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 number of days in which the department should respond, or the action may become final (usually 30 days). The department should notify the administrator in writing if additional time is needed to respond to the preliminary assessment and the reason for the extension. 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 re-routed 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 Services will contact the dean's office via phone or e-mail, and the dean will inform the department. The department will indicate its response to the recommendation to the dean's office, and the dean will forward the response to Academic Personnel Services for final processing.

**UC SAN DIEGO-ACADEMIC PERSONNEL SERVICES**

**GUIDE TO PREPARING AND SUBMITTING ACADEMIC REVIEW FILES**

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).