

Summary - Academic Review Process Changes

1. **Biography, Bibliography and Annual Supplements** – The information required in the biography, bibliography and annual supplements has been combined into one packet and considerably simplified to permit greater flexibility. The packet can be found at: <http://academicaffairs.ucsd.edu/offices/apo/forms/word/BioBib.doc>. Academics may choose to use either the existing or the new format for July 2002 review files.
2. **Ad Hoc Service** – Faculty members will be expected to serve on at least one ad hoc committee per year, if asked, and to respond to the Senior Vice Chancellor in writing, if necessary, to decline such service.
3. **Final Deadlines for July 1, 2002 Academic Review Files**. Completed files must be submitted by the dates shown below. Departments and Deans may establish earlier due dates to meet the campus file deadlines.
 - December 1st – normal merits, merit/reappointment at the Assistant rank, and re-appointments and non salaried actions at all ranks
 - January 15th – appraisals, accelerated merits, further Above-Scale merits
 - February 15th – career reviews (promotions, advancement to or through Step VI and advancement to Above-Scale) and terminal reappointments
4. **Documentation of Teaching** – One form of evaluation each for undergraduate and graduate teaching will be required in academic review files; however, more than one form of evaluation is encouraged.
5. **Electronic Solicitation and Submission of External Letters** – Department Chairs may solicit and receive external letters electronically for inclusion in review files.
6. **External Letters for Appointment of Assistant Professors, Steps I and II** - Letters of reference from the candidate's mentors and colleagues are acceptable. However, additional letters from more independent sources may be obtained, if available.
7. **Ad Hoc Review of Step VI and Above Scale Review Files** – CAP will generally serve as its own ad hoc committee for files proposing advancement to Step VI and Above-Scale. However, in some cases a file will be forwarded to an ad hoc committee for review.
8. **Role of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Provosts** – The Dean of Graduate Studies and Provosts will participate in all career reviews. College Provosts will continue to review all new appointment files and the appraisals of Assistant Professors.
9. **Non-Salaried Adjunct Professor Appointments and Reviews** – CAP will no longer review non-salaried Adjunct Professor appointment files for UCSD faculty holding salaried appointments. For individuals who do not hold a salaried appointment at UCSD, CAP will only review files at the time of appointment, change in rank, and/or every six years within rank.
10. **No Change Actions** – CAP will no longer review uncontested “No Change” actions. Approvals of “No Change” actions will be delegated to the appropriate Dean unless the candidate has an off-scale salary.
11. **Deferral Requests** – Approval of the first-time, one-year deferral of review will be delegated to the appropriate Dean.
- 12-16. **Remaining Items**

Detail - Academic Review Process Changes

1. Biography, Bibliography and Annual Supplements

The information required in the biography, bibliography and annual supplements has been combined into one packet and considerably simplified to permit greater flexibility. The packet can be found at: <http://academicaffairs.ucsd.edu/offices/apo/ProcessChanges.htm>. One of the highlights of this change is the flexibility for schools and divisions to develop the presentation and content of the bibliography listing appropriate to their disciplines.

Specific changes include:

- The yearly submission of the annual supplement has been eliminated.
- Biographic information including personal information, previous employment and educational background may now be provided free form rather than in a set-format.
- Bibliographic sections can be divided into sub-categories (e.g. books, research articles, etc.) if desired.
- Section A – Primary Published or Creative Work will now include “accepted” work (i.e., publisher’s binding acceptance of entire corpus has been received) as well as published and “in press” (i.e., accepted for publication in final form).
- Section B – Other Work will include scholarly activities such as patents, presentations, performed material, non-reviewed works, conference proceedings, abstracts, etc. as well as unpublished work.
- Section C – Work in Progress is an optional section of the bibliography. Use of Section C will continue to be important in certain disciplines and in certain cases (e.g. crossover merits, appraisals).
- Bibliographic citations no longer need to be formatted in “standard UCSD format.” Citation descriptors (e.g. book, research paper, journal article) need not be in located in a separate column adjacent to the citation

The following features remain the same:

- Lines will continue to be drawn on the bibliography to delineate new material from previously reviewed material.
- Bibliographic listings are numbered and recorded in chronological order.
- While increased flexibility has been achieved for presentation of required biographical/ bibliographical information, the order of presentation must be consistent.

During this first transition year, Academics may choose to use either the existing or the new format for July 2002 review files. Because of the many advantages of the new format, Departments are asked to have it in place for the July 2003 review files.

2. Ad Hoc Service

Currently 50% of those asked to serve on an ad hoc committee decline. This causes serious delays in the review process and potentially compromises the quality of reviews.

Beginning academic year 2001/02, faculty members will be expected to serve on at least one ad hoc committee per year, if asked. Faculty who are unable to serve will be asked to respond to the Senior Vice Chancellor in writing regarding their reason for declining such service.

3. Deadlines for Submitting Academic Review Files

Effective with the upcoming July 1, 2002 review files, the following “final” deadlines will be established. In order to honor these campus deadlines, Departments and Deans may establish earlier due dates.

- December 1st – normal merits, merit/reappointment at the Assistant rank, and reappointments and non-salaried actions at all ranks
- January 15th – appraisals, accelerated merits, and further Above-Scale merits
- February 15th – career reviews (promotions, advancement to or through Step VI and advancement to Above-Scale) and terminal reappointments

The deadline for submitting series changes will be that of the associated merit or promotion action.

Files received after the associated deadline will be returned to the Department for submission the following year.

The Academic Personnel Office will be providing departments a listing of academics due for review July 1, 2002 in June, 2001.

4. Documentation of Teaching

Graduate teaching should be documented in a more consistent and complete manner in review files. A review file should address clearly the candidate's effectiveness as a teacher of scheduled graduate courses, as an instructor to interns, residents and fellows, as an adviser of doctoral and masters students, and as a mentor to teaching assistants and postdoctoral students.

Policy will be clarified regarding documentation of teaching effectiveness. Current policy requires more than one kind of evidence in a review file, particularly in career reviews. Policy will be revised, consistent with campus practice, to require one form of evaluation each for undergraduate and graduate teaching. However, more than one form of evaluation is encouraged, especially in reviews for which evidence of teaching effectiveness is unclear.

In addition, information related to the mentoring of students outside the structured classroom setting will be requested as part of the "Student Instructional Activities" section of the new Biography/Bibliography. Specifically, faculty will be asked to list by category (e.g., undergraduate research students, masters or doctoral candidates, postdoctoral or medical fellows, interns, residents) students mentored and their role (e.g. thesis advisor, research advisor) for each student.

5. Electronic Solicitation and Submission of External Letters

Department Chairs may solicit external letters electronically. Letters received electronically may be submitted in review files. Departments are no longer required to obtain letters signed by the referee.

The current system of documenting who has been asked and who has replied via the Referee ID list will continue as before.

6. External Letters for Appointment of Assistant Professors, Steps I and II

Policy will be changed to formalize the campus practice of accepting letters of reference from the mentors and colleagues of Assistant Professor I and II candidates. However, additional letters from more independent sources may be obtained, if available.

7. Ad Hoc Review of Step VI and Above-Scale Review Files

CAP will generally serve as its own ad hoc committee for files proposing advancement to Step VI and Above-Scale. However, in some cases a file will be forwarded to an ad hoc committee for review.

8. Role of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Provost in the Academic Review Process

A thorough evaluation of the role of all reviewers in the review process was conducted. The Dean of Graduate Studies and College Provosts will focus their efforts on reviewing the most important academic personnel actions. They will participate in all career reviews. College Provosts will continue to review all new appointment files and the appraisals of Assistant Professors.

9. Non-Salaried Adjunct Professor Appointments and Reviews

CAP will no longer review non-salaried Adjunct Professor appointment files for UCSD faculty holding salaried appointments. For individuals who do not hold a salaried appointment at UCSD, CAP will only review files at the time of appointment, change in rank, and/or every six years within rank.

When CAP reviews an action, the Senior Vice Chancellor will have authority for the action. When CAP does not review the file, the Dean will have final authority.

10. No Change Actions

When the individual under review, the Department, and the Dean agree, CAP will no longer review "No Change" actions. Authority for these actions will be delegated to the appropriate Dean unless the candidate has an off-scale salary. In cases involving off-scale, authority remains with the Senior Vice Chancellor. CAP will continue to review a "no change" recommendation that is contested by the candidate, the Department, or the Dean.

11. Deferral Requests

Authority to approve a first-time, one-year deferral of review will be delegated to the appropriate Dean. Subsequent requests for deferral remain the authority of the Senior Vice Chancellor.

12. Normal Merits Files

Deans and Departments may agree to limit the number of publications forwarded with a normal merit file.

13. Confidentiality Statement

The confidentiality statement included with solicitation letters is being reworded to be less legalistic and bureaucratic in tone. It will be included in the revisions to PPM 230-20 and PPM 230-28, policies for appointing and reviewing academic employees, to be released Summer 2001.

Task Force Recommendations Requiring Further Review/Action

14. Waiver of Right to Review External Letters

Provide academics the opportunity to waive their right to review external letters.

15. Ad Hoc Committee Composition

Modify the composition of campus ad hoc committees to four member committees including a non-voting departmental member.

16. On-Line Electronic Processing of Academic Reviews

Develop a system of electronic, on-line processing of academic review files. The opportunities to streamline the process through use of technology are obvious at every level. A plan will be developed for establishing such a system.