

## WORKSHEET FOR DEPARTMENTAL USE IN PREPARING ACADEMIC REVIEW FILES

The Senate Committee on Academic Personnel recommends that the following worksheet be used in preparing reappointment, merit, promotion, and appraisal files. Since campus reviewers require the information requested below to be in the file before making a judgment, department chairs should ensure that it is all included when the file is submitted. *If a required item cannot be included, this should be explicitly stated in the departmental recommendation.* Coverage of these points should be complete, clear, and accurate.

### Items Required for the Academic Review File

- \_\_\_\_\_ Summary: Information is complete and consistent with the Academic Biography and Bibliography packet and the departmental recommendation letter.
- \_\_\_\_\_ UC Academic Employment History
- \_\_\_\_\_ Departmental recommendation letter: Points to be covered, where applicable
- \_\_\_\_\_ Indicate the proposed title, rank, step, salary and effective date. If this represents an acceleration, it should be indicated, and the acceleration must be fully justified in the body of the letter.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Provide thorough justification when recommending award of, or policy exceptions for, a bonus or market off-scale salary. It is particularly important to provide justification for continuation of market off-scale beyond the six-year limit. When the proposed action is a no-change, and the candidate currently has an off-scale, the letter should explicitly state the proposed outcome for the off-scale (i.e., if it's a bonus, will it be tapered at the time of range adjustments in keeping with policy, maintained, or increased?) Additional justification is needed to maintain or increase a bonus off-scale salary.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Provide results of departmental consultation and vote. Explain any negative faculty votes, abstentions, absences, or lack of compliance with campus voting policy.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Note conflicts of interest in the file. If a faculty member or department chair has a financial or management interest in a company providing support for either a candidate's research or salary, the faculty member or chair should avoid contributing to the file. If such a faculty member does contribute to the file, his or her relationship to the company and the candidate should be detailed.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluate the candidate's qualifications and effectiveness in research and creative activity, teaching, professional competence and activity, and University and public service.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Research and Creative Activity:
- Describe and evaluate the research and other creative activity conducted during the review period and its impact on the field. Explain the candidate's role in all collaborative and coauthored works where the candidate is not first or senior author. Indicate the standing of the journals and conference proceedings in which the publications appear, whether the journals are refereed, and the rate of acceptance/rejection.
  - For files proposing advancement to a crossover step, work in progress must be listed, discussed in the letter, and submitted with the file. It should be demonstrated that the candidate is making timely progress on the kind of substantial research and creative projects that are likely, when completed, to justify promotion.
  - Indicate the candidate's success in obtaining support for research and other creative activity, including support for graduate students. The role of the candidate on grants should be indicated, with the number of other co-investigators provided.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Teaching (for instructional titles):
- Provide documentation and discuss teaching effectiveness, rather than merely listing courses taught. The letter should discuss any problems in the area of teaching, and specific plans to correct the problems are encouraged.
  - Compare the teaching load to the normal departmental teaching load for similar appointees.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Professional competence and activity & University and public service
- Describe the candidate's professional achievements, where applicable.

b. The nature and quality of the candidate's service contributions should be described.

\_\_\_\_\_ Copy of outside offer letter(s) – for retention files.

\_\_\_\_\_ Certifications A (signed before departmental review of the file) and B (dated after the candidate has been informed of the departmental recommendation). Certification C is included each time material is added to the file after the departmental recommendation is rendered, to demonstrate that the candidate has seen it.

\_\_\_\_\_ Departmental ad hoc report, where applicable. Departmental review committee membership should be indicated in the file; if a written report is not provided, committee membership should be included as an addendum to the Referee ID list.

\_\_\_\_\_ Candidate's self-evaluation (optional)

\_\_\_\_\_ Copy of solicitation letter to external referees. Advise the external referees in a properly worded solicitation letter of the meaning of the proposed advancement and ask them to analyze and evaluate (instead of merely praise) the candidate's work. If an acceleration is being requested, explain the type and amount of the acceleration. Include the University's confidentiality statement in the solicitation letter.

\_\_\_\_\_ Referee I.D. list

\_\_\_\_\_ Ensure that the independence of the external referees and their qualifications with respect to their expertise in the field have been stated fully and clearly on the Referee ID List. (*This information should not appear in the departmental ad hoc report or the departmental recommendation letter.*)

\_\_\_\_\_ External Letters: Are the required number included? Are the letters independent? Avoid use of external referees whom the reviewers may not regard as objective evaluators either because they are too close to the candidate professionally (e.g., collaborators, thesis supervisors, etc.) or because they have a personal relationship with the candidate.

\_\_\_\_\_ Use external referees who are senior scholars. If external referees are not senior scholars or are not independent of the candidate, the department should explain why they were selected as the best-qualified referees. *This information should appear only on the Referee ID list.*

\_\_\_\_\_ Ensure that the majority of external letters in the file are from referees selected by the department, rather than by the candidate.

\_\_\_\_\_ Include in the file all external referee letters solicited and received by the department, whether or not the final departmental recommendation requires external letters.

\_\_\_\_\_ Courseload and Student Direction form (General Campus) or Caseload form (School of Medicine) if applicable

\_\_\_\_\_ Teaching evaluations (if applicable): One form of evaluation each for undergraduate and graduate teaching is required. More than one form is encouraged. Arrange in order, with the most current evaluations first, then the second most current, and so on.

\_\_\_\_\_ Other evidence of teaching effectiveness (course syllabi, students' testimonials, etc.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Level of Administrative Responsibility form (used only for Academic Administrators and Academic Coordinators)

\_\_\_\_\_ Academic Biography and Bibliography packet (completed and signed by the candidate).

\_\_\_\_\_ Sabbatical Leave Report (if applicable)

\_\_\_\_\_ Publications: Include all publications since the last review/advancement. Work in manuscript form accepted for publication may be included.

\_\_\_\_\_ Work listed in Section C of the bibliography (required for proposed crossover actions).