

July 22, 2013

DEANS
DEPARTMENT AND PROGRAM CHAIRS

Re: Annual Memo from CP/EVC and CAP Chair on Academic Advancement-2013

Dear Colleagues:

As another academic year comes to a close, we write to provide you with some information to assist you in preparing Senate faculty review files for the 2013-14 year.

Faculty Contributions to Collaborative Works

To assist reviewers with assessing a faculty member's contribution to jointly-authored publications or other scholarly works, it is important for the review file to document the faculty member's contributions to those works. The Academic Personnel Policy ([APM 210-1.d\(2\)](#)) states that it is the "responsibility of the department chair to establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in the joint effort" and to "make a separate evaluation of the candidate's contribution" to this work. Department chairs may need input from the faculty on their individual contributions. The Campus Academic Personnel Manual (CAPM) provides [guidelines to faculty](#) on how to address their contributions to joint work.

Impact of the Campus's "Special Salary Practice" on Current Reviews

As previously announced, the campus's special salary practice will continue for the 2013-14 review year. Details of this plan were included in the [May 2011 memo](#) to department chairs and deans. At this time, we would like to clarify how the application of this special salary practice is applied at time of major actions (promotion, advancement to Step 6 or Above Scale). First, the file must meet the criteria for the specific advancement under review. After that requirement has been met, the record of accomplishments since the last merit review is evaluated to determine whether to award a normal increase, one of the two greater-than-normal merit increases, an acceleration, or an acceleration plus an additional half step of salary.

Guidance on advancement to Above Scale or to Further Above Scale

As you know, there is no salary scale for faculty who advance to Above Scale status, or are advanced to Further Above Scale. This sometimes causes departments to be unsure of how to approach recommendations for faculty advancing to Above Scale or those being considered for further advancement at that level. The following guidelines are intended to assist you in consideration of such cases:

- Faculty are expected to serve at least four years at Step 9 before advancement to Above Scale; however, some faculty may require additional time to achieve an appropriate record for advancement to Above Scale.
- Salary recommendations must be based on the criteria for advancement to Above Scale, which include the following:
 - Advancement is reserved only for the most highly distinguished faculty who meet the following criteria:

- Work is of sustained and continuing excellence and has attained national and international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact;
 - Teaching performance is excellent; and
 - Service is highly meritorious
- Standard advancement from Step 9 to Above Scale is an increase in salary of 11%
 - Effective with 2013-14 actions, the 11% will be calculated based on the published Step 9 salary rate; the off-scale increment, if any, is then added to this amount as is the practice with all other actions.
- Above Scale is an indefinite “step”, and a minimum of four years must be served between reviews; however, it is expected that some faculty may require additional time to achieve an appropriate record for further advancement.
- Further Above Scale advancement must be justified by new evidence of merit and elevated distinction; continued good service is not an adequate justification.
- Effective with 2013-14 actions, standard advancement for Further Above Scale actions will be a specific dollar amount rather than a percentage increase applied to the candidate’s current salary. The anticipated increase will be a flat rate of \$16,000, to be added to the current salary rate for those files that meet the criteria of elevated level of achievements expected for advancement. If these criteria are not met, requests for less than \$16,000 could be justified for continued distinguished work.
- The campus guidelines for the “Special Salary Practice” do not apply to Above Scale actions. A recommendation greater than 11% at time of initial advancement or greater than \$16,000 for Further Above Scale can only be justified in extraordinary cases that meet the criteria for advancement combined with, for example, a new major award in recognition of career accomplishments.

Teaching at All Levels of the Curriculum

Teaching at all levels of the curriculum, lower-division, upper-division, and graduate, as well as the mentoring of graduate students, is an important component of a faculty member’s teaching record. The department chair should ensure that over time a faculty member is assigned courses at all levels. If a faculty member has not taught at all levels or has not mentored any graduate students, the department should address the circumstances that resulted in this situation in their department letter.

Department letters must provide a comprehensive assessment of the quality of the teaching, not just a reiteration of the courses taught. If problems have been identified in the teaching, then the department letter should discuss how these problems are being addressed. In addition, CAP requests that departments provide a table of the teaching done during the review period that includes a summary of the quantitative course evaluations. CAP will provide a template for such a table at a later date.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes as Part of Teaching

Assessment of student learning and of institution, program, or course learning outcomes is an integral part of teaching and program improvement. As such, faculty efforts toward assessment, if applicable, may be included as contributions in the evaluation of teaching. Such efforts could include development of a program learning outcomes assessment plan or participation in outcomes assessment. More information on this topic will be presented at the Fall Quarter Department Chair Conference scheduled for September 20 and may also be found in the [April 24, 2013 letter from VPAA Lee](#).

On-line Student Evaluations of Instructors

As you know, the campus implemented an on-line process for soliciting student feedback of instructors in 2011-12. Since that time, APO has been working with staff in the Faculty Instructional Technology Center (FITC) to assist the campus in finding a permanent solution to the issues of archiving and providing on-line instructor evaluations in a format that is more usable for campus reviewers. APO continues to work with FITC, and we hope to have both an archiving and a format solution in place for 2013-14 evaluations. As was the practice in 2012-13, departments must continue to archive student evaluations, including downloading and saving both the summary sheets (.pdf) and the Excel spreadsheets from eCommons. ***For actions taking place in 2013-14, academic personnel review files must include both the summary sheet and the Excel spreadsheet for on-line teaching evaluations.*** Additionally, we want to remind you that student evaluation of instructors is only one measure of teaching performance. [APM 210-d\(1\)](#) provides details on further measures for evaluating teaching performance.

As the campus continues to move forward on the on-line personnel review system, we will work to incorporate the electronic submission of student evaluations into this new system.

Salary Limits for Professors, Step 9

We want to remind you of the policy for Professors at Step 9 who are eligible for review, but who choose not to undergo an Above Scale review. [CAPM 803.620 C.5](#) reads, “The off-scale salary of a Professor, Step 9, shall not be higher than \$100 less than the published salary scale for Professor, Step 9, plus 11 percent, barring exceptional circumstances. It is not appropriate for a faculty member to receive an above-scale salary without an Above Scale review. A candidate with an excellent record who chooses not to proceed with such a review, but requests review for a salary increase, may be considered for a modest off-scale increase, such as a quarter or a half step. If the faculty member's performance continues to be excellent, the department may wish to recommend a further modest salary increase in recognition of the faculty member's overall performance during the review period.” Please keep this in mind when advising Professors at Step 9 and when considering recommendations for such Professors who request a salary increase in lieu of an Above Scale review.

Reminders About Materials Included in Department Letters and Review Files:

The following items are reminders about the contents of the department letters:

- Confidentiality of External Letter Writers: University policy states that the campus will maintain the confidentiality of letter writers. Sometimes, departments inadvertently disclose information about letter writers in their department letter. For example, they may include statements such as, “Reviewer A, a member of the National Academy of Sciences....” Such information is important, but should be included in the biographical information contained in the “list of letter writers” included with the file, and not in the department letter.
- Independence of Letter Writers: In 2012-13, a number of files were returned to departments for solicitation of additional letters. This was necessary for two reasons:
 - There were too many letters contained in the file from individuals who were not deemed to be independent enough from the faculty member under review; and
 - There were not enough letters from reviewers at the appropriate level or from academic/research institutions

In selecting external reviewers, please keep in mind the importance of obtaining evaluations from individuals independent of the candidate, who are at a level comparable to or higher than the candidate, who are from academic or research institutions, and who understand the qualifications for advancement. If you do select individuals that do not meet these criteria, include information on the list of letter writers about why these individuals were selected.

- Mid-Career Appraisals: Effective with 2012-13 academic personnel reviews, external letters are no longer required for mid-career appraisals. At the time of that [policy change](#), we communicated the importance of the department letter providing “assessment and guidance” appropriate to a mid-career review. Please be sure to include this essential feedback in your recommendations on these actions.
- Leaves of Absences: Departments must be careful not to disclose the nature of a leave a person takes, especially when medical or personal leave. It is appropriate, however, to address the fact that a person has been on leave. For example, a department could state that the faculty member “took two quarters of leave during the review period.” However, it is not appropriate to say that the faculty member “took two quarters of medical leave during the review period.” This is true even if the faculty member discloses the reason for the leave in their personal statement.

The following items are reminders about the contents of the review files:

- Annotated Bibliography: On May 16, 2012, CAP issued a memo requesting that review files include a copy of the annotated research section of the bibliography from the faculty member’s last review. For major actions (promotion, advancement to Step 6 or Above Scale), the “last review” is defined as the last merit advancement, not the last major action advancement. The purpose is to identify what body of work has been completed since the last merit review, which is not always the same as the review period for the current action.
- In a department’s assessment of a faculty member’s work, they should only discuss the materials from the appropriate review period. If work from outside the review period is introduced and discussed (such as a work in progress that the faculty member did not submit as part of his/her materials), then the department should request that the faculty member include such work in the review file. It is important that work previously reviewed is not resubmitted. Departments should also not introduce work that the faculty member does not wish to submit for the current review period.

Status of On-line Academic Personnel System

Effective in 2012-13, the campus launched an on-line application system, UC Recruit, for Senate faculty searches. Use of UC Recruit will be expanded in 2013-14 to include all Non-Senate searches as well. In addition to UC Recruit, the campus is embarking on an enhancement of the existing DivData Academic Personnel system. The new enhancement will deliver an on-line academic review system module. The project is being led by the Academic Personnel Office, supported by ITS, and guided by a steering committee comprised of divisional and departmental staff and faculty. The system will allow academic review files to be viewed on-line. It will be built as an enhancement to the existing DivData system, which supports academic personnel actions campuswide. We expect the system to launch in support of ladder-rank reviews for 2014-15, with support for other non-student academic titles added the following year. This project will not affect the 2013-14 review process. Additional information will be provided in the fall.

Upcoming Workshops

Fall Quarter Department Chair Conference: The annual meeting with the CAP Chair, the CP/EVC, and the department chairs will be held on Friday, September 20, 2013, 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. This year, we have combined both the annual Chair meeting and the Chair Boot Camp into a single conference. The goal is to provide department chairs with an opportunity to discuss key aspects of academic personnel actions and policies for academic employees while networking with other chairs. Attending this conference is required for all department chairs. More information will be sent later in the summer.

Department Chair Workshops on the Personnel Review Process: These workshops provide a detailed walk-through of the policies and procedures for processing a review file for a ladder-rank faculty member's professorial advancement. Three offerings of this workshop will be held. Note that you need to attend only one of the sessions:

Wednesday, September 11, 10:00-12:00

Tuesday, September 17, 2:00-4:00

Thursday, October 10, 9:00-11:00

More information will be sent later in the summer.

Your role as a department chair or dean is critical to the effective functioning of the campus, and we appreciate all you do to insure that the personnel review process is conducted in a timely and accurate manner. We hope your summer goes well, and we look forward to working with you in the new academic year.

Sincerely,



Ana Christina Ravelo, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

Sincerely,



Alison Galloway
Campus Provost and
Executive Vice Chancellor

cc: Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Lee
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel Peterson
Academic Personnel Office Analysts
Academic Senate Office
Department Managers
Divisional Academic Personnel Coordinators