600.311 - Project (e.g. Scientist) Series (fiscal year basis)

AS OF NOVEMBER 8, 2019, A NEW COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UC AND THE UAW HAS BEEN RATIFIED. The agreement may be found at: https://ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/labor/bargaining-units/ra/contract.html. Policies and procedures below are subject to conditions of the contract for represented employees.
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GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. DEFINITIONS
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4. CRITERIA
5. TERMS OF SERVICE
6. SALARY LIMITATIONS
7. AUTHORITY
8. ELIGIBILITY FOR REVIEW

1. DEFINITIONS

- a. Project (e.g., Scientist) series titles are given to those appointees who make significant and creative contributions to a research or creative project in any academic discipline. Appointees with Project (e.g., Scientist) titles may engage in University and public service. They do not have teaching responsibilities.
- b. Appointees in this series may be ongoing members of a research team or may be employed for a limited period of time to contribute high-level skills to a specific research or creative program.
- c. Appointees in this series are not required to carry out independent research or develop an independent research reputation. Ordinarily, appointees in Project (e.g., Scientist) series titles will carry out research or creative programs with supervision by a member of the Professor or Professional Research series.
• d. The Project (e.g., Scientist) series differs from the Professional Research series in that the former need not demonstrate the same capacity for fully independent research or research leadership required of the Professor series and Professional Research series.
• e. Appointees in the Project (e.g., Scientist) series are expected to have a broader range of knowledge and competency and a higher level of independence than appointees in the Specialist series, whose appointment and advancement depend on the technical contributions that they make to the work of the research team.
• f. An appointee in the Project (e.g., Scientist) series does not usually serve as a Principal Investigator. Contact Office of Sponsored Projects for information about campus policies. For titles that do not automatically qualify as Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator, an exception may be granted. Serving as a Principal Investigator is not required or expected for an appointment, merit increase, or promotion in this series. The designation as Principal Investigator does not in itself justify an appointment to the Professional Research series.
• g. Appointees may serve full-time, part-time, or without salary.
• h. Project (e.g., Scientist) series titles may be supported by State and non-State funds.

2. DEADLINES

Actions with an effective date of July 1 should normally be received in the Division by April 1.

3. POLICY REFERENCES

APM 137    Term Appointment
APM 140    Grievances
APM 145    Layoff and Involuntary Reduction in Time
APM 150    Corrective Action and Dismissal
APM 160    Academic Personnel Office Records, Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of
APM 200-17   Effective Service Dates
APM 311    Project (e.g., Scientist) Series
APM 610    Salary Increase/Merit
APM 620/CAPM 803.620    Off-scale Salaries
CAPM 407.690    Overlapping Steps

4. CRITERIA

The candidate for a title in this series must have earned a doctorate or its equivalent. Exceptions to the requirement of a doctorate may be approved by the divisional dean. This authority may not be further redelegated.
A candidate for appointment, reappointment, merit increase, or promotion in this series shall be judged by the following criteria:

- a. Demonstrated significant, original, and creative contributions to a research or creative program or project;
- b. Professional competence and activity. Appointees in this series need not demonstrate the same independence or scholarly breadth as members of the Professor or Professional Research series. University and public service are encouraged but not required.

Graduate students may not be appointed to this series.

5. TERMS OF SERVICE

An appointment or reappointment in the Project (e.g., Scientist) series shall have a specified ending date. The appointee shall be advised in writing that the appointment is for a specific period and that the appointment ends at the specified date. See APM 137. In addition to specifying the end date, the appointment letter shall also set forth any funding requirements for the position.

- a. Appointments in this series may be for the normal period of service of the step to which the candidate is appointed or advanced, or less.
- b. Appointments may be made for the known period of approved funding. A projected period of employment extending beyond the funding end date must be contingent on funding renewal and/or availability.

6. SALARY LIMITATIONS

- a. The campus salary limit for the Project series, absent advancement to Above Scale rank, is the annual salary rate for Step 9, plus 11 percent (specific to Regular or Business/Engineering/Economics scales).
- b. Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step 4: An appointee who is eligible for promotion may not present a record of performance in research or professional activity sufficient to warrant promotion to the rank of Project (e.g, Scientist). In those cases where the candidate's performance, apart from the deficiency, is extraordinary, the department or supervising principle investigator (P.I.) may wish to recommend a modest off-scale salary increase of one-third or two-thirds of a step in recognition of the appointee’s overall performance during the review period. This recommendation must be accompanied by an assessment of the appointee's future prospects for promotion.
- c. Project (e.g., Scientist), Step 5: It is not appropriate for an appointee to receive a salary increase to a rate equivalent to Step 6 or higher without undergoing a Step 6 review. A candidate at Project (e.g., Scientist), Step 5, with an excellent record who chooses not to proceed with a Step 6 review, but requests review for a salary increase only, may be considered for a modest off-scale increase of one-third or two-thirds of a step in recognition of the appointee's overall performance during the review period.
• d. Project (e.g., Scientist), Step 9: It is not appropriate for an appointee to receive an above-scale salary without a review for Above Scale status. 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 of one-third or two-thirds of a step in recognition of the appointee's overall performance during the review period.

7. AUTHORITY

• a. The dean is delegated authority for all appointment and advancement actions up to the UC Salary Threshold. The dean has discretion to require DCAP review for dean-authority actions.
• b. The Provost of Academic Affairs (UCOP) has authority for appointment and advancement actions above the UC Salary Threshold. Contact the Academic Personnel Office for guidance.

8. ELIGIBILITY FOR REVIEW

• a. The department chair/director or supervising principal investigator (P.I.) is responsible for making certain eligible candidates are reviewed.
• b. The normal periods of service at rank and step in this series are shown in the published salary scales and are described below. Although these time periods indicate the usual intervals between advancements, they do not preclude more rapid advancement in the case of exceptional merit, or more gradual advancement when warranted.
• c. Reappointment and merit increase: candidates are eligible for review for merit increase after serving the normal period at step.
• d. Reappointment and promotion: review for promotion to the Associate Project (e.g., Scientist) rank normally shall be after two years service at Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist) Step 4. Review for promotion to the Project rank normally shall be after two years service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist) Step 3.
• e. Rules concerning effective dates of appointments are set forth in APM - 200-17, except that an appointment period normally will coincide with the University's fiscal year of July 1 through June 30 or with the end date of funding. The effective date of a promotion or merit increase is normally July 1.
• f. The normal periods of service at each step in this series are described in APM 311-17. See summary chart at the end of each section below.
  o (1) Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist)
    An appointment or reappointment in the Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist) rank shall be for a period of two years or less. Ordinarily, appointees serve in the first four steps with the corresponding salary levels. Step 5 may be used in exceptional situations, with proper justification, consistent with campus procedure (see CAPM 407.690). A maximum of two years of service at Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist), Step 5, may count "in lieu" of service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step 1. (see CAPM 407.690)
Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of appointment</th>
<th>Normal Advancement after requisite years at step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steps 1 - 4</td>
<td>Maximum of 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overlapping step -- see paragraph (1) above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overlapping step -- see paragraph (1) above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Associate Project (e.g., Scientist)

An appointment or reappointment in the Associate Project (e.g., Scientist) rank at any one of the first three steps shall be for a period of two years or less. The normal period of service in the rank of Associate Project (e.g., Scientist) is six years. Step 4 may be used in exceptional situations, with proper justification, consistent with campus procedure (see CAPM 407.690). A maximum of three years of service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step 4 may count "in lieu" of service at Project (e.g., Scientist), Step I. See CAPM 407.690 for this and other requirements for advancement in overlapping steps at this rank.

Associate Project (e.g., Scientist)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of appointment</th>
<th>Normal Advancement after requisite years at step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steps 1 - 3</td>
<td>Maximum of 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overlapping step -- see paragraph (2) above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps 4</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overlapping step -- see paragraph (2) above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eligible for promotion after 6 years in rank, or after 2 years at Step 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Project (e.g., Scientist)

An appointment or reappointment in the Project (e.g., Scientist) rank may be for a period of three years or less. The normal period of service at step is three years in each of the first four steps. Service at Step 5 may be of indefinite duration. Advancement to Project (e.g., Scientist), Step 6, usually will not occur after less than three years of service at Step 5, and will be granted on evidence of highly distinguished and creative contributions to a research or creative project. Service at Project (e.g., Scientist), Step 6, or higher may be of indefinite duration. Advancement from Project (e.g., Scientist), Step 6 to Step 7, from Step 7 to Step 8, and from Step 8 to Step 9, usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the lower step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step 6.

Project (e.g., Scientist)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of appointment</th>
<th>Normal Advancement after requisite years at step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steps 1 - 4</td>
<td>Maximum of 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps 5 - 9</td>
<td>Maximum of 3 years (indefinite steps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indefinite steps -- see paragraph (3) above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Project (e.g., Scientist) Above Scale

Advancement to an above-scale salary is reserved for appointees of the highest
distinction whose work has been recognized and acclaimed. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at Step 9. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step 9 is not a justification for further salary advancement. The record must demonstrate additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step 9 was based. A further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an above-scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Continued good service is not an adequate justification. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinite, and only in the most superior cases where there is strong and compelling evidence will an increase at intervals shorter than four years be approved.

---

**APPOINTMENT**

1. **DEFINITIONS**
2. **CRITERIA**
3. **RECRUITMENT**
4. **DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY**
5. **PROCEDURES**

- Assembling the review file
- The department's review
- Progress of the review file after the department and dean reviews
- Compiling the review file - the document inventory for appointment to academic research titles
- Sample extramural letter request

1. **DEFINITIONS**

An appointment occurs when a person is employed in one of the three ranks in this series, if the individual's immediately previous status was not in the employ of the University; or in the employ of the University but not with a title in this series.

2. **CRITERIA**

See [General Provisions, Section 4](#) above.

3. **RECRUITMENT**

See [CAPM 100.500](#) for the Academic Recruitment Procedures. Recruitment compliance, or approved waiver of recruitment, or valid exemption must be issued before the appointment review file can be processed.
4. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

See Delegation of Authority Chart for appointments.

5. PROCEDURES

ASSEMBLING THE REVIEW FILE

- a. The Principal Investigator (P.I.) will initiate and prepare the review file in accordance with the Document Inventory for Appointment to Academic Research Titles. Normally the review file will include updated biographical information, publications or other evidence of significant, original, and creative contributions in research, external letters of recommendation, the Affirmative Action compliance record, and the recommendation for appointment. It is not necessary to complete a Checklist to Assure Fairness for appointment actions.

THE DEPARTMENT'S REVIEW

In cases where the candidate is the P.I., the review file will be prepared by the department chair or director, as appropriate, who will forward it to the division.

If the initiator of the review file is the P.I., the review file will be forwarded to the department chair or director, as appropriate, for review and recommendation, after which the file will be forwarded to the division.

- b. The review file is prepared by the P.I./department chair or director, as appropriate and includes the material listed on the Document Inventory for Appointment to Academic Research Titles (see Forms and Data-Document Inventories). Explain any items that are not included.
  - i. The recommendation is made in accordance with the established governance practices of the hiring unit for appointments in the research series. Each department or research unit should have a copy of its voting procedures on file in the division and the Academic Personnel Office. The letter of recommendation shall report the nature and extent of consultation on the matter within the department/unit and present any significant evidence and differences of opinion which would support a different recommendation. The department or research unit shall adopt procedures under which the department/unit letter shall be available, before being forwarded, for review by all those members of the department/unit eligible to vote on the matter, or by a designated committee or other group of such members.

The recommendation should include the rank, step, and salary desired. A recommendation for off-scale salary (see APM 620) must be accompanied by a justification for the salary; e.g., the market place, to match competing offers, or special recruiting problems in a discipline.
The P.I. or department chair/director letter shall discuss the proposed appointment in light of the criteria set forth in section 310.4 above. Any significant evidence or differences of opinion shall be included. All references to confidential letter writers must be by alpha code. The letter must be an evaluation of evidence, not merely an enumeration or list of accomplishments, or compilation of quotes from review letters.

ii. The chairperson (P.I., director) may write a separate and distinct letter presenting their recommendation and evaluation as chairperson. This letter is confidential and is not made available to other department members eligible to vote on the action. The chair’s letter comments on the review and may not introduce new material. The division shall identify the chairperson's letter with an alpha code on the list of letter writers. Subsequent reviewers shall refer to the chairperson's letter by the assigned alpha code. The confidential chair letter, in redacted form, will be provided to the candidate upon the candidate's request for access to the review file after the offer of appointment has been accepted.

200.160 In cases where the candidate is the P.I., the review file will be prepared by the department chair or director, as appropriate, who will forward it to the division.

If the initiator of the review file is the P.I., the review file will be forwarded to the department chair or director, as appropriate, for review and recommendation, after which the file will be forwarded to the division.

PROGRESS OF THE REVIEW FILE AFTER THE DEPARTMENT AND DEAN REVIEWS

• c. In accordance with the campus delegation of authority chart, the file may be reviewed by the Senate Divisional Committee on Academic Personnel (DCAP) or Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), who will add a recommendation to the review file.
  
  i. Generally an ad hoc review committee is not appointed to consider appointments at any rank in this series, but may be referred to an ad hoc committee by the dean or campus provost/executive vice chancellor, as appropriate under campus delegations, after consultation with CAP or DCAP as appropriate.

  ii. The offer of appointment is issued by the deciding authority.

If the dean does not have authority, the dean will add a written evaluation to the review file and forward it to the campus provost/executive vice chancellor.

  iii. If the review file is found to be incomplete or inadequate during the review, additional information may be solicited by the dean and/or the campus provost/executive vice chancellor. Any new material shall be added to the file by the initiator of the review file (P.I. or department chair/director).

  iv. If the dean has authority for the appointment and the tentative decision is contrary to the recommendation of the P.I./department chair/research director, or
DCAP (when DCAP review is required), the dean shall notify the department and DCAP, indicating the reasons and asking for any further information which might support a different decision. Where DCAP review is required, any additional information that is provided will be forwarded to DCAP for an opportunity to comment on the augmented file before the final decision is made.

If the campus provost/executive vice chancellor has authority for the appointment and the tentative decision is contrary to the recommendation of the P.I./department chair/director, dean or CAP, the campus provost/executive vice chancellor will notify the dean and CAP indicating the reasons and asking for any further information which might support a different decision. If additional information is provided, the dean and CAP will be given an opportunity to comment on the augmented file before a final decision is made. The candidate shall be notified of the final decision in writing with copies to the dean, and P.I./department/unit, as appropriate.

- d. Compiling the Review File

**DOCUMENT INVENTORY FOR APPOINTMENT TO ACADEMIC RESEARCH TITLES**

**Explanation of Document Inventory for Appointment-summary of process**

The top section of the document inventory for appointment should be completed by the department. Questions about how to complete this form may be directed to the division office of the Academic Personnel Office.

Materials to be included with the Document Inventory for appointment are listed below by the party responsible for their submission. Items are submitted at different stages of the review process as indicated.

---

**CANDIDATE**

**BEFORE THE REVIEW FILE IS ASSEMBLED:**

- Candidate's address for correspondence
- List of names of persons (external and internal) who provided letters of evaluation.
- Publications
- Unsolicited material (optional)
- Optional personal statement
- Curriculum Vita
DEPARTMENT

BEFORE THE REVIEW FILE IS ASSEMBLED:

- Annotated Curriculum Vita
- Confidential letters
- Sample copy of solicitation letter (if letters were solicited)
- List of all persons from whom letters were sought; identifies those suggested by the candidate
- Brief comments on academic standing of each letter writer and relationship, if any, to candidate.
- Declining letters (including report of declinations by phone)

DEPARTMENT CHAIR

AFTER THE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION IS DETERMINED

- Department letter (nonconfidential document)
- Department chair letter (optional, confidential document)

DEAN

AFTER THE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION IS DETERMINED

- Decision. If CP/EVC authority, provides decanal letter (nonconfidential document)

SAMPLE EXTRAMURAL LETTER REQUEST

APPOINTMENT

Dear Professor ____________________:

I would appreciate your help in evaluating one of our colleagues, ________________, who is currently being reviewed for appointment as ________________.

Appointment in the Project Scientist series at the University of California is based upon demonstrated significant, original, and creative contributions to a research or creative program or project. I would appreciate your evaluation of the candidate's research accomplishments and future potential.
In order to facilitate evaluation I am enclosing a copy of _______________'s curriculum vita and copies of (their) recent (reprints/slides/publications).

Under University of California policy, the identity of authors of letters of evaluation which are included in the personnel review files will be held in confidence. A candidate may request access to your letter in redacted form after the candidate accepts an offer of appointment at UCSC. Redaction is defined as the removal of identifying information (including name, title, institutional affiliation, and relationship to the candidate) contained either at the top of the letterhead or within and below the signature block of the letter of evaluation.

The full text of the body of your letter will therefore be provided to the candidate if so requested. Thus, if you provide any information that tends to identify you in the body of the letter, that information will become available to the candidate. If you wish, you may provide a brief factual statement regarding your relationship to the candidate at the end of your letter, but below the signature block. This brief statement will not be made available to the candidate.

Although we cannot guarantee that at some future time a court or government agency will not require the disclosure of the source of confidential evaluations in University of California personnel files, we can assure you that the University will endeavor to protect the identity of authors of letters of evaluation to the fullest extent allowable under the law.*

I would very much appreciate receiving your evaluation at your earliest convenience. I thank you in advance for your aid in this matter.

Sincerely,

*Bold paragraphs must be included in all solicitation letters.

---

REAPPOINTMENT AND MERIT INCREASE

1. DEFINITIONS
2. CRITERIA
3. DEADLINES
4. PROCEDURES
   - Before the review file is assembled
   - Before the department recommendation is determined
   - The department review
   - Progress of the review file after the department and dean reviews
5. VARIATIONS FOR ABOVE-SCALE REVIEWS
6. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY
7. COMPILING THE REVIEW FILE - THE DOCUMENT INVENTORY FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO ACADEMIC RESEARCH TITLES
8. SAMPLE EXTRAMURAL LETTER REQUEST

1. DEFINITIONS

Merit Increase: A merit increase is a change in step, e.g., from Project (e.g., Scientist) Step 1 to Project (e.g., Scientist), Step 2.

A reappointment is the renewal of a previous appointment immediately following the ending of the previous appointment in the same series. Reappointment is subject to a positive performance review and availability of funding.

A merit review is usually conducted in conjunction with a reappointment review. The review period for reappointment and/or merit actions commenced with the last approved reappointment/movement in step or salary and ends with the established due date for the candidate's submission of materials.

2. CRITERIA

See General Provisions, Section 4 above, for review criteria.

3. DEADLINES

Actions normally should be received in the division office by April 1 for timely completion.

4. PROCEDURES

BEFORE THE REVIEW FILE IS ASSEMBLED

- a. All reappointment and advancement actions are based on performance and the availability of funding. The University may decide not to renew a term appointment, when, in its judgment, the programmatic needs of the department or unit, lack of work, the availability of suitable funding for the position, or the appointee's conduct and performance do not justify renewal of the appointment. See CAPM 005.137 Campus Procedures for Term Appointments of Non-Senate Academic Appointees.
- b. Refer to General Provisions, Section 5, above, for eligibility requirements.
- c. The initiator of the review shall notify the candidate of the impending review and make certain that the candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process. The candidate is given the opportunity to ask questions and made aware of the relevant sections of APM 160 and 311.
- d. The initiator of the review (P.I. or department chair/director) shall document the formal review process by completing the Checklist to Assure Fairness with the candidate. The procedures outlined in the checklist should be completed in order, with the candidate initialing each number to indicate these obligations have been completed. The candidate
may annotate any item as necessary. Signatures of both the candidate and initiator of the review are required.

• e. The initiator of the review shall inform the candidate that past personnel actions may be viewed during the current review process. Refer to the campus policy on access to prior reviews (section 202.160) for more information.

• f. The initiator of the review shall ask the candidate to supply pertinent information:
  o i. updated cumulative biobibliography. It is the candidate’s responsibility to provide current information;
  o ii. copies of publications (or like material) since the last approved action; for Step 6, since advancement or appointment to full Project (e.g., Scientist) rank; for Above-scale, since advancement or appointment to Project (e.g., Scientist) Step 6;
  o iii. copies of manuscripts (or other research evidence) in preparation which the candidate wishes to submit for review;
  o iv. candidate’s optional personal statement: it is often helpful for the reviewers if the candidate submits a statement of their research plans and progress. The candidate may include any information the candidate desires in this statement, e.g., problems encountered, extenuating circumstances.
  o v. unsolicited material (optional): this is material that has not been solicited by any university agency. It might include unsolicited letters to the candidate or department concerning the candidate, published reviews of the candidate's work, or any relevant material the candidate wants to include in the review file. All unsolicited material normally is nonconfidential; the candidate has direct access to it. If the material is received by the university, and not from the candidate, with the understanding that the identity of the author will be held in confidence to the extent permissible by law, then it should be marked 'unsolicited confidential' and redacted for the candidate;
  o vi. names of persons (external and internal) who, for reasons set forth in writing by the candidate, might not objectively evaluate the candidate’s qualifications and performance. Any names and the reasons shall be included in the review file;
  o vii. Normally letters of evaluation are not solicited from external people for merit increase reviews. Such letters are solicited for advancement to Above-scale (see section 5 below for instructions).

• g. Publications and creative work that have been reviewed by the department must be annotated and numbered on the biobibliography; the original publications and creative work are numbered correspondingly. Materials that are forwarded are marked with the letter ‘F’ on the biobibliography. By annotating the bibliography for the publications reviewed and forwarded by the department, a record is created of what has been used as documentation in the review.

• h. The initiator of the review should be helpful in responding to the candidate's questions and in considering whether additions to the file by the candidate are needed. The initiator of the review has an obligation to consider the interests of both the candidate and the University, and to see to it that the department review is fair to the candidate and rigorous in maintaining University standards.

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION IS DETERMINED
i. Before the recommendation is determined, the initiator of the review (P.I./department chair/director) shall provide the candidate the opportunity to inspect all nonconfidential documents to be included in the review file. The initiator of the review shall provide the candidate with a redacted copy (as defined in APM 160-20-c(4) and 200.160) of the confidential academic review records which will be included in the review file. Refer to section 200.160 for further information concerning confidential documents. The identities of the persons who were the sources of the documents shall not be disclosed. A copy of the redacted confidential documents shall be included in the original copy of the review file.

j. The initiator of the review shall provide the candidate with the opportunity to submit a written comment upon material in the file. The candidate has ten working days from receipt of the redacted confidential documents in which to comment. The candidate's written comment, if any, must be included in the review file. The candidate is encouraged to notify the initiator of the review if the candidate declines to comment, so that the initiator can immediately continue the review.

THE DEPARTMENT REVIEW

k. The department or research unit evaluation and recommendation is made in accordance with the governance practices established by the hiring unit for reappointment and merit actions in the Project (e.g., Scientist) series. Each department or research unit should have a copy of its voting procedures on file in the Academic Personnel Office. The letter of recommendation shall report the nature and extent of consultation on the matter within the department/unit and present any significant evidence and differences of opinion which would support a different recommendation. If the procedures call for a vote, a report of the vote is required. The department or research unit shall adopt procedures under which the department/unit letter shall be available, before being forwarded, for review by all those members of the department/unit eligible to vote on the matter or by a designated committee or other group of such members.

It is suggested that the letter contain:

- (1) name, current rank, step, and salary of the candidate;
- (2) number of years at rank and step;
- (3) rank, step, and salary recommended;
- (4) the vote specifying the number in favor, opposed and abstained;
- (5) an evaluation and analysis of the candidate's performance based on the criteria in APM 311-10. See Suggestions for Letters of Evaluation, for additional information on documenting the evaluation.

l. The initiator of the review provides the candidate with a copy of the department/unit evaluation and recommendation. The identities of the sources of confidential documents shall not be disclosed in the department/unit letter except by alpha code.

m. The candidate is given an opportunity to submit a written comment on the P.I. or department chair/director letter. This comment may be sent to the initiator of the review or dean, at the option of the candidate. If the candidate chooses to send the comment directly to the dean, it shall be confidential from the P.I. and department or research unit.
The candidate has ten working days from receipt of the P.I. or department chair/director letter in which to comment. The candidate's comment, if any, shall be included in the review file.

- n. The chairperson (P.I., director) may write a separate and distinct letter presenting their recommendation and evaluation as chairperson. This letter is confidential and is not made available to other department members eligible to vote on the action. The chair's letter comments on the review file and may not introduce new material. Refer to 200.160 for information concerning the candidate's access after the review to the department chair's personal letter. The division shall identify the chairperson's letter with an alpha code on the list of letter writers. Subsequent reviewers shall refer to the chairperson’s letter by the assigned alpha code. The confidential chair letter, in redacted form, will be provided to the candidate upon the candidate's request for access to the review file after the final decision has been issued. [200.160]

PROGRESS OF THE REVIEW FILE AFTER THE DEPARTMENT/RESEARCH UNIT REVIEW

- o. The review file, including documents specified in the Document Inventory for Merit Increases, shall be forwarded to the division where it will be reviewed for completeness. If the dean has authority for the action, the review file will be forwarded to the divisional senate committee on Academic Personnel (DCAP) for review if required (see Delegation of Authority Chart). If the campus provost/executive vice chancellor has authority for the action, the dean shall review the file, add a written recommendation, and forward the file to the Academic Personnel Office.

- p. If the personnel file is found to be incomplete or inadequate, the dean and/or the campus provost/executive vice chancellor may request additional information or clarification. Any new material shall be added to the file by the initiator of the review file (P.I. or department chair/director).

- q. Generally an ad hoc review committee is not appointed to consider actions in the Project Scientist series, but may be referred to an ad hoc committee by the dean or campus provost/executive vice chancellor, as appropriate, after consultation with CAP or DCAP as appropriate. An ad hoc committee may be appointed for advancement to Step 6 or Above-Scale.

- r. As appropriate, (see Delegation of Authority Chart) the CAP/DCAP shall review reappointment and merit actions and add a written recommendation.

- s. If, during Academic Senate or administrative review, the review file is found to be incomplete or inadequate, additional information shall be solicited through the Division or the Academic Personnel Office, as appropriate. Additional information normally shall be requested in writing from the initiator of the review file (P.I. or department chair/director). The initiator of the review shall provide the candidate with the opportunity to inspect any nonconfidential additional information and a redacted copy of any confidential additional information. A copy of any redacted confidential documents shall accompany the additional information for inclusion in the review file. The candidate has ten working days from receipt of the redaction to respond to, or comment upon, the file material. The candidate's response, if any, shall accompany the additional information for inclusion in the review file. The initiator of the review shall review the
additional information and submit a recommendation or comment. The candidate is provided with a copy of the initiator's comment and has ten working days in which to make a written statement for inclusion in the personnel review file. The candidate may choose to send this statement directly to the dean. If the statement is sent directly to the dean, it will be confidential from the department or research unit. New material or documentation, however, must be submitted to the initiator in order that the initiator may comment. Any additional information shall be forwarded to the dean, accompanied by a completed Checklist to Assure Fairness for the Submission of Additional Information. The review shall then be based upon the review file as augmented.

- t. The dean or campus provost/executive vice chancellor, as appropriate, [see Delegation of Authority Chart] shall make the final decision based upon the review file. The candidate shall be notified of the decision in writing with copies to the P.I. or department chair/director, and dean as appropriate.

- u. After the decision, the candidate shall have the right, upon written request, to receive from the deciding authority (dean or campus provost/executive vice chancellor), a written statement of the reasons for the decision, including a copy of nonconfidential documents and a redacted copy of the confidential academic review records (as defined in APM 160-20-c(4) and 200.160) in the personnel review file.

5. VARIATIONS FOR ABOVE-SCALE REVIEWS

Refer to General Provisions, Sections 4 and 6 above, for eligibility and criteria. The general rules of the Project (e.g., Scientist) Series, Reappointment and Merit Increase section apply. In addition:

- a. For the Above-scale review, the candidate shall be asked to supply copies of publications or other evidence of research activity since advancement or appointment to Step 6.

- b. External letters of evaluation are normally solicited for merits to Above-scale. The review initiator shall ask the candidate to supply names (internal and external) of others who might reasonably be asked to evaluate their work. The candidate should also provide brief comments on the academic standing of each proposed reviewer and relationship, if any, to the candidate. A candidate is not required to supply such names. If the candidate decides not to suggest names, please indicate this in the review file.

- c. The department chair shall ask the candidate to supply names of persons (external and internal) who, for reasons set forth in writing by the candidate, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications and performance because of personal or professional reasons. Any names and the reasons shall be included in the review file.

The reasons given need not be detailed--examples are "My work has just proved that John Smith's work of the last 40 years is completely wrong" or "My work is of the Green School, while hers is of the Smith School." Naming someone as possibly not being objective does not mean that the person will be excluded from participating in the review, but will allow reviewers to place comments in the file in the proper context.
d. The chairperson shall solicit letters of evaluation from qualified persons, including a reasonable number of persons suggested by the candidate. All such letters shall be included in the review file and are confidential documents. See Instructions for Soliciting Letters for procedures to be followed in obtaining and including solicited letters in a review file. See Sample Extramural Letter Request at the end of this section.

6. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY:

See Delegation of Authority Chart for authority and special requirements for off-scale merits at Step 5 and salaries above Step 6.

7. COMPILING THE REVIEW FILE:

The review file is compiled beginning at the bottom of the document inventory. Many of the items must be gathered before the review unit can complete its review and recommendation concerning the candidate. The review file contains the material upon which the decision to grant a merit increase is made.

---

**DOCUMENT INVENTORY REAPPOINTMENT/MERIT FOR ACADEMIC RESEARCH TITLES**

**Explanation of Document Inventory for Reappointment/merit-summary of process**

The top section of the document inventory for reappointment/merit should be completed by the department staff. Questions about how to complete this form may be directed to the division office of the Academic Personnel Office.

Materials to be included with the Document Inventory for reappointment and merit are listed below by the party responsible for their submission. Items are submitted at different stages of the review process as indicated.

**CANDIDATE**

**BEFORE THE REVIEW FILE IS ASSEMBLED:**

- List of names of persons (external and internal) to be solicited for letters of evaluation (if Above-scale)
- List of names (external and internal) who might not objectively evaluate candidate and explanation
- Publications
- Unsolicited material (optional)
- Optional personal statement
- Cumulative biobibliography
BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION IS DETERMINED

- Response to confidential documents (optional)

AFTER THE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION IS DETERMINED

- Comment to department letter (optional)

DEPARTMENT

BEFORE THE REVIEW FILE IS ASSEMBLED:

- Checklist to Assure Fairness (first section)
- Annotated Cumulative Biobibliography
- Student evaluations
- Student letters (if any)
- Confidential letters
- Sample copy of solicitation letter
- List of all persons from whom letters were sought; identifies those suggested by the candidate
- Brief comments on academic standing of each letter writer and relationship, if any, to candidate.
- Declining letters (including report of declinations by phone)

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION IS DETERMINED

- Provides the assembled review materials to the candidate for inspection and comment
- Checklist to Assure Fairness (second section)

AFTER THE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION IS DETERMINED

- Provides candidate with copy of departmental evaluation and recommendation. Confidential letter writers are referenced by alpha code.
- Candidate is given opportunity to respond.
- Checklist to Assure Fairness (last section)

DEPARTMENT CHAIR

AFTER THE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION IS DETERMINED

- Department letter (nonconfidential document)
- Department chair letter (optional, confidential document)
DEAN

AFTER THE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION IS DETERMINED

- Dean's letter (nonconfidential document)

---

SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTER

Advancement to Above Scale

Dear Professor __________:

I would appreciate your help in evaluating one of our colleagues, __________________, who is currently being considered for reappointment and advancement as ___________________.

University policy requires that extramural evaluations of the qualifications and potential of each candidate be secured from recognized authorities outside the University in order to supplement the factual record, and to provide reviewing authorities with an independent assessment.

Accordingly, I am writing to request that you provide me with your analysis and evaluation of ____________________'s scholarly (or) creative contributions with particular reference to their originality and significance. In addition, I would appreciate your comments on their standing within their discipline, and any other aspect of their professional competence with which you may be familiar.

Advancement to an above-scale salary is reserved for appointees of the highest distinction whose work has been recognized and acclaimed. Mere length of service and continued good performance is not a justification.

For your convenience, I am enclosing a copy of __________'s curriculum vita and latest publications.

Under University of California policy, the identity of authors of letters of evaluation which are included in the personnel review files will be held in confidence. A candidate will at certain prescribed stages of the Academic Personnel review process, be provided access to such letters in redacted form. Redaction is defined as the removal of identifying information (including name, title, institutional affiliation, and relationship to the candidate) contained either at the top of the letterhead or within and below the signature block of the letter of evaluation.
The full text of the body of your letter will therefore be provided to the candidate. Thus, if you provide any information that tends to identify you in the body of the letter, that information will become available to the candidate. If you wish, you may provide a brief factual statement regarding your relationship to the candidate at the end of your letter, but below the signature block. This brief statement will not be made available to the candidate.

Although we cannot guarantee that at some future time a court or governmental agency will not require the disclosure of the source of confidential evaluations in University of California personnel files, we can assure you that the University will endeavor to protect the identity of authors of letters of evaluation to the fullest extent allowable under the law.*

I very much appreciate receiving your evaluation at your earliest convenience. I thank you in advance for your aid in this matter.

Sincerely,

* **Bold paragraphs** must be included in all solicitation letters.

---

**PROMOTION**

1. DEFINITIONS
2. CRITERIA
3. DEADLINES
4. PROCEDURES

- Before the review file is assembled
- Before the department recommendation is determined
- The department review
- Progress of the review file after the department and dean reviews

5. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY
6. COMPILING THE REVIEW FILE - THE DOCUMENT INVENTORY FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO ACADEMIC RESEARCH TITLES
7. SAMPLE EXTRAMURAL LETTER REQUEST

1. DEFINITIONS

Promotion: Advancement from one rank to a higher rank, e.g., from Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist) to Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), or from Associate Project (e.g., Scientist) to Project (e.g., Scientist).

2. CRITERIA

see General Provisions, Section 4, above, for review criteria.
3. DEADLINES:

Actions normally should be received in the division office by April 1 for timely completion.

4. PROCEDURES

BEFORE THE REVIEW FILE IS ASSEMBLED

- a. A promotion review is usually conducted in conjunction with a reappointment. All reappointment and advancement actions are based on performance and the availability of funding. The University may decide not to renew a term appointment, when, in its judgment, the programmatic needs of the department or unit, lack of work, the availability of suitable funding for the position, or the appointee's conduct and performance do not justify renewal of the appointment. See CAPM 005.137 Campus Procedures For Term Appointments of Non-Senate Academic Appointees.
- b. Refer to General Provisions, Section 6, above, for review criteria.
- c. The initiator of the review shall notify the candidate of the impending review and make certain that the candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process. The candidate is given the opportunity to ask questions and made aware of the relevant sections of APM 160 and 311.
- d. The initiator of the review (P.I. or department chair/director) shall document the formal review process by completing the Checklist to Assure Fairness with the candidate. The procedures outlined in the checklist should be completed in order, with the candidate initialing each number to indicate these obligations have been completed. The candidate may annotate any item as necessary. Signatures of both the candidate and initiator of the review are required.
- e. The initiator of the review shall inform the candidate that past personnel actions may be viewed during the current review process. Refer to the campus policy on access to prior reviews (section 202.160) for more information.
- f. The initiator of the review shall ask the candidate to supply pertinent information:
  - i. updated cumulative biobibliography. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide current information;
  - ii. copies of publications (and other materials related to research and creative activity) since last promotion;
  - iii. copies of materials related to research and creative work in progress which the candidate wishes to submit for review;
  - iv. candidate's optional personal statement: it is often helpful for the reviewers if the candidate submits a statement of their research plans and progress, and service contributions. The candidate may include any information the candidate desires in this statement, e.g., problems encountered, extenuating circumstances. [sample candidate's optional statement] This statement must be reviewed before a final recommendation and evaluation is made;
  - v. unsolicited material (optional): this is material that has not been solicited by any university agency. It might include unsolicited letters to the candidate or department concerning the candidate, published reviews of the candidate's work, or any relevant material the candidate wants to include in the review file. All
unsolicited material normally is nonconfidential; the candidate has direct access to it. If the material is received by the university, and not from the candidate, with the understanding that the identity of the author will be held in confidence to the extent permissible by law, then it should be marked 'unsolicited confidential' and redacted for the candidate;

- g. External letters of evaluation are solicited for promotion. The department chair shall ask the candidate to supply names (internal and external) of others who might reasonably be asked to evaluate their work. The candidate should also provide brief comments on the academic standing of each proposed reviewer and relationship, if any, to the candidate. A candidate is not required to supply such names. If the candidate decides not to suggest names, please indicate this in the review file.

- h. The department chair shall ask the candidate to supply names of persons (external and internal) who, for reasons set forth in writing by the candidate, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications and performance because of personal or professional reasons. Any names and the reasons shall be included in the review file.

The reasons given need not be detailed--examples are "My work has just proved that John Smith's work of the last 40 years is completely wrong" or "My work is of the Green School, while hers is of the Smith School." Naming someone as possibly not being objective does not mean that the person will be excluded from participating in the review, but will allow reviewers to place comments in the file in the proper context.

- i. The chairperson shall solicit letters of evaluation from qualified persons, including a reasonable number of persons suggested by the candidate. All such letters shall be included in the review file and are confidential documents. See Instructions for Soliciting Letters for procedures to be followed in obtaining and including solicited letters in a review file. See sample solicitation letter at end of this section.

- j. Publications and creative work that have been reviewed by the department must be annotated and numbered on the biobibliography; the original publications and creative work are numbered correspondingly. Materials that are forwarded are marked with the letter 'F' on the biobibliography. By annotating the bibliography for the publications reviewed and forwarded by the department, a record is created of what has been used as documentation in the review.

- k. The initiator of the review should be helpful in responding to the candidate's questions and in considering whether additions to the file by the candidate are needed. The initiator of the review has an obligation to consider the interests of both the candidate and the University, and to see to it that the department review is fair to the candidate and rigorous in maintaining University standards.

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION IS DETERMINED

- l. Before the recommendation is determined, the initiator of the review (P.I./department chair/director) shall provide the candidate the opportunity to inspect all nonconfidential documents to be included in the review file. The initiator of the review shall provide the candidate with a redacted copy (as defined in APM 160-20-c(4) and 200.160) of the confidential academic review records which will be included in the review file. Refer to
section 200.160 for further information concerning confidential documents. The identities of the persons who were the sources of the documents shall not be disclosed. A copy of the redacted confidential documents shall be included in the original copy of the review file.

- m. The initiator of the review shall provide the candidate with the opportunity to submit a written comment upon material in the file. The candidate has ten working days from receipt of the redacted confidential documents in which to comment. The candidate's written comment, if any, must be included in the review file. The candidate is encouraged to notify the initiator of the review if the candidate declines to comment, so that the initiator of the review can immediately continue the review.

THE DEPARTMENT REVIEW

- n. The department or research unit evaluation and recommendation is made in accordance with the governance practices established by the hiring unit for reappointment and merit actions in the research series. Each department or research unit should have a copy of its voting procedures on file in the division and the Academic Personnel Office. The letter of recommendation shall report the nature and extent of consultation on the matter within the department/unit and present any significant evidence and differences of opinion which would support a different recommendation. If the procedures call for a vote, a report of the vote is required. The department or research unit shall adopt procedures under which the department/unit letter shall be available, before being forwarded, for review by all those members of the department/unit eligible to vote on the matter or by a designated committee or other group of such members.

It is suggested that the letter contain:

- (1) name, current rank, step, and salary of the candidate;
- (2) number of years at rank and step;
- (3) rank, step, and salary recommended;
- (4) the vote specifying the number in favor, opposed and abstained;
- (5) an evaluation and analysis of the candidate's performance based on the criteria in APM 311-10. See Suggestions for Letters of Evaluation, for additional information on documenting the evaluation in the departmental letter.

- o. The initiator of the review provides the candidate with a copy of the department/unit evaluation and recommendation. The identities of the sources of confidential documents shall not be disclosed in the department/unit letter except by alpha code.

- p. The candidate is given an opportunity to submit a written comment on the P.I. or department chair/director letter. This comment may be sent to the initiator of the review or dean, at the option of the candidate. If the candidate chooses to send the comment directly to the dean, it shall be confidential from the P.I. and department or research unit. The candidate has ten working days from receipt of the P.I. or department chair/director letter in which to comment. The candidate's comment, if any, shall be included in the review file.

- q. The P.I. or chairperson/director may write a separate and distinct "chair" letter presenting their recommendation and evaluation as "chairperson".
confidential and is not part of the documents redacted by the chairperson for the candidate, nor must it be made available to other department members eligible to vote on the action. The chair's letter comments on the review and may not introduce new material. The division shall identify the chairperson's letter with an alpha code on the list of letter writers. Subsequent reviewers shall refer to the chairperson's letter by the assigned alpha code. The confidential chair letter, in redacted form, will be provided to the candidate upon the candidate's request for access to the review file after the final decision has been issued. [200.160]

PROGRESS OF THE REVIEW FILE AFTER THE DEPARTMENT REVIEW

- r. The review file, including documents specified in the Document Inventory for Promotion, shall be forwarded to the division where it will be reviewed for completeness. If the dean has authority for the action, the review file will be forwarded to the divisional senate committee on Academic Personnel (DCAP) for review if required (see Delegation of Authority Chart). If the campus provost/executive vice chancellor has authority for the action, the dean shall review the file, add a written recommendation, and forward the file to the Academic Personnel Office.
- s. If the personnel file is found to be incomplete or inadequate, the dean and/or the campus provost/executive vice chancellor may request additional information or clarification. Any new material shall be added to the file by the initiator of the review file (P.I. or department chair/director).
- t. If the campus provost/executive vice chancellor has authority for the action, the review file shall be reviewed for completeness and forwarded to the Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) by the Academic Personnel Office, if CAP review is required.
- u. Normally, an ad hoc review committee is not appointed to consider promotions, but may be referred to an ad hoc committee by the dean or campus provost/executive vice chancellor, as appropriate, after consultation with CAP or DCAP as appropriate.
- v. As appropriate, the CAP/DCAP shall review the file and add a written recommendation.
- w. If, during Academic Senate or administrative review, the review file is found to be incomplete or inadequate, additional information shall be solicited through the Division or the Academic Personnel Office, as appropriate. Additional information normally shall be requested in writing from the initiator of the review file (P.I. or department chair/director). The initiator of the review shall provide the candidate with the opportunity to inspect any nonconfidential additional information and a redacted copy of any confidential additional information. A copy of any redacted confidential documents shall accompany the additional information for inclusion in the review file. The candidate has ten working days from receipt of the redaction to comment upon, the file material. The candidate's comment, if any, shall accompany the additional information for inclusion in the review file. The initiator of the review shall review the additional information and submit a recommendation or comment. The candidate is provided with a copy of the initiator's comment and has ten working days in which to make a written comment for inclusion in the personnel review file. The candidate may choose to send this statement directly to the dean. If the statement is sent directly to the dean, it will be
confidential from the department or research unit. New material or documentation, however, must be submitted to the initiator in order that the initiator may comment. Any additional information shall be forwarded to the dean, accompanied by a completed Checklist to Assure Fairness for the Submission of Additional Information. The review shall then be based upon the review file as augmented.

- x. The dean or campus provost/executive vice chancellor, as appropriate, shall make the final decision based upon the review file. The candidate shall be notified of the decision in writing with copies to the P.I. or department chair/director, and dean as appropriate.
- y. After the decision, the candidate shall have the right, upon written request, to receive from the deciding authority (dean or campus provost/executive vice chancellor), a written statement of the reasons for the decision, including a copy of nonconfidential documents and a redacted copy of the confidential academic review records (as defined in APM 160-20-c(4) and 200.160) in the personnel review file.

5. DELEGATIONS OF AUTHORITY

See Delegation of Authority Chart for delegated authority for promotion review.

6. COMPILING THE REVIEW FILE

The review file is compiled beginning at the bottom of the document inventory. Many of the items must be gathered before the review unit can complete its review and recommendation concerning the candidate. The review file contains the material upon which the decision to grant a promotion is made.

**DOCUMENT INVENTORY FOR PROMOTION IN ACADEMIC RESEARCH TITLES**

**Explanation of Document Inventory for Promotion/Summary of Process**

The top section of the Document Inventory for promotion should be completed by the department staff. Questions about how to complete this form, may be directed to the division office or the Academic Personnel Office.

Materials to be included with the Document Inventory for promotion are listed below by the party responsible for their submission. Items are submitted at different stages of the review process as indicated.

**CANDIDATE**

BEFORE THE REVIEW FILE IS ASSEMBLED:

- List of names of persons (external and internal) to be solicited for letters of evaluation.
- List of names (external and internal) who might not objectively evaluate candidate and explanation.
- Publications
- Unsolicited material (optional)
- Optional personal statement
• Cumulative biobibliography

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION IS DETERMINED

• Comment on confidential document (optional)

AFTER THE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION IS DETERMINED

• Comment on department letter (optional)

-------------------------

DEPARTMENT

BEFORE THE REVIEW FILE IS ASSEMBLED:

• Checklist to Assure Fairness (first section)
• Annotated Cumulative Biobibliography
• Student evaluations
• Student letters (if any)
• Confidential letters
• Sample copy of solicitation letter
• List of all persons from whom letters were sought; identifies those suggested by the candidate
• Brief comments on academic standing of each letter writer and relationship, if any, to candidate.
• Declining letters (includes report of declinations by phone)

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION IS DETERMINED

• Provides the assembled review materials to the candidate for inspection and comment
• Checklist to Assure Fairness (second section)

AFTER THE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION IS DETERMINED

• Provides candidate with copy of departmental evaluation and recommendation. Confidential letter writers are referenced by alpha code.
• Candidate is given opportunity to comment.
• Checklist to Assure Fairness (last section)

-------------------------

DEPARTMENT CHAIR

AFTER THE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION IS DETERMINED

• Department letter (nonconfidential document)
SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTER

Promotion

Dear Professor __________:

I would appreciate your help in evaluating one of our colleagues, ________________, who is currently being considered for reappointment and advancement as ________________.

Accordingly, I am writing to request that you provide me with your analysis and evaluation of __________'s scholarly (or) creative contributions with particular reference to their originality and significance. In addition, I would appreciate your comments on their standing within their discipline, and any other aspect of their professional competence with which you may be familiar.

For your convenience, I am enclosing a copy of __________'s curriculum vita and latest publications.

Under University of California policy, the identity of authors of letters of evaluation which are included in the personnel review files will be held in confidence. A candidate will at certain prescribed stages of the Academic Personnel review process, be provided access to such letters in redacted form. Redaction is defined as the removal of identifying information (including name, title, institutional affiliation, and relationship to the candidate) contained either at the top of the letterhead or within and below the signature block of the letter of evaluation.

The full text of the body of your letter will therefore be provided to the candidate. Thus, if you provide any information that tends to identify you in the body of the letter, that information will become available to the candidate. If you wish, you may provide a brief factual statement regarding your relationship to the candidate at the end of your letter, but below the signature block. This brief statement will not be made available to the candidate.

Although we cannot guarantee that at some future time a court or governmental agency will not require the disclosure of the source of confidential evaluations in University of
California personnel files, we can assure you that the University will endeavor to protect the identity of authors of letters of evaluation to the fullest extent allowable under the law.

*Bold paragraphs must be included in all solicitation letters.*