

CAP FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS (FAQS)

Revised September 1, 2009

The Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) is a standing committee of the Academic Senate of UCI. It is a faculty body that makes recommendations to the Administration regarding appointments, promotions and merit increases. The following are CAP's responses to questions frequently asked at our meetings with various faculty groups. It must be emphasized that the **University of California Academic Personnel Manual (APM)** (systemwide) and UCI's **Academic Personnel Procedures (APP)** are CAP's governing principles, and these documents override anything written below. This document has no legal standing, and merely represents opinions held by members of CAP. The APM and UCI's APP should answer most questions. If something is not clear, a faculty member should ask the Department chair, the school's Dean, or the Office of Academic Personnel.

CAP forwards its recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (EVCP), the administrative officer chiefly responsible for academic personnel matters at UCI, and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, the administrative officer at the head of the Office of Academic Personnel ("AP"). Letters received by Deans, Department chairs, and faculty members from the VP's office reflect the input of various levels of review, including the Department, Department chair, Dean, external reviewers, and CAP.

The questions below are grouped into five sections whose subjects are roughly indicated by the titles. The focus is on the Professor ("line") series, except in the last section, but much is of general applicability.

CAP FAQs in one pdf file

A. ACADEMIC PERSONNEL STANDARDS AND CRITERIA | FAQs 1-13

- 1. What standards does CAP use for the various ranks?**
- 2. Whatever happened to the Pister Report and its advocacy for increased flexibility in personnel reviews?**
- 3. How does CAP weigh university service?**
- 4. Is "service" an important category for assistant professors?**
- 5. How does CAP weigh teaching?**
- 6. How can our personnel system reward (and retain) exceptionally accomplished faculty?**
- 7. Why does CAP trouble to review initial assistant professor appointments?**
- 8. What is CAP's view of proposals for the initial appointment of a recent Ph.D. at a level above assistant professor, step I?**
- 9. What are the criteria for tenure? If an assistant professor completes a major project earlier than expected, e.g., turns the dissertation into a book within a year, is acceleration to tenure appropriate?**
- 10. What are the criteria for acceleration?**
- 11. Are some units more rigorous and demanding of their faculty than others?**
- 12. What is UCI's policy on "overlapping steps"?**
- 13. How do activities related to diversity affect the academic review process?**

B. THE PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS | FAQs 14-27

- 14. Can I ask CAP questions about the personnel review process?**
- 15. Which personnel actions are promotions?**

16. What does CAP look for in a mid-career appraisal?
17. What is an accelerated action?
18. What is a Career Equity Review? Do I qualify for one?
19. What are the personnel deadlines?
20. What are common mistakes or tactical errors made in dossier preparation?
21. Can the Addendum to the Biography be abolished?
22. How can a professor exclude others (department members, chair, dean, members of CAP, extramural referees) from participation in a review?
23. Are the names of extramural referees in fact held in confidence?
24. What is the normal timing of a personnel action?
25. What can delay the normal personnel process?
26. Why do we preserve the cumbersome "tentative decision" process?
27. How can I register a complaint or fix a mistake?

C. WHAT IS REVIEWED; CONTENTS OF THE DOSSIER: | FAQs 28-48

28. Does CAP consider aspects of a professor's career that fall outside the review period?
29. How can CAP make personnel recommendations about professors whose work the members of CAP cannot understand?
30. Can work in progress be considered in a personnel review?
31. How does CAP evaluate collaborative research or creative work?
32. How does CAP evaluate such impermanent productions as plays, dances, and installations?
33. Why do we need so many letters in our personnel actions?
34. In the external letters of evaluation, what distinguishes "department-nominated" from "candidate" letters?
35. What mix of letters does CAP like to see, how can departments avoid potential conflict of interest in external letters, and what constitutes a good letter of evaluation?
36. How can non-UC referees be expected to understand our step system?
37. What constitutes a good internal letter of evaluation and how can departments avoid potential "conflict of interest" in internal letters of evaluation?
38. Are separate chair's letters in a dossier particularly useful?
39. Does CAP require a description of the search and the candidate pool for appointments?
40. How does CAP view publication by way of conference proceedings or electronic media as opposed to "archival" print journals and books?
41. Does CAP take into consideration the quality of the publisher, or the stature of the journal?
42. How does CAP respond to published reviews of work in scholarly and popular media?
43. Is grant funding a requirement for advancement?
44. Are peer-reviewed or federal grants counted more than others?
45. Are prizes and awards necessary?
46. Can CAP distinguish and reward real service as opposed to nominal membership on a committee?
47. Does CAP require the "raw" course evaluation forms in every personnel action? Do CAP members actually review them?
48. Should faculty members provide a self-statement for the dossier?

D. COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL PROCEDURES | FAQs 49-62

49. Does the Short Form still exist?
50. What can a unit do when there is need for exceptional speed in a personnel case?
51. Do CAP members have the right to vote twice on a personnel action?

52. Should CAP have a representative from each school or other unit?
53. If a school's representative on CAP is absent at a CAP meeting how are the school's cases handled?
54. Do CAP members themselves examine the scholarly or creative works, e.g., read the publications?
55. Does CAP make salary recommendations? What is CAP's attitude toward Off-Scale salaries?
56. Why and how does CAP call for *ad hoc* committee review of some cases?
57. Why do *ad hoc* review committees sometimes include people who are not experts in the field?
58. Why am I never/always asked to serve on *ad hoc* review committees?
59. Why does CAP send comments back to the faculty member under review?
60. Does CAP ever recommend a higher step than the one proposed?
61. Why does CAP refuse to talk about personnel cases directly with deans or chairs?
62. Does CAP see deferred tenure reviews?

E. CRITERIA FOR OTHER SERIES | FAQS 63-68

63. What are the criteria for appointment and advancement in the Professional Researcher series?
64. What are the criteria for the Adjunct series?
65. What are the criteria for the In Residence series?
66. What are the criteria for the Professor of Clinical X series?
67. What are the criteria for the Project Scientist series?
68. What are the criteria for the Lecturer series? What is an "Excellence Review" in the Lecturer series?

A. ACADEMIC PERSONNEL STANDARDS AND CRITERIA | FAQs 1-13

1. What standards does CAP use for the various ranks?

CAP reviews research or creative work, teaching, professional competence and activity, and university service. We use the APM for guidance, as quoted below.

For tenure and all ranks, "superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification." Reasonable accomplishment in professional competence and activity and in university service is also required. Documented competence in teaching is also expected.

No specific guidelines in the Academic Personnel Manual distinguish the general competence expected of Professors step I-V from Associate Professors.

Advancement to Professor, step VI, involves an overall career review. "(G)reat academic distinction, recognized nationally, will be required in scholarly or creative achievement or teaching." Also required is "evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in each of the following three categories: (1) scholarship or creative achievement, (2) University teaching, and (3) service." (APM 220-18)

Service at Professor, steps VI, VII, VIII, and IX may be of indefinite duration and advancement (from VI, VII, or VIII) to the next step "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 VI." (APM 220-18)

Advancement to Above Scale (A/S) involves an overall career review and is "reserved only for the most highly distinguished faculty (1) whose work of sustained and continuing excellence has attained national and international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact; (2) whose University teaching performance is excellent; and (3) whose service is highly meritorious. ...Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not justification for further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step IX was based." CAP treats advancement to Above Scale as a major promotion. It is obvious that these guidelines are not and cannot be entirely objective, definitive, and mechanically applied.

The duty of a professor's department, chair, dean, CAP, the Vice Provost, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, and the Chancellor is to apply their best judgment in the process of peer review, which presumes that one's academic peers can apply standards to each academic discipline based on their experience. CAP's main job is to apply strictly academic standards from a university-wide, disinterested point of view, and to maintain equity across the various fields represented in the university.

2. Whatever happened to the Pister Report and its advocacy for increased flexibility in personnel reviews?

The "spirit" of the report is reflected in **APM 210-1**, which asks reviewers to balance, when the case requires it, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area (e.g., service) as opposed to another (e.g., research). Review committees are to be flexible especially in cases where "the proper work of faculty members departs markedly from established academic patterns." Flexibility in CAP's view allows for changing balances in teaching, research or creative activity and service from review period to review period, not allowance for the absence of any one category of activity.

The APM reminds reviewers that flexibility does not "entail a relaxation of high standards." The meaning seems to be that reviewers should appreciate the intellectual accomplishment involved in different aspects of an academic career, particularly when a professor distinctly alters his or her research or creative activity from one focus to another. CAP in fact finds no change here from UCI's traditional criteria of evaluation, which always included this flexibility.

In no case can even excellent teaching and/or service compensate for a serious lack of research and creative activity.

3. How does CAP weigh university service?

Service counts. It can be a deciding factor in close decisions. Especially heavy service commitments, with documented effective performance, can partially compensate for reduced achievement in other areas. However, normally advancement in the University of California cannot take place without effective teaching and continuing superior scholarly or creative productivity as well as good service. CAP expects less service from untenured professors and expects significant service to the campus and university at higher ranks.

CAP understands that certain administrative duties can reduce one's creative output. CAP takes this into consideration in making recommendations; however, university service, especially compensated university service, cannot wholly replace creative activity. The APM provides flexibility for special cases. For example, a department chair's effective leadership and administrative work are in themselves academic activities, and reviewers may evaluate these in personnel actions. Especially burdensome administrative work, such as chairing a large department, can offset diminished accomplishment in other areas of review. The APM says "it is entirely appropriate to award a merit increase, or if performance warrants it, an accelerated increase, primarily for demonstrated excellence in the chair appointment." But note that this last sentence continues, "when accompanied by evidence of continued productive involvement in scholarly activities." Further, the APM specifies that advancements above professor, step V "should require substantial justification beyond excellence of administrative service." (APM 245-11)

CAP takes these statements to mean that unusually heavy and effective service should count significantly in personnel reviews (and of course all service should be evaluated and given proper weight), but that even heavy administrative responsibilities cannot compensate for nearly abandoned research or creative activity. Acceptance of administrative activity that reduces scholarly or creative activity nearly to zero must be rewarded by other means than by advancement in the professorial series. This stricture applies more severely at the point of a major action (promotion to tenure or to full professor), or for any step above professor, step V. If service is a particularly important part of a particular action, its effectiveness, not merely its formal responsibilities, should be documented in the dossier.

4. Is "service" an important category for assistant professors?

Much less than for higher ranks. CAP agrees with those departments that assign a relatively light service responsibility to assistant professors, who may think it unwise to decline any service requested of them. Assistant professors should take care not to become overburdened with service.

Still, a willingness to perform university service is welcome, and assistant professors will want to participate in various aspects of academic life. Knowledgeable reports from the department as to whether the service was conscientiously and ably performed is useful to CAP.

Professional service such as refereeing journal articles, chairing a panel at a meeting, or giving invited talks is evidence of impact on the field and therefore considered positively in any review.

5. How does CAP weigh teaching?

Good teaching is essential for any advancement, and can be the deciding factor in an acceleration. CAP gives more weight to courses for which evaluations are provided (except for the College of Health Sciences). Bad teaching can sink an otherwise adequate case for a merit increase. It cannot be the sole basis for advancement; CAP is obliged to consider the four areas enumerated in question #1 above. The University of California is a research university, and its professors are given released time in order to carry on vigorous research programs; its faculty cannot be advanced on the basis of teaching alone. CAP also considers supervision of graduate students to completion of their degrees and their subsequent placement as evidence of teaching effectiveness.

At UCI a professor may provide a "Teaching Portfolio" as part of the materials for review. Information about these is available from the Teaching, Learning and Technology Center (TLTC; <http://www.tluc.edu/>) (formerly the Instructional Resources Center). CAP does not require a Teaching Portfolio, but does require careful evaluation by the department of a candidate's teaching, according to guidelines spelled out in the **Academic Personnel Manual**. Faculty may find the services offered by the TLTC, including the Faculty Teaching Academy (FTA), to be helpful in identifying the best strategies to strengthen his/her teaching effectiveness.

6. How can our personnel system reward (and retain) exceptionally accomplished faculty?

CAP's business is to ensure the appropriate advancement and placement of faculty in terms of rank and step relative to other faculty in the UC system. CAP evaluates faculty on the basis of research and creative accomplishments as well as teaching and service. Responsibility for salary adjustments are wholly within the hands of the EVCP and Chancellor. Deans and chairs can provide other rewards. CAP's responsibility is to recommend an appropriate professorial rank and step.

7. Why does CAP trouble to review initial assistant professor appointments?

CAP reviews initial assistant professor appointments to ensure equity across the campus with regard to the appropriate step at which a faculty member is hired. CAP also considers the candidate's potential for a distinguished career in independent research and creative activity. CAP rarely recommends against initial appointments, although it may recommend a higher or lower step.

8. What is CAP's view of proposals for the initial appointment of a recent Ph.D. at a level above assistant professor, step I?

Practice from school to school varies. CAP attempts to recommend the proper step based on the criteria laid out in the APM and on achieving equity across campus. In some disciplines, time as a postdoctoral researcher and publication of independent research often occur before the initial assistant professor appointment. This and other professional qualifications can justify appointment beyond step I. But CAP is reluctant to recommend a step beyond step I for a candidate who has just completed a Ph.D. and who has no publications, formal post-secondary teaching, or other professional qualifications.

9. What are the criteria for tenure? If an assistant professor completes a major project earlier than expected, e.g., turns the dissertation into a book within a year, is acceleration to tenure appropriate?

CAP expects a tenure file to describe a career of a person whose accomplishments match those of an associate professor (see Question #1 above). These include the publication of doctoral work, a start on a second, independent project, renewal of initial funding according to disciplinary norms (e.g., in many of the sciences), and external evidence of visibility in the profession. Reasonable experience in teaching, professional activity, and university service are expected.

Evidence of formal acceptance of books, journal articles and book chapters is essential if the works are not available in published form at the time of the tenure review.

For fields in which book publication is the norm for tenure, a completed book manuscript does not carry nearly as much weight as one that has been fully peer-reviewed and evaluated. A provisional contract does not carry nearly as much weight as evidence that a book manuscript is in its final form, formally accepted for publication, and in production. If a book is primarily a revision of the dissertation, peer-reviewed evidence of a second, independent project is expected. Published reviews in professional journals provide incontrovertible evidence of a book's significance and impact.

Assistant professors are sometimes advanced to tenure in less than six years, especially if they are hired at an advanced step.

10. What are the criteria for acceleration? (See also FAQ #17)

The criteria for an acceleration are unusually vigorous and accomplished academic productivity since the last advancement, coupled with continued excellence in teaching and/or service. For accelerations, CAP requires research or creative activity beyond the specific disciplinary norm in the period of review.

For accelerations of more than one year, CAP has considered exceptional productivity and external markers of professional distinction and achievement.

Extramural letters are not required for an acceleration. In those cases in which the department finds it helpful to solicit letters from extramural referees, letters from UC faculty at other campuses may be useful because "acceleration" may not be understood outside of the UC system.

11. Are some units more rigorous and demanding of their faculty than others?

Yes, we think so. CAP's role as protector of equity across the disciplines is most effective when it corrects disparities among schools, Departments and other units on campus.

12. What is UCI's policy on "overlapping steps"?

Assistant Professor Step V and VI, and Associate Professor IV and V are considered to "overlap" with Associate Professor I and II and Professor I and II, respectively (see **APM 220-18 b (2) and (3)**). Time served at the overlapping steps of lower rank may be considered as service at the overlapping step at the higher rank. However, this does not automatically justify "skipping" a whole step at the time of promotion.

The default promotion is to Step I of the next rank even when one has been at an overlapping step. Using the overlapping steps in lieu of steps in the higher rank must be carefully justified. Departments should consider addressing the prospects of later using steps at a lower rank in lieu of overlapping steps at the higher rank at the time the step at the lower rank is proposed.

Promotion is a weighty sign of academic success in itself. On the grounds of equity, the step to which a professor is promoted should be based on the career profile as a whole, as judged in comparison with the professor's peers. Regardless of step, a salary increase at the time of a promotion is always provided by the Administration, as an off-scale salary adjustment, if necessary.

13. How do activities related to diversity affect the academic review process?

In July 2005 changes were adopted to APM 210-10d, the UC policy which governs faculty appointment, promotion and appraisal reviews. The principle governing these changes is contained in the following statement on the criteria for personnel actions: "Teaching, research, professional and public service contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of a candidate's qualifications." Below are responses to several frequently asked questions that relate to the revised APM 210 review criteria and the associated review process.

- a. *Can faculty in all disciplines benefit from this change to the APM?* Yes. Faculty in any field may engage in activities that concern diversity and equal opportunity in ways that conform to our research, teaching and service mission as a public university.
- b. *Will this change to the APM alter the review process?* No. Faculty will continue to be evaluated based on their research, teaching and professional and public service on a regularly scheduled basis.
- c. *Are the different levels of review—department or program, school or division, and campus--aware of these changes?* Yes. As with all changes to the APM, the entire campus was consulted and informed through their representative bodies and/or reporting channels.
- d. *Are faculty appointments, appraisals or promotions contingent on research, teaching or service that promote diversity, equal opportunity or equity?* No. But, faculty who engage in such activities that meet the standards of excellence in their field or discipline should be recognized and rewarded.
- e. *How can I get credit in the review process for my diversity efforts?* Describe them in the designated sections of the addendum. If appropriate, describe your diversity efforts and their contribution to the research, teaching, or service mission of the university in your personal statement.
- f. *In what way does promoting diversity and equal opportunity relate to our research, teaching and service mission?* It not only reflects the changing nature of scholarship and

research in the academy, but also underscores the obligation of the University of California as a land grant university to the state of California.

- g. Is there any additional information that I might consult to learn more about the role of diversity in the mission of the University of California? Yes. The Academic Council adopted a “Statement on Diversity” in May 2006. Please visit the link at: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/>

B. THE PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS | FAQs 14-27

14. Can I ask CAP questions about the personnel review process?

CAP members may not talk with individuals about specific personnel cases. All file information is confidential and no individual should have special access to reviewers that others don't have. To prepare your file or find out the status of your own personnel review, talk to your School equity advisor, chair, dean, or the Office of Academic Personnel.

15. Which personnel actions are promotions?

The University of California personnel system designates changes of rank from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Full Professor as promotions. In addition, the system includes two further “barrier” distinctions. Movement from Professor Step V to Step VI and from Professor Step IX to Professor Above Scale are also treated as promotions.

Six years normally separate the first two promotions. The normal period of service in step in each of the first four steps of the rank of Professor is three years. Service at Step V may be of indefinite duration. Movement to Professor Step VI represents fifteen years of work at the level of Professor with national or international recognition for significant research accomplishments (**APM 220-18 b (4)**). Advancement to Professor VII, VIII and IX will usually not occur after less than three years of service at the previous step.

The APM states that, “except in rare and compelling cases,” advancement to Above Scale will not occur after less than four years at Step IX. Promotion to Above Scale is reserved for the most distinguished scholars, creative artists, and clinical researchers whose work achieves international recognition and acclaim, whose teaching performance is excellent, and whose service is highly meritorious.

16. What does CAP look for in a mid-career appraisal?

The purpose of the mid-career appraisal is to inform an assistant professor in a thorough and formal way about her or his prospects for tenure on the basis of the accomplishment so far. It is a crucial document and one of the most effective instruments in the UC personnel system.

The mid-career appraisal thus serves a very different function from the departmental letter for a merit increase and should not simply re-state the case made for a merit increase.

Of utmost importance are rigorous evaluation and complete candor. If there are weaknesses in the candidate's career to date, a department's natural reluctance to cause pain can do much more harm than good to the candidate and the university. CAP very often rejects mid-career appraisals that withhold severe judgment out of a misguided sense of kindness.

The most common weakness in an assistant professor's early career is a lack of strenuous effort toward research publication. The University of California is a research university, and provides generous resources and time for research. A relatively thin publication record (or its equivalent in the arts) cannot be lightly passed over.

Fields vary in their expectations for tenure, and mid-career appraisals reflect this. In general, however, positive mid-career accomplishments show evidence of research independent from doctoral work, of research projects that promise leadership in the field, and peer-reviewed evidence that research will continue once tenure is granted. In the sciences, the award of grants for research is a prominent piece of evidence that the research program is valid, although grants do not in themselves substitute for lack of published scholarship.

Letters from outside referees are not required for a mid-career appraisal, but can be included at the option of the department.

17. What is an accelerated action?

Individuals may request early consideration for higher step or rank on the basis of exceptional accomplishments in research or creative activity. Accelerations are rarely granted solely on the basis of exceptional performance in the classroom or for professional, university, or community service alone. Accelerations at a more senior level will usually require more evidence of exceptional performance than accelerations at a more junior level.

Actions may be requested one or two years earlier than the next normally scheduled review. As per the APM, teaching and service should be commensurate with the acceleration under consideration. A doubled number of publications, for instance, with little or poor teaching would not constitute a strong case for a two-year acceleration. The most successful accelerated actions occur one year earlier than the normally scheduled review. Because these are “off” cycle, responsibility for such requests lies with the individual.

Accelerations requested at the time of a normally scheduled review involve “skipping” a whole step, and must show excellence in research productivity, in teaching, and in various forms of service. For accelerations within ranks, external evaluations from within the UC system that speak to step are useful and recommended, but not required.

Accelerations of more than three years have been requested on the basis of current research productivity and have been denied more often than granted. Superlative teaching and/or extraordinary service are expected together with research productivity and impact. In the rare case of a proposed acceleration of more than three years, external letters, especially from UC faculty who can speak to step, are advisable.

18. What is a Career Equity Review? Do I qualify for one?

A Career Equity Review (CER) is an examination of a faculty member's personnel actions from the initial hiring at UCI onward in order to determine whether those actions have resulted in an inappropriately low rank and/or step. The purpose of a CER is not to re-open or appeal the decision(s) of any previous action(s), but to see if the candidate's performance, when considered over multiple review periods, may warrant additional advancement. The goal of a CER is to determine whether a faculty member's initial appointment was at too low a step; whether over time sufficient productivity has accumulated to warrant additional advancement even though individual merit actions did not call for accelerated advancement;

and whether contributions have been overlooked, undervalued, or gained delayed impact after particular merit actions. A CER should normally be undertaken within rank, not between ranks.

A Career Equity Review may be initiated by any regular in-line faculty member as well as by Lecturers SOE and Senior Lecturers SOE who are members of the Academic Senate.

The Office of Academic Personnel can provide more information on the process of initiating a Career Equity Review.

19. What are the personnel deadlines?

- a) Deadlines for files: School and departmental deadlines are based upon those set by the EVCP and AP. A deadline for submitting one's personnel materials near the beginning of Fall Quarter is usual.
- b) Admissible materials and deadlines for submission:
 - Generally the department decides whether materials submitted after its submission deadlines will be accepted for that year's review cycle. For reasons of equity, a uniform, firm deadline is desirable.
 - For normal merit reviews, CAP considers only materials accepted or published by September 30 of the review year.
 - For cases considered to be promotions only (e.g., tenure cases, promotion to Professor, advancement to Professor VI and Professor A/S), CAP considers all materials and information available up until the time that CAP makes its final recommendation.

20. How can the Department and Chair avoid common mistakes in dossier preparation?

- The department is expected to examine the work first hand and provide a full and independent analysis of the candidate's contribution, especially his/her clear and defined contributions in any collaborative work.
- External letters (which CAP reviewers do carefully read for themselves) should not be quoted at length in lieu of independent departmental analysis and evaluation of the work of the faculty member.
- The department should not parrot the candidate's self-statement.
- It is helpful for the department to provide an honest assessment of the quality of the publishing media or performance venues. Indicating that a journal is top-tier, when it is not, is not helpful to the candidate.
- The department is expected to describe the actual effort and effectiveness of the teaching as well as the actual quality and effort that goes into university and professional service.
- The candidate and department should identify clearly what work has been accomplished within the review period for the specific action.
- The department should address shortcomings that are obvious in the dossier and clarify exceptional circumstances.
- On tenure and promotion cases, the department should obtain sufficient analytical external letters (5-7 department-nominated, independent letters) and carefully select outside referees, with few, if any, from scholars whose opinion carries less weight than that of professors at our peer universities.

- For the integrity of the review process, it is important to avoid the appearance of conflict of interest at all levels of review. The internal letters (i.e., from the department, the ad hoc committee, chair, and dean) should be written by faculty who have not collaborated with the candidate during the preceding four years.
- Rather than "bean counting," the department should focus on the significant matters, the original and important discoveries, the exceptional contribution to teaching, the influence of the work on others, and laborious and effective service.

21. Can the Addendum to the Biography (replaced by Review Profile in some units beginning in 2008) be abolished?

No. The Addendum (form UCI-AP-10) remains the most efficient way for a candidate and a department to specify exactly what has been accomplished in a review period. Some professors and conscientious departments may look upon these details as trivial and be negligent toward them, but our personnel system requires precision and comparable information from all faculty. The Addendum was developed in response to palpable needs. This is an instance of general suffering for the general good. Being time-sensitive, the Addendum classifies information in a manner to make CAP review as efficient as possible and to make equivalent judgments across fields as easy as possible.

22. How can a professor exclude others (department members, chair, dean, members of CAP, extramural referees) from participation in a review?

Although a professor has no absolute right to exclude anyone who would normally participate in the review, the professor may give notice in writing of her or his concerns, which are often honored. Reviewers at all levels will in any case be aware of any potential prejudice and will take the notice into consideration. Explanation of the grounds for suspected prejudice might be helpful to reviewers. The complex and multi-tiered nature of the UC review system goes as far as is practical toward obviating the effects of prejudicial reviews or actions. Sometimes a person who is presumed to be prejudiced against a candidate in fact turns out to be a strong supporter and vice versa.

23. Are the names of extramural referees in fact held in confidence?

Yes. CAP has no direct evidence of breaches of this confidence except, perhaps, for those personnel cases that have gone to court. Gossip on this subject abounds; our impression is that authorship of these letters is generally held in confidence. The authors of letters are urged not to betray themselves as authors in the body of the letter. However, revealing comments probably account for most cases in which the reviewed faculty member learns of the author's identity.

24. What is the normal timing of a personnel action?

Files for normally scheduled reviews are due in the Department by the end of September at the latest. Actions requiring external letters of evaluation should follow a departmental schedule that assures letters will be in hand in time for departmental review during the Fall Quarter.

The Schools have varying deadlines for departments to submit completed files to their Deans. The files consist of the Addendum, teaching evaluations, publications and reviewable evidence of creative activity; the departmental evaluation and vote; external letters of evaluation if applicable; and the chair's evaluation or letter of transmittal.

For delegated merit reviews, the Dean judges the file, determines the personnel action if there is no disagreement at a lower level of review (i.e., chair, department), and informs the candidate of that action. The Dean's judgment is final, subject only to procedural appeals to the Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

All other files proceed to the Office of Academic Personnel, where they are reviewed for completeness and consistency, and then are transmitted to CAP. CAP seeks to review each action within 9 working days of its arrival. CAP generally meets biweekly in Fall quarter and weekly from January through July. For each case, the chair of CAP then writes up the Council's recommendation, which is reviewed by other CAP members and transmitted to the Office of Academic Personnel.

The Chancellor, in consultation with the EVCP, decides on ladder rank promotions and non-reappointments; all other actions have been delegated to the EVCP, who has in turn delegated certain merits and appointments to the Deans.

25. What can delay the normal personnel process?

Failure of the department or school to submit files in a timely fashion.

Need for additional information. Sometimes CAP needs additional information in order to make its recommendation. "Back to School" requests for additional information are processed through the Office of Academic Personnel. CAP never contacts individuals or the Schools directly.

Need for additional external letters. For promotions and large accelerations, the external letters as a group may be faulty. CAP may request that the department solicit additional external reviews when, for example, the group of letter writers largely consists of close collaborators and friends of the candidate; too many writers represent non-research or non-academic entities; a UC perspective on appropriate step is necessary; or few of the letters received are sufficiently analytical to assist CAP in its review. Solicitation, receipt and departmental review of additional letters usually adds at least a month to the entire process.

Formation of an ad hoc review committee. At times, CAP or the EVCP forms an *ad hoc* committee to provide additional, specific expert evaluation. This adds considerable time to the review process, occasionally as much two or three months. But evaluations made by *ad hoc* committees are often crucial for CAP or the EVCP in making informed recommendations.

Responding to a tentative decision. In some cases in which different levels of review (including CAP) disagree on the action proposed, the Office of Academic Personnel transmits a tentative decision to the candidate's dean or department for comment or additional information. CAP usually re-reviews any subsequent response.

26. Why do we preserve the cumbersome "tentative decision" process?

To protect the faculty. Sometimes files are unwittingly imperfect. The EVCP's tentative decision, when it differs from that of prior levels of review, affords the department an opportunity to clarify matters, to correct mistakes, or to emphasize overlooked aspects of a case. The tentative decision is sometimes reversed in the review of the response to the tentative decision.

The EVCP's tentative decision takes into account recommendations from all previous levels of review, including that of CAP and the *ad hoc* committee (if there is one); it usually, but not always, agrees with

CAP's recommendation. While the comments in the tentative decision letter are generally assumed to be those of CAP, they are in fact a selection or conflation from all levels of review (the department, chair, dean, external referees, CAP, *ad hoc* committees, and the EVCP).

UCI is one of the few, if not the sole, campus in which CAP provides this step before a final decision.

27. How can I register a complaint or fix a mistake?

Write a letter that will be forwarded through your chair to the Office of Academic Personnel.

C. WHAT IS REVIEWED; CONTENTS OF THE DOSSIER: | FAQs 28-48

28. Does CAP consider aspects of a professor's career that fall outside the review period?

At the major actions – promotion to associate or full professor, and advancement to step VI and above scale – CAP evaluates the candidate's career since the last positive review and since the last major action, as represented in the Addendum, as well as the entire academic career, as represented in the CV. For merit increases CAP focuses on the work accomplished during the review period since the last advancement.

CAP regularly reviews whatever appears in the candidate's dossier, including the full curriculum vitae and Addendum. CAP may occasionally request and review material from previous review files, especially if questions arise regarding previously submitted material.

29. How can CAP make personnel recommendations about professors whose work the members of CAP cannot understand?

CAP relies on the department's presentation of a candidate's work. For major actions CAP depends as well on the reports of extramural reviewers, and can call upon the advice of an *ad hoc* committee or request that the department provide more extramural letters. A dossier usually includes evidence of the professor's standing in the profession.

In short, CAP must rely on the judgments of others, and on its own experience of the career profiles of professors in similar disciplines. Service on CAP is for three years; each member will have reviewed over 1,000 cases from ten different schools by the end of his or her term.

30. Can work in progress be considered in a personnel review?

Section II C of the Addendum is for "Works in Progress." It should be used rarely and judiciously. Section II C is reserved for completed but unpublished parts of larger creative works that cannot reasonably be expected to appear in a publicly accessible form in a normal review period. When work in progress is submitted, the department must thoroughly and critically evaluate it, with the aid of extramural reviewers if appropriate. The faculty member's unit can present and analyze work in progress if it seems appropriate in a particular case. It is most appropriate for a normal merit in which a long-term research or creative project does not fit into the normal two or three-year cycle of review.

It is wisest not to list work not yet accepted for publication on the Addendum to the Biography form. Nonetheless, if work in progress forms a significant part of the basis for the current action, that work cannot again be the sole basis for a future action. In short, work is credited only once.

As in many ambiguous matters in personnel reviews, the key here is for the candidate and the unit to explain fully and candidly what is taking place. In many departments it is not the custom to submit work in progress for review; it is certainly not required.

31. How does CAP evaluate collaborative research or creative work?

The department should, with the help of the candidate and other collaborators, explain fully the nature of collaborative work including the proportion of the candidate's individual contribution. CAP looks for substantial intellectual contribution, and for evidence of clear and defined creative role in research or artistic production. For a basic scientist, for example, to serve regularly as a technical consultant on experiments devised by others is a sign of good professional conduct but is not in itself a sign of superior academic achievement. In these cases, CAP has sought evidence of creativity, indispensability, and unique impact in collaborative projects, together with sole- or few-authored publications supporting claims of intellectual contribution or achievement. For a performing artist, participation in a professional orchestra or dance corps is more a confirmation of professional competence and activity than an independent contribution to a creative performance.

For major actions such as promotion to tenure, documentation of clear research contribution and leadership is critical. For creative artists, there should be evaluation of the individual's achievement beyond the success of the collaborative work. CAP relies heavily on departmental, chair, dean and extramural letter writers' careful assessments of an individual's contribution to collaborative work.

32. How does CAP evaluate such impermanent productions as plays, dances, and installations?

As always, the department is CAP's main source of knowledge, and full analysis of creative works is important. CAP cannot consider work that has not been witnessed and judged by others.

CAP has equipment available to review videotapes, recordings, DVDs, CD ROMs, photographs, etc. These may be equivalent to professional publications (as with commercial audio recordings of musical compositions or dramatic readings). When such media are self-produced, however, and not in national or worldwide distribution, they are considered solely as illustrations to the Addendum items and to departmental or external evaluations.

Apart from competitions, juried festivals, and the like, the venues or professional levels of performances may serve as indicators parallel to the rankings of publication venues (journals, selective presses). It is incumbent upon the department to articulate these distinctions. Published reviews are helpful. Publicity material serves as documentation that a production occurred, but is not in itself a form of evaluation.

33. Why do we need so many letters in our personnel actions?

We require outside referees for major actions (appointment, promotion to associate and full professor and advancement to Professor VI and Above Scale). They are optional for accelerations but can be used, especially in accelerations of three or more years if the department thinks they will bolster the case. Depending on the action, receipt of three to nine analytical letters may be sufficient. Three are usually sufficient for appointment of an Assistant Professor in lower steps (I – IV), four for a large acceleration,

and five to nine for promotions or appointments at Assistant V or higher (with at least five letters in promotion files that are free of the appearance of conflict of interest as defined in FAQ 34).

If departments are careful to specify the kinds of information needed when they solicit extramural appraisals, the letters may be of better quality and more helpful. However, leading language must be avoided in solicitation letters. External letters providing detailed analysis of the candidate's accomplishments and thoughtful evaluation of the professor's contribution by recognizable standards are most helpful. Brief, testimonial letters and letters from close associates of the candidate are, even in large quantity, of less use.

34. In the external letters of evaluation, what distinguishes "department-nominated" from "candidate" letters?

Formally, all letters of evaluation are solicited by the Department. "Candidate" letters, however, are those solicited from an official list of names that the candidate provides. These may include doctoral and postdoctoral advisors, collaborators, and colleagues with whom the candidate may have worked in professional contexts, but independent reviewers are preferred. "Candidate" letters evaluate and explain recent research, creative, or professional activity within the designated review period, and may provide insight into the nature of collaborations or details of specific activities or research fields.

External "department-nominated" letters are solicited from people *other than* those on the candidate's official list of potential referees. In promotion cases or appointments at the Associate Professor rank or higher, "department-nominated" letters should be solicited from a slate of expert reviewers who are higher in rank than the candidate. The goal of "department-nominated letters" is to provide objective and analytical reviews of the candidate's work and its impact. Often this includes comparisons with others at the same career stage.

Although letters from the candidate's dissertation advisor, or from other mentors and collaborators with whom the candidate has published in the preceding four years (the current federal standard for defining potential conflict of interest) may be useful, CAP generally gives those letters less weight than letters from reviewers without such affiliations with the candidate.

The UCI-AP-11 form, "Identification and Qualifications of External Referees" (revised 07/08), has a checkbox to identify when the candidate has had a professional relationship to the letter writer (e.g., former advisor/mentor or a collaborator in the preceding four years). When "department-nominated" letters have been solicited from individuals at the same or lower rank, or from former mentors or recent collaborators, this should be noted and explained in the "Qualifications" section of form.

See also FAQ 35 for qualities of good letters and recommended number and mix of external letters.

35. What mix of letters does CAP like to see, how can departments avoid potential conflict of interest in external letters, and what constitutes a good letter of evaluation?

For *appointment at the Assistant Professor* level, there should be at least 3 external letters; "candidate" letters are acceptable; additional letters, including "department-nominated" letters may be helpful for appointments at the higher steps of the Assistant Professor rank (Steps V or VI).

For *promotion review*, and for *appointment at Associate Professor and higher*, there should generally be 5 to 7 external letters in the file that are analytical and from individuals who are independent of the

candidate. "Candidate" letters should be carefully selected (not scattershot) and fewer in number than "department-nominated" letters. For advancement to *Professor VI* and *Professor Above Scale*, analytical letters from internationally recognized "department-nominated" senior colleagues are particularly helpful for assessing international recognition and acclaim.

It is especially important to receive advice from experts with sufficient professorial experience within the University of California system to evaluate appropriate placement of the candidate on the UC step scale or when the action involves a subtle knowledge of the UC step system, e.g., acceleration, or advancement to Professor VI or Professor Above Scale.

Because it is rare for a person closely associated with a candidate, such as a previous teacher, collaborator, former fellow student, old friend, or relative, to write in fully objective terms, CAP regards such letters as potentially less discriminating than letters from people selected by the department and independent of the candidate. However, "candidate" letters can sometimes be as useful as "department-nominated letters," when letters from collaborators can explain the historical development of the collaboration and the role of each partner in it.

To preserve the integrity of the review process when soliciting external "department-nominated" letters of evaluation, potential conflicts of interest should be avoided whenever possible. A potential conflict of interest (COI) occurs when a person writing a letter of evaluation has a professional relationship or shared academic history with the candidate that might influence his/her judgment of the candidate's performance and/or the suitability of the proposed action. (See also FAQ 34.) The revised form UCI-AP-11, "Identification and Qualifications of External Referees" has a checkbox to identify reviewers, e.g. former mentors and colleagues, who have a potential conflict of interest. When "department-nominated" letters have been solicited from individuals at the same or lower rank, or from former mentors or recent collaborators, this should be noted and explained in the "Qualifications" section of form.

The most useful letters provide both description of the candidate's work and a thorough analysis of the candidate's important and original contributions. A "thorough analysis" places the contribution in historical and contemporary context; it answers questions such as how a key contribution has advanced the field and addresses the originality and impact of that contribution. It may explain, for example, how the contribution elucidated a long-standing problem that has been difficult to resolve, or has opened a new area of inquiry or creative expression. An analytical letter often addresses the quality of scholarship of the candidate's work and how the candidate's contributions compare with the work of his/her peers. Since letters for promotions cover work over many years, evaluators should concentrate on the most significant past work but always comment on the most recent work.

Least helpful are perfunctory "testimonial" letters, with no analysis of the scholarship or creative work, and with indications that the only thing actually reviewed has been the curriculum vitae; CAP give little consideration to such letters.

CAP is aware that departments cannot control the quality of letters received. However, the quality of the letter of solicitation has considerable impact on the quality of letters received. It is advisable to provide in the solicitation letter information that would help external reviewers write letters that are strongly analytical. Solicitation letters should include the rank and step of the action proposed by the department as well as a statement if the proposed action is an acceleration. It may be useful to begin the solicitation process early, so there is time to send a second solicitation if several "testimonial" letters are received. For examples of effective solicitation letters, see the Academic Personnel Procedures manual (APP 3-60).

36. How can non-UC referees be expected to understand our step system?

They cannot entirely, but some steps (tenure, full professor) are widely understood in this country. Those referees who provide full and cogent analyses of the candidate's work, and specific comparisons with a candidate's peers, are most helpful.

37. What constitutes a good internal letter of evaluation and how can departments avoid potential "conflict of interest" in internal letters of evaluation?

The same attributes that make an external "department-nominated" letter useful also apply to the internal evaluation of the candidate's research. Specifically, internal letter writers should strive for letters that are analytical and evaluative. Letters that simply enumerate numerical contributions are less helpful, as are letters that quote extensively from those written by external letter writers. When published work in joint authorship (or other product of joint effort) is presented as evidence of academic achievement, it the responsibility of the department chair to establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in the joint effort (APM 210-1d(2))

It is helpful for the *department* letter to comment on the candidate's formal teaching and service contributions, relative to those of others at similar rank/step (without identifying them by name), and to explain apparent discrepancies (e.g., a lack of formal undergraduate teaching during the review period) wherever possible.

Units should avoid the appearance of conflict of interest in internal letters of evaluation, including letters from the departmental committee, the department chair, and the dean. The department should apply the same guidelines articulated above (see FAQ 35) to determine whether internal colleagues are in potential COI situations and, if so, should exclude such colleagues from file preparation whenever possible. If this is unavoidable (e.g., a candidate in a small department collaborates with most line faculty), then the potential conflict of interest should be clearly noted in the internal document. Whenever a department recommendation is developed by a committee; it is most important that the chair of the committee be free of the appearance of conflict of interest. CAP recognizes that departments might favor inclusion of collaborators in file preparation for reasons of expertise and expediency; however, collaborators sometimes stand to benefit indirectly from a positive outcome of a proposed action and/or their judgment may be unduly influenced by their recent interactions with the candidate. For these reasons, CAP may give less weight to letters of evaluation that have been authored by collaborators of the candidate. CAP may return the file to the department for additional information or a new letter due to the appearance of possible conflict of interest.

38. Are separate chair's letters in a dossier particularly useful?

Yes, the chair of a department can helpfully summarize a case and provide a different perspective. Often the chair's letter can broadly comment on the candidate's record in comparison with those of other faculty, a comparison less likely to appear in the department letter.

39. Does CAP require a description of the search and the candidate pool for appointments?

No, but a brief statement about the search can be helpful, particularly if it has yielded few applicants.

40. How does CAP view publication by way of conference proceedings or electronic media as opposed to "archival" print journals and books?

The department should always explain in good detail the specific case. CAP is usefully made aware of the different selectivity and impact of different media and venues of publication in different fields.

41. Does CAP take into consideration the quality of the publisher, or the stature of the journal?

Yes. Publication in a broadly respected and highly selective journal can be a sign of the quality of the work, and suggests high professional impact. Publication with an academic press implies selection by expert peer review. Trade books and textbooks are generally considered professional activity or as contributions to teaching. Published reviews and the departmental letter can demonstrate otherwise.

42. How does CAP respond to published reviews of work in scholarly and popular media?

Published reviews can be especially helpful guides to the professional reception of a candidate's work. CAP is able, with the department's guidance, to evaluate the nature of a review, its venue, and the standing and possible prejudices of its author. CAP is conscious that a review in the local press will differ in its quality and helpfulness from the solicited review of an academic peer in a learned journal.

Reviews provided in dossiers from the School of the Arts are expected and helpful. In fields like Humanities and Social Sciences, CAP assumes that there will be reviews of a professor's work in respected journals and uses them in the evaluation of the publication, with the department's guidance.

43. Is grant funding a requirement for advancement?

No. It can be a secondary sign of scholarly or creative achievement, but the scholarly or creative work itself is the basis for advancement (**see question #1 above**). The awarding of a grant is not itself sufficient for advancement. CAP considers the awarding of a grant to be a promise of future productivity. In some scientific fields, grant funding or renewal of funding (e.g., an NIH RO1 grant) greatly enhances a tenure case or advancement at higher levels. A lack of funding in a discipline that typically requires grant support for doing research raises questions: Is the research effort continuing and what is the acceptance of the investigator's research by other experts in the field? Is the researcher unable or unwilling to seek such funding? Is prior performance such that granting agencies no longer wish to support the researcher? Has the investigator not been successful in competing for grant support?

44. Are peer-reviewed or federal grants counted more than others?

More competitive grants may be reckoned a stronger sign of scholarly accomplishment than less competitive ones. Specific comments from departments, chairs, deans and extramural letter writers on the selectivity of major grants can be helpful. Small intramural grants are rarely significant in major actions except when they are the normal means of continuing work.

45. Are prizes and awards necessary?

Not always. Like success in winning grant funding, awards, prizes, and honorific positions in societies can be a sign of achievement and recognition. For the upper steps of the professor rank including Above Scale, however, such indications of professional recognition are expected.

46. Can CAP distinguish and reward real service as opposed to nominal membership on a committee?

Not without the department's help. CAP welcomes testimony from committee chairs or whomever can comment on the real effectiveness of university service as part of the dossier. This is especially the case when extensive service is judged to compensate for weakness in other parts of the profile. The attendance rosters of various UCI committees demonstrates that mere membership on a committee is not itself a sign of service.

47. Does CAP require the "raw" course evaluation forms in every personnel action? Do CAP members actually review them?

Schools differ in what they provide. The APM requires more than one type of evidence about teaching. When "raw" evaluations are provided, CAP does review the students' comments. It is very helpful if departments summarize the crucial questions (teacher's overall effectiveness, overall quality of course) and provide comparisons with other courses in a summary way. CAP members are conscious of the imperfections of course evaluations as indices of teaching quality. CAP hopes that departments provide other evidence (e.g., classroom visits and comments by other faculty) especially where teaching plays an exceptional role in the decision for or against a merit or promotion.

48. Should faculty members provide a self-statement for the dossier?

This is a matter best judged by the professor's department. However detailed a candidate's self-statement may be, the department should provide its independent and thorough analysis of all aspects of a professor's academic work. CAP does not require such self-statements, and only a minority of departments at UCI routinely include them in the dossier. In departments that embrace a wide range of very different disciplines, a professor's explanation of the character of the work may be helpful to the professor's colleagues in preparing a department letter. Professors should not feel obliged to praise themselves in these statements.

D. COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL PROCEDURES | FAQs 49-62

49. Does the Short Form still exist?

Yes; it is UCI-AP-24. In some schools, the short form is used for delegated merit actions. For non-delegated merit actions (Asst V to VI, Assoc IV to V, for example), the short form may be appropriate if the case is straightforward.

50. What can a unit do when there is need for exceptional speed in a personnel case?

Let the Office of Academic Personnel know about the situation. CAP can make emergency provisions that should cope with any event.

51. Do CAP members have the right to vote twice on a personnel action?

No. At UCI, once a faculty member becomes a member of CAP, she or he generally no longer attends or otherwise participates in personnel actions at a lower level. If a CAP member has participated in the department's deliberations, he/she does not participate in CAP's deliberations or vote. If the CAP member is closely involved with the candidate, by custom the member leaves the room during deliberations.

52. Should CAP have a representative from each school or other unit?

CAP currently consists of eleven members from those schools with faculty of more than 40. There are two members from the College of Health Sciences, one from the basic sciences and one from the clinical areas. No member represents his or her school in terms of advocacy for the school, a department, or an individual. All members have the interests of the campus as a whole as their area of responsibility. The members are therefore representative of the units mainly with respect to their expertise and their experience with a particular academic culture. Indeed, rarely is the work of a candidate for advancement within the field of a CAP member; that is why letters of review and levels of review from the Department, chair, and Dean are so important in CAP's deliberations. In 2007-08, CAP consulted with academic leaders in Law and Nursing Science to establish the appropriate criteria on which appointments and advancements should be based.

53. If a school's representative on CAP is absent at a CAP meeting how are the school's cases handled?

Sometimes the particular expertise of an absent CAP member is needed for a special reason, and CAP will defer review to the next meeting. However, it often happens that the CAP member with the most expertise in a particular area comes from outside the candidate's own school.

54. Do CAP members themselves examine the scholarly or creative works, e.g., read the publications?

This will vary with individual CAP members and the nature of the case, but broadly, yes, CAP members sometimes sample and read significant parts of the published work included in the dossier.

55. Does CAP make salary recommendations? What is CAP's attitude toward Off-Scale salaries?

CAP's main function is to recommend the proper step in the professorial series. CAP does not make recommendations on salary, and does not focus on the salary level in its review of a case. CAP sometimes comments on whether an off-scale salary is justified on the basis of merit. It does not comment on whether an off-scale salary is justified on the basis of the market. It is CAP's view that, on grounds of equity, equal academic achievement should be rewarded with equal pay.

56. Why and how does CAP call for *ad hoc* committee review of some cases?

The reasons for calling for *ad hoc* committee review, the committee's composition, and the importance given to its recommendation can vary from case to case.

An *ad hoc* committee is called by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost usually at the request of CAP. CAP prepares a slate of nominees, offering from three to five names for each of the committee's positions—chair, campus members and member(s) from other UC campuses. CAP has no other role in forming *ad hoc* review committees. The number of members serving on an *ad hoc* committee varies from three to five.

An *ad hoc* committee's chair is always from outside the candidate's unit and is not necessarily an expert in the candidate's area of research. The chair almost always has served before as a member of an *ad hoc* review committee and is familiar with the process. The role of the chair is to lead the discussion and to provide an objective, analytical and dispassionate report, including a description of conflicting opinion. To ensure independence and a fresh look, as well as to prevent an individual voting twice on a file, faculty from the candidate's department rarely serve on *ad hoc* review committees. With the exception of

the chair, campus members are from departments with some intellectual overlap, if not always from the same school. *Ad hoc* members outside UCI provide additional expertise in the candidate's field.

The Office of Academic Personnel calls potential members, using the slate recommended by CAP, and makes all meeting arrangements. Both CAP and the Administration are dedicated to the confidentiality of *ad hoc* committee members. The *ad hoc* committee's evaluation is forwarded for CAP's review and, though not determinative, constitutes an important element in the file.

57. Why do *ad hoc* review committees sometimes include people who are not experts in the field?

The composition of *ad hoc* review committees is confidential. The chair of the *ad hoc* review committee is normally not expert in the candidate's field, but serves as a moderator and articulator of the experts' opinions.

58. Why am I never/always asked to serve on *ad hoc* review committees?

The members of *ad hoc* committees normally are tenured professors at or above the rank and step of the candidate. Ideally the members (except for the chair, who is chosen for other reasons as mentioned above) bring to bear special expertise in the candidate's field. Because of these criteria some faculty are rarely asked to serve, and some are asked frequently.

59. Why does CAP send comments back to the faculty member under review?

The comments received by a faculty member are a summary and selection of comments sent to the EVCP's office from all levels of review. CAP cannot be assumed to be the author of the comments a faculty member receives. A negative tentative decision, however, provides an opportunity for the faculty member to respond to specific points.

60. Does CAP ever recommend a higher step than the one proposed?

Yes.

61. Why does CAP refuse to talk about personnel cases directly with deans or chairs?

At some UC campuses, deans may address their CAPs about individual cases, but not at UC Irvine. The strongly held view of UCI's CAP is that this can lead to inequity: an especially skillful or relentless verbal advocate of one professor might sway opinion, where another professor may have no such advocacy.

62. Does CAP see deferred tenure reviews?

In 1991, deans were granted authority to postpone tenure reviews from the normal sixth year to the seventh year. In 2006, the authority to defer tenure reviews returned to the EVC/Provost. It is generally not in the interest of the candidate, the department, or the university to postpone either promotion or non-reappointment unless there is a compelling reason to do so. Postponement can be justified if the candidate has significant work in progress or under review, the evaluation of which will occur within a year but not in time to be included in the sixth year review.

Postponements of review will not normally be granted to candidates if they had a No Action in the preceding merit review or if they received a negative Mid-Career Appraisal. According to campus

procedures (see **Academic Personnel Procedures 3-50**), the candidate is to provide tangible evidence that the one-year deferral will enhance the record significantly. The department will then review and discuss the request and vote for or against the postponement.

The request is then forwarded through the dean to the Office of Academic Personnel (AP) and CAP. CAP will consider the case and make a recommendation to the EVC/Provost for the final decision. The documents in the request for deferral, and comments made by different levels of review, may be made available to the candidate and will be included in any subsequent tenure review.

E. CRITERIA FOR OTHER SERIES | FAQS 63-68

63. What are the criteria for appointment and advancement in the Professional Researcher series?

Refer to **APM 310**. The titles in this series are Assistant Researcher, Associate Researcher, and Researcher. Appointees do not have teaching responsibilities, but the research expectations and the criteria for performance in research are equivalent to those in the Professorial series. The School, program, and PI have a responsibility to mentor an Assistant Researcher and aid him or her to develop an independent career. Advancement to the Associate level is mandatory within eight years at the Assistant level. According to the APM, this series is not appropriate for those "whose duties are merely to provide technical assistance to a research project." Such individuals belong in the Specialist or Project (e.g. Scientist) series, where they will be able to advance in their careers.

64. What are the criteria for the Adjunct series?

Refer to **APM 280**. An appointee in the Adjunct series is judged in the four areas listed in question #1, but the weight given to each is adjusted according to the assignment of duties. These duties may be skewed toward research or teaching in some proportion that should be clearly stated at the time of appointment and reviews. However, every appointee in this series is expected to teach at least the equivalent of one-quarter course per year. There is an eight-year limitation of service at the Assistant rank.

65. What are the criteria for the In Residence series?

Refer to **APM 270**. The individuals in this series are judged in the four areas listed in question #1 by the same standards as for the Professor (In Line) series. They are members of the Academic Senate, but salary is contingent on available funds. Appointments at the Assistant rank are for at most two years at a time and for a cumulative total of at most eight years. Appointments at higher levels do not carry tenure or security of employment and generally should have a specified ending date.

66. What are the criteria for the Professor of Clinical X series?

Refer to **APM 275**. This series, in the School of Medicine, is designed for clinical scholars in full-time University service. They must be outstanding teachers. Though the major part of their time may be devoted to teaching and clinical service, they are expected to engage in creative scholarly activities aimed at improving clinical practice or medical education. For appointment or promotion to the Associate Professor level, a regional reputation within a clinical specialty is expected, and for the Professor level, a national reputation. Professors of Clinical X are members of the Academic Senate and are an important component of the College of Health Sciences faculty.

67. What are the criteria for the Project Scientist series?

Refer to **APM 311**. This series is for individuals who make significant and creative contributions to a research or creative project in any discipline. They do not have teaching responsibilities. They are not required to carry out independent research or develop an independent research reputation.

68. What are the criteria for the Lecturer series? What is an "Excellence Review" in the Lecturer series?

Refer to **APM 283** and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the University of California and the American Federation of Teachers. The primary criterion of review is documented evidence of truly exceptional teaching. Such evidence usually includes reports from classroom visits by departmental faculty.