**Annual Call**

**General:**

**New [Cutoff] Deadline for Submitting Materials to Review Files**. Effective with the 2017-2018 review cycle, this date will change to September 30. Materials will not be accepted after September 30 unless the person undergoing review is an Assistant Professor in his/her “seventh year” of service. For example: a journal article accepted as in-press on October 12, 2017 cannot be included in the 2017-2018 review file. Please be sure to communicate this information to all academic members of your unit(s). We will issue a formal advisory during 2016-2017. SD: Annual Call 2016-2017 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-16-17.pdf>

**Change to order of Joint Department Review per APM UCD 220**, effective 2017-2018: According to APM UCD 220 Procedure 3 for Joint Appointments, a candidate’s joint department conducts their review prior to the home department, and the home department is expected to consider all the joint department recommendations in their own review (see steps 14 and 15). With the implementation of Step Plus, and the rule that the highest department recommendation becomes the action submitted to the Dean’s Office, the joint department’s review is no longer required to take place prior to the home department. In short, a candidate’s joint department(s) and home department may conduct their reviews concurrently, and both are expected to meet the deadline for submission of the candidate’s dossier to their dean’s office. This change is effective with the 2017-2018 review cycle and will be included in the revision to APM UCD 220 and all of its procedures. SD: Annual Call 2017-2018 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-17-18.pdf>

**Overlapping Steps**: Documenting Progress When Advancing to Overlapping Steps. When pursuing an overlapping step (e.g., merit to Asst 5 instead of promotion to Assoc 1), it is important to document progress on scholarly/creative works such as grant proposals or manuscripts that are in progress or submitted. Progress should clearly be described and discussed in the candidate’s statement(s) and the department letter. SD: Annual Call 2013-2014 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-13-14.pdf>

**Newly Appointed Assistant Professors**. Newly appointed Assistant Professors should not come up for tenure review (promotion) until they have been on our campus for approximately one year. We expect newly hired tenure-track faculty to have an opportunity to acclimate and participate in teaching and service on our campus prior to tenure review. For example, an Assistant Professor hired effective July 1, 2015 would not be eligible to come up for promotion review effective July 1, 2016. SD: 2015-2016 Annual Call Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-15-16.pdf>

**Advancement Proposals and Faculty Retention Issues**. CAPOC has indicated that retention as a justification for advancement is inappropriate and should not be included in departmental and dean recommendation letters for merits and promotions. SD: Annual Call 2011-2012 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-11-12.pdf>

**Consecutive Negative Reviews and Off-Scale.** The Vice Provost made it our practice not to reduce off-scale salary components as a result of every deferral or denied action, as an exception to APM-UCD 620. APM-UCD 620 has been revised and reissued to reflect this policy change. The Vice Provost retains the authority to reduce off-scale salary components in the event an academic appointee has consecutive negative reviews. Please see the policy at: <http://manuals.ucdavis.edu/apm/620.htm> SD: Annual Call 2014-2015 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-14-15.pdf>

**Greater than 1.0 Step Advancements:** When the Department, FPC or Dean recommends a greater than 1.0 step advancement, the applicable area(s) of review (e.g., scholarly and creative activity, teaching, university and public service, professional competence and activities)must be identified and include supporting narrative for which outstanding performance is deemed to warrant the extra half step recommendation. Furthermore, if a dean recommends a 2.0 step advancement on an action that was previously redelegated, or greater than 1.0 step advancement that crosses a barrier step, the dean must write a strong recommendation letter themselves in support of the higher advancement. SD: Annual Call 2018-2019 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-18-19.pdf>

**Adjunct Professor Series Appointment and Review.** APM 280-4 states, “Titles in this series may be assigned (1) to individuals who are predominantly engaged in research or other creative work and who participate in teaching, or (2) to individuals who contribute primarily to teaching and have a limited responsibility for research or other creative work; these individuals may be professional practitioners of appropriate distinction...” Furthermore, APM UCD 280-10 states, “Appointment to this title requires a meaningful and regular participation in teaching...” Due to the broad scope of this policy, we want to provide clarity and guidance for the Adjunct Professor series, which is reviewed by the Committee on Academic Personnel-Oversight Committee (CAP-OC). For candidates who are appointed and reviewed in the Adjunct Professor series, the department letter should clearly describe the balance of research versus teaching expected of the candidate. Note that there is also an expectation within APM 280 that a minimum of 50% of the funding for an Adjunct appointment should be derived from non-State funding. SD: Annual Call 2015-2016 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-15-16.pdf>

**Appraisals for Assistant Adjunct Professors**: After system-wide consultation and thorough review of the Adjunct Professor policy (APM 280, and APM 220), we found that the Davis campus was not in compliance with the appraisal requirements for Assistant Adjunct Professors. Effective with the 2018-2019 review cycle, all Assistant Adjunct Professors will be required to go through an appraisal review in their fourth year of service. This appraisal review is a non-redelegated action decided by the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs, with recommendations from the department, dean and the Committee on Academic Personnel-Oversight Committee. The Delegation of Authority has been appropriately updated. SD: Annual Call 2018-2019 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-18-19.pdf>

**Department Letters:**

**Acronyms.** Please spell out acronyms in department letters to provide a clear understanding of what the acronym represents. Identifying the acronym at its first use within a document will reduce confusion or misunderstanding for the reviewing bodies. For example, “AAAS” can stand for either the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences or for the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. SD: Annual Call 2015-2016 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-15-16.pdf>

**Periods of Review for Promotion.** The period of review for promotion to the Associate rank is that since the candidate’s terminal degree. The period of review for promotion to the Full rank is that since promotion to the Associate rank. For both types of promotion, the review should consider academic activities conducted at an outside institution if the candidate served in a faculty position elsewhere during the period of review. SD: Annual Call 2016-2017 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-16-17.pdf>

**Chair’s Confidential Letter (letter from the chairperson per APM 160-20(b)(1)(b)):** The Chair’s Confidential Letter will automatically be provided to the candidate at the conclusion of the personnel action. The name of the letter writer will continue to be redacted, as is the current practice, per APM 160-20(c)(4): “... redaction shall consist of the removal of the name, title, organizational/institutional affiliation, and relational information contained below the signature block of the letter of evaluation. SD: Annual Call 2018-2019 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-18-19.pdf>

**Confidentiality in Peer Review**. A letter dated August 20, 2012, was sent by my office regarding the significance of confidentiality in peer review. The letter stated, “Peer review is critical to our academic personnel processes, and confidentiality is essential for meaningful and credible peer review.” Confidentiality is imperative at every level, including review of candidate files, discussion during faculty meetings involving appointments, advancement or other personnel review actions, submission of internal letters of evaluation, and serving on ad hoc, college or campus personnel committees. The identities of those writing external letters, serving on ad hoc committees, and speaking during faculty discussions, as well as the contents of their evaluations, must be kept confidential if candid assessments are to occur. The complete letter is attached as Appendix D. SD: Annual Call 2013-2014 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-13-14.pdf>

**External Letters:**

**“Arms-length” Letters for Promotion Actions**. Extramural letters are to be obtained from reviewers recommended by the candidate and from reviewers selected independently by the chair, with the advice of other colleagues (“arms-length” evaluations). The department chair should select reviewers that are not on the candidate’s list. At least half of the extramural letters should be from the department’s list rather than the candidate’s list. “Arms-length” evaluations are letters from sources without personal connections to the candidate. Letters from mentors, thesis supervisors, and collaborators are NOT “arms-length.” SD: Annual Call 2011-2012 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-11-12.pdf>

**Extramural Letters for high-level merit advancement to Professor Step 6.** As of the 2014-2015 review cycle, extramural letters were no longer required or encouraged for advancement to Professor Step 6 for all Senate Professor titles. However, systemwide policy specifies that Professor Step 6 is a barrier step, and so national recognition of scholarship and/or teaching must be documented in the dossier and fully described in the department letter. Additionally, the review period for this high-level advancement is the time since Promotion to Professor. Establishing a candidate’s national reputation, recognition and impact is somewhat more challenging without extramural letters, but can be achieved. For example, the department letter and dossier can describe the candidate’s invitations to speak at national or international conferences or institutions, service in a professional capacity at national or international levels, and awards, fellowships or other forms of national and international recognition. Candidates considering future advancement to Professor Step 6 and beyond should be advised to keep these criteria in mind.

SD: Annual Call 2015-2016 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-15-16.pdf>

**Candidate’s Statement:**

**Candidate Statements:** Candidates must limit their statements to 5 pages as stated on the checklist. Departments are asked to enforce this prior to submitting a dossier to the Dean’s office. The review committee and Academic Affairs have the right to return dossiers that do not meet the requirements on the checklist. SD: Annual Call 2017-2018 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-17-18.pdf>

**Student Evaluations:**

**Student Evaluations for Promotion/Barrier Step Merit**: Provide summary of teaching evaluations for the full promotion/high-level merit review period.” Please note this paragraph does not apply to the Teaching, Advising, and Curricular Development Record. The paragraph does apply to the numerical summaries of student evaluations for the period of review. The advisory is attached as Appendix C. SD: Annual Call 2013-2014 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-13-14.pdf>

NOTE: Under student evaluations (3rd page) on the Merit Checklist, it indicates “For merit to Professor, Step 6 or Professor, Above Scale, provide summaries of all courses taught since CAP’s last review.

**Service:**

**Entering Committee Membership/Service Roles in the Dossier**: When preparing the dossier, please display committee service in the format that displays the committee name once and the years served on that committee, instead of displaying the list of relevant committees for each year separately. When entering service entries into MyInfoVault (MIV), each administrative activity, committee, or editorial/advisory board on which the candidate has served should be listed only once, with a date range included in the “From/To Year” field. SD: Annual Call 2018-2019 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-18-19.pdf>

**Faculty membership in Graduate Groups**: Faculty membership in Graduate Groups is in itself not a form of service. However, if a faculty member is providing service to the graduate group (e.g., serving as Chair, Vice Chair, or member of a committee), that is considered service, and should be included on the list of campus-level service in the dossier. SD: Annual Call 2016-2017 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-16-17.pdf>

**Publications List:**

**Significant Publications**. We have heard from review committees, including the Oversight Committee on Academic Personnel (CAPOC), that they would find it useful to have faculty indicate which publications are the most significant in terms of findings/impact and for which the faculty member has a significant role. This can be done by adding a footnote to the publication list, providing the information to the Chair to include in the departmental letter, and/or including the information in the candidate’s statement. The most significant work should be limited to five publications.

SD: Annual Call 2011-2012 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-11-12.pdf>

**Publication Links in MIV**: If there is a direct link on the publication list to the manuscript, it will not be necessary to provide a reprint in the backup documents. If the link sends you to a web page where a search for the article is necessary, you will need to provide a copy of the article in the supporting documents. SD: Annual Call 2011-2012 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-11-12.pdf>

**Hyperlinks provided in the Dossier**: All dossiers containing inadequate links will be returned for correction, which will result in delaying the review and final decision on the action. It is important that all hyperlinks in MyInfoVault (MIV) take the reviewer to the record without requiring searching and/or making a purchase. The crucial point is that hyperlinks frequently change and must be checked for each action—to prevent delays in review, all reviewers must be able to navigate to online materials using workable links. SD: Annual Call 2017-2018 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-17-18.pdf>

**Use of Asterisk (\*) Notation on Publications List**. Effective with the advancement cycle for AY 2014-15, we are clarifying the use of notations on publication and creative activities lists in dossiers. Please use an \* to annotate items to be considered in the review period regardless of whether the item is above or below previous advancement action/review lines. Should the publication be above the prior advancement action/review line, an explanatory footnote should be provided to indicate the reason why this publication was not included in the past action. SD: Annual Call 2014-2015

Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-14-15.pdf>

**Scholarly/Intellectual Leadership in Collaborative Work**: Many disciplines are increasingly collaborative, and this is often reflected in publications that have multiple authors. Intellectual leadership can be a problematic criterion to document in research that requires substantial collaboration across disciplines and areas of expertise. Academic appointees are strongly urged to clearly and succinctly describe their roles in each co-authored scholarly/creative activity in the “Contributions to Jointly Authored/Created Works” section of MIV. Importantly, faculty candidates should thoroughly identify any leadership roles that they played in collaborations resulting in co-authored publications/created activities. Examples of scholarly leadership include developing the conceptual framework for the project, procuring competitive funding for it, inventing or applying novel analytic techniques, making key discoveries, changing the interpretation of findings, and substantially writing key sections of the paper. Faculty are enjoined to avoid the usage of vague or repetitive language (i.e., cutting and pasting identical contributions across publications). Department letters should be interpretive and analytic in assessing such collaborative research efforts, rather than providing an unnecessary recitation of what is already in the dossier. Because of different publication expectations and research cultures across the disparate disciplines represented on our campus, such letters also should advisedly address the relative importance and weight afforded peer-reviewed conference proceedings and preprints, in addition to journal manuscripts. SD: Annual Call 2018-2019 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-18-19.pdf>

**Dean’s Recommendation:**

**Dean’s Recommendation**. CAPOC has agreed that if the dean concurs with the department recommendation the reviewing Dean may opt to write a statement indicating that he/she has reviewed the dossier and agrees with the recommendation of the department (in lieu of writing a detailed letter, unless there is new information to add to the dossier). SD: Annual Call 2011-2012 Link: <https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/annual-call/annual-call-11-12.pdf>