

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. I – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present PPM 230-29. I	APM	Proposed PPM 230 (all new sections)
<p>I. REFERENCES AND RELATED POLICIES</p> <p>A. Academic Personnel Manual (APM)</p> <p>200-30 Academic Personnel Actions—Personnel Review Files</p> <p>210 Appointment and Promotion—Review and Appraisal Committees</p> <p>220 Appointment and Promotion—Professor Series</p> <p>140 Appeals—Non Senate Academic Appointees</p> <p>160 Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of Academic Personnel Records</p> <p>B. UCSD Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM)</p> <p>230-5 Appeals for Academic Appointees Other than Members of the Academic Senate</p> <p>230-11 Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of Academic Personnel Records</p> <p>230-20 UCSD Academic Appointment Guidelines</p> <p>230-21 Procedures for Appointment to Unit 18 Titles</p> <p>230-28 Procedures and Schedules for Academic Appraisals, Advancements, and Reappointments</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p><i>Each new PPM section will identify the relevant source APM Section and specify the UC San Diego policies contained therein, with a link to APS Review Guidelines containing campus procedures.</i></p> <p><i>Bargaining Agreement Disclaimers will appear in new PPM sections, as applicable.</i></p>

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. II – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/Policy

Present		Proposed
<p align="center">PPM 230-29. II - Policy</p>	<p align="center">APM 160 - Academic Personnel Records/Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of</p>	<p align="center">PPM230-160 - Academic Personnel Records/Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of</p>
<p>II. POLICY The policies and procedures contained in this document apply to the following titles and series: Academic Administrator series* Academic Coordinator series* Adjunct Professor series Assistant and Associate University Librarian series Clinical Professor series Continuing Education Specialist series* Lecturer titles ** Lecturer and Senior Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment titles Lecturer and Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment titles Librarian series Postgraduate Research Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) series Professional Research series - Research Scientist/Scholar* - Project Scientist/Scholar* Professor series Professor in Residence series Program Coordinator title* Specialist series Supervisor of Physical Education series Supervisor of Teacher Education titles** Teacher of Special Programs** University Professor title Acting and Visiting titles, where appropriate in —above series and titles —*— Added to listing of applicable titles as San Diego campus policy. **— Access to personnel records is governed by the Memorandum of Understanding between The Regents of the University of California and the University Council American Federation of Teachers.—</p>	<p>APM 160-20. c - Access by the Individual c. (6) The provisions of APM - 160-20-c(2), (3), (4) apply only to the following academic personnel titles and title series: Professor, Professor in Residence, Acting Professor, Adjunct Professor, Visiting Professor, Clinical Professor, University Professor, Professor of Clinical _____, Agronomist, Astronomer, Lecturer, Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Lecturer with Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer, Senior Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment, Professional Research, Specialist, Cooperative Extension Specialist (Advisor), Supervisor of Physical Education, Librarian.</p>	<p>PPM-230-160-20. c - Access by the Individual. c (6) The provisions of APM - 160-20-c(2), (3), (4) apply only to the following academic personnel titles and title series: Professor, Professor in Residence, Acting Professor, Adjunct Professor, Visiting Professor, Clinical Professor, University Professor, Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine), Professor of Practice, Agronomist, Astronomer, Lecturer, Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Lecturer with Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer, Senior Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment, Supervisor of Teacher Education, Teacher of Special Programs, <u>Professional Research</u> (Research Scientist), Project Scientist, <u>Specialist</u>, Postgraduate Research, Academic Administrator, Academic Coordinator, <u>Coordinator of Public Programs</u>, Continuing <u>Educator</u>, <u>Cooperative Extension Specialist (Advisor)</u>, Supervisor of Physical Education, Librarian.</p> <p><u>For appointees covered by a Collective Bargaining Agreement Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), this policy applies only to the extent provided for in the MOU.</u></p>

Notes: Updated “Continuing Education Specialist” and “Program Coordinator” titles to and “Continuing Educator” and “Coordinator of Public Programs” to reflect system-wide title changes. See Proposed PPM 230-220-80 c., on next page.

- KEY:** Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion
Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
Bold Text = Existing APM language
Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. II – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/Policy

PPM 230-29. II - Policy		PPM 230-220 - Professor Series/Recommendations and Review: General Procedures
<p>II. POLICY The policies and procedures contained in this document apply to the following titles and series: Academic Administrator series* Academic Coordinator series* Adjunct Professor series Assistant and Associate University Librarian series Clinical Professor series Continuing Education Specialist series* Lecturer titles ** Lecturer and Senior Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment titles Lecturer and Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment titles Librarian series Postgraduate Research Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) series Professional Research series - Research Scientist/Scholar* - Project Scientist/Scholar* Professor series Professor in Residence series Program Coordinator title* Specialist series Supervisor of Physical Education series Supervisor of Teacher Education titles** Teacher of Special Programs** University Professor title Acting and Visiting titles, where appropriate in —above series and titles * Added to listing of applicable titles as San Diego campus policy.</p> <p>** Access to personnel records is governed by the Memorandum of Understanding between The Regents of the University of California and the University Council-American Federation of Teachers. —</p>	<p>APM 220-80. c (footnote 1) 1The provisions of APM - 220-80-c, 220-80-d, 220-80-e, 220-80-h, 220-80-i, 220-80-j, and 220-84-b, modified as appropriate, apply to the following series: Professor, Professor in Residence, Acting Professor, Adjunct Professor, Visiting Professor, Clinical Professor, University Professor, Professor of Clinical _____, Agronomist, Astronomer, Lecturer, Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Lecturer with Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer, Senior Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment, Professional Research, Specialist, Cooperative Extension Advisor, Specialist in Cooperative Extension, Supervisor of Physical Education, Librarian.</p>	<p>PPM 230-220-80. c (footnote 1) 1The provisions of APM - 220-80-c, 220-80-d, 220-80-e, 220-80-h, 220-80-i, 220-80-j, and 220-84-b, modified as appropriate, apply to the following series: Professor, Professor in Residence, Acting Professor, Adjunct Professor, Visiting Professor, Clinical Professor, University Professor, Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine), Professor of Practice, Agronomist, Astronomer, Lecturer, Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Lecturer with Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer, Senior Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment, Supervisor of Teacher Education, Teacher of Special Programs, Professional Research (Research Scientist), Project Scientist, Specialist, Postgraduate Research, Academic Administrator, Academic Coordinator, <u>Coordinator of Public Programs</u>, Continuing <u>Educator</u>, Cooperative Extension Specialist (Advisor), Supervisor of Physical Education, Librarian.</p> <p><u>For appointees covered by a Collective Bargaining Agreement Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), this policy applies only to the extent provided for in the MOU.</u></p>

Notes: Updated “Continuing Education Specialist” and “Program Coordinator” titles to and “Continuing Educator” and “Coordinator of Public Programs” to reflect system-wide title changes

- KEY:** Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion
Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
Bold Text = Existing APM language
Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 200 - Appointment and Promotion/General	Proposed
PPM 230-29. III.A - Definitions		PPM 230-200 - Appointment and Promotion/General
<p>III. PROCEDURES</p> <p>A. Definition of Academic Personnel Review File and Other Academic Personnel Records</p> <p>1. Personnel Review File</p> <p>The Personnel Review File is that portion of an individual's academic personnel record which is maintained by the University for purposes of considering personnel actions under the relevant criteria and shall contain only material relevant to these purposes. Final administrative decisions concerning promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment, nonreappointment and terminal appointment shall be based solely upon the material contained in the individual's Review File.</p>	<p>APM 200-30 Academic Personnel Actions – Personnel Review Files</p> <p>The personnel review file is that portion of the academic personnel records pertaining to an individual maintained by the University for purposes of consideration of personnel actions under the relevant criteria set forth in this Manual. An individual's personnel review file shall contain only material relevant to consideration of personnel actions under these criteria. Final administrative decisions concerning appointment, promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment, non-reappointment, and terminal appointment shall be based solely upon the material contained in the individual's personnel review file.</p>	<p>PPM 230-200-30 Academic Personnel Actions – Personnel Review Files</p> <p>PPM is unnecessary; rely upon APM 200-30.</p>
Present	APM 110 – Academic Personnel Definitions	Proposed
PPM 230-29. III.A - Definitions		PPM 230-110 – Academic Personnel Definitions
	<p>APM 110-4. (30) Personnel Review File</p> <p>The personnel review file is that portion of the academic personnel records pertaining to an individual, maintained by the University for purposes of consideration of personnel actions under the relevant criteria set forth in this Manual. An individual's personnel review file shall contain only material relevant to consideration of personnel actions under these criteria. Final administrative decisions concerning personnel actions such as appointment, promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment, non-reappointment, and terminal appointment shall be based solely upon the material contained in the individual's personnel review file (APM - 200-30).</p>	<p>PPM 230-110-4. (30) Personnel Review File</p> <p>PPM is unnecessary; rely upon APM 110-4. (30).</p>

Notes: Headings are non-substantive. Language in PPM 230-29. A. 1 appears nearly verbatim in APM 110-4 (30) and APM 200-30, EXCEPT that the APM includes appointment actions in the statement, "Final administrative decisions concerning appointment, promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment, non-reappointment, and terminal appointment shall be based solely upon the material contained in the individual's personnel review file," whereas the PPM omits "appointment" from the list. Campus is not authorized to remove "appointment" as an action applicable to APM 110-4 (30) and APM 200-30; Aligning PPM with APM for compliance purposes.

- KEY:** Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion
Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
Bold Text = Existing APM language
Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 160 - Academic Personnel Records/Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of	Proposed
<p align="center">PPM 230-29. III.A - Definitions</p>	<p align="center">APM 160-20 - Access to Academic Personnel Records</p>	<p align="center">PPM230-160 - Academic Personnel Records/Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of</p>
<p>The Personnel Review File contains:</p> <p>A.1.a. Confidential academic review records:</p> <p>(1) — A letter of evaluation or other statement pertaining to an individual received by the University with the understanding that the identity of the author of the letter will be held in confidence to the extent permissible by law.</p> <p>(2) — A letter from the chair setting forth a personal recommendation in connection with an academic personnel action.</p> <p>(3) — Reports, recommendations, and other related documents from campus and departmental ad hoc committees concerning evaluations of the individual in connection with an academic personnel action.</p> <p>(4) — Information placed in the review file by a chair that provides reference to the scholarly credentials of individuals who have submitted letters of evaluation or their relationship to the candidate.</p> <p>A.1.b. Non-Confidential academic review records are:</p> <p>(1) — A letter from the chair setting forth a departmental recommendation in connection with an academic personnel action.</p> <p>(2) — Reports, recommendations, and other related documents from administrative officers (e.g., Deans, Provosts) and standing personnel committees (e.g., CAP, AARP, PSSRP) concerning evaluation of the individual in connection with an academic personnel action.</p> <p><u>(3) Letters of recommendation and/or evaluation -- including those from past or present students -- that are added to the file by the candidate.</u></p>	<p>APM 160-20 - Access to Academic Personnel Records</p> <p>b. (1) Confidential academic review records are:</p> <p>(a) A letter of evaluation or other statement pertaining to an individual received by the University with the understanding that the identity of the author of the letter or statement will be held in confidence to the extent permissible by law.</p> <p>(b) A letter from the chairperson (or equivalent officer) setting forth a personal recommendation in connection with an academic personnel action concerning the individual, such as appointment, promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment, nonreappointment, or terminal appointment.</p> <p>(c) Reports, recommendations, and other related documents from campus and departmental ad hoc committees concerning evaluations of the individual under applicable University criteria in connection with an academic personnel action, such as appointment, promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment, nonreappointment, or terminal appointment.</p> <p>(d) Information placed in the review file by a department chair that provides reference to the scholarly credentials of individuals who have submitted letters of evaluation or their relationship to the candidate.</p> <p>(2) Non-confidential academic review records are:</p> <p>(a) A letter from the chairperson (or equivalent officer) setting forth a departmental recommendation in connection with an academic personnel action concerning the individual, such as appointment, promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment, nonreappointment, or terminal appointment.</p> <p>(b) Reports, recommendations, and other related documents from administrative officers and standing personnel committees concerning evaluation of the individual under applicable University criteria in connection with an academic personnel action, such as appointment, promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment, nonreappointment, or terminal appointment.</p>	<p>PPM 230-160-20. b</p> <p>PPM is unnecessary; rely upon APM 160-20. b. (1) and b(2)</p>

Notes: Headings are non-substantive. Substance of PPM 230-29. A. 1 (a) appears in APM 160-20. b (1).

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present		Proposed
<p align="center">PPM 230-29. III.A - Definitions</p>	<p align="center">APM 160 - Academic Personnel Records/Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of</p>	<p align="center">PPM230-160 - Academic Personnel Records/Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of</p>
<p>A.2. Other Academic Personnel Records Other academic personnel records, pertaining to the individual as an employee of the University, may include the following materials:</p> <p>Miscellaneous correspondence Leave records Documents related to administrative appointments Employment history other than that contained in the Personnel Review File Retirement matters Payroll matters Academic Senate matters concerning the individual Other similar information</p> <p>Such materials shall not be referred to or considered in connection with a recommendation or decision in a personnel action involving an individual unless they are made a part of the individual's Personnel Review File by an appropriate administrative officer.</p>	<p>APM 160, Appendix B - Additional Academic Personnel Policies Pertaining to Academic Personnel Records</p> <p>...This section defines “personnel review file and sets forth the basic principles that final administrative decisions in personnel actions shall be based solely upon the material contained in the individual’s personnel review file, and that the personnel review file shall contain only material relevant to consideration of personnel actions under applicable University criteria set forth in the Academic Personnel Manual.</p> <p>In addition to the personnel review file, other academic personnel records, pertaining to an individual as an employee of the University, may include materials such as miscellaneous correspondence, leave records, and documents related to administrative appointments, employment history, retirement, payroll, Academic Senate matters concerning the individual, and the like.</p> <p>Such materials shall not be referred to or considered in connection with a recommendation or decision in a personnel action involving an individual unless they are made part of the individual’s personnel review file by an appropriate administrative officer.</p>	<p>PPM 230-160, Appendix B - Additional Academic Personnel Policies Pertaining to Academic Personnel Records PPM is unnecessary; rely upon APM 160, Appendix B.</p>

Notes: Headings are non-substantive. Substance of PPM 230-29. A. 2 appears in APM 160, Appendix B.

- KEY:** Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion
Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
Bold Text = Existing APM language
Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present		Proposed
<p>PPM 230-29. III.B – Access by the Individual</p>	<p>APM 160 - Academic Personnel Records/Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of</p>	<p>PPM 230-160 - Academic Personnel Records/Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of</p>
<p>B. Access by the Individual to Academic Personnel Records</p> <p>1. The individual shall have access to all documents in the academic personnel records, including the individual's Personnel Review File, except those defined as confidential academic review records.</p> <p>2. When an individual requests access to confidential academic review records, the records shall be subject to redaction as follows:</p> <p>a. For a letter of evaluation or statement from an individual evaluator, redaction shall consist of the removal of name, title, organizational/institutional affiliation, and relational information contained within or below the signature block of the letter of evaluation. <u>The full text of the body of the letter is available to the candidate.</u></p> <p>b. For reports or recommendations of an ad hoc committee, redaction shall consist of the removal of the names of individual members of the committee.</p> <p>c. For information that references the scholarly credentials or relationship to the candidate of the authors of the letters of evaluation, no access shall be provided to the candidate. <u>Chairs should provide this information on the "Identification and Qualifications of External Referees" form (see PPM 230-28).</u></p> <p>NOTE: Policies and procedures regarding the maintenance of, access to, and opportunity to request amendment of Academic Personnel records are contained in PPM 230-11.</p>	<p>APM 160-20. c - Access by the Individual</p> <p>In any of the academic personnel records pertaining to an individual, including the individual's personnel review file, all documents other than confidential academic review records as defined in APM - 160-20-b (1) shall be accessible at reasonable times for inspection by the individual to whom the record pertains.</p> <p>(1) In any of the academic personnel records pertaining to an individual, including the individual's personnel review file, all documents other than confidential academic review records as defined in APM - 160-20-b (1) shall be accessible at reasonable times for inspection by the individual to whom the record pertains (including the right to receive the first copy of such material free, and subsequent copies at reasonable cost). Confidential academic review records shall be accessible, upon request, in redacted form as defined in APM - 160-20-c (4). Access to confidential information as defined in APM - 160-20-b (3) shall be in accord with legal requirements.</p> <p>...</p> <p>(4) When an individual requests access to confidential academic review records (as defined in APM - 160-20-b (1)), the records shall be subject to redaction as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For a letter of evaluation or statement from an individual evaluator, redaction shall consist of the removal of name, title, organizational/institutional affiliation, and relational information contained below the signature block of the letter of evaluation. • For reports or recommendations of an ad hoc committee, redaction shall consist of the removal of the names of individual members of the committee. • For information that references the scholarly credentials or relationship to the candidate of the authors of letters of evaluation, no access shall be provided to the individual. 	<p>PPM 160-20. c - Access by the Individual</p> <p>PPM is unnecessary; rely upon APM 160-20. c.</p>

Notes: Headings and last paragraph are non-substantive. Substance of PPM 230-29. B appears in APM 160-20. c.

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present		Proposed
<p>PPM 230-29. III. C – Safeguards against Potential Injustice</p>	<p>APM 160 - Academic Personnel Records/Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of</p>	<p>PPM230-160 - Academic Personnel Records/Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of</p>
<p>C. Safeguards Against Potential Injustice There are several elements in the academic personnel process of the University that provide safeguards to assure that the use of confidential documents in that process does not cloak abuse, while retaining the benefits to that process from the receipt of confidential evaluations. These safeguards are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An academic personnel process in which final administrative decisions are based solely upon the Personnel Review File, which contains only documentary material relevant to consideration of personnel actions concerning the individual under applicable University criteria. 2. A multitiered process of academic review typically involving two or three different faculty review groups (departmental faculty, campus ad hoc or standing committees, and the Committee on Academic Personnel) and review by two or three different administrators (chair, Provost, Dean, and/or Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs). 3. Opportunity for the individual to contribute to the Personnel Review File. 4. Opportunity for the individual to receive, upon request, a copy of all non-confidential documents and a redacted copy of all confidential academic review records in the Personnel Review File. 5. Clearly defined grievance procedures through which individuals can have their complaints inquired into concerning allegations of failure to comply with applicable procedural requirements in the academic personnel review process or allegations of the use of impermissible criteria in the process. 	<p>APM 160, Appendix A - ...Procedural Safeguards Designed to Assure Fairness in the Academic Personnel Process (b) There are several elements in the academic personnel process of the University which provide safeguards to assure that the use of confidential documents in that process, as described in APM - 160, does not cloak abuse. There are understandable concerns that the use of confidential evaluations may sometimes produce unjust results. ... These safeguards are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An academic personnel process in which, as set forth in APM - 200-30, final administrative decisions are based solely upon the personnel review file, which contains only documentary material relevant to consideration of personnel actions concerning the individual under applicable University criteria. 2. A multi-tiered process of academic review, as set forth in APM - 220, typically involving (and in particular in cases of decisions concerning tenure) three different faculty review agencies (departmental faculty, campus ad hoc committee, and standing Committee on Academic Personnel or equivalent Committee), and two or three different administrative reviews (department chairperson, Dean or Provost, and Chancellor’s Office). ... 3. Opportunity for the individual to receive, upon request, a redacted copy of all confidential academic review records in the personnel review file, as provided in APM - 160-20-c(1), (2) and (3). 4. Opportunity for the individual to contribute to the personnel review file, as set forth, for example, in APM - 220-80 and 220-84. 5. Clearly defined grievance procedures through which individuals can have their complaints inquired into concerning allegations of failure to comply with applicable procedural requirements in the academic personnel process, or allegations of the use of impermissible criteria in the process. 	<p>PPM 230-160, Appendix A - ...Procedural Safeguards Designed to Assure Fairness in the Academic Personnel Process PPM is unnecessary; rely upon APM 160, Appendix A.</p>

Notes: Headings are non-substantive. Substance of PPM 230-29. C appears in APM 160, Appendix A. PPM 230-29. III. C. 2 states that the process typically includes “two or three” review groups, rather than “three,” as specified in APM 160, Appendix A; however, this language is permissive and not absolute (i.e., three groups are not a requirement).

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
<p data-bbox="184 188 617 215">PPM 230-29. III. D – Procedural Safeguards</p> <p data-bbox="92 220 674 272">D. Procedural Safeguards in the Academic Personnel Review Process</p> <p data-bbox="92 306 699 358">The following are to insure fairness in the academic personnel review process:</p> <p data-bbox="92 393 611 420">1. Before Personnel Review File is Assembled:</p> <p data-bbox="92 451 707 508">a. The chair or unit head (hereafter referred to as chair) notifies candidate of impending review.</p> <p data-bbox="92 539 716 623">b. The chair makes certain the candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process and is made aware of APM 160, 210, and 220 and PPM 230 28 and 230 29.</p> <p data-bbox="92 654 667 711">c. The chair makes certain the candidate is given an opportunity, within reasonable deadlines, to:</p> <p data-bbox="92 742 331 769">(1) Ask questions,</p> <p data-bbox="92 800 615 828">(2) Supply pertinent information and evidence,</p> <p data-bbox="92 859 663 915">(3) Suggest, where relevant, names of persons to be solicited for letters of evaluation,</p>	<p data-bbox="737 220 1283 272">APM 220-80 - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures</p> <p data-bbox="737 277 1358 537">c. Early in the course of a personnel review, before departmental consideration of a case, the chair shall notify the candidate of the impending review and in one or more conferences with the candidate make certain that the candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process and is given the appropriate opportunity to ask questions, to supply pertinent information and evidence to be used in the review, and, where relevant, to suggest names of persons to be solicited for letters of evaluation....</p>	<p data-bbox="1383 220 1974 272">PPM 230-220 -80 - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures</p> <p data-bbox="1383 277 1837 305">PPM is unnecessary; rely upon APM 220-80. c.</p>

Notes: Headings are non-substantive. Substance of remaining deleted text appears in APM 220-80. c.

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion
Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
Bold Text = Existing APM language
Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
<p data-bbox="184 185 619 211">PPM 230-29. III. D – Procedural Safeguards</p> <p data-bbox="92 217 711 328">D.1.c.(4) Provide in writing to the chair names of persons who, for reasons set forth by the candidate, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications and performance. Such statement shall be included in the Personnel Review File.</p> <p data-bbox="92 363 711 503">Based upon the above, candidates occasionally have asked that the department chair, Deans, Provosts, members of the Committee on Academic Personnel, and other individuals within and outside the department be excluded from participation in their academic personnel review.</p> <p data-bbox="92 539 711 824">CAP does not consider it appropriate to honor requests to exclude particular members of CAP from participation in the review of any file. CAP members routinely exclude themselves from review of candidates at the departmental level, and to exclude them at the CAP level would essentially disenfranchise them. It would, in general, be inappropriate to exclude them from consideration of any cases involving candidates from their own or other departments because their expertise is needed by CAP. Any member of CAP can, however, on his/her own initiative, voluntarily withdraw from a review.</p> <p data-bbox="92 860 711 1146">Candidates occasionally name reviewers, inside and outside the University, who, for reasons stated in writing, might not provide an objective evaluation of the candidate's work. The department chair, in consultation with the voting members of the department, should decide whether or not to solicit letters from those named. If a named reviewer is used, the chair should explain the reasons for consulting the named individual so that the file will show not only the candidate's reasons for the exclusion, but also the reason for the department's decision to seek the opinion of the named person.</p> <p data-bbox="92 1153 115 1172">...</p>	<p data-bbox="737 217 1283 269">APM 220-80 - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures</p> <p data-bbox="737 276 1346 444">c. ...The candidate may provide in writing to the chair names of persons who, in the view of the candidate, for reasons set forth, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications or performance. Any such statement provided by the candidate shall be included in the personnel review file...</p>	<p data-bbox="1549 185 1837 211">PPM - 220 – Professor Series</p> <p data-bbox="1381 217 1969 269">PPM 230-220-80 - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures</p> <p data-bbox="1381 276 1990 444">c. ...The candidate may provide in writing to the chair names of persons who, in the view of the candidate, for reasons set forth, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications or performance. Any such statement provided by the candidate shall be included in the personnel review file.</p> <p data-bbox="1381 480 2001 620">Based upon the above, candidates occasionally have asked that the department chair, Deans, Provosts, members of the Committee on Academic Personnel, and other individuals within and outside the department be excluded from participation in their academic personnel review.</p> <p data-bbox="1381 656 2001 941">CAP does not consider it appropriate to honor requests to exclude particular members of CAP from participation in the review of any file. CAP members routinely exclude themselves from review of candidates at the departmental level, and to exclude them at the CAP level would essentially disenfranchise them. It would, in general, be inappropriate to exclude them from consideration of any cases involving candidates from their own or other departments because their expertise is needed by CAP. Any member of CAP can, however, on his/her own initiative, voluntarily withdraw from a review.</p> <p data-bbox="1381 977 2001 1263">Candidates occasionally name reviewers, inside and outside the University, who, for reasons stated in writing, might not provide an objective evaluation of the candidate's work. The department chair, in consultation with the voting members of the department, should decide whether or not to solicit letters from those named. If a named reviewer is used, the chair should explain the reasons for consulting the named individual so that the file will show not only the candidate's reasons for the exclusion, but also the reason for the department's decision to seek the opinion of the named person.</p> <p data-bbox="1381 1269 1404 1289">...</p>

Notes: Substance of deleted text appears in APM 220-80. c.

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
PPM 230-29. III. D – Procedural Safeguards		PPM - 220 – Professor Series
<p>D.1.c.(4)... ...On rare occasions, candidates ask that the department chair not prepare the review file. Such requests will be decided by the Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs following consultation with CAP. In those instances where someone other than the department chair is asked to prepare the review file, the department chair will participate in the review as a voting member of the department.</p> <p>Members of the candidate's department, Deans, Provosts, and members of the Committee on Academic Personnel cannot be barred from participation in the personnel process on the basis of a challenge to their objectivity. To do so would infringe on rights granted to faculty by The Regents in Standing Order 105.2(c) and rights granted to the Academic Senate by The Regents in Standing Order 105.2(d). Individuals may voluntarily withdraw from participation in the review process.</p>	<p>APM 220-80 - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures c ...The candidate may provide in writing to the chair names of persons who, in the view of the candidate, for reasons set forth, might not objectively evaluate the candidate’s qualifications or performance. Any such statement provided by the candidate shall be included in the personnel review file.</p>	<p>PPM 230-220-80 - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures cThe candidate may provide in writing to the chair names of persons who, in the view of the candidate, for reasons set forth, might not objectively evaluate the candidate’s qualifications or performance. Any such statement provided by the candidate shall be included in the personnel review file.</p> <p>... On rare occasions, candidates ask that the department chair not prepare the review file. Such requests will be decided by the Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs following consultation with CAP. In instances where someone other than the department chair is asked to prepare the review file, the department chair will participate in the review as a voting member of the department.</p> <p>Members of the candidate's department, Deans, Provosts, and members of the Committee on Academic Personnel cannot be barred from participation in the personnel process on the basis of a challenge to their objectivity. To do so would infringe on rights granted to faculty by The Regents in Standing Order 105.2(c) and rights granted to the Academic Senate by The Regents in Standing Order 105.2(d). Individuals may voluntarily withdraw from participation in the review process.</p>

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
<p>PPM 230-29. III. D – Procedural Safeguards</p> <p>D. 2. Solicitation of Letters of Evaluation a. In accordance with established policy applicable to the personnel action under consideration, the chair shall solicit letters of evaluation from qualified persons, including a reasonable number of persons nominated by the candidate. All such letters received shall be included in the File; unsolicited letters that are used also shall be included in the File. NOTE: All letters received shall be included in the file, including files for which the departmental recommendation is one that normally does not require outside referee letters.</p> <p><u>Normally, no more than one out of three (when three extramural letters are required for the File) or two out of five (when five extramural letters are required for the File) letters should be from referees selected solely by the candidate, but this level may be exceeded if the candidate's list includes all of the recognized experts in the field.</u></p>	<p>APM 220-80 - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures</p> <p>c. ...In accordance with established policy applicable to the personnel action under consideration, the chair shall solicit letters of evaluation of the candidate from qualified persons, including a reasonable number of persons nominated by the candidate. All such letters received shall be included in the file; unsolicited letters that are used shall also be included in the file.</p>	<p>PPM - 220 – Professor Series</p> <p>PPM 230-220 -80 - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures</p> <p>PPM is unnecessary; rely upon APM 220-80. c.</p>

Notes: Heading is non-substantive. Substance of remaining deleted text appears in APM 220-80. c.

- KEY:** Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
 Strikethrough = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion
 Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
 Bold Text = Existing APM language
 Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
<p data-bbox="186 188 617 212">PPM 230-29. III. D – Procedural Safeguards</p> <p data-bbox="92 220 711 331">D. 2.b. In soliciting or receiving unsolicited letters of evaluation, the chair should include, attach or send a statement regarding the confidentiality of such letters. This statement must include the following (or its equivalent):</p> <p data-bbox="92 367 711 824">"Under University of California policy, the identity of authors of letters of evaluation which are included in the personnel review file will be held in confidence. A candidate may, upon request, be provided access to such letters in redacted form. Redaction is defined as the removal of identifying information (including name, title, institutional affiliation, and relationship to the candidate) contained either at the top of the letterhead or within or below the signature block of the letter of evaluation. The full text of your letter, therefore, will be provided to the candidate if so requested. Thus, if you provide any information that tends to identify you in the body of the letter, that information may become available to the candidate. You may provide a brief statement regarding your relationship to the candidate at the end of your letter but below the signature block. This statement will be subject to redaction and will not be made available to the candidate.</p> <p data-bbox="92 860 711 1029">Although we cannot guarantee that at some future time a court or governmental agency will not require disclosure of the source of confidential evaluations in University of California personnel files, we can assure you that the University will endeavor to protect the identity of authors of letters of evaluation to the fullest extent allowable under the law."</p>	<p data-bbox="737 220 1276 272">APM 220-80 - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures</p> <p data-bbox="737 280 1356 418">c. ...In soliciting or receiving unsolicited letters of evaluation, the chair should include, attach or send a statement regarding the confidentiality of such letters. The Provost and Senior Vice President—Academic Affairs shall issue guidelines for the contents of statements.</p>	<p data-bbox="1549 188 1839 212">PPM - 220 – Professor Series</p> <p data-bbox="1381 220 1965 272">PPM 230-220-80 - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures</p> <p data-bbox="1381 280 2007 391">c. ...In soliciting or receiving unsolicited letters of evaluation, the chair should include, attach or send a statement regarding the confidentiality of such letters. This statement must include the following (or its equivalent):</p> <p data-bbox="1381 427 2007 711">"Although a candidate may request to see the contents of letters of evaluation, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will exclude the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the signature block. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly information about your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources."</p>

Notes: Substance of deleted text appears in APM 220-80. c. Confidentiality statement replaced with updated language from APS website. (<https://academicaffairs.ucsd.edu/aps/advance-train/forms.html#Reviews>).

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
<p>PPM 230-29. III. D – Procedural Safeguards</p> <p>D. 3. Before Departmental Recommendation is Determined</p> <p>a. The chair shall provide the candidate the opportunity to inspect all documents in the Personnel Review File other than confidential academic review records.</p> <p>b. The chair shall provide to the candidate, upon request, a redacted copy of the confidential academic review records in the File.</p> <p>c. Within seven days of receiving redacted copies, the candidate may submit for inclusion in the Personnel Review File a written statement in response to or commenting upon material in the File. The candidate's response must be made available to the faculty prior to the meeting at which the departmental recommendation is determined.</p> <p>d. The candidate's signature on Certification A (Exhibit A) certifies that these procedures have been followed. Certification A should be signed and dated on the date this action occurs and must be included in each Personnel Review File.</p> <p>D. 3. Before Departmental Recommendation is Determined</p> <p>a. The chair shall provide the candidate the opportunity to inspect all documents in the Personnel Review File other than confidential academic review records.</p> <p>b. The chair shall provide to the candidate, upon request, a redacted copy of the confidential academic review records in the File.</p> <p>c. Within seven days of receiving redacted copies, the candidate may submit for inclusion in the Personnel Review File a written statement in response to or commenting upon material in the File. The candidate's response must be made available to the faculty prior to the meeting at which the departmental recommendation is determined.</p> <p>d. The candidate's signature on Certification A (Exhibit A) certifies that these procedures have been followed. Certification A should be signed and dated on the date this action occurs and must be included in each Personnel Review File.</p> <p>D. 4. During Departmental Review</p> <p>a. The chair has an obligation to consider the interests of both the candidate and the University, and to see to it that the departmental review is fair to the candidate and rigorous in maintaining University standards.</p> <p>b. The chair has the responsibility of making the complete Review File available for inspection by the voting members of the department before the departmental vote is taken. Copies of the files or portions thereof should not be distributed to members of the faculty.</p> <p>D. 4. During Departmental Review</p> <p>a. The chair has an obligation to consider the interests of both the candidate and the University, and to see to it that the departmental review is fair to the candidate and rigorous in maintaining University standards.</p> <p>b. The chair has the responsibility of making the complete Review File available for inspection by the voting members of the department before the departmental vote is taken. Copies of the files or portions thereof should not be distributed to members of the faculty.</p> <p>"Complete Review File" refers to the review file prepared for the proposed personnel action and generally does not include previous review files or other material which are not relevant for the proposed personnel action. The department or the candidate can, of course, make material in a previous review file a part of the current file.</p>	<p>APM 220-80 Recommendations and Review: General Procedures</p> <p>c. ...The chair has an obligation to consider the interests of both the candidate and the University, and to see to it that the departmental review is fair to the candidate and rigorous in maintaining University standards.</p> <p>d. Before the departmental recommendation is determined, the chair shall provide the candidate the opportunity to inspect all documents in the personnel review file other than confidential academic review records (as defined in APM - 16020-b (1)), and shall provide to the candidate upon request a redacted copy (as defined in APM - 160-20-c(4)) of the confidential academic review records in the file. The candidate may submit for inclusion in the personnel review file a written statement in response to or commenting upon material in the file.</p>	<p>PPM 230-220 -80 c.- Recommendations and Review: General Procedures</p> <p>PPM is unnecessary; rely upon APM 220-80. c.</p> <p>PPM 230-220 -80 d.- Recommendations and Review: General Procedures</p> <p>d. Before the departmental recommendation is determined, the chair shall provide the candidate the opportunity to inspect all documents in the personnel review file other than confidential academic review records (as defined in APM – 160-20-b (1)), and shall provide to the candidate upon request a redacted copy (as defined in APM - 160-20-c (4)) of the confidential academic review records in the file. Within seven days of receiving redacted copies, the candidate may submit for inclusion in the personnel review file a written statement in response to or commenting upon material in the file. The candidate's response must be made available to the faculty prior to the meeting at which the departmental recommendation is determined. The candidate's signature on Certification A (Exhibit A) certifies that these procedures have been followed. Certification A should be signed and dated on the date this action occurs and must be included in each Personnel Review File.</p> <p>The chair has the responsibility of making the complete Review File available for inspection by the voting members of the department before the departmental vote is taken. Copies of the files or portions thereof should not be distributed to members of the faculty.</p> <p>"Complete Review File" refers to the review file prepared for the proposed personnel action and generally does not include previous review files or other material which are not relevant for the proposed personnel action. The department or the candidate can, of course, make material in a previous review file a part of the current file.</p>

Notes: Headings are non-substantive. Substance of deleted text in PPM 230-29.III.D.3 appears in APM 220-80. d. Substance of deleted text in PPM 230-29.III.D.4.a appears in APM 220-80. c.

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
PPM 230-29. III. D – Procedural Safeguards		PPM - 220 – Professor Series
<p>PPM 230-29.III. D.4 c. The department shall adopt procedures under which the letter setting forth the departmental recommendation, before being forwarded for academic and administrative review, shall be available for inspection by all those members of the department eligible to vote on the matter or, where applicable, by a designated committee or group of such members. The operating word is inspection, not approval; dissenting faculty may add dissenting letters into the File. Dissenting letters are considered non-confidential and will be available to the candidate.</p>	<p>APM 220-80 Recommendations and Review: General Procedures e. ...The department shall adopt procedures under which the letter setting forth the departmental recommendation shall be available, before being forwarded, for inspection by all those members of the department eligible to vote on the matter or by a designated committee or other group of such members.</p>	<p>PPM 230-220-80 Recommendations and Review: General Procedures e. ...The department shall adopt procedures under which the letter setting forth the departmental recommendation shall be available, before being forwarded, for inspection by all those members of the department eligible to vote on the matter or by a designated committee or other group of such members. The operating word is inspection, not approval; dissenting faculty may add dissenting letters into the File. Dissenting letters are considered non-confidential and will be available to the candidate.</p>

Notes: Substance of deleted text in PPM 230-29.III.D.4.c appears in APM 220-80. e.

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
<p>PPM 230-29. III. D – Procedural Safeguards</p>	<p>APM 220-80 Recommendations and Review: General Procedures</p>	<p>PPM - 220 – Professor Series</p>
<p>PPM 230-29.III. D.4 d. The departmental recommendation is made in accordance with the procedural regulations of the Academic Senate and established governance practices of the department. The chair initiates a personnel action by addressing a letter setting forth the departmental recommendation. This departmental letter shall discuss the proposed personnel action in light of applicable University criteria, and shall be accompanied by supporting evidence. The chair shall report the nature and extent of consultation on the matter within the department, including any vote taken, and present any significant evidence and differences of opinion which would support a contrary recommendation. The chair should ensure that individuals who have provided confidential letters of evaluation are not identified in the departmental letter except by code.</p> <p>e. The chair, in a separate letter, may make an independent evaluation and recommendation which may differ from the departmental recommendation. This letter should be shown to all voting members of the department, and will be accessible to the candidate, upon request, in redacted form.</p>	<p>APM 220-80 Recommendations and Review: General Procedures e. The departmental recommendation is made in accordance with the procedural regulations of the Academic Senate and established governance practices of the department. The chair initiates a personnel action for an appointment, promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment, non-reappointment, or terminal appointment by addressing a letter setting forth the departmental recommendation to the Chancellor (or to the Dean, Provost, or Vice Chancellor, according to the applicable campus procedure). This departmental letter shall discuss the proposed personnel action in the light of the criteria set forth in APM - 220-10, and shall be accompanied by supporting evidence. The chair shall report the nature and extent of consultation on the matter within the department (including any vote taken) and present any significant evidence and differences of opinion which would support a contrary recommendation. The chair should ensure that individuals who have provided confidential letters of evaluation are not identified in the departmental letter except by code... ...Pursuant to campus procedures, the chair may also, in a separate letter, make an independent evaluation and recommendation, which may differ from the departmental recommendation.</p>	<p>PPM 230-220-80 Recommendations and Review: General Procedures e. The departmental recommendation is made in accordance with the procedural regulations of the Academic Senate and established governance practices of the department. The chair initiates a personnel action for an appointment, promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment, non-reappointment, or terminal appointment by addressing a letter setting forth the departmental recommendation to the Chancellor (or to the Dean, Provost, or Vice Chancellor, according to the applicable campus procedure). This departmental letter shall discuss the proposed personnel action in the light of the criteria set forth in APM - 220-10, and shall be accompanied by supporting evidence. The chair shall report the nature and extent of consultation on the matter within the department (including any vote taken) and present any significant evidence and differences of opinion which would support a contrary recommendation. The chair should ensure that individuals who have provided confidential letters of evaluation are not identified in the departmental letter except by code... ...Pursuant to campus procedures, the chair may also, in a separate letter, make an independent evaluation and recommendation, which may differ from the departmental recommendation. This letter should be shown to all voting members of the department, and will be accessible to the candidate, upon request, in redacted form.</p>

Notes: Substance of deleted text in PPM 230-29.III.D.4.d and PPM 230-29.III.D.4.e appears in APM 220-80. e.

- KEY:** Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion
Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
Bold Text = Existing APM language
Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
PPM 230-29. III. D – Procedural Safeguards		PPM - 220 – Professor Series
<p>PPM 230-29.III. D.5 5. After Departmental Recommendation is Determined</p> <p>Before or at the time of forwarding the departmental recommendation letter and the Personnel Review File, the candidate has the following rights.</p> <p>a. The candidate shall be informed of the following:</p> <p>(1) The departmental recommendation.</p> <p>(2) The substance of the departmental evaluations under each of the University criteria.</p> <p>b. Upon request, the chair shall provide to the candidate a copy of the letter setting forth the departmental recommendation.</p>	<p>APM 220-80 Recommendations and Review: General Procedures</p> <p>e. Before or at the time of forwarding the departmental letter and the personnel review file, the candidate shall be informed orally or, upon request, in writing of the departmental recommendation and of the substance of departmental evaluations under each of the applicable University criteria (teaching, research and creative work, professional competence and activity, and University and public service). If the chair provides this information to the candidate in writing, a copy of the written statement is to be included in the personnel review file. Upon request, the chair shall provide to the candidate a copy of the letter setting forth the departmental recommendation....</p>	<p>PPM 230-220 -80 - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures</p> <p>PPM is unnecessary; rely upon APM 220-80. e.</p>

Notes: Heading is non-substantive. Substance of deleted text in PPM 230-29.III.D.5.a and PPM 230-29.III.D.4.b appears in APM 220-80. e.

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
<p align="center">PPM 230-29. III. D – Procedural Safeguards</p>		<p align="center">PPM - 220 – Professor Series</p>
<p>PPM 230-29.III. D.5 5. c. The candidate has the right to make a written comment on the departmental recommendation. If the candidate makes a written comment, it shall be submitted to the chair within seven days of the candidate being informed of the departmental recommendation and shall become a part of the Personnel Review File. d. The candidate's signature on Certification B (Exhibit B) certifies that these procedures have been followed. Certification B should be signed and dated on the date this action occurs and must be included in each Personnel Review File.</p>	<p>APM 220-80 Recommendations and Review: General Procedures e. ... Before or at the time of forwarding the departmental letter and the personnel review file, the candidate shall be informed orally or, upon request, in writing of the departmental recommendation and of the substance of departmental evaluations under each of the applicable University criteria (teaching, research and creative work, professional competence and activity, and University and public service). If the chair provides this information to the candidate in writing, a copy of the written statement is to be included in the personnel review file. Upon request, the chair shall provide to the candidate a copy of the letter setting forth the departmental recommendation. As stated above, the identities of persons who were the sources of confidential documents are not to be disclosed in this letter. The candidate has the right to make a written comment on the departmental recommendation. The candidate should in such a case request a written statement from the chair as described above, and the candidate's comment shall be transmitted, at the option of the candidate, either to the chair, Dean, or Provost. This should be done within a time limit prescribed by the Chancellor. This written comment shall become part of the personnel review file as the review proceeds.</p>	<p>PPM 230-220 -80 - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures e. ... Before or at the time of forwarding the departmental letter and the personnel review file, the candidate shall be informed orally or, upon request, in writing of the departmental recommendation and of the substance of departmental evaluations under each of the applicable University criteria (teaching, research and creative work, professional competence and activity, and University and public service). If the chair provides this information to the candidate in writing, a copy of the written statement is to be included in the personnel review file. Upon request, the chair shall provide to the candidate a copy of the letter setting forth the departmental recommendation. As stated above, the identities of persons who were the sources of confidential documents are not to be disclosed in this letter. The candidate has the right to make a written comment on the departmental recommendation within seven days. The candidate should in such a case request a written statement from the chair as described above, and the candidate's comment shall be transmitted, at the option of the candidate, either to the chair, Dean, or Provost. This should be done within a time limit prescribed by the Chancellor. This written comment shall become part of the personnel review file as the review proceeds. The candidate's signature on Certification B (Exhibit B) certifies that these procedures have been followed. Certification B should be signed and dated on the date this action occurs and must be included in each Personnel Review File.</p>

Notes: Substance of deleted text in PPM 230-29.III.D.5.c appears in APM 220-80. e.

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
PPM 230-29. III. D – Procedural Safeguards		PPM - 220 – Professor Series
<p>PPM 230-29.III. D. 6 6. During Academic Senate or Administrative Review of a Departmental Recommendation</p> <p>a. Any additional information or material requested by reviewers must be solicited from the chair through the Office of the Vice Chancellor-- Academic Affairs or the applicable Dean/Director in cases where the Dean/Director is the approving authority.</p> <p>b. Such new material shall be added to the Personnel Review File and the department shall be given the opportunity to comment on the new material.</p> <p>c. The candidate shall be informed by the chair of the new material which has been added to the Personnel Review File, without disclosing the identities of sources of confidential academic review records, and may be provided access to the new material in accord with APM 220-80-d.</p> <p>d. The candidate shall be provided the opportunity to make a written statement for inclusion in the Personnel Review File.—The candidate's statement should be received by the department within seven days of the candidate being informed of the new material. The candidate's statement will become part of the File as augmented.</p> <p>e.—The candidate's signature on Certification C (Exhibit C) certifies that these procedures have been followed.</p>	<p>APM 220-80 Recommendations and Review: General Procedures h. If, during Academic Senate or administrative review of a departmental recommendation, the personnel review file is found to be incomplete or inadequate, additional information shall be solicited through the Chancellor's Office. Such new material shall be added to the personnel review file, and the department shall be invited to comment on the new material. The candidate shall be informed by the chair of the new material which has been added to the personnel review file (without disclosing the identities of sources of confidential academic review records), and may be provided access to the new material in accord with APM - 220-80-d. The candidate shall be provided the opportunity to make a written statement for inclusion in the personnel review file. The review shall then be based upon the personnel review file as augmented.</p>	<p>PPM 230-220 -80 - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures h. If, during Academic Senate or administrative review of a departmental recommendation, the personnel review file is found to be incomplete or inadequate, additional information shall be solicited from the chair through the Office of the Vice Chancellor-- Academic Affairs or the applicable Dean/Director in cases where the Dean/Director is the approving authority. Such new material shall be added to the personnel review file, and the department shall be invited to comment on the new material. The candidate shall be informed by the chair of the new material which has been added to the personnel review file (without disclosing the identities of sources of confidential academic review records), and may be provided access to the new material in accord with APM - 220-80-d. The candidate shall be provided the opportunity to make a written statement for inclusion in the personnel review file. —The candidate's statement should be received by the department within seven days of the candidate being informed of the new material. The candidate's signature on Certification C (Exhibit C) certifies that these procedures have been followed. The review shall then be based upon the personnel review file as augmented.</p>

Notes: Heading is non-substantive. Substance of deleted text in PPM 230-29.III.D.6 appears in APM 220-80. h.

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
PPM 230-29. III. D – Procedural Safeguards		PPM - 220 – Professor Series
<p>PPM 230-29.III. D. 7 7. If there is a tentative decision by the administrative authority that is contrary to the recommendation of the department or of reviewers, the Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs (or applicable dean, where appropriate) shall notify the candidate, chair or applicable reviewers of the preliminary decision and the reasons for it. The chair or applicable reviewers will have an opportunity to accept the preliminary decision or to respond to it, within fourteen days, before a final decision is made. If additional information is furnished, appropriate reviewers will be given an opportunity to comment on the augmented file. If the candidate chooses to comment, such comments should be received by the department chair within seven days from the date the candidate was informed of the preliminary decision. Any response to the preliminary decision and/or submission of additional material must be accompanied by a signed and dated Certification C.</p>	<p>APM 220-80 Recommendations and Review: General Procedures j. If the Academic Vice Chancellor’s (or designee’s) preliminary assessment in a case of appointment, reappointment, formal appraisal, non-reappointment, or promotion is contrary to the recommendation of the department, Dean or Provost (or comparable officer), or the Committee on Academic Personnel, the Academic Vice Chancellor shall notify the Dean or Provost and the Committee on Academic Personnel, indicating the reasons and asking for any further information which might support a different decision. When additional information is furnished, the Dean or Provost and the Committee on Academic Personnel will be given opportunity to comment on the augmented file before the Chancellor makes the final decision.</p>	<p>PPM 230-220 -80 - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures j. If the Administrative Authority’s preliminary assessment is contrary to the recommendation of the department, or of reviewers, the Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs (or applicable dean, where appropriate) shall notify the candidate, chair or applicable reviewers, indicating the reasons and asking for any further information which might support a different decision. The chair or applicable reviewers will have an opportunity to accept the preliminary decision or to respond to it, within fourteen days, before a final decision is made. When additional information is furnished, appropriate reviewers will be given opportunity to comment on the augmented file before a final decision is made. If the candidate chooses to comment, such comments should be received by the department chair within seven days from the date the candidate was informed of the preliminary decision. Any response to the preliminary decision and/or submission of additional material must be accompanied by a signed and dated Certification C.</p>

Notes: Substance of deleted text in PPM 230-29.III.D.7 appears in APM 220-80. j.

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
PPM 230-29. III. D – Procedural Safeguards		PPM - 220 – Professor Series
<p>PPM 230-29.III. D. 8 8. After the final administrative decision has been communicated to the candidate, the candidate shall have the right, upon written request, to receive from the Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs, or other designated administrative officer, a written statement of the reasons for that decision, including a copy of non-confidential documents and a redacted copy of the confidential academic review records.</p>	<p>APM 220-80 Recommendations and Review: General Procedures i. After the final administrative decision has been communicated to the candidate, the candidate shall have the right, upon written request, to receive from the Chancellor, or other designated administrative officer, a written statement of the reasons for that decision, including a copy of non-confidential documents and a redacted copy of the confidential academic review records (as defined in APM - 160-20-b (1)) in the personnel review file.</p>	<p>PPM 230-220 -80 - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures PPM is unnecessary; rely upon APM 220-80. j.</p>

Notes: Substance of deleted text in PPM 230-29.III.D.8 appears in APM 220-80. j.

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
 Strikethrough = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion
 Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
 Bold Text = Existing APM language
 Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
<p>PPM 230-29. III.E – Additional Safeguards</p> <p>E. Additional Safeguards in the Academic Personnel Process for Assistant Professors, Assistant Professors In Residence, Assistant Adjunct Professors, Assistant Professor of Clinical _____, Assistant Supervisors of Physical Education, and Assistant Research Scientists/Scholars</p> <p>1. A proposal not to reappoint an Assistant Professor/Supervisor/Research Scientist/Scholar may originate with the department chair as a result of departmental review during consideration of reappointment. Also, during a formal appraisal of an Assistant Professor/Supervisor/Research Scientist/Scholar, a department may recommend that a candidate be notified of a terminal appointment. In either event, the case shall be reviewed in accordance with policies outlined in APM Sections 220-82, 220-83, and 220-84; PPM 230-28; and PPM 230-29....</p>	<p>APM 220-84- Recommendations and Review: Procedure for Non-Reappointment of an Assistant Professor</p> <p>The general rules of APM - 220-80 apply here. In addition:</p> <p>a. A proposal not to reappoint an Assistant Professor may originate with the department chair as a result of departmental review during consideration of reappointment. In this event, the case shall be reviewed in accordance with the provisions of APM-220-82.</p>	<p>PPM - 220 – Professor Series</p> <p>PPM 230-220 -84 - Recommendations and Review: Procedure for Non-Reappointment of an Assistant Professor</p> <p>The general rules of APM - 220-80 apply here. In addition:</p> <p>a. A proposal not to reappoint an Assistant Professor may originate with the department chair as a result of departmental review during consideration of reappointment Also, during a formal appraisal of an Assistant Professor/Supervisor/Research Scientist/Scholar, a department may recommend that a candidate be notified of a terminal appointment. In either event, the case shall be reviewed in accordance with the provisions of APM Sections 220-82, 220-83, and 220-84.</p>

Notes:

- KEY:** Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion
Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
Bold Text = Existing APM language
Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present PPM 230-29. III.E – Additional Safeguards	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed PPM - 220 – Professor Series
<p>2. If, during review of a departmental recommendation in favor of reappointment or promotion or during a positive departmental appraisal of an Assistant Professor, Assistant Supervisor, or Assistant Research Scientist/Scholar, there is a recommendation to make a terminal appointment or not to reappoint by a Dean, Provost, campus ad hoc review committee, and/or the Committee on Academic Personnel; and if the Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs or other designated administrative officer's tentative decision is to make a terminal appointment or not to reappoint; then, before the final decision is made:</p> <p>a. The candidate and the chair shall be notified of this in writing (including a statement of reasons) by the Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs (or applicable dean, where appropriate).</p> <p>b. The candidate also shall be notified of the opportunity to request access to records placed in the personnel review file subsequent to the department review. The candidate may request this information by writing to the Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs, within seven days of receipt of the tentative decision. When the candidate is provided with copies of the records, the department chair also shall be provided with copies of the extra-departmental records.</p> <p>c. The candidate and the chair, after appropriate consultation within the department, shall then have the opportunity to respond within fourteen days and to provide additional information and documentation. The candidate may provide to the chair, within seven days of being informed of the preliminary decision (or within seven days of receipt of the extra-departmental records as outlined in b.), any comments or additional information he/she wishes to have added to the file. The departmental response and/or submission of additional material must be accompanied by a signed and dated Certification C.</p> <p>d. The Personnel Review File, as augmented by the new material, shall then be considered in stages of the review process as designated by the Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs and the Committee on Academic Personnel before a final decision is reached by the Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs.</p>	<p>APM 220-84- Recommendations and Review: Procedure for Non-Reappointment of an Assistant Professor</p> <p>The general rules of APM - 220-80 apply here. In addition:</p> <p>...b. During a review of a formal appraisal, or consideration of reappointment or promotion of an Assistant Professor (or other appointee of equivalent rank), if the Academic Vice Chancellor's (or designee's) preliminary assessment is to make a terminal appointment, is not to reappoint or promote, or is contrary to the departmental shall be notified of this in writing by the Academic Vice Chancellor. The candidate also shall be notified of the opportunity to request access to the records placed in the personnel review file subsequent to the departmental review in accordance with APM - 160-20-c. When the candidate is provided copies of such records, the department chair also shall be provided with copies of the extradepartmental records. The candidate and the chair, after appropriate consultation within the department, shall then have the opportunity to respond in writing and to provide additional information and documentation. The candidate may respond either through the department chair or directly to the Academic Vice Chancellor. The personnel review file, as augmented by the added material, shall then be considered in any stage of the review process as designated by the Academic Vice Chancellor before a final decision by the Chancellor is reached. The Chancellor's final decision to make a terminal appointment, or not to reappoint or promote, shall not be made without the appropriate preliminary assessment notification process and opportunity to respond being provided to the candidate as specified herein.</p>	<p>PPM 230-220 -84 - Recommendations and Review: Procedure for Non-Reappointment of an Assistant Professor</p> <p>...b. During a review of a formal appraisal, or consideration of reappointment or promotion of an Assistant Professor (or other appointee of equivalent rank), , there is a recommendation to make a terminal appointment or not to reappoint by a Dean, Provost, campus ad hoc review committee, and/or the Committee on Academic Personnel; and if the Academic Vice Chancellor's (or designee's) preliminary assessment is to make a terminal appointment, is not to reappoint or promote, or is contrary to the departmental shall be notified of this in writing (including a statement of reasons) by the Academic Vice Chancellor (or applicable dean, where appropriate). The candidate also shall be notified of the opportunity to request access to the records placed in the personnel review file subsequent to the departmental review in accordance with APM - 160-20-c. When the candidate is provided copies of such records, the department chair also shall be provided with copies of the extradepartmental records. The candidate and the chair, after appropriate consultation within the department, shall then have the opportunity to respond in writing within fourteen days and to provide additional information and documentation. The candidate may respond either through the department chair or directly to the Academic Vice Chancellor within seven days of being informed of the preliminary decision (or within seven days of receipt of the extra-departmental records as outlined above). The personnel review file, as augmented by the added material, shall then be considered in any stage of the review process as designated by the Academic Vice Chancellor before a final decision by the Chancellor is reached. The departmental response and/or submission of additional material must be accompanied by a signed and dated Certification C. The Chancellor's final decision to make a terminal appointment, or not to reappoint or promote, shall not be made without the appropriate preliminary assessment notification process and opportunity to respond being provided to the candidate as specified herein.</p>

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Notes: Substance of deleted text appears in APM 220-84.b, which is incorporated into other series by reference (See APM 270-80, APM 275-80, APM 280-80, APM 300-80 and APM 310-80)..

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
PPM 230-29. III. F Certifications		PPM - 220 – Professor Series
<p><u>1. Certification A</u> <u>At the beginning of the review process, which should be no later than October 15, the chair informs the candidate of the nature and process of the impending review and of the candidate's rights to provide information for the review. The candidate certifies that he/she had the opportunity to update the bibliography and Annual Supplement to the Bio Bibliography, to inspect teaching evaluations and other non confidential material in the Review File, to receive, upon request, a redacted copy of the confidential academic review records in the File, and to submit for inclusion in the File a written statement in response to or commenting on the File. The candidate's signature on Certification A (Exhibit A) certifies that these procedures have been followed prior to determination of the departmental recommendation. Certification A should be signed and dated on the date this action occurs, and must be included in the Review File.</u></p> <p><u>2. Certification B</u> <u>After the department has determined its recommendation, the candidate shall be informed orally or, upon request, in writing, of the results of the departmental recommendation. If the chair provides this information in writing, a copy of the written statement shall be included in the File. Upon request, the chair shall provide to the candidate a copy of the letter setting forth the departmental recommendation. The candidate's signature on Certification B (Exhibit B) certifies that these procedures have been followed. Certification B should be signed and dated on the date this action occurs and must be included in the Review File.</u></p> <p><u>3. Certification C</u> <u>The candidate's signature on Certification C (Exhibit C) should be obtained whenever new material is added to the File after the File has been forwarded to Academic Personnel. If it is not possible to obtain the candidate's signature, this should be noted on Certification C by the chair.</u></p> <p>NOTE: APM 158, 160, 210, and 220, revised effective August 1, 1992, eliminate the use of Waivers in the academic personnel review process.</p>		

Notes: Last sentence is non-substantive.

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
PPM 230-29. III. G - Miscellaneous		PPM - 220 – Professor Series
<p>1. Procedures outlined in this policy apply only to candidates who are currently University of California employees. They do not apply to candidates proposed for appointment who are not currently University of California employees. However, the general principles of fairness in the review process should be accorded to prospective new appointees to whatever degree is feasible.</p> <p>2. <u>If an appointee is on leave during a review process, the procedures should be followed as closely as possible by mail. Since candidates and chairs know in advance when an individual is going to take leave, they should complete as much of the Review File as possible prior to the individual's leave. If it is impossible to complete all steps of the procedures outlined in this policy prior to leave or by mail, the Review File should go forward and the steps completed without consultation with the candidate should be noted in the File. Upon the candidate's return to campus, the chair should inform the individual of the status of his/her Review File.</u></p> <p>3. <u>When a candidate holds a joint appointment (an appointment in more than one department), one department should take responsibility for assembling the File in compliance with these policies and procedures. In the case where an individual holds an appointment in a salaried instructional title and salaried research title in two different departments, the department where the teaching title is held should assemble the File. In the case of a non salaried and salaried appointment in different departments, the department where the salaried appointment is held should assemble the File. If there is no obvious determination by teaching or salaried status of the candidate, the chairs of the departments should meet and determine which department will assume responsibility for assembling the File. The chair preparing the File should ask the other chair for input into the File as appropriate to the situation. For example, if a candidate holds a salaried appointment of 50% in Department X and 50% in Department Y, both departments have the right to vote on the case and provide their respective departmental letter of evaluation for the File; one of the chairs should take the lead in initiating the action....</u></p>		

Notes: Deleted text has been removed for compliance with APM 220.

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
<p data-bbox="233 185 571 209">PPM 230-29. III. G - Miscellaneous</p> <p data-bbox="92 217 296 241">PPM 230-29. III. G.3</p> <p data-bbox="92 245 705 505"><u>...Another type of joint appointment might involve a salaried appointee who holds a non salaried appointment in another department. Both departments have the right to vote on the case and provide their respective input. The department where the candidate holds a non salaried appointment may choose to have its input reflected by having the chair sign the Summary and letter of evaluation prepared by the department in which the candidate holds a salaried appointment. If there are questions, please contact Academic Personnel.</u></p> <p data-bbox="92 537 701 824"><u>In cases where candidates have a major teaching obligation in an interdisciplinary program, the department chair shall contact the Program Coordinator to evaluate the teaching and service contributions of the candidate to the interdisciplinary program. In tenure and promotion cases of faculty associated with programs where the candidate's research falls into the interdisciplinary area, the chair shall solicit from the Coordinator suggestions of appropriate external referees. The final choice of referees, however, remains within the purview of the department.</u></p> <p data-bbox="92 857 701 971">4. In the case of department chairs and program directors, the Administration shall appoint an appropriate individual or committee to prepare the File. The policies contained in this document apply for such review.</p> <p data-bbox="92 1003 642 1117"><u>5. If a candidate refuses to sign any of the documents necessary for the Review File, the chair should provide a written statement to that effect and send a copy of this statement to the candidate.</u></p>	<p data-bbox="737 217 1276 266">APM 220-80 - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures</p> <p data-bbox="737 274 1327 358">The statements in this section set forth general procedures applicable in circumstances described in each of the five following sections (APM - 220-81 through 220-85).</p> <p data-bbox="737 363 1327 561">a. Formal considerations of appointments and reappointments, merit increases, appraisals, non-reappointments, and promotions are normally initiated by the department chair, after appropriate consultation with members of the departmental faculty. For actions affecting the chair, the vice chair, the Dean or Provost, or an appropriate officer may take the initiative.</p> <p data-bbox="737 570 764 594">...</p>	<p data-bbox="1381 217 1965 266">PPM 230-220-80 - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures</p> <p data-bbox="1381 274 1793 298">PPM unnecessary; rely upon APM 220-80.</p>

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present PPM 230-29. III. G - Miscellaneous	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed PPM – 220 – Professor Series
<p>PPM 230-29. III. G <u>6. Unless a request to defer a review has been approved by the Vice Chancellor-Academic Affairs, a Personnel Review File must be submitted during the year of normal academic review. If a candidate refuses to participate in his/her review, a Personnel Review File should be forwarded based upon the information that is available to the department.</u> 7. The following procedural guidelines should eliminate unnecessary delays in the review process while maintaining the University's commitment to assure candidates of a fair review: <u>a. Department chairs should establish in writing a deadline (no later than October 15) for the submission by candidates of all materials for their Review Files. Departments may establish an earlier deadline, but, in these cases, candidates must have a reasonable period of time to gather and submit the material. For equity reasons, activities and accomplishments beyond that date shall not be added. Adherence to the established deadline will allow the necessary time for voting members of the department to review the material prior to the departmental meeting on the candidate's case.</u> <u>b. If material is received after the departmental meeting and vote, the chair shall determine whether or not the added material is of such significance that it should be reviewed by all voting members and whether a new departmental meeting should be scheduled to reconsider the case. If the chair determines that the new material is not of such substance as to require a new departmental meeting and/or vote, the chair should take steps to include the material in the File and describe the degree of departmental review of the material. The candidate also should be informed of the degree of departmental review and asked to sign Certification C as an indication of his/her awareness that the material has been added to the File.</u></p>	<p>APM 220-80. c - Recommendations and Review: General Procedures ...Early in the course of a personnel review, before departmental consideration of a case, the chair² shall notify the candidate of the impending review and in one or more conferences with the candidate make certain that the candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process and is given the appropriate opportunity to ask questions, to supply pertinent information and evidence to be used in the review, and, where relevant, to suggest names of persons to be solicited for letters of evaluation. Each campus shall develop guidelines and checklists to instruct chairs about their duties and responsibilities in connection with personnel reviews. The chair has an obligation to consider the interests of both the candidate and the University, and to see to it that the departmental review is fair to the candidate and rigorous in maintaining University standards...</p>	<p>PPM 230-220-80. c: General Procedures Early in the course of a personnel review, before departmental consideration of a case, the chair shall notify the candidate of the impending review and in one or more conferences with the candidate make certain that the candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process and is given the appropriate opportunity to ask questions, to supply pertinent information and evidence to be used in the review, and, where relevant, to suggest names of persons to be solicited for letters of evaluation. Department chairs should establish in writing a deadline (no later than <u>the established campus deadline</u>) for the submission by candidates of all materials for their Review Files. Departments may establish an earlier deadline, but, in these cases, candidates must have a reasonable period of time to gather and submit the material. Departmental deadlines may not be later than <u>the established campus deadline</u>. For equity reasons, <u>an appointee may not add bibliographic or other documentation reflecting activities or accomplishments beyond the established campus deadline.</u> If material is received after the departmental meeting and vote, the chair shall determine whether or not the added material is of such significance that it should be reviewed by all voting members and whether a new departmental meeting should be scheduled to reconsider the case. If the chair determines that the new material is not of such substance as to require a new departmental meeting and/or vote, the chair should take steps to include the material in the File and describe the degree of departmental review of the material. The candidate also should be informed of the degree of departmental review and asked to sign Certification C as an indication of his/her awareness that the material has been added to the File. The chair has an obligation to consider the interests of both the candidate and the University, and to see to it that the departmental review is fair to the candidate and rigorous in maintaining University standards...</p>

Language in blue is from PPM 230-28. IV. A. 3 and 4.

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
PPM 230-29. III. G - Miscellaneous		PPM - 220 – Professor Series
<p>PPM 230-29. III. G</p> <p><u>7.c. There may be instances where material is added to the File without subsequent departmental review or a new departmental meeting to reconsider the case; in such cases, there are "checks and balances" provided in the review process to assure that the chair's judgment on the significance or substance of the new material is valid:</u></p> <p>(1) <u>New material added to the File after the established deadline (e.g., when requested by campus reviewers) will be identified as such and the degree of departmental review and consultation specified.</u></p> <p>(2) <u>If reviewers do not concur with the chair's judgment, the File will be returned to the department for full consultation and review by all voting members.</u></p>		

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion
Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM
Bold Text = Existing APM language
Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.

Proposed Disposition of PPM 230-29. III – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ASSURE FAIRNESS IN THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW PROCESS/References and Related Policies

Present	APM 220 – Professor Series	Proposed
PPM 230-29. III. H – Faculty Discipline and Academic Reviews		PPM - 220 – Professor Series
<p>H. Faculty Discipline and Academic Reviews</p> <p>Policies governing the inclusion of incidents of admitted or proven misconduct by a faculty member in academic review files are being formulated by the administration and the Academic Senate, and will be issued in the near future.</p>	n/a	n/a

Notes: Section H. is non-substantive.

KEY: Plain Text = Existing PPM language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

~~Strikethrough~~ = Existing PPM language proposed for deletion

Underlined Text = New policy language proposed for inclusion in new section of PPM

Bold Text = Existing APM language

Highlighted/Double Underline = Existing PPM language that will appear in the *APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions*.