

3.4 Preparing a Review File

1. General

An academic review file is first prepared by the academic appointee and the department for departmental review. Once a decision regarding the departmental recommendation is reached, the file, with the department recommendation letter, is submitted for campus review and decision. The department is responsible for preparing the academic review file for department consideration, and for submitting the file for campus review. If the academic review file is not submitted for campus review by the established deadline, the academic review file will be deferred for one (1) year and not be considered until the next academic review cycle.

The required documentation (which varies depending upon the proposed action) is set forth in the chart below:

File Documents	Reappointment	Merit	Accelerated Merit	Promotion/Career Reviews including Advancement to Full Step VI and Advancement to Above Scale
Review Summary Form	X	X	X	X
UC Academic Review History Form	X	X	X	X
Departmental Recommendation Letter	X	X	X	X
Departmental Ad Hoc Report	Please refer to Section 1.4.2 , 2.4.8 , or 3.4.13 for guidance on the inclusion of ad hoc committee reports.			
Academic Appointee's Personal Statement	Optional	Optional	Optional	Optional
External Referee Solicitation Letter (1 copy)				X ¹
Identification & Qualifications of External Referees				X
Number of External Referee Letters				5 for promotion to Associate 3 for promotion to Full & Advancement to Above Scale; optional for advancement to Step VI
Courseload/Case Load/TED Form	X ¹	X	X	X
Teaching Evaluations	Required for all instructional titles			
Level of Administrative Responsibility (LAR) Form	Required for Academic Administrators and Academic Coordinators			
Job Description	Required for Academic Administrators and Academic Coordinators			
Updated Biography & Bibliography Form	X	X	X	X
Sabbatical Leave Report, if applicable	X ²	X	X	X
Publications/Reviews/Creative Work	X ²	X	X	X
Certification 1A/Certification 1B	X	X	X	X
¹ External referee letters are not required if the departmental recommendation is termination.				
² Not required for temporary files				

2. Short Form Evaluation Review

Departments are encouraged to use the [Short Form Evaluation](#) in lieu of a full departmental recommendation letter, and School Dean's final action letter, for normal merit actions delegated as Dean's Authority.

A full review file and accompanying documentation must accompany any files where:

- a. the file requires full campus review as dictated by existing policy of [Academic Senate Bylaw 55](#)
- b. the Dean determines that the file requires full campus review.

About Department Letters and Short Form Evaluations

If the Final Authority returns the Short Form Evaluation to the Department for a full recommendation letter, the Short Form Evaluation needs to be included as part of the expanded file

3. Standard Evaluation Review

The following items should be presented in a standard academic review file in the order listed below, as applicable to the candidate. All documents received and reviewed by departmental reviewers, including the departmental ad hoc committee reports, and all letters from external referees, must be included in the file. The same documents must be seen by all those with responsibility for evaluating the file.

4. Review Summary Form

Using AP Data and Interfolio, the department will produce a review summary displaying the candidate's current appointment status, the proposed review action, proposed appointment details, associated department vote, and reviewer recommendations.

5. Review History

Using AP Data and Interfolio, the department should generate a Review History showing periods of service and the title, step, percentage of time, and department for each period. Generally, the review history should cover the candidate's entire employment history at the University of California, not just at the UC San Diego campus. Include periods of leave without pay and period of sabbatical leave. (Note that salary information should not be included in the employment history.)

About Appending Additional UC Employment History

System generated review histories only includes UC San Diego specific actions to the extent available in AP Data. Departments/schools are welcome to include addendum histories detailing employment at other UC institutions or periods prior to those available in the system.

6. Department Chair's Independent Letter

Related Manual Sections: [2.4.4](#)

The department chair may, in a separate letter, make an independent evaluation and recommendation, which may differ from the departmental recommendation. This letter should be shared with all voting members of the department post completion of the departmental recommendation letter and post completion and submission of a candidate's Certification B and/or 2.

About a Department Chair's Independent Letter

A department chair's independent letter should be shared with all departmental voting members and added as a component of an in-process appointment or review file after the department's recommendation letter has been completed and a candidate has submitted Certification B and/or Certification 2.

The chair's independent letter is shared with voting member on a purely informational basis.

Per [APM-160](#), the department chair's independent letter is a confidential document and if requested, will be provided to the candidate in redacted form following issuance of a final outcome.

7. Departmental Recommendation Letter

Related Manual Sections: [2.4.3](#)

The departmental recommendation letter presents the department's justification for the action recommended. It should be based on an evaluation of the appointee by all eligible members of the department, and it should be addressed to the administrator with approval authority for the action proposed, as specified in the [Authority and Review Chart](#).

If the department chair and the appointee are near relatives (see [APM 520](#) for definition) or close collaborators, the chair should recuse themselves and the vice chair (or other senior faculty member, such as a former department chair) should prepare the review file and draft the departmental recommendation letter. To determine if the appointee has collaborated with the department chair or vice chair, check the appointee's bio-bib to see if they have published with the appointee within the past five years. If so, another faculty member will need to author the departmental recommendation letter and the solicitation of external referees, as applicable. A close collaborator is generally defined as someone who has published and/or who has worked on a grant or project with the appointee within the previous five (5) years.

If the appointee holds appointments (salaried or non-salaried) in two or more departments, each department must evaluate the appointee and provide a recommendation letter. The home department prepares the file and provides a copy to the other department(s) for evaluation. The chairs of each department may submit separate letters of recommendation or elect to co-author one letter.

Specifically, the departmental recommendation letter should include:

- a. An initial paragraph stating the proposed action and the proposed status of the appointee's off-scale salary component (if any); the appointee's current title, rank, step, and salary, the proposed title, rank, step, and salary, percentage of effort, and the effective date.

Example: "On behalf of the Department of Marine Archaeology, I am pleased to recommend a three-year accelerated merit advancement for Professor J. Doe, From Professor, Step VI (OS), at an annual nine-month market off-scale salary of \$XX,XXX, to Professor, Step VIII (OS), at an annual academic year, market off-scale salary of \$XX,XXX, effective July 1, 20XX.

- b. Mention any special element of the review, such as an appraisal, career equity review, off-scale salary proposal, or retention effort. Such elements should be noted near the beginning of the letter, although detailed discussion may be provided farther down.
- c. A description of the nature and extent of consultation with members of the department, including a statement specifying the degree of departmental consultation (e.g., use of a departmental ad hoc committee, discussion at a faculty meeting) and any dissenting opinion. The letter must make clear who was consulted and the manner of consultation.
- d. Verify that a complete file was presented for voting members' consideration, and present the results of the vote taken, including the reason (if known) for any negative votes. (If the reason for the negative votes is unknown because votes were cast by secret ballot, this should be stated as well.)
- e. Departments are required to document the membership of the departmental ad hoc committee, but the departmental recommendation letter should not mention committee members' names since the appointee has the right to see the departmental letter and ad hoc committee members' names are confidential.

- f. A statement regarding any conflicts of interest in the file. If a department chair or any faculty member contributing to a file has a financial interest in a company employing the appointee under review, that information should be included in the letter, and such individuals should recuse themselves from contributing to the file.
- g. A thorough evaluation of the appointee's performance and achievements in each area of responsibility to the University, as specified in the series criteria.
- h. A statement regarding the department standards for reappointment, merit, promotion, and/or accelerated advancement. Additionally, department standards should be appended to the department letter as an accompanying document.
 - i. An evaluation of the academic appointee's performance and achievements in each area of responsibility to the University, as specified by the series criteria. The academic appointee's performance in each area should be evaluated, and in the departmental recommendation letter, clearly described, in terms of the department's established performance norms and expectations, using established departmental evaluation methods. This may include one or more of the following, depending on the series:
 - ii. A clear description and evaluation of the research and other creative activity conducted during the review period and the impact of that research and creative activity on the academic appointee's field. The letter also should explain the academic appointee's specific role in all collaborative and co-authored works, if the academic appointee is not first or senior author. Further, the letter should indicate the standing of journals and conference proceedings in which the academic appointee's publications appear, whether the journals are refereed, and their rates of acceptance/rejection. Indices of the stature of journals (e.g., journal ratings by professional societies, acceptance/rejection rates, etc.) should be provided for key pieces of work, particularly if they are published in journals that are not likely to be familiar to campus reviewers.
 - iii. A mere listing of publications is inadequate; the work must be analyzed with regard to its nature, quality, importance, and impact on the academic appointee's field. Departmental recommendation letters for Health Sciences faculty should make clear whether clinical case reports are merely historical or whether they contain new ideas or results.
 - iv. The academic appointee's success in obtaining support for research and other creative activity, including support for graduate students, should be addressed. The academic appointee's role on grants should be indicated (e.g., Principal Investigator, Co or Multi-Principal Investigator or Co or Multi-Investigator, with the number of other co-investigators specifies). While evidence of successful grant funding may be an indicator of research productivity or impact, grants are not required as a measure of productivity or impact unless required by applicable department standards.

- v. The chair should review the academic appointee's previous file to note which publications were considered for that review, as these publications cannot be counted again for subsequent advancement (except that they may be appropriately counted in full career reviews).
- vi. A clear statement describing the department's teaching requirements and how the academic appointee's teaching contributions met those requirements. The letter should note all formal and informal teaching efforts undertaken by the appointee during the review period. A meaningful assessment of the academic appointee's teaching effectiveness at both the undergraduate and graduate levels of instruction, accompanied by a concise statement of the amount and type of undergraduate and graduate teaching done during each year of the review period, and a statement of whether this is a normal pattern of teaching for someone at that rank and step in that department. Any extraordinary effort or extenuating circumstances, such as the newness, difficulty, or popularity of the course or its content, also should be evaluated. The letter should also address any problems in the area of teaching, measures taken during the review period to improve teaching, and specific plans to correct the problems.
- vii. In addition to an evaluation of the regularly scheduled undergraduate and graduate classes, the departmental recommendation letter should include an assessment of the appointee's non-structured activities, which the appointee has documented on the biobib form, including a discussion of: undergraduate research students, master's and doctoral residents, and any other students mentored outside of the structured classroom setting; and the appointee's role (e.g., thesis adviser, research adviser) for each student.
- viii. In Health Sciences, the departmental recommendation letter should indicate the number of students for each elective course offered by the academic appointee.
- ix. A discussion of the academic appointee's service accomplishments. For example, if the academic appointee served on a committee, the committee responsibilities and workload should be described. If the academic appointee chaired the committee, this also should be noted. Exceptional service in a capacity such as department chair is generally cited and proposed for reward only after the completion of such service, not while it is in progress. As department chairs are compensated for their role, the department must provide a justification for any additional reward.
- x. The departmental recommendation letter should also indicate whether the appointee holds appointed or elective office in professional organizations, on professional publications, or within community, state, national, or international organizations in which professional standing is a prime consideration for appointment.
- xi. Justification for the award of bonus or market off-scale salary components.

- xii. A statement regarding external referees' recommendations. External referee letters should be referenced by code as assigned on the Referee ID list. Comments that might identify external referees must not appear in the department letter, the text of which is available to the academic appointee in redacted form or in the departmental ad hoc report, if any. Excessive quotations from external referee letters are redundant and therefore are discouraged.
- xiii. A description of the contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion of the appointee.
- xiv. For Retention Files – the department chair is responsible for ensuring that the departmental recommendation letter includes a discussion of how the competing institution compares to UC San Diego and demonstrate how loss of a candidate would be significant. For offers from foreign institutions, the presumption is that the offer is for a fiscal year basis. The department chair is responsible for ensuring the proper conversion of the foreign offer to an academic year basis.

Retention or other financial incentives and proposed resources (space assignments, non-salaried resources, etc.) are not appropriate in the departmental recommendation letter and are best left out of the review file altogether.

Departments 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.

8. Department Standards

Departments should ensure a candidate's academic review file includes either a document dedicated to listing applicable department standards or a thorough description and discussion of those standards as part of the departmental recommendation letter.

9. Memorandum of Understanding (If Applicable)

Related Manual Sections: 2.3.1 2.4.5 3.3.7

For candidates who are joint appointees (serving in two or more departments), a copy of the signed Memorandum of Understanding is required to be included in the file. The MOU outlines each department's performance expectations for the candidate in regards to the academic series criteria for each title the candidate holds.

Please note, MOU are not required in cases where the primary appointment is salaried and all secondary appointments are non-salaried.

10. Principal Investigator Letter for Project Scientist & Specialist Titles (If Applicable)

At the time of academic review, the Project Scientist/Specialist's supervisor (normally the principal investigator) should evaluate the Project Scientist/Specialist and submit their written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair. The department chair must specify in the departmental recommendation letter the role of the appointee in the research project.

11. Dissenting Letters

If departmental faculty members do not agree with the departmental recommendation, they can submit dissenting letters to be included in the file. These letters may not be anonymous and are not considered confidential documents. As such they will be available to the candidate without redaction along with the department letter.

12. Certification Forms

Certifications are obtained in order to ensure that appointees have been made aware of their rights and responsibilities during the review process and that the correct procedures have been followed. For this reason, it is important that certifications be signed only at the appropriate point in the review process, as described below. Departments should schedule review files in a manner to provide all candidates a specified period of time to complete these certifications.

a. Certification 1A

At the beginning of the review process, the chair must inform the appointee of the nature of and procedures for the impending review and of their rights to provide information for the review. After the review file is assembled, the appointee is asked to certify that they had the opportunity to update the Biography and Bibliography packet; to inspect teaching evaluations and other non-confidential materials in the review file; to receive, upon request, a redacted copy of the confidential materials in the file; and to submit for inclusion in the file a written statement in response to or commenting on the file. The appointee's signature on Certification A certifies that these procedures have been followed prior to the departmental review of the file and determination of the departmental recommendation.

b. Certification 1B (If Applicable)

Should be completed after a file has been reviewed by a departmental ad hoc committee and the candidate was provided an opportunity to receive a redacted copy of the report before the file is submitted for department review and recommendation.

For joint files, each department is responsible for collecting a Certification 1B if they adopted the use of a departmental ad hoc committee.

c. Certification 2

After the department has determined its recommendation, the appointee must 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 must be included in the file. Upon request, the chair must provide the appointee a copy of the departmental recommendation letter. The appointee's signature on Certification B certifies that these procedures have been followed.

For joint files, the home department is responsible for coordinating the collection of Certification 2.

d. **Certification 3 (If Applicable)**

If new material (for example, an additional external referee letter) is added to the file after the file has been forwarded to the appropriate dean's office or to Academic Personnel Services, the department must inform the appointee of the new material and obtain the appointee's signature on Certification C to certify that this has been done.

For joint files, the home department is responsible for coordinating the collection of Certification 3.

13. Departmental Ad Hoc Committee Report (If Applicable)

Related Manual Sections: 1.4.2 2.4.8

Departmental ad hoc committee membership and recommendations (if any) should be included in a file as outlined below:

- a. If an ad hoc committee is convened and advises the department via a formal report, its recommendation becomes part of the file. A signed copy of the ad hoc committee report, with full membership indicated at the end (with member's signatures), must be included in the file. This is a confidential document, and references to ad hoc members must be avoided in the departmental recommendation letter.
- b. If an ad hoc committee is convened to advise the department but no formal report is produced, the department chair should summarize the ad hoc committee's feedback in a few sentences within the departmental recommendation letter. The department chair should avoid identifying any ad hoc committee members within the departmental recommendation letter. Additionally, ad hoc committee membership should be included as an addendum to the Referee I.D. List.

14. Appointee's Personal Statement (Optional but Strongly Encouraged)

Related Manual Sections: [1.3.3](#) [2.4.9](#)

If the appointee provides a personal statement (which is optional; inclusion of which may be based on departmental practice) regarding their achievements and future plans, this document should be so titled, and it must be signed and dated. Appointees may wish to provide such statements in part to ensure that special efforts, such as development of a new class, or unusual service contributions, are fully recognized and credited.

About COVID-19 Impact Statements

Candidates are encouraged to provide a statement explaining negative impacts on teaching, research, or service resulting from the global COVID-19 Pandemic. Candidates need not provide extensive descriptions of personal or private COVID-19 related hardships, but should detail how COVID-19 impacted specific areas of their academic series criteria. These statements should be included so reviewers can incorporate the consequences of the COVID-19 Pandemic into their academic judgment.

Additionally, academic appointees are welcome to draft two separate self-statements, one for distribution to potential external referees when departments solicit feedback and one directed at campus reviewers.

About Multiple Personal Statements

Academic appointees are welcome to draft two (2) separate self-statements, one for distribution to potential external referees when departments solicit feedback and one directed at campus reviewers.

The self-statement intended for campus reviewers should use layperson's language whenever possible to ensure included explanations are understandable to reviewers at all levels such as department colleagues, school deans, CAP members from across various disciplines, the Executive Vice Chancellor and/or Chancellor.

The personal statement intended for potential external referees may use discipline specific language that is understandable and specific to their peers and their field of expertise.

15. Referee I.D. List

Related Manual Sections: [1.2.4](#) [2.4.11](#)

The Identification and Qualifications of External Referees form (informally known as the “Referee I.D. List”) is used to aid reviewers by identifying the external referees asked to provide letters of evaluation and explaining their qualifications to evaluate the appointee. All referees who are solicited should be listed on the form, whether or not they responded and whether or not they provided a letter, and it should be indicated whether they were selected by the department or by the appointee, or both. All other documents in the file (e.g., the ad hoc committee report and the departmental recommendation letter) must refer to referees only by code (e.g., Referee A, Referee B, and so on) and must not describe or in any way identify referees. In addition, if the department solicits letters from referees who are not senior scholars, at least at the candidate’s proposed rank, or are not independent of the appointee, it must explain why these referees were considered the best qualified, and this must be done on the Referee I.D. form, not in the departmental or ad hoc report.

It is sometimes argued that it is difficult not to use collaborators in relatively small fields or subdisciplines. Nevertheless, there is likely to be a perception of bias if a letter writer contributed significantly to scholarship on which the departmental recommendation is based. When a department feels it is necessary to include a letter from the candidate’s collaborator, coauthor or mentor, the department letter should be clear about the nature of the association.

In instances where an external reviewer and candidate have collaborated on a publication, but the department considers the reviewer to be sufficiently “arms-length”, such information should be explicitly discussed in the department letter. Inclusion of this discussion in a departmental letter should avoid disclosing or identifying an external referee in any way.

These types of situations should also be noted and explained in the “Qualifications” section of the Referee I.D. List

16. Solicitation Letter

Related Manual Sections: [1.2.4](#) [2.4.10](#)

A copy of the external referee solicitation letter must be included with the appointment file. If the same letter is sent to several individuals, only one copy should be included in the file. If the text of the letter varies among referees, one copy of each version should be included in the file. The date the letter was sent and the names of the recipients should be indicated on each version.

About Department Chair Conflicts of Interest

Department chairs should avoid participating in the preparation, signing, or distribution of solicitation letters in cases where their participation presents a conflict of interest.

In cases where the department chair does not author the departmental recommendation due to a conflict of interest, they should also not sign or issue related solicitation letters.

17. External Referee Letters

Related Manual Sections: [1.2.4](#) [2.4.10](#)

Letters of evaluation from referees external to UC San Diego are required for certain academic review actions (see below). It is important to solicit external referee evaluations well in advance of preparing the review file so that delays in file preparation can be avoided.

External referee letters are required as follows:

EXTERNAL INDEPENDENT REFEREE LETTER REQUIREMENTS	
Academic Appointments	
Assistant Rank Appointees Assistant Teaching Professor	Step I-III: 3 External Non-Independent Referee Letters
	Step IV and Above: 3 External Independent Referee Letters
Associate or Full Rank Appointees Associate Teaching Professor Teaching Professor	5 External Independent Referee Letters
Academic Administrators Academic Coordinators	3 External Independent Referee Letters
Academic Reviews	
Promotion to Associate Professor Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor	5 External Independent Referee Letters
Promotion to Full Professor Promotion to Sr. Teaching Professor	3 External Independent Referee Letters
Advancement to Above Scale	3 External Independent Referee Letters
Career Equity Review (CER)	
Career Equity Reviews (CER) involving advancement to/through a barrier step require the inclusion of referee letters in alignment with this chart.	
Advancement to Step VI	
External referee letters are not required for advancement to Step VI.	

If a department opts to solicit letters, they should only be used when needed to justify an extraordinary case, such as a multiyear acceleration.

For detailed information on the selection and solicitation of external referees, see [Section 1.2.4](#) for additional details.

All responses from external referees should be included in the file (even those stating only that they do not have time to write an evaluation).

About External Referee Declinations

In situations where an external referee is solicited and the referee responds with a declination to participate, the referee's declination should be included in the corresponding academic appointment or review file similar to an external referee letter.

The declining referee should be noted on the Referee ID List and their declination, whether in memo or email format, should be labeled with the corresponding Referee ID number and included in the file.

Letters should be coded to correspond to the Referee I.D. list (the letter from Referee A on the list should have the letter "A" in the upper right-hand corner of all pages; the letter from Referee B should be coded with "B," and so forth).

External letters may be solicited and received electronically, but they must be submitted with an e-mail from the referee as evidence of authenticity.

18. Course Load and Student Direction Report

a. General Campus/SIO

This information is available in electronic format from the office of Institutional Research. The appointee is responsible for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of the teaching record since the previous advancement. Contact hours per course per quarter are the hours actually spent by the faculty member on classroom instructional duties.

"Independent Study" contact hours are hours spent by the faculty member with the student in instruction-related to the student's independent-study duties.

Independent-study instruction (e.g., 195, 199, 299, and 500 courses) should be shown under "Individual Instruction."

For appointees who hold instructional titles in more than one department, a complete listing of all courses taught in each department should appear on the Course Load form.

The appointee should annotate the Course Load form to correct any errors, and the department should report these errors to Institutional Research in UC 409.

b. Health Sciences

For assistance in completing the Teaching Evaluation Document (TED) and Case Load forms, contact the office of the Vice Chancellor Health Sciences, Academic Affairs.

19. Teaching Evaluations/Other Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Per [APM 210](#), it is the responsibility of the department chair to submit meaningful statements, accompanied by evidence, of the candidate's teaching effectiveness at lower-division, upper-division, and graduate levels of instruction. More than one kind of evidence shall accompany each review file. Please see [APM 210](#) for additional examples of teaching evidence. Evaluations should be arranged in reverse chronological order (most current evaluations first).

- a. Course and Professor Evaluations (CAPE), a student-run organization, conducts evaluations of undergraduate classes. CAPE posts statistical information and student comments online for faculty access only within two weeks after final grades are turned in. Statistical data only is posted online for student viewing.
- b. Departments may conduct their own evaluations of graduate and undergraduate courses. Numerical ratings and individual student comments should be summarized in the departmental recommendation letter. Compiled forms including all collected comments or individual evaluations should be included with the file.
- c. Scatter diagrams that provide a graphical presentation of each faculty member's teaching effectiveness as compared with others in the same department and for the same course are made available to departments by the office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education.

20. Holistic Teaching Evaluations

A [Senate-Administration Workgroup on Holistic Evaluation](#) was convened in 2019 to provide recommendations for placing teaching efforts into a broader context and allow the University to:

- a. Identify and make available multiple existing tools for teaching evaluation
- b. Establish a campus culture where both formative and summative assessment of teaching and learning is a standard practice
- c. Institute or augment faculty development programs

The workgroup's findings and resulting recommendations for establishing a holistic evaluation of a candidate's teaching efforts can be found [here](#).

21. Other Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

In addition to teaching evaluations, other evidence of teaching effectiveness may include a copy of the syllabus for each course taught, student testimonials (letters, emails, cards, etc.), reports resulting from faculty observations of classes, written analyses of course materials, reports on interviews with students who did well in the courses, reporting of the grade distribution, and documentation of activities in curriculum development.

22. Level of Administrative Responsibility Form (If Applicable)

The Level of Administrative Responsibility (LAR) form is submitted only by Academic Administrators and Academic Coordinators and gives an overview of the budget, personnel, and space under the appointee's supervision.

23. Job Description for Academic Administrators & Academic Coordinators

A description of the appointee's position should be included for Academic Administrator and Academic Coordinator review files. Such descriptions may have been developed when the recruitment was conducted for the position, and this can serve as the basis for the job description for the review file. The description should also include the working title, if applicable.

24. Sabbatical Leave Report (If Applicable)

If the appointee has taken a sabbatical or leave in lieu of sabbatical leave since the last review, a copy of the sabbatical leave report must be included in the file. It should be inserted prior to the Biography-Bibliography packet.

25. Biography & Bibliography Packet

Related Manual Sections: 1.3.2.a 2.4.16
--

The UC San Diego Academic Biography and Bibliography form ("Bio bib") must comply with the written instructions provided in the current form and must be reviewed and signed by the appointee. If the appointee is unavailable for signature, the form should be so annotated, with the reason included below the space for the signature.

Please note that item II.F. in the biography section asks for information regarding faculty contributions to promoting diversity, equity and inclusion. The Academic Senate Committee on Diversity and Equity has provided [examples of diversity service](#) for use in filling out this section.

Although the appointee may delegate preparation of the biobib to an assistant, the appointee is responsible for its completeness and accuracy. By signing the biobib form, the appointee indicates their request to be assessed on the basis of the information contained in the form.

The requirements for organization of the bibliographies were revised in 2015, thus appointees are required to bring the entire bibliography into compliance with the prescribed format.

26. Items that Accompany the Review File

Many review files will be supplemented by additional items:

- a. Publications – For files that require review by the Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), all new items in Section A of the bibliography should be provided with the file. For normal merit review files, appointees may determine which Section A publications to submit. If the appointee has not provided an electronic link to their list of publications under review in their biobib packet, they may submit physical publications to the dean's office at the time the review file is submitted. It is important that the publications be numbered to correspond with the entry on the bibliography (see biobib instructions for details).
- b. Raw Teaching Data – When available, raw teaching data (e.g., all student evaluation forms for a particular course) can be compiled, including all collected student comments, and included in a file to help clarify the teaching record.

27. Review File Outcomes

Review files which require committee review are routed to campus reviewers by Academic Personnel Services, as indicated in the [Authority and Review Chart](#). Reviewers may include the college provost, the Committee on Academic Personnel ([CAP](#)), the Project Scientist and Specialist Review Panel ([PSSRP](#)), the Academic Administrator and Coordinator Review Panel ([AARP](#)) and others. The administrator with final approval authority is also indicated in the Authority and Review Chart.

During the review process, the department may receive the following from the office of the administrator with final authority for the review action.

a. Request for Additional Information

The department chair may receive a request for additional information or clarification for a particular file. The request will indicate the number of days in which a response is due and usually goes as follows:

- iii. 90 days for additional information requests involving the solicitation of additional referee letters or teaching evaluations/materials
- iv. 30 days for other information requests

The department should notify the appointing authority in writing if additional time is needed to respond to the request and the reason for the extension. If the candidate is an existing UC academic employee, they must sign Certification 3 to acknowledge that new material has been added to the appointment file. While Certification 3 is not required if the candidate is not already a UC academic employee, it is encouraged. Once the requested material has been added to the file, the file is re-routed to reviewers for further evaluation and comment. In the response to the request for additional information, the department chair should indicate the level of departmental consultation and review. Failure to respond by the response deadline may result in the effective date being delayed.

b. Preliminary Assessment

If reviewers' recommendation differs from the departmental recommendation, a preliminary assessment is sent to the department with a corresponding 30-day response period for acceptance of the preliminary outcome or reconsideration of the initial proposed action. The department should notify the appointing authority in writing if additional time is needed to respond to the preliminary assessment and the reason for the extension. The department may choose to accept the preliminary assessment or to challenge it. In either case, the department must respond within the requested time period (including in its response the level of departmental consultation and review) in writing with new information and if the candidate is an existing UC academic employee, they must sign Certification 3 to acknowledge that new material has been added to the appointment file. While Certification 3 is not required if the candidate is not already a UC academic employee, it is encouraged. Once the requested material has been added to the file, the file is re-routed to reviewers for further evaluation and comment. Failure to respond with an acceptance or reconsideration request by the response deadline will result in the preliminary assessment becoming final, and the final letter (including offer letters) will be issued.

28. Final Outcome Letter

Once a final decision has been determined, the administrator with authority for the action will send the department a letter communicating that decision and notifying the department to implement the final action in the payroll system. The department chair will also meet with the appointee to inform them of the final outcome.

29. Implementing an Approved Outcome

Following receipt of the final outcome, the department via the Dean or VC office, will be notified to implement the outcome online. Prior to entry of the action into UCPATH, the department should complete all required payroll forms. Immediately following PATH entry, appropriate payroll forms must be forwarded to the Payroll Office.