UC SAN DIEGO
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL SERVICES

September 2026

Process Manual

Contents

1.0 Introduction 10
1. General Information 10
2. How to Use This Manual 10
3. Process Manual Updates 10
1.1 Academic Personnel Policy & Major Academic Series 11
1. General 11
a. General University Policy Regarding Academic Appointees 11
b. Appointment and Promotion 11
c. Recruitment 12
d. Salary Administration 12
2. File Deadlines 12
a. School & Departmental Deadlines 12
b. Campus Deadlines 13
c. File Submission 13
3. Most Common Academic Series Used at UCSD 14
a. Professor Series 14
i. Non-Professorial Instructional Series 15
j. Research Series 16
k. Other Series 17
1.2 Department Chair Responsibilities 18
1. Department Chair's Role 18
2. Department Chair Conflict of Interest (COI) 18
3. Interdisciplinary Programs or Units 19
4. External Referee Letters – Appointments & Reviews 19
a. Selection of External Referees 20
b. Electronic Solicitation of External Referees 21
c. Use of Applicant Letters from AP On-Line Recruit 22
d. Handwritten External Referee Letters 22
e. External Referee Letters in a Foreign Language 22
f. Unsolicited Letters of Evaluation 22
g. Additional External Evaluation Information 22
5. Teaching and Mentoring Evaluations 23

a. Teaching Professor Series 23
b. Project Scientist and Specialist Series 23
6. Academic Appointment Responsibilities 23
a. Funding 23
b. Department Letter 24
1.3 Academic Appointee Responsibilities – Submission of Review Materials 25
1. General 25
2. Academic Appointee Materials 26
a. Biography and Bibliography Form (Biobib) 26
b. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness (If Applicable) 27
c. Copies of publications from the review period. 27
3. Personal Statement 28
4. Career Reviews (Promotion to Tenure/Security of Employment, Promotion to Full, Advancement to Step VI, Advancement to Above-Scale) 29
5. Academic Appointees with Teaching Responsibilities 30
6. Career Equity Review 30
1.4 Department Consultation & Voting 31
1. General 31
2. Departmental ad hoc committees 31
3. Departmental Vote 32
1.5 Series Appointment & Advancement Criteria 34
1. General 34
1.6 Conflicts of Interest 36
a. Mentors, Co-Authors & Collaborators 36
b. Financial Interest 36
c. Near Relatives 36
2.0 Academic Recruitment and Appointment 37
1. General 37
– Appointments Exempt from Open Recruitment: 37
b) Additional Recruitment Considerations 37
– Non-U.S. Citizens 37
– University of California Inter-Campus Recruitments 37
– California State University Employees 39

– Recruitment of Near Relatives 39
– Series Changes 39
2.1 Limitations on Total Period of Service in Certain Academic Titles 40
1. General 40
2. Calculation of Years of Service Prior to Appointment 44
3. Applicability of Periods of Leave Toward Calculating Years of Service 44
i. Temporary Transfers or Change of Status 44
j. Without Salary Status 45
k. Additional Provisions 45
4. Appointments Subject to the Eight Year Limit 45
2.2 Appointment Considerations 46
1. General 46
2. Determining Salary 46
a. Market Off-scale Salaries 46
b. Entry Level Salary Agreements (ELSAs) 46
3. Determining the Departmental Recommendation 47
4. Determining Work Authorization Compliance 47
5. Appointment Effective Date 48
a. Academic Year Appointments 48
b. Fiscal Year Appointments 50
6. Series Change (New Appointment) 50
7. Mid-Year Option 50
a. “Yes” to Zero Year Option 51
b. “No” to Zero Year Option 52
8. Timing of Appointment File Submission 52
2.3 Special Types of Appointments 53
1. Joint Appointments 53
2. 0% Faculty Appointments 53
3. Acting Appointments 53
4. Visiting Appointments 54
5. Recall Appointments 54
6. Temporary Academic Coordinator Appointments 55
2.4 Preparing an Appointment File 56

1. General....56
2. Review History....56
3. Departmental Recommendation Letter – Appointments....56
4. Department Chair's Independent Letter (If Applicable)....59
5. Memorandum of Understanding (If Applicable)....59
6. Dissenting Letters (If Applicable)....60
7. Certification Forms (If Applicable)....60
8. Departmental Ad Hoc Report (If Applicable)....61
9. Candidate's Personal Statement (Optional)....62
10. Solicitation Letter to External Referees....62
a. Preparation of Solicitation Letters....62
11. Referee I.D. List....63
12. External Referee Letters....64
13. Teaching Evaluations....64
14. Level of Administrative Responsibility (LAR) Form (If Applicable)....64
15. Job Description (If Applicable)....65
16. Academic Biography & Bibliography Form....65
17. Other Items that Accompany an Appointment File....65
a. Publications or Comparable Items....65
18. Submitting an Appointment File....66
19. Appointment File Outcomes....66
a. Request for Additional Information....66
b. Preliminary Assessment....67
c. Offer Letter....67
d. Implementing an Approved Appointment....67
3 Academic Reviews....69
1. General....69
3.1 Determining the Departmental Recommendation – Reviews....70
1. General....70
3.2 Reviews-Evaluation of Senate Assistant Rank Academic Appointees....72
1. General....72
2. Deferral....72
3. Reappointment and/or No Change....72

4. Consecutive No Change Actions 73
a. Full Service at a Barrier Step 73
b. Extenuating Circumstances 74
c. Insufficient Contributions 74
5. Merit Advancement 74
6. Promotion 75
7. Acceleration 77
8. Bonus Off-Scale Salary Components (BOS) 78
9. Market Off-Scale Salary Components (MOS) 79
10. Advancement to Step VI 80
11. Advancement to Above Scale 81
12. Career Equity Review 82
13. Probationary Period 83
14. Terms of Service 83
15. First Reappointment/Merit Review 84
a. Reappointment with Merit Advancement 84
b. Reappointment without Merit Advancement 84
c. Non-Reappointment 84
16. Second Reappointment/Merit Review 85
a. Reappointment with Merit Advancement 85
b. Reappointment without Merit Advancement 85
c. Non-Reappointment 85
17. Appraisal 86
a. Timing 86
b. Appraisal Vote 86
c. If the Vote Results in an Unfavorable Rating 86
d. Result of Second Faculty Vote: 87
i. Continuation of Appointment is Recommended 87
ii. Termination of Appointment is Recommended 87
18. Promotion 87
19. Campus Review 87
20. Final Reappointment/Merit Review 88
a. Promotion is Recommended 88

i. Tenure or Security of Employment 88

ii. Augmentation of Senate Promotion Files (Tenure/Security of Employment) Through April 30th 88

b. Postponement of Promotion Review is Recommended 90

c. Termination is Recommended 90

i. Notice of Termination 90

21. Reconsideration of Promotion 90

22. Five-year Prohibition of Appointment 91

23. Joint Appointees – Reviews 91

3.3 Reviews-Evaluation of Non-Senate Assistant Rank Appointees 93

1. General 93

2. Probationary Period 93

3. Terms of Service 93

4. Reappointment/Merit Review 93

a. Reappointment with Merit Advancement 94

b. Reappointment without Merit Advancement 94

5. Appraisal 94

a. Timing 94

b. Department Considerations 95

c. Appraisal Vote 95

d. If the Vote results in an Unfavorable rating 96

e. Result of second faculty vote: 96

iv. Continuation of Appointment is Recommended 96

v. Termination of Appointment is Recommended 96

vi. Promotion 96

vii. Campus Review 97

6. Final Reappointment/Merit Review 97

a. Promotion is Recommended 97

b. Postponement of Promotion Review is Recommended 97

c. Non-reappointment 97

i. Notice of Non-Reappointment 98

7. Joint Appointees – Reviews 98

3.4 Preparing a Review File 100

1. General....100
2. Short Form Evaluation Review....101
3. Standard Evaluation Review....101
4. Review Summary Form....101
5. Review History....101
6. Department Chair's Independent Letter....102
7. Departmental Recommendation Letter....102
8. Department Standards....106
9. Memorandum of Understanding (If Applicable)....106
10. Principal Investigator Letter for Project Scientist & Specialist Titles (If Applicable)....106
11. Dissenting Letters....107
12. Certification Forms....107
    a. Certification 1A....107
    b. Certification 1B (If Applicable)....107
    c. Certification 2....107
    d. Certification 3 (If Applicable)....108
13. Departmental Ad Hoc Committee Report (If Applicable)....108
14. Appointee's Personal Statement (Optional but Strongly Encouraged)....108
15. Referee I.D. List....110
16. Solicitation Letter....110
17. External Referee Letters....111
18. Course Load and Student Direction Report....112
    a. General Campus/SIO....112
    b. Health Sciences....113
19. Teaching Evaluations/Other Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness....113
20. Holistic Teaching Evaluations....113
21. Other Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness....114
22. Level of Administrative Responsibility Form (If Applicable)....114
23. Job Description for Academic Administrators & Academic Coordinators....114
24. Sabbatical Leave Report (If Applicable)....114
25. Biography & Bibliography Packet....114
26. Items that Accompany the Review File....115
27. Review File Outcomes....115

a. Request for Additional Information 116
b. Preliminary Assessment 116
28. Final Outcome Letter 117
29. Implementing an Approved Outcome 117
4.0 Appendix A: Retention Actions (Full & Preemptive) 118
1. General 118
a. Full Retentions 118
b. Preemptive Retentions 118
c. Timing 118
d. Foreign Offers 118
2. Pre-Approval 119
a. Department Pre-Approval Requests 119
b. Dean Review 119
c. Sr. AVC-AA Review 119
3. Retention File Components 120
a. Departmental Letter 120
b. Proof of Outside Offer or Evidence of Credible Threat 120
c. Sr. AVC-AA Pre-Approval 120
d. Special Considerations 120
i. Intercampus Transfers 120
ii. Bonus Off-Scale (BOS) Salary Components and Career Milestone Salary Incentives (CMSI) 121
4. Full Retention and Preemptive Retention Embargos and Limits 121
a. Full Retentions 121
b. Preemptive Retentions 121
c. APM 510 – Intercampus Transfers 122
5. Additional Retention Resources 123
4.1 Appendix B: COVID-19 Extension of the Probationary Period and Academic Deferral Toolkit 124
1. General 124
2. Process 125
3. Frequently Asked Question (FAQ) 125
a. General 125
b. Assistant Professor Review Impacts 126
c. All Ranks 127

d. Additional Consideration FAQ 128
4. Expanded COVID-19 Extensions of the Probationary Period Options.....129
5.0 Revision History 130

1.0 Introduction

1. General Information

The UC San Diego Academic Personnel Services (APS) Process Manual (Manual) is published annually under the authority of the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (EVC) as a companion guide to UC San Diego Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM) Section 230 – Academic Personnel and the University of California Academic Personnel Manual (APM). The Manual serves to aid department chairs and staff in the preparation of various academic appointments, reviews, and other academic personnel actions. Should you have questions regarding school, department, or division specific rules and deadlines, please consult with your dean's office AP staff.

For academic appointees in a series covered by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with an exclusive bargaining agreement, procedures in this manual apply to the extent where the Memorandum of Understanding states that such procedures apply. UC's bargaining unit contracts can be found here.

Additional department chair and staff training opportunities are provided throughout the academic year through EVC-sponsored department chair meetings & workshops, and specialized training offered through the UC Learning Center, Academic Personnel, and deans' offices.

2. How to Use This Manual

This manual provides detailed instructions and guidance for many regular appointment and review actions. In addition to instructions in this manual, one should always consult the relevant policy for guidance.

- UC Academic Personnel Manual (APM)
- UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual (PPM)

Your dean's office is also a resource and can help guide you where policy or procedure may be silent.

3. Process Manual Updates

The Manual represents a joint review effort between the UC San Diego Office of Academic Personnel Services (APS) and the Academic Senate. Future modifications to this manual will be made by APS and reviewed by the Academic Senate prior to issuance. Academic Senate review will not be required in situations where an update is technical in nature or in cases where the Academic Senate has expressly waived its review.

Please contact APS at academicpersonnel@ucsd.edu if you wish to provide comments, feedback, or recommendations related to the modification of this manual

1.1 Academic Personnel Policy & Major Academic Series

1. General

The department chair (or equivalent officer) is responsible for complying with the policies and procedures for the review and appointment of academic personnel. The relevant campus policies governing the academic appointment, review, and ancillary academic personnel actions are as follows:

a. General University Policy Regarding Academic Appointees

PPM 230-133 - Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles
PPM 230-160 - Academic Personnel Records/Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of

b. Appointment and Promotion

PPM 230-200 - General
PPM 230-205 - Recall for Academic Appointees
PPM 230-210 - Review and Appraisal Committees
PPM 230-220 - Professor Series
PPM 230-230 - Visiting Appointments
PPM 230-235 - Acting Appointments
PPM 230-255 - Non-Salary Instructional Positions
PPM 230-270 - Professor of (e.g., Psychiatry) In Residence Series
PPM 230-275 - Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine) Series
PPM 230-278 - Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series
PPM 230-280 - Adjunct Professor Series
PPM 230-281 - Professor of Practice Series
PPM 230-283 - Lecturer and Senior Lecturer Series
PPM 230-285 - Lecturer with Security of Employment (Teaching Professor) Series
PPM 230-289 - Guest Lecturers (Including Lecturers, Miscellaneous Part-Time)
PPM 230-290 - Regents' Professors and Regents' Lecturers
PPM 230-310 - Professional Research (Research Scientist) Series
PPM 230-311 - Project Scientist Series
PPM 230-330 - Specialist Series
PPM 230-340 - Continuing Educator Series
PPM 230-355 - Non-Salary Research Positions
PPM 230-360 - Librarian Series
PPM 230-370 - Academic Administrator Series
PPM 230-375 - Academic Coordinator Series

c. Recruitment

PPM 230-500 - Recruitment – General

d. Salary Administration

PPM 230-610 - Salary Increases
PPM 230-620 - Off-Scale Salaries for Appointments and Advancement

2. File Deadlines

Review File Submission Deadline
CAP – Committee on Academic Personnel

The academic review process is based on principles of fairness and equity. Adherence to deadlines helps ensure personnel cases are treated equitably. Administrative delays are inherently unfair to candidates who provide required file materials in a timely manner. An academic review file that is not submitted for campus review by the established deadline, linked below, may not be considered until the next academic review cycle.

Visit the Academic Personnel Services Academic Review & Appointment Life-Cycle webpage for a visual representation of the academic review process.

Applicable Intercampus Recruitment (APM 510) procedures and deadlines should be considered when coordinating the submission of appointment files. Please reference Section 2.0 of this process manual for additional information. While posted campus deadlines do not apply to academic appointment files, departments and deans need to be cognizant of deadlines for the receipt of files that require committee review and should plan well in advance of the appointee's proposed start date. See Section 1.1.2.c below for details

a. School & Departmental Deadlines

Dean's offices will establish deadlines that allow for the review of files well in advance of published campus deadlines. Similarly, department chairs will establish deadlines for the submission of academic review file materials to enable departments to submit files by established dean's deadlines (and likewise, campus deadlines).

Departments should contact their dean's office for applicable school deadline dates.

Departmental deadlines may not be later than the published file cut-off date for actions effective the following July 1st. In addition, an academic appointee undergoing review may not add bibliographic or other documentation reflecting activities or accomplishments beyond the

published file cut-off date of June 30th. Departments, in consultation with their respective chair and dean, may establish earlier cut-off dates.

All academic review files must be submitted to the appropriate dean's office by the dean's established deadline.

About Joint Files

For academic review files involving the reappointment and/or review of a candidate appointed in two or more departments, the home department must take special care in coordinating the review to allow each department adequate time to meet all applicable deadlines.

Joint academic appointment and review files should include a copy of any established and/or applicable memorandums of understanding (MOU) detailing the candidate's assigned involvement and responsibilities across the multiple departments that compose their FTE.

MOU are not required in cases where only one appointment is salaried and the rest are non-salaried or, where all joint appointments are non-salaried.

b. Campus Deadlines

All academic review files are due to Academic Personnel Services (APS) on or before the due dates set forth on APS' Campus File Deadlines webpage. The posted dates reflect campus file deadlines for the current academic year and are updated each summer to reflect deadlines for the upcoming academic year. Deans' offices must forward files subject to campus-level review to Academic Personnel no later than the stated deadlines in order for actions to be effective July 1st. Files received after the specified deadlines will require an effective date for the following July 1st.

Files received after the published deadline without an approved extension will be returned to the department for submission the following year.

c. File Submission

Academic appointments and review files must be submitted via Interfolio Review, Promotion & Tenure (RPT) and compiled in accordance with established policies and procedures, with submission to the proper reviewing authorities.

Visit the Academic Personnel Services Interfolio webpage for additional information related to RPT.

3. Most Common Academic Series Used at UCSD

a. Professor Series

- **Professor (Assistant, Associate, Full, Above Scale "Distinguished Professor")**

  The professorial series is used for members of the faculty of an academic or professional college or school of the University who have instructional as well as research, University, and public service responsibilities. The terms "regular rank" and "Ladder Rank" are other names for the Professorial series.

  Tenure: Yes (Upon promotion to Associate)

  Senate Membership: Yes

- **Professor In-Residence (Assistant, Associate Professor, Full)**

  Professor In-Residence titles are used for individuals supported by non-state funds who engage in teaching, research or other creative work, as well as University and public service.

  Tenure: No

  Senate Membership: Yes

- **Professor of Clinical X (Assistant, Associate, Full)**

  These are faculty members whose predominant responsibilities are in teaching and clinical service, and who also engage in creative activities.

  Tenure: No

  Senate Membership: Yes

- **Adjunct Professor (Assistant Adjunct Professor, Associate Adjunct Professor, Adjunct Professor)**

  Titles in this series may be assigned to individuals who are predominantly engaged in research or other creative work and who participate in teaching, or to individuals who contribute primarily to teaching and have a limited responsibility for research or other creative work.

  Tenure: No

  Senate Membership: No

- **Health Sciences Clinical Professor (Assistant, Associate, Full)**

  Appointees in the clinical series teach the application of basic sciences and clinical procedures to clinical practice in all those areas concerned with patient care.

  Tenure: No

  Senate Membership: No

i. Non-Professorial Instructional Series

- **Teaching Professor (Assistant, Associate, Full, Above Scale "Distinguished Teaching Professor")**

  This series is used for appointees who are faculty members with instructional, University, and public service responsibilities.

  Tenure: No

  Security of Employment: Yes

  Senate Membership: Yes (for full time appointees only)

- **Professor of Practice (and Visiting Professor of Practice)**

  Appointees in this series are distinguished professionals, either practicing or retired, with specific expertise in their fields, and though leaders in their fields, do not have traditional academic backgrounds.

  Tenure: No

  Senate Membership: No

- **Supervisor of Teacher Education**

  This title is used for individuals who are responsible for activities/classes in the Teacher Education Program. This title normally is concurrent with a non-salaried Lecturer title.

  Supervisor of Teacher Education salaries are based upon the Supervisor of Teacher Education salary scale.

  Tenure: No

  Senate Membership: No

- **Lecturer (Pre-Six, Continuing, Sr. Continuing) – Non-Senate Instructional Unit**

  This title is assigned to a professionally qualified appointee not under consideration for appointment in the professorial series whose services are contracted for certain teaching duties, often for limited periods or for part-time. Please note, this series is represented under by the American Federation Teachers (AFT), please refer to the UC-AFT Labor Agreement for additional series guidance.

Tenure: No

Senate Membership: No

j. Research Series

– **Research Scientist Series (Assistant, Associate, and Full)**

Research Scientists are expected to carry out independent research programs, to be leaders in an academic field, and to provide service to the academic and public communities. They are engaged personally and directly in research and do not have teaching responsibilities. This title is not intended for individuals whose duties are merely to provide technical assistance to a research project. The review criterion for this tier parallels that of Ladder Rank Faculty. Please note, this series is represented by the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), please refer to the UC-UAW Labor Agreement for additional series guidance.

Tenure: No

Senate Membership: No

– **Project Scientist Series (Assistant, Associate, and Full)**

Project Scientists are expected to make significant and original contributions to university research programs; however, they do not function as independent or principal investigators and are not required to possess the scholarly breadth and academic leadership expected of Professorial and Research Scientist appointees. Project Scientists either serve as ongoing members of a research team or have appointments of limited duration to participate in specific research projects. Please note, this series is represented under by the International Union, United Automobile, aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), please refer to the UC-UAW Labor Agreement for additional series guidance.

Tenure: No

Senate Membership: No

– **Specialist Series (Jr., Assistant, Associate, and Full)**

The specialist series is used for academic appointees who are engaged in research in specialized areas and who do not have any teaching responsibilities. Specialists provide research projects with special skills, experience, and knowledge in support of research, rather than conducting research, and they generally work under the direction of a member of the Professorial, Research Scientist, or Project Scientist series. Please note, this series is represented by the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), please refer to the UC-UAW Labor Agreement for additional series guidance.

Tenure: No

Senate Membership: No

k. Other Series

- **Academic Administrator Series**

  The duties of the position in this series administer programs that either 1) provide service to academic departments, but not as totally or exclusively research or teaching activities; or 2) serve the general public and may be either research or educational in nature.

  Tenure: No

  Senate Membership: No

- **Academic Coordinator Series**

  The duties of the position administer academic programs that provide service closely related to the teaching or research mission of the University e.g. academic departments, students, general public.

  Tenure: No

  Senate Membership: No

1.2 Department Chair Responsibilities

1. Department Chair's Role

As the academic leader and administrative head of the department, the chair is responsible for the recruitment, selection, and evaluation of faculty and other academic personnel. In consultation with colleagues, the chair recommends appointments, promotions, merit advances, and terminations. The department chair is responsible for ensuring that faculty members are aware of the criteria prescribed for appointment and advancement, and for making academic personnel recommendations in accordance with University of California, UC San Diego, School and Department procedures and principles. See APM 245. Appendix A for Duties of Department Chairs (or Equivalent Officers)

The department chair or equivalent officer should ensure that an academic action, or file, is prepared and forwarded for review by the applicable authority for each of the following:

- Candidates under consideration for appointment (Academic Appointments).
- Appointees under consideration for advancement (Academic Reviews) either with or without an expected appointment end date.

  In adherence to APM 220-80, the department chair is responsible for making certain that there is an annual review of the status and performance of each faculty member in the department including those who are not eligible for advancement. This annual assessment may include an interview with the academic appointee. The Department Chair's Toolkit is available to assist department chairs with their responsibilities.

About Non-Reappointment

For many academic series, reappointment is not automatic. Department Chairs should ensure non-reappointments, adhere to policy and application notification requirements.

2. Department Chair Conflict of Interest (COI)

If a department chair's participation in preparing an appointment or review file presents a conflict of interest the department 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.

Conflicts of interest include, but are not limited to the following:

- Near relatives (see APM 520 for definition)
- Financial interests
- Active or close collaborations (collaboration within the last five (5) years)
- Current or past mentorship relationships

For additional information related to conflict of interest, please see Section 1.6 of this manual.

3. Interdisciplinary Programs or Units

If an appointee has significant research, teaching, and/or service obligations in an interdisciplinary program or organized research unit (ORU), the chair of their department should ask the program coordinator or ORU director to evaluate the academic appointee's contributions in those programs or research units. If the academic appointee is eligible for promotion and their primary research and creative activity falls within the interdisciplinary area, the department chair should also ask the program coordinator to suggest appropriate external referees. However, the department chair will make the final selection of referees.

4. External Referee Letters – Appointments & Reviews

Related Manual Sections:	**2.4.10**	**3.4.15**	**3.4.16**	**3.4.17**

Letters of evaluation from referees external to UC San Diego are required for most academic appointment files (except for visiting appointees) and for certain academic review actions. It is important to solicit external referee evaluations well in advance of preparing a review file, especially an appointment file, so that delays in file submission can be avoided. The required number of referee letters varies depending on the review action as detailed below:

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 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.

a. Selection of External Referees

Careful selection of external referees is very important. The department chair should solicit evaluations from individuals who are independent of the candidate or academic appointee, who are experts in the candidate's field, and who are able to provide an objective appraisal of the academic's work. When possible, letters should be included from those who know candidates only through their work. Department Chairs are encouraged to review CAP's Guide to Selecting External Referees.

When external letters are included in a file, either when required or when included at the department's discretion, the referee letters should be from senior scholars who are at the same rank or higher than that proposed for the appointee, and who are independent of the candidate. If external referees are not senior scholars or are not independent of the candidate, the department must explain why they were selected as the best-qualified referees and obtain additional independent referees. This information should only appear on the Referee I.D. list.

Use of external referees whom reviewers may not regard as objective or independent evaluators, either because they are too close to the candidate professionally (e.g., collaborators, thesis supervisors, etc.) or because they have a personal relationship with them, may be included if they shed light on collaborations. However, these are considered *non-independent letters* and do not count toward the minimum number of required external letters. Evaluation letters from colleagues in a candidate's department also will not count towards the required number of external referee letters. The department chair must give the candidate or academic appointee the opportunity to suggest names of persons to be solicited for letters of evaluation.

Candidates may also 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 review file. See APM 220

Other names should be added to this list by the department chair in consultation with a departmental review committee (or departmental faculty with expertise in the candidate's field if there is not a departmental review committee convened).

Actions requiring three external letters must include a minimum of two letters from department-selected external referees with the remaining letter coming from the list of referees suggested by the candidate. Actions requiring five external letters should include a minimum three letters from department-selected external referees with the remaining two letters being from the list of referees suggested by the candidate. Additional letters from referees suggested by a candidate or selected by the department are acceptable as long as applicable campus minimum requirements are met. Current appointees and potential candidates may not solicit their own evaluation letters. The majority of the letters should be from those selected by the department in all cases.

It is expected that units will use the solicitation templates provided for appointments and reviews on the Academic Personnel web site.

All external referee letters formally solicited and received by the department must be included in the file, whether or not the final departmental recommendation requires external letters. For example, if the department solicits letters for a promotion and, after reviewing those letters, determines that an action other than a promotion (e.g., merit advancement) is appropriate, the external letters received and reviewed by the departmental faculty must be included in the file so that campus reviewers consider identical file documents. If the departmental practice is to conduct an availability check or pre-solicitation, the response is not needed in the file. Only formally solicited letter responses should be included.

About External Referee Declinations

When an external referee responds with a declination, the referee's declination, whether in memo, letter or email format, should be labeled with the corresponding Referee ID number and included in the file.

A best practice is for departments to share a candidate's curriculum vitae, redacted biobib, publications and/or links to publications, as well as the candidate's personal statement with external referees. Departments are encouraged to impress upon candidates the importance of maintaining a neutral tone in their personal statement, and refraining from arguing for a specific outcome. Some departments may routinely share other documents with external referees (teaching evaluations, teaching statements, COVID statements, etc.). Departments are encouraged to document its internal processes so faculty are aware of what is sent to reviewers. The same documents and/or links to publications should be sent with the solicitation letter to each external referee.

b. Electronic Solicitation of External Referees

External letters may be solicited and received electronically, **but they must be submitted with an email cover letter or electronic signature from the referee to verify authenticity.** A copy of the department's letter to the external referees, reflecting the date the letter was sent, must be included in 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, indicating the date the letter was sent and the names of the recipients.

c. Use of Applicant Letters from AP On-Line Recruit

For appointments at Assistant step I, II, and III, the department may include the reference letters solicited via the AP On-Line Recruit system.

d. Handwritten External Referee Letters

The department should provide typed versions of any handwritten letters received; both the handwritten and typed versions of the letter must be included in the file.

e. External Referee Letters in a Foreign Language

Translations of letters written in foreign languages must be included in the file, along with the original untranslated versions. At the end of the translation, the translator must be identified by name and position held. Candidates may not serve as translators for letters solicited for their appointment files.

f. Unsolicited Letters of Evaluation

Unsolicited letters of evaluation that are added to the file by the candidate or academic appointee are not considered confidential and should be labeled "provided by candidate."

Unsolicited letters received by the department may be included in the file at the department chair's discretion. Before including an unsolicited letter in an appointment file, the department chair must send the University's confidentiality statement to the letter writer and obtain a signed or electronic authorization to use the unsolicited letter in the file. The authorization, the unsolicited letter, and the department chair's letter transmitting the confidentiality statement should be included in the file.

g. Additional External Evaluation Information

i. See Process Manual Section 1.2.5.a for external evaluations related to Teaching Professor Series.

ii. See Process Manual Section 1.2.5.b for external evaluations related to the Project Scientist and Specialist Series.

5. Teaching and Mentoring Evaluations

Departments are encouraged to request feedback from mentees and graduate students as a regular form of collecting evidence of teaching effectiveness instead of tying periods of letter collection to a faculty member's advancement cycle. When requesting mentee and graduate student input, solicitation letters should not reference the specific academic review action under consideration to prevent inadvertently involving students in the promotion/advancement process.

Much like the background information included with responses from external evaluators, files that include solicited student letters should also include a summary of how the letters were collected/solicited. Specifically, the file should include a description of the criteria used to select letter writers, and a notation identifying those solicited at the department's request and/or those requested by the candidate.

a. Teaching Professor Series

For advancement in the Teaching Professor (LPSOE/LSOE/Sr. LSOE) series, external evaluation letters must be solicited from individuals who are professionally independent from the academic appointee; however, additional evaluation letters may be solicited from referees from within UC San Diego as a tool to assist the effective evaluation of an academic appointee's contributions to pedagogy on campus.

b. Project Scientist and Specialist Series

For advancement in the Project Scientist and Specialist series, evaluation letters may be solicited from individuals who are not professionally independent of the academic appointee; however, additional letters from more independent sources should be obtained if possible.

In cases in which the department chooses not to solicit letters from external referees, campus reviewers may later recommend that the department do so.

6. Academic Appointment Responsibilities

a. Funding

The department chair must ensure that funding is, or will be available, for the prospective appointee prior to forwarding the appointment file for consideration. For an appointment requiring an FTE, the department chair must also ensure that an FTE has been secured. The department chair should consult with the school dean's office if they are unsure about the availability of funding.

b. Department Letter

The department chair is responsible for discussing in the departmental recommendation letter an overview of the recruitment conducted by the department for the position, the voting process used, and the degree of consultation within the department.

1.3 Academic Appointee Responsibilities – Submission of Review Materials

1. General

Academic appointees must provide evidence of achievement in each of the criteria specified for their series, see table in Section 1.5.1 of this manual. Appointees are responsible for assuring the accuracy of provided information and meeting the department's deadlines for submission of academic review file materials. Failure to do so may result in the academic review action being delayed until the next July 1 effective date.

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 consultation and review of the material. The academic appointee should also be informed of the degree of additional departmental review and asked to sign Certification 3 as an indication of their awareness that the material has been added to the file.

Historically, UC San Diego has used an October 15th material cutoff date for academic review materials, however, effective academic year 2025-2026 all VC areas are expected to begin a two-year transition to a new June 30th material cutoff date. Please refer to the May 13, 2025, dated Academic Personnel Advisory for additional guidance on the transition to a June 30th material cutoff date.

About the June 30th Material Cutoff Date Transition

Implementation of a June 30th material cutoff date will occur over a two-year period.

Academic year 2025-2026 will serve as a transitional year followed by mandatory adoption effective academic year 2026-2027.

Academic appointees scheduled for review effective July 1, 2026 (2025 – 2026), will have the option to compile their reviews using either an October 15th or June 30th date. The option to choose between October 15th or June 30th is reserved for appointees scheduled for review effective July 1, 2026.

Academic appointees should be informed of their option to select between the two cutoff dates and departments should mention the selected cutoff date in the academic review file.

For units where a June 30th cutoff date is the norm, appointees scheduled for review academic year 2025 – 2026 will not receive the option to select between June 30th or October 15th.

See section 2.4.7 of this manual for information on candidate certifications.

2. Academic Appointee Materials

Related Manual Sections:	2.4.16	3.4.24	3.4.25	3.4.26

Academic appointees are expected to submit the following materials as applicable:

a. Biography and Bibliography Form (Biobib)

A biobib is the equivalent of a curriculum vitae (CV) but in UC San Diego's standardized format. A biobib is meant to document an academic's employment history, publication history, grant funding, instructional & mentoring activities, service, awards, and clinical activity where applicable.

Items listed in a biobib should have their associated start and end dates clearly stated and service contributions should specify whether it was at the department, school, or University level. Additionally, as many areas of research become increasingly collaborative, it has become imperative for campus reviewers to have the ability to accurately assess the contributions and overall responsibilities of individual authors engaged in multi-authored research. To that effect,

all candidates should clarify the extent of their contributions for every multi-authored piece listed in their Bio-Bibliography form. Authorship clarifications should be presented in a standardized manner and should appear after each entry in the biobib.

About Multi-Author Publications

Authorship clarifications should be presented in a standardized manner.

Pertinent models as to how to do this across fields already exist, including models used by the journals Nature and PNAS. CAP has noted they strongly prefer brief statements describing contributions to multi-author publications.

Files lacking multi-author descriptions will be returned to the department for revisions.

About Biography/Bibliography Resources

Instructions on the completion of a Biography/Bibliography Form can be found here.

Additional insight on how to best prepare a Biography/Bibliography for reviewers can be found by visiting the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel webpage and reviewing the various documents housed under Guidelines for File Preparation, Annual Reports, Where CAP Stood, Tips for Personnel Files, and Frequently Asked Questions.

b. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness (If Applicable)

i. Examples include syllabi, evaluations, testimonials, thank-you letters, etc. **Candidates should refrain from directly soliciting their students for letters related to their advancement and/or review.**

c. Copies of publications from the review period.

i. **Electronic publications** can be submitted via a shareable online file depository link. Examples include Google Drive or Microsoft One Drive.

ii. **Hardcopy publications** can be submitted to Academic Personnel Services. For assistance with submitting hardcopy publications, please contact your assigned Academic Personnel Analyst.

About a Candidate's Failure to Submit Requested Materials

If an academic appointee does not provide updated material for the academic review file, the department chair should proceed with the review based upon the information that is available to the department. Although policy does not indicate a required number of attempts, departments should make a good faith effort to acquire the appointee's participation, common campus practice is three (3) attempts, and document of the effort should be included in the file if/when the candidate does not comply. In these situations, the submitted academic review file should document the department's efforts to obtain file materials from the appointee (e.g., copies of written requests/reminders).

3. Personal Statement

Related Manual Sections:	**2.4.9**	**3.4.14**

Academic appointees are strongly encouraged to provide a concise personal statement describing their research and creative activity, teaching, and service within the review period (which may include more detail than the Bio-Bib form). They may explain any extraordinary responsibilities and accomplishments and the significance of their research and creative activity and its impact on their field. They may also wish to provide information to ensure that special efforts, such as development of a new class, or unusual service contributions, are fully recognized and credited. Candidates are also encouraged to directly address any weaknesses in the file, such as negative teaching evaluations or student comments and any plans for improvement.

If an academic appointee provides a personal statement regarding their achievements and future plans, this document should be so titled, and candidates should be encouraged to sign and date it. In the absence of a signed and dated personal statement, Certification 1A will suffice.

See section 2.4.7 of this manual for information on candidate certifications.

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 should 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.

4. Career Reviews (Promotion to Tenure/Security of Employment, Promotion to Full, Advancement to Step VI, Advancement to Above-Scale)

Academic appointees undergoing a career review should include scholarly accomplishments since their last career review, as well as a description of significant work produced earlier in their academic careers. For promotions to tenure where progress on future projects or independence is required, appointees should explain how they meet the criteria.

5. Academic Appointees with Teaching Responsibilities

Academic appointees with teaching responsibilities should provide information on the courses they have taught and graduate student mentoring. If the teaching involved the establishment of a new course, major revision of a course, new innovations in teaching, or other extraordinary efforts, these should be described. Academic appointees should also describe their service contributions, indicating whether they chaired any committees and detailing their committee responsibilities and workloads. Responses to both positive and negative student feedback is appreciated by campus reviewers as is discussion of plans for improvement in future course offerings.

6. Career Equity Review

Related Manual Sections:	**3.2.13**

If eligible, academic appointees may initiate a Career Equity Review (CER). An academic appointee is responsible for requesting a CER at the time of their regular, on-cycle academic review. See Section 3.2.13 of this document for additional information on Career Equity Reviews.

1.4 Department Consultation & Voting

1. General

The department chair is responsible for complying with the provisions of Academic Senate Bylaw 55, departmental bylaws, as well as all applicable academic personnel policies and procedures regarding academic reviews.

Departments may develop their own rules, if necessary, for consultation or voting on academic personnel actions not covered by Academic Senate Bylaw 55. The establishment and revision of departmental bylaws requires Academic Senate review.

The department chair must make clear in the departmental recommendation letter the degree of consultation with the faculty.

Departments and ORUs should establish voting procedures for academic review actions for Research Scientists.

2. Departmental ad hoc committees

Related Manual Sections:	**2.4.8**	**3.4.13**

Although the department chair is responsible for documenting and presenting the departmental recommendation, a departmental ad hoc committee may be appointed to advise the chair.

Departments are encouraged to document in bylaws how departmental ad hoc committees are used.

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.

When using ad hoc committees, chairs should ensure the following:

a. Remind ad hoc committee members of the confidential nature of their assignment;

b. Verify the academic appointee's mentors, co-authors, or collaborators do not chair ad hoc committees. However, they may serve as committee members if their expertise is needed. In these cases, an explanation of why they were asked to serve should be included below the signature block on the ad hoc committee report;

If the departmental ad hoc report fails to describe the content and importance of research and/or creative activity, this should be included in the departmental recommendation letter.

3. Departmental Vote

The results of a department vote must be reflected accurately on the appropriate UC San Diego Academic Summary form and thoroughly discussed in the departmental recommendation letter. Except in unusual circumstances, whenever University or departmental policy requires a vote on a proposed action, the action must be supported **by at least 50% of the members eligible to vote and in residence on campus in the quarter when the vote is taken**. Unusual circumstances may make it impossible to comply with this rule. In such cases, the department chair should explain the circumstances in the recommendation letter. In general, a proposal where the vote does not comply with Bylaw 55 requirements should not come forward from the department. Files forwarded without an explanation of why the 50% threshold is not met will be returned as incomplete and risk delayed review.

If faculty members are on approved leave away from campus, or otherwise are unavailable, they should be counted as absent. If known, the reasons for negative votes should be explained in the departmental letters. **Departments should encourage faculty to list the reasons why they do not support a proposed action, if possible, so that it is easy to include comments in the departmental recommendation letter.** Members of the voting faculty who are on the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel or who will comment on the file (i.e., deans, etc.) should abstain. The department chair may also choose to abstain.

Methods of voting, including the use of mail ballots and electronic voting systems are at the discretion of the department within the constraints of Bylaw 55. Departments are strongly encouraged to document departmental voting procedures in bylaws, and the departmental voting procedures must be provided to the Committee on Academic Personnel. It is expected that voting faculty will familiarize themselves with the candidate's academic file in order to render an informed vote.

Using the following guidelines, votes should be solicited in accordance with Bylaw 55 (when applicable) and departmental bylaws:

a. Faculty should be notified that the file is available for review and that voting will be conducted for a designated period of time that is consistent for all actions voted on.

b. Votes should be tallied at the end of the voting period and the results recorded on the Academic Recommendation Summary form and discussed in the departmental recommendation letter.

c. Except for appraisals, votes should be “for,” “against,” “abstain,” or “absent,” as defined below:

FOR	The voter is in favor of the proposed action.
AGAINST	The voter is not in favor of the proposed action.
ABSTAIN	The voter is available but has elected to refrain from voting.
ABSENT	The voter is unavailable for voting due to an approved leave or other absence from campus.

1.5 Series Appointment & Advancement Criteria

1. General

The main appointment and advancement criteria at UC San Diego vary depending on the appointee's academic series. The chart below indicates the specific required (indicated by X) and desirable/allowable (indicated by Y) criteria for each academic series.

About Departmental Recommendations

Accomplishments in each of these areas, as well as other performance-related information, must be discussed in the departmental recommendation letter. Follow the APM policy links for each series for detailed information.

Academic Criteria as Derived from Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 210, Review and Appraisal Committees

Academic Series	Teaching and Mentoring	Research & Creative Work	Scholarly or creative activity	Creative Work	Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity, Including Creative Activity	Professional Competence & Activity	University & Public Service
Professor (Ladder-Rank)	X	X				X	X
Professor in Residence	X	X				X	X
Professor of Clinical X	X			X		X	X
Health Sciences Clinical Professor	X		X			X	X
Adjunct Professor	X	X				X	X
Professor of Practice	X	X[a]				X	X
Teaching Professor (LSOE)	X				X		X
Professional Research (Research Scientist)	Y[1]	X				X	X[b]
Project Scientist		X				X	
Specialist		X				X	X[c]
Academic Administrator		Y[2]				X	X
Academic Coordinator		Y[2]				X	X
Librarian Series		X				X	X
Continuing Educator						X	X

[a] Contributions to the research and/or creative mission of the University, with emphasis on professional practice and leadership contributions

[b] Academic appointees at the Associate and Full level are expected to engage in University and/or public service in accordance with policy.

[c] Specialists may engage in University and/or public service provided these services comply with the requirements of the candidate's funding source. Such service should be related to the candidate's area of professional expertise and achievement. Service activities may be at the level of the department, the organized research unit (ORU), the college/school/division, the campus, the University, and/or the public.

Y[1] on occasion, a Research Scientist whose full-time salary is administered by the University participates in the instructional program. In order to engage in formal instruction and/or significant participation in the instructional program, the individual must be appointed in a salaried

instructional title. The service requirement may be interpreted flexibly; service activities should be focused on the professional development of the appointee and may include teaching.

[2] Although an Academic Administrator or Coordinator may oversee a program involving research, responsibility for engaging in research, while desirable, is not required for this series.

About Contributions to Diversity

Contributions to diversity may appear as a component to any of the above listed appointment and advancement criteria. Contributions to diversity are encouraged and worthy of discussion in an academic's appointment and/or review file.

A new appointment is defined as employment of an individual whose immediately prior status was:

a. not in the employ of the University of California, San Diego, or

b. in the employ of the University of California, San Diego, but in a series that is different than the series being proposed. (This is commonly referred to as a "series change.")

c. in the employ of the University of California, but at another campus in the UC system.

Once a department has identified a need to hire an academic in a specific area and has received approval from the appropriate authority (e.g., school dean, EVC, Chancellor) to go forward with the hire, a recruitment begins and a search ensues. Once a final candidate has been identified, an appointment file is then prepared. The appointment file highlights the candidate's professional achievements and qualifications as they relate to the criteria for the academic position they are being proposed for. It also includes documentation of the department's assessment of the candidate and provides the record that campus reviewers will read, further assess, and then document their recommendation on the hiring of the prospective candidate.

Department chairs are expected to propose appointments and prepare appointment files in compliance with policy (see table above).

Once the file has progressed through all levels of review, the final authority for the appointment proposal will render a final decision. An approval by the final authority results in an official offer letter to the candidate.

1.6 Conflicts of Interest

The department chair is responsible for curing all conflicts of interest. In all cases where a conflict of interest exists involving the department chair (or equivalent), the chair should not participate in the preparation of any aspect of the academic review file, including appointments. The vice chair or another independent senior faculty member should oversee the process, prepare the department recommendation letter, and issue solicitation letters as applicable. The department chair (or equivalent) may participate in the faculty discussion and vote according to bylaw 55 and department bylaw voting rights.

Examples of conflicts of interest include:

a. Mentors, Co-Authors & Collaborators

A collaborator should be recused if they have published with the appointee/candidate within the past five (5) years.

b. Financial Interest

A conflict of interest may occur when an individual has a financial interest in a University decision. There is financial interest if an employee can reasonably foresee that the decision will have a material effect on:

- Any business for profit or any real property.
- Any source of income.
- Any business entity in which an employee is a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or holds any management position.

Such information should be included in a proposed file, and the department chair or conflicted faculty member should not participate in the preparation of any aspect of the proposed action.

c. Near Relatives

For definition of "near relative," see APM 520.

Recusals due to near relatives or relationship status should be documented in the departmental letter.

2.0 Academic Recruitment and Appointment

1. General

An open recruitment is required to propose a candidate for a new academic appointment, including appointments involving inter-campus transfers from another UC institution and/or series change appointments.

No action may be taken on a proposed appointment until the recruitment process has been completed, unless the appointment is exempt as noted below.

– Appointments Exempt from Open Recruitment:

i. Appointments of UC San Diego academic personnel to "Recalled" status.

ii. Appointments to "Visiting" titles when a candidate is on leave from another university, college, or public or private research laboratory.

iii. Non-salaried appointments.

iv. Positions requiring student status, e.g., teaching assistant, research assistant, tutor.

b) Additional Recruitment Considerations

– Non-U.S. Citizens

Departments should consult with the International Services and Engagement Office (ISEO) regarding visa and work-authorization requirements for the appointment of non-U.S. citizens. The ISEO process should be initiated well in advance of the candidate's proposed appointment effective date to avoid unnecessary delays.

– University of California Inter-Campus Recruitments

As part of the University of California system, UC San Diego must adhere to the procedures outlined in APM 510. This means UC San Diego is required to keep the candidate's home campus informed the candidate's proposal for appointment and any offer that results from it.

i. Authority

Responsibility for notifying a proposed candidate's home campus is delegated to the office with authority to approve the appointment.

- Academic Personnel Services (APS) is responsible for issuing intercampus notices for files where the final delegated authority is the Sr. AVC, EVC, or Chancellor.

- Academic Personnel representatives at the school level are responsible for issuing intercampus notices for files where the final delegated authority is the cognizant dean or equivalent.

ii. Intercampus Notifications

1. Courtesy Notification

   Per APM 510, no offer of appointment that includes an intercampus transfer shall be made after April 1st for service during the immediately following academic year.

   If it is expected that a proposed appointment review will be completed and an offer issued prior to April 1st for the following academic year, UC San Diego should issue a courtesy notice to the candidate's home campus informing them their Senate faculty member is being considered for appointment at UC San Diego.

2. Courtesy Notification + April 1st Waiver Request

   Per APM 510, no offer of appointment that includes an intercampus transfer shall be made after April 1st for service during the immediately following academic year.

   If it is expected that a proposed appointment review will not be completed and an offer issued prior to April 1st for the following academic year, UC San Diego should issue a courtesy notice that includes a request to waive the April 1st deadline.

3. Letter of Intent (LOI)/Offer Letter 10-Day Notice and Waiver Request

   Per APM 510, at least ten working days before issuing a formal offer (or LOI), UC San Diego must notify the candidate's home campus and provide the details of the proposed LOI or offer. The 10-day notification period will begin from the date the notice is issued to the candidate's home campus.

   When informing the home campus of the intent to issue an LOI or offer letter, UC San Diego can also request that the home campus waive the 10-day notice period. UC San Diego may issue the proposed LOI or offer letter

upon confirmation of waiver by candidate's home campus or once the 10-day notice period has passed, whichever occurs first.

iii. Intercampus Transfer Salaries

Per APM 510, when considering a Senate faculty appointee from another UC for appointment in a Senate faculty title at UC San Diego, UC San Diego may only offer advancement and/or a salary increase of no more than one step, or the equivalent of one step, above the transferee's **current step and salary**. If the candidate's current home campus salary is an off-scale salary, the UC San Diego may offer the next higher step along with the same off-scale dollar amount.

If, at any time during the recruitment, the home campus is reviewing the faculty member for a salary increase and/or advancement to become effective at a later date, the recruiting campus may not offer more than one step above the current salary until the review is complete.

If the home campus personnel action occurring during the recruitment results in a salary increase and/or advancement, UC San Diego may offer a salary, rank and step equivalent to the increase and/or advancement.

If the Senate faculty member is also being recruited by an outside non-UC institution, then the home and/or UC San Diego may make a counter-offer higher than the above limits in order to compete with a bona fide outside offer.

– California State University Employees

Combined teaching appointments at the University of California and the California State University (CSU) may not exceed 120% of full time, except for University Extension service. That is, CSU faculty who are employed 100% time may be appointed at UC San Diego up to 20% time with written authorization by the appropriate dean at the CSU campus.

– Recruitment of Near Relatives

The employment of near relatives in the same department is permitted when the near relative relationship is disclosed and the appointment is pre-authorized. For additional information, refer to APM 520, Recruitment/Employment of Near Relatives.

– Series Changes

A change in series is described as a current academic appointee's movement from their current academic series to a different academic series. Series change proposals are considered appointment files and should include all the components of an appointment file.

2.1 Limitations on Total Period of Service in Certain Academic Titles

Related Manual Sections:	3.2.14	3.2.15	3.2.23

1. General

University of California policy (APM 133) and UC San Diego policy (PPM 230-133) provide limits on periods of service in certain academic titles. Total University service in the academic titles listed in Column A in the tables below is limited to a maximum of eight years (referred to as the eight-year limit). Periods of service on any campus of the University of California in any combination of the titles listed in Column B below count toward the eight-year limit. At UC San Diego, this eight-year limit is known as the "probationary period."

If a candidate for appointment to a series listed in Column A has had prior University of California service in any of the titles listed in Column B, **it is the department's responsibility to compute the maximum remaining years of service allowable in the proposed title and to inform the candidate of the remaining years of service allowable for the UC San Diego appointment.**

University policies (PPM 230-15 and PPM 230-133) allow extensions to the probationary period if certain conditions are met. Depending on the reason, the appointee would either complete the Family Accommodations Reporting Form and submit it to their department chair, or request an exception to policy by completing the Policy Exception Form with any supporting documentation, and submit all to the department chair.

TABLE 1

COLUMN A	COLUMN B
UC San Diego titles subject to a limitation on total period of service:	**Previous periods of service on any campus of the University of California in any combination of the following titles count toward the eight-year limit:**
• Assistant Professor (Ladder-Rank) • Assistant Professor in Residence	Professor series and related titles • Instructor • Assistant Professor • Acting Assistant Professor • Acting Associate Professor • Acting Professor • Visiting Assistant Professor • Visiting Associate Professor • Visiting Professor Supervisor of Physical Education series • Junior Supervisor of Physical Education • Assistant Supervisor of Physical Education Professor in Residence series • Instructor in Residence • Assistant Professor in Residence

	Astronomer series and related titles • Junior Astronomer • Assistant Astronomer • Acting Junior Astronomer • Acting Assistant Astronomer • Visiting Assistant Astronomer Agronomist in the Agricultural Experiment Station series and related titles • Junior Agronomist • Assistant Agronomist • Acting Junior Agronomist • Acting Assistant Agronomist • Visiting Assistant Agronomist **Note**: Appointment at less than full time to a title in this section while in student status on any UC campus will not count toward the 8yr limit.

TABLE 2

COLUMN A	COLUMN B
UC San Diego titles subject to a limitation on total period of service:	**Previous periods of service on any campus of the University of California in any combination of the following titles count toward the eight-year limit:**
• Assistant Teaching Professor (Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment*) • Senior Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment*	Lecturer titles at ***more than 50% time*** • Lecturer • Senior Lecturer • Assistant Teaching Professor (Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment) • Senior Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment Professor series and related titles • Instructor • Assistant Professor • Acting Assistant Professor • Acting Associate Professor • Acting Professor • Visiting Assistant Professor • Visiting Associate Professor • Visiting Professor Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) series • Assistant Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) Health Sciences Clinical Professor series • Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor at ***more than 50% time***

Note: Candidates with the title of Lecturer or Senior Lecturer who do not have the potential for security of employment are not subject to the limitation on total period of service.	Supervisor of Physical Education series • Junior Supervisor of Physical Education • Assistant Supervisor of Physical Education Professor in Residence series • Instructor in Residence • Assistant Professor in Residence Adjunct Professor series • Adjunct Instructor at ***more than 50% time*** • Assistant Adjunct Professor at ***more than 50% time***

TABLE 3

COLUMN A	COLUMN B
UC San Diego titles subject to a limitation on total period of service:	**Previous periods of service on any campus of the University of California in any combination of the following titles count toward the eight-year limit:**
• Acting Assistant Professor • Acting Associate Professor • Acting Professor • Visiting Assistant Professor • Visiting Associate Professor • Visiting Professor • Assistant Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) • Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor at more than 50% time • Assistant Adjunct Professor at more than 50% time	Professor series and related titles • Instructor • Assistant Professor • Acting Assistant Professor • Acting Associate Professor • Acting Professor • Visiting Assistant Professor • Visiting Associate Professor • Visiting Professor Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) series • Assistant Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) Health Sciences Clinical Professor series • Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor at ***more than 50% time*** Supervisor of Physical Education series • Junior Supervisor of Physical Education • Assistant Supervisor of Physical Education Professor in Residence series • Instructor in Residence • Assistant Professor in Residence

	Adjunct Professor series • Adjunct Instructor at **more than 50% time** • Assistant Adjunct Professor at **more than 50% time** Astronomer series and related titles • Junior Astronomer • Assistant Astronomer • Acting Junior Astronomer • Acting Assistant Astronomer • Visiting Assistant Astronomer Agronomist series • Junior Agronomist • Assistant Agronomist • Acting Junior Agronomist • Acting Assistant Agronomist • Visiting Assistant Agronomist Lecturer titles at ***more than 50% time*** • Lecturer • Senior Lecturer • Assistant Teaching Professor (Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment) • Senior Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment

TABLE 4

COLUMN A	COLUMN B
UC San Diego titles subject to a limitation on total period of service:	**Previous periods of service on any campus of the University of California in any combination of the following titles count toward the eight-year limit:**
• Assistant Research Scientist	• Assistant Research Scientist • Associate Research Scientist • Research Scientist • Visiting Assistant Research Scientist
• Assistant Project Scientist	• Assistant Project Scientist • Associate Project Scientist • Project Scientist • Assistant Research Scientist • Associate Research Scientist • Research Scientist

2. Calculation of Years of Service Prior to Appointment

The following rules must be observed when calculating years of service at another UC campus:

a. For purposes of calculating service toward the eight-year limit, service on any campus of the University of California counts. “On any campus” means “anywhere in the University system.”

b. All years of service on any campus of the University of California are counted. If there is any break in service, whether because of leave without salary or because of resignation and subsequent reappointment, service prior to the interruption counts toward the eight-year limit. For example, if an individual who previously served as an Assistant Professor on one campus is appointed as an Assistant Professor on another campus after a break in service, all previous years of service count toward the eight-year limit.

c. Years of service are calculated from the beginning of the first complete semester or quarter of service.

d. For an academic-year appointee, eight years will consist of 16 complete semesters or, under the quarter system, 24 complete quarters, or a combination of these, with one semester equal to one and one-half quarters. However, no academic-year appointee may accrue more than three quarters of service credit in any one fiscal year toward the eight-year limit unless the fourth quarter was approved under an arrangement to provide compensatory time off and that year is immediately preceded or succeeded by a two-quarter year of service.

e. For a fiscal-year appointee, eight years will consist of 96 months of completed service, inclusive of accrued vacation time.

f. An appointment at any percentage of time, including 0% or without salary, counts toward the eight-year limit, unless otherwise specified in Table 1 above. Appointments that are at 0% time because the appointee is on leave may be eligible for exclusion, as specified below.

g. Complete semesters or quarters of service for an academic-year appointee and complete months of service for a fiscal-year appointee will be counted regardless of the percentage of time of the appointment in alignment with percentage thresholds specified in Table 1 above.

h. Any break in service, whether because of leave without salary or because of resignation and subsequent reappointment, does not invalidate the counting of service prior to the interruption.

3. Applicability of Periods of Leave Toward Calculating Years of Service

i. Temporary Transfers or Change of Status

Temporary transfers or changes of status from Assistant Professor (or any other title listed in Column A above) to any other title or title series will be regarded as periods of academically related leave under this rule and will be counted toward the eight-year limit.

j. Without Salary Status

Except as provided in the additional provisions in 2.1.2.c below, periods of leave, whether with or without salary, will be counted toward the eight-year limit unless the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, after consultation with the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel, determines that the activity undertaken during the course of the leave was substantially unrelated to the individual's academic career. For new appointments, this determination is made on the basis of a petition filed at the time of the proposed appointment. In such cases, the Executive Vice Chancellor may permit the leave period to be excluded from service for the purposes of calculating the eight years.

k. Additional Provisions

i. Periods of childbearing and/or parental leave equal to or in excess of one quarter or one semester, whether with or without salary, are not included as periods of service for the purposes of calculating the eight years.

ii. The combined total of periods of leave excluded as unrelated to academic duties or as childbearing and/or parental leave may not exceed two years.

iii. See 4.1 Appendix B for information on COVID-19 related extensions of the probationary period

4. Appointments Subject to the Eight-Year Limit

Whenever possible, appointments subject to the eight-year limit should be made effective July 1st.

2.2 Appointment Considerations

1. General

Upon successful completion of an open recruitment, or when an open recruitment is not required, an appointment file must be prepared, with the department chair (or equivalent officer) responsible (with assistance and advice from the departmental and school academic personnel staff) for complying with the policies and procedures for appointment of academic personnel. This includes all recruitment requirements, as well as preparation and submission of academic appointment files in accordance with University and campus policies. It is the department's responsibility to submit appointment files sufficiently in advance to allow adequate time for completion of academic review prior to the proposed effective date.

2. Determining Salary

Salary scales for academics are issued by the University of California Office of the President. Current salary scales are on the Academic Personnel Services website.

a. Market Off-scale Salaries

A market off-scale salary component may be proposed for a candidate when marketplace conditions necessitate such measures to keep UC San Diego salaries competitive. All academic titles except student titles may be considered eligible for off-scale salary. For academic appointees covered by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), eligibility for off-scale salaries is determined by the terms of the MOU. Market off-scale salaries are not awarded to Health Sciences Compensation faculty.

Departments may propose a market off-scale salary component when a candidate has received a competing offer from a peer academic institution for appointment in a similar position, and/or is currently similarly employed by a peer institution. Departments should specifically address how the competing institution compares to UC San Diego and take this information into consideration when determining the proposed salary. Whenever possible, departments should discuss the ranking of the department of the competing institution relative to their own ranking.

See UC San Diego Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM) Section 230-620, Salary Administration – Off-Scale Salaries for Appointments and Advancement for additional information.

b. Entry Level Salary Agreements (ELSAs)

In disciplines in which market demands consistently require the award of market off-scale salary components, departments may propose an entry-level market off-scale agreement to

establish department-specific market off-scale salaries for new assistant-level appointees. The proposal should specify whether the entry-level market off-scale applies to the entire department or only to specific fields or disciplines within the department. Approved ELSAs are in effect for three years. Entry-level Salary proposal forms are available from Academic Compensation. Contact the school dean's office to find out if your department has an ELSA in place.

Absent an ELSA, market considerations within a specific discipline may justify an off-scale salary. Supporting information may include salary data from academic institutions of comparable stature and/or discipline-based salary studies by national organizations. Whenever possible, the department should include data from other University of California campuses. This data may be requested through the office of Institutional Research.

An off-scale salary must be in a multiple of $100 when the scale salaries of the relevant title series are multiples of $100. At UC San Diego, a market off-scale salary may not be the same as any salary on the published salary scale for the particular title or series.

Off-scale salaries for Acting appointees are determined in the same manner as those for regular ranks. Market off-scale salary components, once awarded, are typically maintained indefinitely.

See Section 3.2.4.c.i for information pertaining to market off-scale salary components and consecutive no-change actions.

Questions on how to establish a new ELSA or manage an existing ELSA should be directed to Academic Compensation at academicpersonnel@ucsd.edu

3. Determining the Departmental Recommendation

The series proposed for a candidate must be appropriate for the functions and duties they will perform. Special attention must be paid to the criteria for appointment specified for each academic series.

When establishing the rank and step for a candidate, a department must give due consideration to the candidate's experience and accomplishments.

4. Determining Work Authorization Compliance

Department chairs are responsible for ensuring compliance with the Department of Homeland Security regulations. Candidates who are not U.S. Citizens must hold the appropriate Visa before beginning employment. The department should contact the International Faculty and Scholars Office for guidance as soon as it is aware that a candidate has visa or work authorization issues.

5. Appointment Effective Date

An appointment may become effective only after approval by the appropriate authority.

Under no circumstances may a candidate begin work at UC San Diego before their academic appointment is approved.

Academic Year (AY) appointments end on June 30th of each academic year. AY appointees who resign or leave service mid-year may be required to pay back a portion of their paid salary.

a. Academic Year Appointments

Academic-year appointments must be effective at the beginning of quarterly pay periods (i.e., July 1 for fall quarter; November 1 for winter quarter; March 1 for spring quarter).

Academic year appointments may be retroactive provided the employee is in place before the start of the designated service period. (For example: Professor X is proposed for an appointment as Professor, Step I, effective July 1, 2018; however, the appointment file was not reviewed by the Committee on Academic Personnel until July 28, 2018, and the offer letter from the Chancellor is dated July 31, 2018. As long as the offer is officially accepted before the first day of fall quarter 2018 service period, the offer letter may state that the appointment is retroactive to July 1, 2018.)

About Academic Year Appointments and Separations

Academic year appointees (9/12 academic year appointees) will receive their annual academic year salary in twelve equal monthly installments. Appointees who receive their annual academic year salary over twelve equal installments over the period of July 1st through June 30th are prepaid to some extent, e.g., pay begins in July for service not rendered until mid-September.

When such an appointee separates from the University before the end of the academic year, the total amount actually owed for services from the beginning of the academic year to the time of departure may differ from the total of the salary installments received by the appointee. The amount of salary actually due for services rendered up to the date of separation will be compared with the total amount of pay already received. If the amount of pay already received exceed the amount owed, the appointee shall refund the difference to the University. If the amount owed exceeds the amount received, the University shall pay the difference to the appointee.

In general, academic year appointments processed after the beginning of the fall quarter service period, will be effective at the start of the immediately following quarter as illustrated below:

Academic Year Appointees Paid over 12 Months (09/12)			
Quarter	**Effective Date**	**Pay Period**	**Service Period**
Fall	July 1, 20XX	July August September October	Mid-September through December
Winter	November 1, 20XX	November December January February	January through March
Spring	March 1, 20XX	March April May June	April through mid-June

Academic Year Appointees Paid over 9 Months (09/09)			
Quarter	**Effective Date**	**Pay Period**	**Service Period**
Fall	October 1, 20XX	October November December	Mid-September through December
Winter	January 1, 20XX	January February March	January through March
Spring	April 1, 20XX	April May June	April through mid-June

b. Fiscal Year Appointments

Fiscal-year appointments may be effective on any date, preferably the first day of a month. Fiscal year appointments may not be retroactive.

6. Series Change (New Appointment)

An academic appointment may become effective only after it is approved in writing by the appropriate authority. Under no circumstances may a candidate begin work at UC San Diego before their academic appointment is approved. Series change appointments may not be retroactive.

7. Mid-Year Option

Per UC Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 200, General, years at rank and step for appointees are recorded as follows:

a) An academic year appointee who has served at least two full quarters in any fiscal year (July 1 through June 30) will receive one year's credit at rank and step.

b) An academic year appointee who has served just one quarter in any fiscal year (July 1 through June 30) will not receive credit for that year at rank and step.

c) A fiscal year appointee who is appointed during the period July 1 through January 1 will receive one year's credit at rank and step.

d) A fiscal year appointee who is appointed during the period January 2 through June 30 will not receive credit for that year at rank and step.

Non-Senate and Senate Assistant-level appointees with a proposed start date that aligns with scenarios b) and d) above, may elect or opt-out of the 'zero year' option by reading and signing the "Mid-Year Election Form." Departments meet with candidates during recruitment and describe the option and implications. The department recommendation letter should indicate which option the candidate selects.

For academic appointees in a series covered by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)/Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) with an exclusive bargaining agreement, mid-year options are available only to the extent allowed by the established and applicable MOU.

a. "Yes" to Zero Year Option

Academic appointees who elect "Yes" to a Zero Year Option elect to postpone the beginning of their first review cycle and delay their first academic review by one year. Appointees who elect "Yes" to the Zero Year Option cannot be appointed in their eligible academic series for more than eight (8) years.

Senate appointees who elect "Yes" to a Zero Year Option also understand that because they may not be appointed for more than eight (8) years, if promotion is postponed and ultimately not successful, they may have less than one (1) full year remaining following a negative promotion decision, and will be unable to ask for reconsideration of such a decision.

Things to consider:

i. Appointee eligibility for an academic review is delayed by one year but the appointee also gains an additional year to prepare for their first academic review.

ii. Senate appointees may, have less than one (1) full year's notice if not promoted.

iii. Time spent at "Zero Year" counts toward the appointee's 8-year probationary clock.

"Yes" Zero Year Example:

Appointee is hired effective 3/1/2024 as an Assistant Professor, Step 1 with a two (2) year review cycle.

Appointment Start Date/Effective Date:	3/1/2024
Zero Year Delayed Review Cycle Start Date:	7/1/2024
Next Review Effective Date:	7/1/2026
Eight (8) Year Probationary Clock Start Date:	3/1/2024
Probationary Clock End Date:	2/29/2032
Must be Promoted by Date:	7/1/2031

b. "No" to Zero Year Option

Academic appointees who elect "No" to the Zero Year Option acknowledge their first academic review cycle will coincide with their initial start date without delay. Appointees who elect "No" to the Zero Year Option cannot be appointed in their eligible academic series for more than eight (8) years.

"No" Zero Year Example:

Appointee is hired effective 3/1/2024 as an Assistant Professor, Step 1 with a two (2) year review cycle.

Appointment Start Date/Effective Date:	3/1/2024
Non-Zero Year Review Cycle Start Date:	3/1/2024
Next Review Effective Date:	7/1/2025
Eight (8) Year Probationary Clock Start Date:	3/1/2024
Probationary Clock End Date:	2/29/2032
Must be Promoted by Date:	7/1/2031

8. Timing of Appointment File Submission

The department chair is responsible for submitting the appointment file sufficiently in advance to allow adequate time for file review and to allow for the completion of the review process prior to the proposed effective date of the appointment. Retroactive appointments are not allowed except as noted above regarding academic year appointments.

Due to the degree of urgency that often accompanies new appointments, preparing a complete and accurate file is critical to avoid delays. Departments should notify their dean's offices as soon as they are aware of a potential new appointment. This may help to expedite the processing of the file.

2.3 Special Types of Appointments

1. Joint Appointments

Related Manual Sections:	2.4.5	3.2.24	3.3.7

A faculty joint hire may be proposed when two departments wish to collaborate to support multidisciplinary research and educational goals.

2. 0% Faculty Appointments

A 0% faculty appointment may be proposed to reflect a secondary department affiliation and may only be proposed for UC San Diego faculty with a current, salaried Professor (ladder-rank) appointment. Such appointments require a faculty vote from the home department and the receiving department and are limited to a term equal to one review cycle. Reappointments may be proposed at the time of regular review.

Additional details on the composition of a 0% faculty appointment can be found here.

3. Acting Appointments

The Acting prefix is used for either probationary or conditional appointments in the Professor (ladder-rank) or Teaching Professor (LSOE) series and may be for a one- or two- year probationary period. (See PPM 230-235 for conditions when a department may propose an Acting title.) A regular file is prepared for such proposals.

When certain specific requirements have been met (such as receipt of the terminal degree in the field, e.g. Ph.D., or acquisition of the appropriate visa), regularization to the regular title may be proposed. A change to a regular appointment may be made upon receipt of official certification that an appointee has completed all formal degree requirements or received the appropriate immigration credential. Upon receipt of credentials, the applicable authority will issue a final regularization appointment action letter. For other regularizations, a file is required and are subject to review and recommendation by the Committee on Academic Personnel.

When a change to a regular appointment is approved for an academic-year appointee, the change in title shall be effective with the beginning of the quarter following the date of completion of all formal degree requirements. For fiscal-year appointees, the change in title will be effective at the beginning of the month following the date of completion of all formal degree requirements.

4. Visiting Appointments

The Visiting prefix is used to designate one who is appointed temporarily to perform the duties of the title to which the prefix is attached. (PPM 230-230-00.) The criteria for appointment in a Visiting title will be the same as for the corresponding regular title.

The departmental recommendation letter should describe the expertise a visitor brings to the campus, clearly state the individual will return to their home institution upon completion of the visiting appointment, and justify the salary recommended.

Visiting appointments may be made for up to a one-year period and may not exceed two consecutive years. A regular appointment file should be prepared for such proposals.

5. Recall Appointments

Individuals who have retired from a University of California academic appointment and who receive retirement income (or have received a lump sum pay out) from the University of California Retirement Plan (UCRP) are considered retired academic appointees and may be recalled to active service. (PPM 230-205-00.)

Academics may be recalled to perform teaching, research, and/or administrative service duties if there is a departmental need and adequate funding. A minimum 30-day break in service after the date of retirement is required before a recall appointment begins.

Generally, recall appointments are approved for only one year at a time and are self-terminating.

Recalls of up to three years may also be submitted in conjunction with the Pathways to Retirement Program.

The maximum compensation limit is 43% per month of the individual's salary at the time of retirement (range adjusted to current dollars). This limit applies to appointments at any UC campus during a rolling twelve-month period.

Recall appointments are not an entitlement and are contingent upon funding and programmatic considerations. Recalled appointees are not eligible for merit or promotion increases.

Departments may enter into pre-retirement recall agreements under the Pathways to Retirement Program with faculty who are age 60 or older and have at least five years of UCRP service credit Pathways to retirement plans must be approved by the Executive Vice Chancellor–Academic Affairs (route via the Associate Vice Chancellor–Resource Administration).

Recall appointments may be proposed by completing a submitting a Kuali RTAD Form and following the instructions provided in the Kuali RTAD Form FAQ and EDM.

6. Temporary Academic Coordinator Appointments

School Dean's (or equivalent) may appoint candidates in the Academic Coordinator series on a short term urgent temporary basis for up to one (1) year.

Regardless of the appointment's temporary nature, an analysis and critical evaluation of a candidate's qualifications should still occur, and a "mini" file should be compiled with inclusion of the following documents:

- Academic Appointment Summary
- Dean's Appointment Letter
- Candidate's Acceptance
- Academic Review History (When Available)
- Department Letter
- Candidate Certification (When Applicable)
- Candidate Biography/Bibliography

Reappointment of a candidate past the initial one (1) year period will require the candidate apply to an available open recruitment and a file be submitted for committee review.

2.4 Preparing an Appointment File

1. General

The following items should be presented in an appointment file in the order listed below. All documents received and reviewed by departmental reviewers, 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.

2. Review History

A UC Academic Review History must be included if the proposed candidate has had previous UC academic employment, including service at another UC campus. The review history should show periods of service and the title, step, percentage of time, and department for each period. The review history should cover the candidate's entire period of academic employment at any UC institution. Also, be sure to show periods of leave, including sabbaticals and leaves without pay. Salary information should not be listed.

About System Generated Review History Documents

System generated review histories only include UC San Diego history to the extent available in AP Data, generally beginning in the mid-90s. Departments/schools are welcome to include addendum histories detailing employment at other UC institutions or periods prior to those available in the AP Data system.

3. Departmental Recommendation Letter – Appointments

Related Manual Sections: 3.4.7

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

For joint appointments, the home department is responsible for preparing the file and providing copies of evaluations and recommendations from a candidate's other departments. The chairs of each department may either submit separate letters of recommendation or elect to co-author one letter. The letter(s) should indicate the degree of consultation in each department or program, as well as the candidate's expected role in each area.

Recruitment 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 appointment file altogether.

If the department chair and the candidate 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 appointment file and draft the departmental recommendation letter. To determine if the candidate has collaborated with the department chair or vice chair, check the candidate's bio-bib to see if they have published with the appointee within the past five (5) 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.

In accordance with the procedural regulations of the Academic Senate and established governance practices of the department, the department chair is responsible for drafting the departmental recommendation letter, which is a presentation of the department's recommendation of appointment based upon the evaluation of the appointee by all eligible members of the department. The letter should include:

a. The proposed title, rank, step, salary, effective appointment date(s), and any funding contingencies. These should be specified in the first paragraph.

b. A brief description of the recruitment conducted by the department for the position, or a description of the waiver request, and how the candidate was selected. Other applicants should not be identified in this description, either by name or by a description of their activities or affiliations.

c. Justification of the recommended rank, step, and salary based on the criteria specified for the series, including justification for a market off-scale salary, if applicable. If the market-off scale salary proposal is based on an Entry Level Salary Agreement (ELSA) please indicate in the letter.

   If and when available, it's recommended departments provide reviewers with a comparative statistical analysis as way to further justify a proposed rank and step,

d. A description of the nature and extent of consultation on the proposed appointment 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.

e. Verify that a complete file was presented for voting members' consideration, and present the results of all votes taken, including the reason(s) (if known) for any negative votes. Departments are required to document in the appointment file the participation and membership of the departmental ad hoc committee, but the departmental recommendation letter should not mention committee members' names.

f. A description of the candidate's expected role(s) in the department whether salaries or non-salaried: research to be conducted and/or classes the candidate will teach; the candidate's anticipated contribution to the department's instructional mission at both the undergraduate and graduate levels; a description of the department's teaching requirements and how the candidate's teaching load meets those requirements (for applicable titles); and a description of the type of service that will be expected of the candidate.

g. A thorough evaluation of the candidate's qualifications in accordance with the specific criteria established for the proposed series. This includes a full and detailed evaluation of the candidate's scholarly and creative achievements, a description and evaluation of the candidate's teaching experience and effectiveness, and assessment of their professional reputation in the academic community.

h. When published work in joint authorship (or other product of joint effort) is presented as evidence, it is the responsibility of the department chair to establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in the joint effort. The department should identify the extent to which the joint work meets the specified research expectations.

i. For appointments with teaching responsibilities – If available, the departmental recommendation letter should include a meaningful assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness at previous institutions at both the undergraduate and graduate levels of instruction. Departments may also wish to review APM 210, Instructions to Review and Appraisal Committees, for a better understanding of the criteria and standards used by campus review committees when advising on actions concerning prospective appointees in the instructional titles.

j. A summary of the external referees' assessments of the candidate, ensuring that individuals who have provided confidential letters of evaluation are not identified in the departmental letter except by code as assigned on the Referee I.D. list. Excessive quoting of referees' letters should be avoided, and referees should not be identified, either by name or by a description of their activities or affiliations. Departments should identify on the Referee I.D. list any referees who have conflicts of interest in recommending the candidate and from which letters should not be considered independent.

k. All department recommendation letters for appointment should include the name of a senior faculty member or members who will serve as a mentor to the candidate (this includes assistant-level appointees, as well as associate and above ranks).

l. A statement from the chair regarding any conflicts of interest. See Section 1.2.2 and 1.6 for potential conflicts of interest.

m. For visiting titles - Describe clearly the special expertise that the visitor brings to the campus, that the appointment is for limited duration, and clearly state that the individual will be returning to the home institution upon completion of the visiting appointment.

n. For Salaried Professor of Practice titles – When proposing a salaried appointment in the Professor of Practice series, the department must clearly articulate the candidate's expected

contributions and specifically discuss how these contributions justify appointment at the proposed percentage of effort. The department must further articulate the expected impact of the candidate's expected contributions to the department and explain the manner in which the candidate's engagement with the department will be commensurate with the percentage of effort of the appointment.

o. For Acting titles – When an acting prefix is used to indicate the lack of Ph.D. for an Assistant Professor candidate whom the department intends to transfer to a regular rank Assistant Professor title, or in the rare case when used at the Associate or Full level (e.g. when the appointee lacks teaching experience), the appointment file proposing the Acting title must clearly indicate the department's recommendation regarding metrics to be achieved for regularization.

4. Department Chair's Independent Letter (If Applicable)

Related Manual Sections: 3.4.6

The 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.

5. Memorandum of Understanding (If Applicable)

Related Manual Sections: 2.3.1 3.2.24 3.4.9

When a department is proposing to hire a candidate to serve in two or more department(s), proposing appointment to a Senate title at less than 50% effort, and/or a permanent multi-campus appointment, a copy of a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) 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 that the candidate will hold.

This MOU will also be included in all future academic review files for the candidate.

About Joint Appointment Memorandums of Understanding (MOU)

An MOU is expected for all joint appointments in which a faculty member holds a salaried appointment in more than one department. MOUs for non-salaried secondary appointments are encouraged, but not required. The MOU shall include expectations as to teaching load, research expectations, academic reviews, and any other applicable conditions of employment.

6. Dissenting Letters (If Applicable)

During the recruitment of a candidate, in rare instances, some faculty in the hiring department may not agree with the departmental recommendation. Policy allows these faculty to submit a letter of dissent to include in the appointment 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.

7. Certification Forms (If Applicable)

For candidates who are current UC academic employees Certification 1-A and 2 are required for appointment files. Departments should schedule review files in a manner to provide all candidates a specified period of time to complete these certifications.

a. Certification 1-A: Certification of Department Review

   Should be signed by the candidate after the file is complete, but before the file is evaluated by departmental faculty.

b. Certification 1-B: Certification of Departmental Committee Report (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.

c. Certification 2: Certification of Departmental Recommendation Access

   Should be signed after the departmental recommendation has been determined.

d. Certification 3: Certification of Additional Materials (If Applicable)

Should be completed if additional material is added to a file after determination of an initial department recommendation and its submission to campus reviewers.

The purpose of the certifications is to ensure that proper procedures have been followed, so it is important that they be signed at the correct point in the review process and that the candidate understands their significance. Certification 2 is placed in front of Certification 1-A in the file.

8. Departmental Ad Hoc Report (If Applicable)

Related Manual Sections:	1.4.2	3.4.13

Although the department chair is responsible for documenting and presenting the departmental recommendation, a departmental ad hoc committee may be appointed to advise the chair.

Departments are encouraged to document in bylaws how departmental ad hoc committees are used.

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.

When using ad hoc committees, chairs should ensure the following:

c. Remind ad hoc committee members of the confidential nature of their assignment and ensure the ad hoc has clear information on the criteria for advancement at the relevant rank and step;

d. Verify the academic appointee's mentors, co-authors, or collaborators do not chair ad hoc committees. However, they may serve as committee members if their expertise is needed. In these cases, an explanation of why they were asked to serve should be included below the signature block on the ad hoc committee report;

If the departmental ad hoc report fails to describe the content and importance of research and/or creative activity, this should be included in the departmental recommendation letter.

9. Candidate's Personal Statement (Optional)

Related Manual Sections:	1.3.3	3.4.14

The candidate is strongly encouraged to provide a personal statement regarding their academic achievement and future plans.

10. Solicitation Letter to External Referees

Additional Applicable Sections:	1.2.4	3.4.15	3.4.16	3.4.17

External referee letters are required in most academic appointment files. Letters from external referees typically evaluate the candidate's accomplishments, stature, and/or potential and are an extremely important part of any appointment proposal. Individuals asked to provide their opinion should be solicited in writing. Detailed instructions for the selection of external referees are located in Section 1.2.4 of this manual.

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.

a. Preparation of Solicitation Letters

Examples of solicitation letters to prospective external referees are available on the Academic Personnel web site. Units are expected to use the pre-approved solicitation letter templates, and the required University confidentiality statement always must be included. If the department would like to deviate from the standard language, it is essential to review the proposed text with the Academic Personnel Office prior to sending the solicitation letter to referees.

External letters may be solicited and received electronically, but they must be submitted with an e-mail from the referee as evidence of authenticity. For Assistant-level appointments proposed at Step I, II, or III, letters of evaluation from the candidate's mentors and others at the home institution are acceptable; however, additional letters from more independent sources should be obtained if available.

A copy of the 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.

EXTERNAL INDEPENDENT REFEREE LETTER REQUIREMENTS	
Academic Appointments	
Assistant Rank Appointees Assistant Teaching Professor (LPSOE)	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 (LSOE) Teaching Professor (Sr. LSOE)	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. Although letters are no longer required for merit advancement to/through Step VI, they constitute a prime method of establishing a candidate's national recognition, especially in the absence of other awards showing such recognition or when needed to justify an extraordinary case, such as a multiyear acceleration.	

11. Referee I.D. List

The Identification and Qualifications of External Referees list (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 candidate. All referees who are solicited should be

listed on the form, whether or not they responded, whether or not they provided a letter, and it should be indicated whether they were selected by the department or by the candidate.

12. External Referee Letters

All responses to solicitations for letters from external referees should be included in the file (including, for example, responses stating that they do not have time to write an evaluation).

Letters should be coded to correspond to the Referee I.D. list (the letter from the person designated as Referee A on the form should have the corresponding letter "A" in the upper right-hand corner of all pages; the letter from Referee B should be coded with "B," and so forth). See Section 1.2.4 for additional information.

In cases where the department is aware a referee is not independent, they should include an explanation of why the referee was solicitate in the Referee I.D. list.

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.

13. Teaching Evaluations

When a candidate who has teaching experience is being proposed for an appointment that requires teaching, the appointment file must include a thorough evaluation of teaching experience and effectiveness, as well as copies of past teaching evaluations. If the candidate has no prior teaching experience, the departmental letter soliciting external letters should request an assessment of the candidate's potential teaching effectiveness.

14. Level of Administrative Responsibility (LAR) Form (If Applicable)

The Level of Administrative Responsibility (LAR) Form is only used for the appointment of Academic Administrators and Academic Coordinators. It provides an overview of the budget, personnel, and space that will be under the candidate's supervision.

15. Job Description (If Applicable)

A job description must be provided in appointment files for the Academic Administrator and Academic Coordinator series, along with an explanation of the candidate's role in the program and within a larger unit, if appropriate.

16. Academic Biography & Bibliography Form

Related Manual Sections:	1.3.2	3.4.24

The UC San Diego Academic Personal Data Form and Biography/Bibliography portion of the UC San Diego Academic Biography and Bibliography packet must be prepared and submitted with all files. Academic appointments can be accompanied by a candidate's curriculum vitae (CV) with an annotated publication list in lieu of a UC San Diego review-formatted bibliography. The bibliography portion must comply with the written instructions provided in the packet and should be reviewed and signed by the candidate. If the candidate is unavailable for signature, the form should be so annotated, and a signature should be obtained at the earliest opportunity. The department may also obtain the candidate's signature via email and include in the file.

If a CV and publication list are submitted, the list should be annotated so that the publications are listed and numbered in chronological order from least to most recent (i.e., the oldest publication is numbered 1, the next oldest is numbered 2, etc.) If any listed items are in the process of being submitted, accepted, or in press, they should be annotated accordingly.

Instructions on how to complete a UC San Diego Biography/Bibliography can be found here.

About New Appointment Biography/Bibliography Requirements

The Academic Biography Data Form must be completed and included in new appointments, but a CV with an annotated publication list may be submitted in lieu of the UC San Diego Bibliography section.

17. Other Items that Accompany an Appointment File

a. Publications or Comparable Items

Copies of the candidate's most important publications, completed work in manuscript form that has been accepted for publication, and published reviews of any publications should be forwarded with the file, unless a functioning electronic link to the publications is provided in the CV or bibliography. Films, CDs, and other items may be submitted in addition to or instead of published works, as appropriate for the candidate's discipline. Many if not most

candidates select the top 5 to 10 items they consider to be representative of their seminal works.

18. Submitting an Appointment File

All personnel reviews are submitted in the Interfolio system. Click here to visit the Interfolio resource page on the APS website.

Appointment files are started and prepared at the department level and once completed are submitted as follows:

a. **General Campus** – submit files to the appropriate school's dean's office.

b. **Health Sciences** – submit files to the Vice Chancellor HS Academic Affairs Office, School of Medicine

c. **Scripps Institution of Oceanography** – submit files to the SIO Academic Personnel Office.

19. Appointment File Outcomes

After an appointment file is submitted, it is routed to various reviewers as indicated in the Authority and Review Chart. These vary between the General Campus, Health Sciences and SIO, but for appointments may include the school dean, the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), the Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor. 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 the final appointing authority:

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:

I. 90 days for additional information requests involving the solicitation of additional referee letters or teaching evaluations/materials

II. 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 appointment effective date being updated to a later date.

b. Preliminary Assessment

If reviewers' recommendations differ 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.

c. Offer Letter

If the appointment is approved as proposed, the final appointing authority will issue an offer letter addressed to the candidate. Check with your school dean as to the distribution of the offer letter to the candidate, as practices vary. Candidates may be asked to sign and return a copy of the accepted offer to their department or school, but are generally only required to indicate acceptance within three weeks of the date of offer letter by emailing the general Academic Personnel inbox academicpersonnel@ucsd.edu.

If the proposed appointment is not approved, the department is notified by the appropriate authority. The department is responsible for informing the candidate.

Requests for an extended acceptance deadline may be submitted to the applicable delegated authority's office.

d. Implementing an Approved Appointment

Following receipt of the candidate's formal, written acceptance of the appointment offer made by the appointing authority, the department will be notified to implement the appointment online. Prior to entry of the appointment into UCPATH, the department should complete all required payroll forms. Immediately following PATH entry, appropriate payroll forms must be forwarded to the Payroll Office.

3 Academic Reviews

1. General

Once appointed, most academic appointees will undergo review for reappointment and/or advancement at designated intervals. This almost always requires that the department, school or unit prepares an academic review file for the appointee.

A review file is prepared when an appointee is due to be considered for one or more of the following actions:

a. Reappointment (for those whose appointments have specified ending dates)

b. Merit Advancement (regular or accelerated advancement from one step to the next within rank, e.g., the Associate Professor rank—or advancement to the next proposed salary level for those appointees not on steps)

c. Appraisal (assessment of an Assistant-level appointee's progress toward promotion)

d. Promotion (advancement from one rank to the next within a series, e.g., from Assistant to Associate Professor)

e. Termination

f. As required by the University of California Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 200, faculty review is required every five years

For those appointed at the Assistant rank, a formal appraisal is usually conducted at the time of a regularly scheduled review for advancement and/or reappointment, generally during the fourth year of appointment, but under certain circumstances, it may be conducted separately.

AP Data is equipped with a reporting feature that allows departments to run lists of eligible academics who are up for review. Instructions for this reporting feature can be found here.

3.1 Determining the Departmental Recommendation – Reviews

1. General

Advancement is contingent upon demonstration of achievement in each of the criteria specified for the appointee's series as detailed in section 1.5 of this manual. Normal periods of service are assigned to the various steps in the published academic salary schedules and are described in policy for each series. When reviewing each academic appointee within a department, the department chair is responsible for computing the number of years the academic appointee has served at rank and step in order to determine whether they are eligible for normal advancement.

An academic review file must be prepared and submitted for review for appointees serving in the final year of the normal period at step[1], even if the appointee is not recommended for advancement. However, in some situations, an appointee may request a Deferral. See Section 3.2.2 for Deferrals.

Below is a general guide for what is considered normal time in step:

Normal Time in Step					
Assistant Professor	**Associate Professor**	**Full Professor**		**Distinguished Professor Above Scale**	**Normal Period of Service at Step**
Step	**Step**	**Step**	**Step**	**No Steps**	
I					2 years
II					2 years
III					2 years
IV					2 years
V	I				2 years individually or combined
VI	II				2 years individually or combined
	III				2 years
	IV	I			3 years individually or combined
	V	II			3 years individually or combined
		III			3 years
		IV			3 years
		V*			open steps – 3 or more years
			VI*		open steps – 3 or more years
			VII*		open steps – 3 or more years
			VIII*		open steps – 3 or more years
			IX*		4 or more years
				No steps/just merits within Above-Scale	4 or more years between merit advancements

*Step V through Above Scale are considered "Open Steps" meaning service at Step V or above may be of indefinite duration.

- Advancement from Step V to Step VI will not occur before at least three (3) years of service in Step V.
- Advancement from Step VI to Step VII, from Step VII to Step VIII, and from Step VIII to Step IX usually will not occur before at least three (3) years of service at the lower step.
- Advancement from Step IX to Above Scale, and from Above Scale to Further Above Scale will not occur before at least four (4) years.

About Full Year Counts

Two or more full quarters of service at 50% time or more by an academic-year appointee in any one academic year (from the beginning of the fall quarter to the end of the spring quarter, as set forth in the academic calendar) count as one full year of a normal period of service. Fewer than two full quarters at 50% time or more in any one academic year does not count.

A fiscal year academic appointee who is appointed during the period July 1 through January 1 will receive credit for one year of service at rank and step. A fiscal-year appointee who is appointed during the period January 2nd through June 30th will not receive credit for that years' service at rank and step.

3.2 Reviews-Evaluation of Senate Assistant Rank Academic Appointees

1. General

The following are academic review action proposals that departments may choose to recommend:

Policy References	
Assistant-level Academic Appointees:	**Policy:**
Professor series	PPM 230-220*
Teaching Professor Series (LPSOE/LSOE)	PPM 230-285
Professor in Residence series	PPM 230-270
Professor of Clinical X Series	PPM 230-275
*Applicable to Assistant Teaching Professors (Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment-LPSOE) to the extent provided by policy.	

2. Deferral

Policy Reference:	230-220-86

With appropriate justification, an academic appointee may request that their regularly scheduled academic review be deferred. An academic appointee may request a maximum of two consecutive deferrals. Faculty on four-year review cycles may only be approved for one deferral in order to comply with APM 200-0, which requires that all faculty must be reviewed every five (5) years. Obtaining approval of a deferral request is the only alternative to recommending a no-change action.

An academic appointee may request a deferral of their academic review when:

a. There is evidence that work in progress will come to fruition within the year and that having the additional year will make a difference in the result of the next review; or

b. Circumstances beyond the academic appointee's control have impacted their productivity (i.e., illness, family member's illness, etc.).

The appropriate dean has the authority to approve the first deferral request. The Executive Vice Chancellor must approve a second consecutive deferral request. Deferral requests must be submitted to the academic appointee's department(s) no later than October 15 and are due to a candidate's Dean or Executive Vice Chancellor by date specified online here.

3. Reappointment and/or No Change

Policy Reference:	230-220-87

An academic review file must be prepared and submitted for review for an academic appointee serving in the final year of the normal period at step[1], even if the appointee is not recommended for advancement. However, in some situations, an appointee may request a deferral. See above for information on academic review deferrals.

About Deferral Review Files

If deferral of an academic review is approved, a review file must be prepared and submitted for appointees serving in the final year after deferral, not to exceed five years since their previous review, even if the appointee is not recommended for advancement.

A reappointment is required for continuation of a time-limited appointment. A reappointment may or may not be accompanied by a merit or promotion proposal.

A department should propose a no-change action if productivity is not sufficient to justify advancement, or if the academic appointee is unresponsive to departmental requests to submit updated file materials. For appointees subject to APM 137 – Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the department may allow the appointment to expire instead of recommending a no-change action. Departments should refer to APM 137 for procedures on notifying non-senate appointees of non-reappointment.

If the academic appointee has an off-scale salary component, its disposition should be discussed in the departmental letter.

After a no-change action takes effect, the academic appointee's review cycle will be reset for the normal two-, three-, or four-year cycle. Should the department propose advancement prior to the end of the academic appointee's normal review cycle, this action will not be considered an acceleration or off-cycle and grants candidates the opportunity to advance without penalty.

The appropriate dean has the authority to approve the first no-change action.

4. Consecutive No Change Actions

In cases where an appointee is proposed for a consecutive no change action, the department must discuss the reasons for the no change action in the departmental letter. Potential reasons include:

a. Full Service at a Barrier Step

[1]For appointees subject to APM 137, this applies only if the appointee is to be reappointed.

This is the case where an academic appointee fails to advance resulting from insufficient career accomplishments to pass through a barrier step, while continuing to provide full service to the University. For example, an academic appointee may continue to be productive in research and/or creative activities, teaching, and service at a level that would support normal merit advancement but may not be sufficiently productive at a level that would support promotion, advancement to step VI, or advancement to Above Scale.

Barrier steps are those steps that require the completion of a career review for appointees to advance (i.e. promotion, advancement to Step VI, or advancement to Above Scale).

b. Extenuating Circumstances

An academic appointee's failure to advance resulting from extenuating circumstances, such as the academic appointee's own illness, the illness of a family member, or other significant event outside of their control that impacted productivity and/or performance.

c. Insufficient Contributions

In the absence of extenuating circumstances, an academic appointee's failure to advance resulting from contributions which are insufficient in quality and/or quantity to support normal advancement.

i. When an academic appointee is proposed for a consecutive no change action due to insufficient contributions, the department or subsequent reviewers may propose the reduction or elimination of a market off-scale salary component at the time of future range adjustment actions.

ii. In cases in which an academic appointee receives a second consecutive no change action due to insufficient contributions:

The department chair, in consultation with the dean, must meet with the appointee to develop a plan to correct the deficiencies in the record contributing to the lack of advancement. This plan must be included in the next academic review file.

The academic appointee is ineligible to defer a regularly scheduled review until deficiencies in the record are corrected and the academic appointee advances.

Proposals for consecutive no change actions require review by the applicable committee (i.e. CAP).

5. Merit Advancement

Policy Reference:	230-220-80

If an academic appointee is serving in the final year of the normal period at step, they are eligible for a merit advancement (or promotion, if applicable and the appointee has met the criteria) on the following July 1.

A merit advancement is an advancement in step and salary rate (or advancement to a further-above-scale salary) without a change in title or rank.

6. Promotion

Policy Reference:	230-220

If an academic appointee is serving in the final year of the normal period at step, they may be eligible for merit advancement and promotion (if applicable and the appointee has met the criteria) on the following July 1.

A promotion is an advancement from one rank to a higher rank within a series and requires a full career review.

Promotion from the Assistant level to the Associate level, regardless of when proposed, is not considered an acceleration. Assistant-level appointees should be proposed for promotion whenever they are deemed ready for such advancement. However, a promotion to a higher-than-normal step at the Associate level is considered an acceleration.

If an Associate Professor is promoted to Professor after two years at step III, it is considered a normal promotion, even if the individual has not spent six years as Associate Professor.

Below is a general guide for promotion from the Assistant to Associate rank:

From Assistant Rank	To Associate Rank	Proposed Action
Step I	Step I	Promotion
	Step II	Promotion + 2 Year Accel
	Step III	Promotion + 4 Year Accel
Step II	Step I	Promotion
	Step II	Promotion + 2 Year Accel
	Step III	Promotion + 4 Year Accel
Step III	Step I	Promotion
	Step II	Promotion + 2 Year Accel
	Step III	Promotion + 4 Year Accel

Step IV	Step I	Promotion
	Step II	Promotion + 2 Year Accel
	Step III	Promotion + 4 Year Accel
Step V (1 Year at Step)	Step I*	Promotion (Lateral)^
	Step II	Promotion + 1 Year Accel
	Step III	Promotion + 3 Year Accel
Step V (2 Years at Step)	Step II	Promotion
	Step III	Promotion + 2 Year Accel
	Step IV	Promotion + 4 Year Accel
Step VI (1 Year at Step)	Step II*	Promotion (Lateral)^
	Step III	Promotion + 1 Year Accel
	Step IV	Promotion + 3 Year Accel
Step VI (2 Years at Step)	Step III	Promotion
	Step IV	Promotion + 2 Year Accel

* Like time at step requirement requiring two (2) years cumulative service

- Assistant V and Associate I
- Assistant VI and Associate II

^ Lateral promotion with partial completion of a cumulative two (2) year service requirement will require submission of an academic review the year immediately following promotion.

Below is a general guide for promotion from the Associate to Full rank:

From Associate Rank	To Full Rank	Proposed Action
Step III	Step I	Promotion
	Step II	Promotion + 3 Year Accel
Step IV (1 Year at Step)	Step I*	Promotion (Lateral)
	Step II	Promotion + 2 Year Accel
Step IV (2 Years at Step)	Step I*	Promotion (Lateral)
	Step II	Promotion + 1 Year Accel
	Step II	Promotion

Step IV (3 Years at Step)	Step III	Promotion + 3 Year Accel
Step V (1 Year at Step)	Step II*	Promotion (Lateral)^
	Step III	Promotion + 2 Year Accel
Step V (2 Years at Step)	Step II*	Promotion (Lateral)^
	Step III	Promotion + 1 Year Accel
Step V (3 Years at Step)	Step III	Promotion
	Step IV	Promotion + 3 Year Accel

* Like time at step requiring three (3) years cumulative service

- Associate IV and Full I
- Associate V and Full II

^ Lateral promotion with partial completion of a cumulative three (3) year service requirement will require submission of an academic review two (2) or one (1) year immediately following promotion.

7. Acceleration

Policy Reference:	230-220-88

Accelerated advancement is early advancement to a higher step and/or rank.

An appointee whose performance is at an exceptional level over an established normal review period at rank and step may be considered for accelerated advancement. Exceptional performance is defined as work that significantly exceeds the normal departmental expectations in one or more of the areas of review than would be required for normal merit advancement. Areas of review include research and other creative activities, teaching and mentoring, professional competence and activities, and university and public service. For a candidate to be considered for acceleration, they must meet established departmental standards for normal merit advancement in every area of review. Additional guidance on proposing accelerations may be found in the Academic Senate's "Where CAP Stood" reports.

Proposals for acceleration must address department standards for normal merit advancement and articulate the manner in which the academic appointee's performance is exceptional and exceeds what is otherwise required for normal merit advancement.

About Department Standards and Accelerations

Department standards should be included in all academic review files regardless of whether a candidate is proposed for normal or accelerated advancement. If not included as a separate document, departments standards should be thoroughly discussed in a department's recommendation letter.

8. Bonus Off-Scale Salary Components (BOS)

Policy Reference:	230-620-00

A bonus off-scale is a temporary increase in salary which is generally awarded in recognition of outstanding achievements exceeding what is required for normal merit advancement, but insufficient to support accelerated advancement. In limited circumstances, a bonus off-scale may be awarded in conjunction with a no change action, when an academic appointee's achievements in the review period demonstrate both full service to the University and progress in all series criteria, but fall short of what is required for advancement.

A Bonus off-scale salary component is equivalent to half the difference between an approved salary step and the next higher salary step on the applicable salary scale (or equivalent in series without formal steps).

Proposals for a Bonus off-scale salary component must address the department's standards for normal merit advancement and articulate the manner in which the appointee's achievements warrant the award of a bonus off-scale salary component.

About Calculating Bonus Off Scale Salary Components

$$\frac{\text{(Next Higher Salary Step)} - \text{(Approved Salary Step)}}{2} = \text{BOS}^{*}$$

*Bonus off-scale salary components are rounded to the nearest $100 if the scale rates for the applicable academic series are given in $100 increments.

In scenarios where the next higher step shares a like-time service requirement with a higher rank and step, use the higher rank and step to calculate the BOS.

If Next Highest Step Is	Calculate BOS Using
Assistant V	Associate I
Assistant VI	Associate II
Associate IV	Full I

Bonus off-scale salary components are paid over a single review period. Payments occur monthly for each year of the review period, and end on the effective date of the next review.

If an academic appointee is not proposed and approved for a new bonus off-scale salary component at the time of their next review, the bonus off-scale salary component will end as scheduled, which may result in a reduction in salary.

For academic appointees who defer their academic review by one (1) year, the deferral will only impact the appointee's review schedule but does not impact their rank, step, or salary components. Candidates advancing to or further Above Scale are not eligible to receive a BOS.

9. Market Off-Scale Salary Components (MOS)

Policy Reference:	230-620

A market off-scale salary may be proposed for an existing academic appointee when marketplace conditions necessitate such measures to keep UC San Diego salaries competitive.

a. Departments may propose a market off-scale salary when an academic appointee receives a competing offer from a peer academic institution for appointment in a similar position. Departments should specifically address how the competing institution compares to UC San Diego and take this information into consideration when determining the proposed value of a

market off-scale salary component. Whenever possible, departments should discuss the ranking of the department of the competing institution relative to their own ranking.

b. Market considerations within a specific discipline may also justify an off-scale salary. Supporting information may include salary data from academic institutions of comparable stature and/or discipline-based salary studies by national organizations.

Market off-scale salary components are typically maintained indefinitely and do not require re-justification following the initial award; however, when there is evidence that an academic appointee with a market off-scale salary component has failed to sustain their career trajectory or stature in the field, the department or subsequent reviewers may propose reduction or elimination of the market off-scale salary component.

When an academic appointee whose salary includes a market off-scale salary component advances to Above Scale, the market off-scale salary component is folded into the new above-scale salary.

An off-scale salary must be in multiples of $100 when the scale salaries of the relevant title series are multiples of $100. A market off-scale salary may not be the same as any salary on the published salary scale for the particular title or series.

10. Advancement to Step VI

Policy Reference:	230-220-18 b.

Full Professor/Professor in Residence/Professor of Clinical X/Adjunct Professor/Research Scientist Advancement to step VI usually will not occur after less than three years of service at step V. This involves an overall career review and will be granted on evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in each of the following categories: (1) scholarship or creative achievement, (2) University teaching, and (3) service. Above and beyond that, great academic distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, will be required in scholarly or creative achievement or teaching. Service at Professor, step V may be of indefinite duration however, faculty are required to undergo regular academic review with no more than 5 years between review.

About Professional Competence and Activity Criteria

As per APM 210, in certain positions in the professional schools and colleges, such as architecture, business administration, dentistry, engineering, law, medicine, etc., a demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to the field and its characteristic activities should be recognized as a criterion for advancement. A candidate's professional activities should be scrutinized for evidence of achievement and leadership in the field and of demonstrated progressiveness in the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems, including those that specifically address the professional advancement of the individuals in underrepresented groups in the candidate's field.

For advancement to Step VI, external referee letters are not required, but may be solicited at the department's discretion when helpful for demonstrating national or international prominence, highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, or excellent teaching.

Please note external referee letters are optional for advancement to Step VI outside of a Career Equity Review (CER).

11. Advancement to Above Scale

Policy Reference:	230-220-18 b.

Advancement to an above-scale rank involves an overall career review. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at step IX.

The normal salary increase for an academic appointee in the Above Scale category is either 50% or 100% of the difference between the top two steps of the salary scale (i.e., 50% or 100% of the salary increase between steps VIII and IX for the Professor and Research Scientist series.) Files proposing 100% of the difference between the top two steps must demonstrate exemplary performance in all areas (research and creative activity, teaching, service, and professional competence and activity as applicable[2]). In accordance with APM 210, a further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an above-scale salary level must be justified by continuing evidence of accomplishment consistent with this level. Continued good performance in all areas of applicable review criteria is not an adequate justification. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinite, and only in the most superior cases where there is strong and compelling evidence will an increase greater than 100% be approved, such cases will be considered accelerations.

[2] The evaluation of professional competence and activity generally focuses on clinical expertise or achievement and the quality of patient care. See APM 210

The honorary title of "Distinguished Professor/X/In-Residence" will be conferred on Ladder Rank and Health Sciences Faculty who advance to Above Scale; the title "Distinguished Research Scientist" will be conferred on those who advance to Above Scale in the Research Scientist series; and the title "Distinguished Teaching Professor" is conferred to those who advance to Above-Scale.

12. Career Equity Review

Related Manual Sections: 1.3.6

Policy Reference:	230-220-89

A Career Equity Review (CER) is available to Senate faculty members (excluding those at the Assistant or Above Scale level). The decision to initiate a CER rests solely with the faculty member. A CER may be initiated by a faculty member only at the time of their regularly on-cycle academic review by submitting a written request to the department chair or to the appropriate dean. CER may be requested only once while the faculty member is at the Associate Professor rank, once while at the Full Professor rank prior to advancement to Professor, Step VI, and once after advancement to Professor, Step VI, prior to advancement to Above Scale. If the request is submitted to the department chair, a copy should also be submitted to the dean by the department chair.

The request for a CER must contain the specific rank and step desired and justification for the recalibration. Possible justification may include, but is not limited to, the following assessments: 1) the cumulative record warrants an acceleration, even though no one review period did; 2) the rank-step was low at the time of initial appointment; 3) particular work and contributions should be reevaluated by the department and/or other reviewing bodies.

The faculty member must identify the specific area(s) of the record that they believe should be reevaluated. The faculty member may submit selected publications from earlier review periods that they consider relevant to the CER request.

The CER is conducted in parallel with the regularly scheduled academic review. The department chair should compile an academic review file that addresses the academic appointee's entire academic record for the purposes of the CER, as well as the regular action for the current review period. If the CER request involves advancement to or through a "barrier" step (promotion to full Professor or advancement to Professor, Step VI, or to Professor, Above Scale), the department must seek external referee letters addressing the barrier step advancement for inclusion in the file. Please note external referee letters are optional for advancement to Step VI outside of a CER. The academic review file must include the faculty member's request for the CER. The number of applicable independent referee letters is listed below in section 3.4.16.

The department should assess the academic appointee's accomplishments during the review period and determine its recommendation regarding the regular action (e.g., merit advancement). This should be done by a vote of the eligible faculty, if this is the normal department practice. The department should

then determine its recommendation regarding recalibration on the basis of a CER, and this must be determined by a vote of the eligible faculty. This recommendation should be based upon the academic appointee's overall record and the University's established criteria for the requested rank and step, with one exception: If a significantly higher rank or step is requested, the case will not require demonstration of the basis for an accelerated advancement. Proposals for a specific rank and step can be further justified by providing comparison data against those in the department already appointed at the requested rank and step including years since PhD, publications, funding, etc. The purpose of the CER is to assess rank and step, and therefore recommendation of a bonus off-scale salary award in lieu of recalibration is not appropriate.

Regardless of the department's recommendations, both review processes should be discussed in the departmental recommendation letter, and the vote(s) should be recorded on the Academic Recommendation Summary Form. The letter should also state what materials were evaluated in order to arrive at the recommendation regarding the CER. The summary should clearly indicate that the file is both a review for the regular action for the current review period and a career equity review.

If recalibration is approved, the effective date will be the same as that which would have applied to the regular action.

CERs are intended to supplement regular academic reviews, and they neither replace nor affect existing procedures for regular reviews.
Upon concluding an initial review or reconsideration request, the applicable final authority, as detailed UC San Diego's Authority and Review Chart, will render a final decision on the CER proposal, depending on the final action. This decision is not subject to appeal and is not retroactive.

13. Probationary Period

Related Manual Sections:	2.1	2.1.2	2.1.3	3.2.23

At UC San Diego, promotion consideration typically occurs in the sixth year of appointment at the Assistant rank. Please note this should not be interpreted to mean a candidate must serve six years of service at the Assistant rank. Promotion can occur at any time, from one to eight years, within a candidate's eight-year probationary period without consideration of acceleration. See Normal Time at Step chart in Section 3.1.1 of this manual. The period of time prior to consideration for promotion is referred to as the probationary period. During the probationary period, Assistant-rank appointees are expected to produce work sufficient to justify promotion. Note that there are limited circumstances in which the probationary period may be extended, most commonly as a family accommodation (see PPM 230-15 – Family Accommodations Policy).

14. Terms of Service

Related Manual Sections:	2.1	2.1.2	2.1.3	3.2.23

Each appointment at the Assistant rank is limited to a maximum term of two years. Reappointment may be for a period of less than two years only under the following circumstances:

a. An appointment or reappointment with an effective date other than July 1st must end on the second June 30th following the appointment date.

b. A promotion or merit advancement may become effective before the end of a two-year term and will mark the beginning of a new term of appointment.

c. When the status of an Acting or Visiting Assistant Professor is changed to Assistant Professor, the new appointment will normally end on the second June 30th following the effective date of the Acting or Visiting appointment. The combined initial period of service in the Acting or Visiting Assistant Professor title and the Assistant Professor title should not exceed two years. This also applies to candidates in an Acting or Visiting Assistant Teaching Professor title who transition to a regular Assistant Teaching Professor title.

d. A reappointment to a terminal period of service may be for a term of less than two years, provided adequate notice is provided (see below).

There is no assurance of reappointment, merit advancement, or eventual promotion. Decisions about reappointment and advancement are based upon careful reviews of an academic appointee's achievements and promise for continued growth in accordance with campus and University policy.

15. First Reappointment/Merit Review

The first reappointment/merit review of an Assistant-rank academic appointee normally occurs during the second year of appointment. (PPM 230-220-82 d.; APM 220-82) The department may propose:

a. Reappointment with Merit Advancement

If an academic appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department will recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.

Please note, an accelerated merit advancement may be proposed in place of a normal merit advancement if the appointee's file and performance support such a proposal.

b. Reappointment without Merit Advancement

If an academic appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment without advancement.

c. Non-Reappointment

Policy Reference:	PPM 230-220-82 d APM 220-82

If an appointee is not making acceptable progress, the eligible department faculty may vote to recommend non-reappointment at the end of the first two-year appointment period. When appointment at the Assistant rank is not to be renewed, an appointee will receive written notice from the Chancellor/Executive Vice Chancellor in advance of the expiration date.

The Committee on Academic Personnel must review a recommendation of non-reappointment for Senate faculty. The Chancellor/Executive Vice Chancellor has final authority to approve a recommendation of non-reappointment.

16. Second Reappointment/Merit Review

The second reappointment review of an Assistant-rank academic appointee normally occurs in the fourth year of appointment. (PPM 230-220-83.) The second reappointment/merit review is usually combined with an appraisal (see below).
As a result of the second reappointment/merit review, the department should submit one of the following recommendations:

a. Reappointment with Merit Advancement

If an academic appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.

Please note, an accelerated merit advancement may be proposed in place of a normal merit advancement if the appointee's file and performance support such a proposal.

b. Reappointment without Merit Advancement

If an academic appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with no merit advancement.

c. Non-Reappointment

Policy Reference:	PPM 230-220-82 d APM 220-82

If an academic appointee's performance is unacceptable, the department may consider termination. A recommendation to terminate an assistant-rank appointee requires a vote of the eligible department faculty and may only be recommended after the department has conducted an appraisal (see below).

17. Appraisal

An assistant-rank academic appointee must receive an appraisal, which is a formal evaluation of their achievements and progress toward promotion. (PPM 230-220-83; APM 220-80.)

An appraisal should provide an appointee with a careful, considered, analytical evaluation of their performance to date in the areas of research and creative work, teaching, professional competence and activity, and University and public service, as well as a candid assessment of their potential for promotion based upon the evidence.

External letters are not required for an appraisal.

If an academic appointee has been advised at any time of departmental concerns or reservations about continuation of appointment, this should be considered and stated in the departmental letter of recommendation. If the appointee has been advised in writing, a copy of such correspondence should be included in the academic review file.

a. Timing

Per PPM 230-220-83 , the appraisal is conducted in an appointee's fourth year of service at the Assistant rank (and is combined with the second reappointment/merit review), except when an extension of the probationary period has been granted. If the appraisal is not combined with the second reappointment/merit review, the appraisal must be presented in a separate academic review file.

b. Appraisal Vote

After evaluating and discussing an academic appointee's achievements and prospects for promotion, the eligible department faculty should vote on an appraisal rating. The possible appraisal ratings are as follows:

Favorable	Indicates that promotion is likely, contingent on maintaining current trajectory of excellence on appropriate external validation.
Favorable with Recommendations	Indicates that the candidate is on track for promotion to the Associate rank, apart from recommendations to eliminate identified weaknesses or imbalances in the present record.
Problematic	Indicates that promotion is possible if substantial deficiencies in the present record are remedied.
Unfavorable	Indicates that substantial deficiencies are present, promotion is unlikely.

c. If the Vote Results in an Unfavorable Rating

If the majority of eligible department faculty vote for an appraisal rating of "unfavorable," a second vote of the faculty should be taken to determine whether the department wishes to continue the appointment or recommend termination.

d. Result of Second Faculty Vote:

i. Continuation of Appointment is Recommended

When the appraisal is combined with a reappointment/merit review, the department must make a recommendation regarding reappointment and merit advancement. Reappointment with merit advancement indicates that sufficient work has been completed during the review period to justify merit advancement, and the potential exists for an appointee to make marked improvements prior to consideration for promotion. Reappointment without merit advancement indicates there has not been sufficient work completed in the review period to justify merit advancement, but the potential exists for an appointee to make marked improvements prior to consideration for promotion.

ii. Termination of Appointment is Recommended

Termination should be considered if the majority of voting faculty are convinced the substantial deficiencies cannot be corrected in time for consideration for promotion and therefore further effort will not result in promotion. The department letter should discuss the justification for the recommendation to terminate, as well as the details of the vote.

18. Promotion

If, as a result of the appraisal process, the department wishes to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full rank, the department must conduct a promotion review and solicit letters from external referees. In cases where a promotion is proposed at a time when a 4th year appraisal would normally be carried out; the promotion file should still include an appraisal.

19. Campus Review

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) reviews appraisals for academic series they are charged with reviewing. An ad hoc review committee may be appointed if deemed necessary by the EVC or CAP.

Please note, instances where the final appraisal outcome differs from CAP's recommendation are not considered CAP overrides. At the conclusion of the campus review process, the department will receive the final appraisal outcome, as well as any information or advice resulting from the appraisal. The department chair must discuss the result of the appraisal with the academic appointee and provide the academic appointee with a copy of the decision letter.

The final appraisal outcome will be issued by the applicable final authority as detailed in UC San Diego's Authority and Review Chart.

20. Final Reappointment/Merit Review

The third reappointment/merit review of an assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the sixth year of appointment. (PPM 230-220-82 d.) Absent an extension of the probationary period or a prior deferral of an academic review, an academic appointee's third reappointment/merit review is the academic appointee's final reappointment/merit review at the assistant rank. Three outcomes are possible in the final reappointment/merit review, and the eligible faculty must vote on the proposed action.

a. Promotion is Recommended

If the department is convinced that an academic appointee's record meets or exceeds the University's expectations for promotion, the department may vote to recommend a promotion effective the following July 1.

i. Tenure or Security of Employment

For an academic appointee to be promoted to a title that accords tenure or security of employment, the academic appointee must hold a title eligible for tenure or security of employment, and the Chancellor must provide in writing an affirmative decision to grant tenure or security of employment following a review process that involves consultation with the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP).

ii. Augmentation of Senate Promotion Files (Tenure/Security of Employment) Through April 30th

Effective academic year 2025-2026, UC San Diego institutionalized the opportunity to augment senate promotion files involving tenure or security of employment through April 30th in scenarios where the initial recommendation was to deny tenure or security of employment.

Since first introduced following the recommendation of the Senate-Administration Workgroup on Academic Advancement in the time of COVID-19, the opportunity to augment promotion files for tenure or security of employment is applied in consideration of an academic appointee's career trajectory and probationary clock.

The possible promotion scenarios and corresponding augmentation opportunities are outlined as follows:

Early Promotion	Academic appointee is proposed for promotion to tenure or security of employment earlier than expected for their specific academic series, career trajectory, and probationary clock timeline. Postponement of promotion or terminal appointment may not be an immediate option as the candidate continues to have time on their probationary clock to continue at the assistant rank.	– May initiate an April 30th promotion file augmentation.
Promotion, Postponement, Terminal	Academic appointee is eligible for promotion, postponement, or terminal appointment at the normal time and has time on the probationary clock to accommodate a possible postponement if recommended by reviewers.	– Postponement may initiate an April 30th promotion file augmentation. – Preliminary notice of terminal appointment will offer a separate process for file augmentation.
Promotion, Terminal	Academic appointee is eligible for promotion or terminal appointment. Postponement of promotion is not an option due to career trajectory (decoupled promotion review, zero-year, etc.), and/or probationary clock limitations.	– Preliminary notice of terminal appointment will offer a separate process for file augmentation.

Promotion file augmentation will be available in scenarios where a preliminary recommendation for postponement of promotion or security of employment is the recommendation of CAP or the EVC, if academic judgment indicates it is warranted.

For tenure and security of employment promotion scenarios where postponement is not an option due to career trajectory and probationary clock limitations, the opportunity to augment the promotion file will be made available following the issuance of a preliminary notice of terminal reappointment.

If approved, Academic Personnel Services (APS) will issue a Request for Additional Information (RFI) notifying schools of the opportunity for augmentation. In such cases, the academic appointee, department, and school may include additional materials, if any, to augment the academic review file through the April 30th immediately preceding the proposed academic review effective date (Ex: April 30, 2026 for a proposed July 1, 2026 promotion to tenure).

Requests to augment an academic review file will carry a 30-day response timeline encompassing response times from the academic appointee, department, and dean level reviewers.

Please note, initial preparation of an academic review file proposing tenure or security of employment should observe the standard June 30th material cut-off

date. Augmentation through April 30th, as described in this section, should only occur until such a time when APS issues the corresponding RFI.

b. Postponement of Promotion Review is Recommended

If the department believes there is significant work in progress that cannot be completed in time to justify promotion, but which should be completed prior to the promotion review and, when completed, would likely suffice for promotion, the department may propose postponement of the promotion review. The department must demonstrate that the academic appointee's academic record is strong and that they are making active and timely progress on substantial work that:

i. Should be completed prior to the promotion review (the anticipated completion date must be indicated); and

ii. Would likely suffice for promotion

If the department proposes postponement of the promotion review, a reappointment file (recommending a one or two-year reappointment with or without merit advancement) must be submitted in accordance with the campus deadline for submission of reappointment and merit advancement files.

c. Termination is Recommended

If the department believes an academic appointee's overall career achievements do not justify promotion, the department may vote to recommend terminations with notice. External letters of reference are not required if the department recommendation is termination. However, the departmental recommendation letter must include information on the appraisal rating and should indicate how an appointee failed to improve sufficiently or declined in performance such that promotion is not justified.

i. Notice of Termination

A Senate Assistant-rank academic appointee with more than two years of university service must be provided 12 months' notice of termination. Only the Chancellor may provide an academic appointee with written notice of termination.

If adequate notice of termination cannot be provided due to error or oversight, the Chancellor may authorize an extension of the appointment for a period not to exceed one year. Neither the failure to provide the required notice nor extension of the appointment will afford tenure, security of employment, or promotion.

21. Reconsideration of Promotion

An academic appointee who has received notice of termination may be reconsidered for promotion. (PPM 230-220-82 e.) Reconsideration is appropriate only when there is substantial evidence of significant improvement in the academic appointee's record of scholarly achievement since the termination decision was reached, particularly with respect to those elements of the record previously identified as areas of weakness.

A reconsideration file must be received in the Academic Personnel office no later than February 15th of the terminal year. All reconsideration files are submitted to CAP for review. Neither submission of a reconsideration file nor a failure to meet the established reconsideration file submission deadline will postpone a terminal appointment end date.

A reconsideration file is typically prepared and reviewed during an academic appointee's 12-month notice period. If a final decision has not been made by the ending date of the terminal period of service, the appointment will end as scheduled. If reconsideration results in a decision to promote, the promotion action becomes effective retroactive to July 1, regardless of when the decision is reached.

22. Five-year Prohibition of Appointment

Related Manual Sections:	**2.1**	**2.1.2**	**2.1.3**	**3.2.14**	**3.2.15**

When there has been an academic review of an Assistant Professor, an Assistant Professor in Residence, an Assistant Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine), or an Assistant Teaching Professor (Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment-LPSOE) appointed at more than 50% time, and the review has resulted in a decision not to continue the individual's appointment in that series (non-reappointment or termination), the individual may not be appointed on any UC campus to certain faculty titles, see APM 133, Appendix A for a list of applicable titles.

23. Joint Appointees – Reviews

Related Manual Sections:	**2.3.1**	**2.4.5**	**3.4.9**

When an academic appointee holds joint appointments in two or more departments, all departments should be involved in the academic appointee's academic review, however, only one academic review file should be submitted. The home department should take the lead in preparing the file (e.g., gathering material from the appointee, soliciting external letters, gathering teaching evaluations, obtaining a completed and signed UC San Diego Academic Biography and Bibliography Form, gathering publications, etc.). Each department, however, should act independently in arriving at its recommendation for inclusion in the academic review file.

About Joint Appointment Memorandums of Understanding (MOU)

An MOU is required to be included in the review file for all joint appointments in which a faculty member holds a salaried appointment in more than one department. MOUs for non-salaried secondary appointments are encouraged but not required. The MOU shall include expectations as to teaching load, research expectations, academic reviews, and any other applicable conditions of employment.

The home department chair initiates the secondary department's participation by soliciting from the other department chair the department's evaluation, recommendation, and, if applicable, faculty vote. The department preparing the academic review file should send the secondary department the basic file materials. After each department has made its decision, copies of the departmental recommendations should be exchanged by the departments. If so desired and agreed to, departments may submit a joint letter with appropriate endorsement from each participating department.

In cases where one department includes an ad hoc committee review, the department should share the ad hoc report with the appointee prior to a departmental vote and recommendation in order to obtain the appropriate candidate certification and maintain procedural safeguards.

3.3 Reviews-Evaluation of Non-Senate Assistant Rank Appointees

1. General

Policy References	
Assistant-level Academic Appointees:	**Policy:**
Adjunct Professor series	PPM 230-280-00
Health Sciences Clinical Professor series	PPM 230-278-00
Professional Research (Research Scientist) series	PPM 230-310-00
Project Scientist series	PPM 230-311-00
Specialist series	PPM 230-330-00

2. Probationary Period

Related Manual Sections: 2.1 2.1.2 2.1.3 3.2.14 3.2.15 3.2.23

At UC San Diego, promotion consideration typically occurs in the sixth year of appointment at the Assistant rank. The period of time prior to consideration for promotion is referred to as the probationary period. During the probationary period, Assistant-rank appointees are expected to produce work sufficient to justify promotion. There are limited circumstances in which the probationary period may be extended, most commonly as a family accommodation (see PPM 230-15 – Family Accommodations Policy).

3. Terms of Service

Related Manual Sections: 2.1 2.1.2 2.1.3 3.2.14 3.2.15 3.2.23

Each appointment at the Assistant rank is limited to a maximum term of two years. Reappointment may be for a period of less than two years.

There is no assurance of reappointment, merit advancement, or eventual promotion. The University has the discretion to appoint and reappoint non-Senate academic appointees with term appointments; reappointment is not automatic. Advancement and appointment decisions are made in accordance with the UC San Diego Authority and Review Chart.

4. Reappointment/Merit Review

When a non-Senate academic appointee is scheduled for reappointment/merit review, the department should first determine whether reappointment is warranted. If the department does not wish to reappoint, then in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the

appointment will expire on the established ending date. Departments should refer to APM 137 for procedures on notifying non-senate appointees of non-reappointment.

If reappointment is warranted, the department must prepare a reappointment/merit review file with one of the following recommendations:

a. Reappointment with Merit Advancement

If an academic appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend reappointment with merit advancement.

b. Reappointment without Merit Advancement

If an academic appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend reappointment with no merit advancement.

5. Appraisal

Related Manual Sections: 3.2.18

An assistant-rank academic appointee in the Adjunct Professor, Health Sciences Clinical Professor, or Professional Research (Research Scientist) series must receive an appraisal, which is a formal evaluation of their achievements and progress toward promotion. The appraisal also identifies academic appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence expected for academic appointees.

Although not required, departments may conduct appraisals for academic appointees in other non-Senate series if the department believes such an assessment would be valuable to the department and/or appointee.

An appraisal should provide an appointee with a careful, considered, analytical evaluation of their performance to date in the areas of research and creative work, teaching, professional competence and activity, and University and public service, as well as a candid assessment of their potential for promotion based upon the evidence.

a. Timing

The appraisal is conducted in an appointee's fourth year of service at the Assistant rank (and is combined with the second reappointment/merit review), except when an extension of the probationary period has been granted. If the appraisal is not combined with the second reappointment/merit review, the appraisal must be presented in a separate academic review file.

An appraisal is not required if, prior to the normal occurrence of the appraisal, an academic appointee is recommended for a promotion that will take effect within a year, or has given written notice of resignation, or the department has not prepared a reappointment file and the appointment will therefore expire on the established ending date.

b. Department Considerations

The following factors should be evaluated, if appropriate for the series, when conducting an appraisal:

i. An academic appointee's published research and other completed creative activity and their potential for continued research and creative activity.

ii. For series that require teaching, at least one type of student or faculty evaluation each for undergraduate and graduate-level instruction, and other evidence of teaching effectiveness, such as course syllabi, reading lists, and statements of course goals, as applicable.

iii. An academic appointee's departmental, University and community service contributions, as applicable.

iv. Professional competence and activity (patient care).

v. An academic appointee's self-evaluation (if any).

If the academic appointee has made significant scholarly contributions (such as research or teaching) in another academic unit, the department should solicit input from the unit on the appointee's contributions.

External letters are not required for an appraisal.

If an academic appointee has been advised at any time of departmental concerns or reservations about continuation of appointment, this should be considered and stated in the departmental letter of recommendation. If the appointee has been advised in writing, a copy of such correspondence should be included in the academic review file.

c. Appraisal Vote

An appraisal vote is not required for non-Senate appointees; however, department and/or schools may choose to establish voting procedures for non-Senate appraisals.

A department may form a departmental ad hoc committee in order to assess the appointee's achievements and activities. The departmental recommendation letter should discuss the nature and extent of departmental consultation on the appraisal, as well as the result of a vote, if taken.

The possible appraisal ratings are as follows:

Favorable	Indicates that promotion is likely, contingent on maintaining current trajectory of excellence on appropriate external validation.
Favorable with Recommendations	Indicates that the candidate is on track for promotion to the Associate rank, apart from recommendations to eliminate identified weaknesses or imbalances in the present record.
Problematic	Indicates that promotion is possible if substantial deficiencies in the present record are remedied.
Unfavorable	Indicates that substantial deficiencies are present, promotion is unlikely.

d. If the Vote results in an Unfavorable rating

If the majority of eligible department faculty vote for an appraisal rating of "unfavorable," a second vote of the faculty should be taken to determine whether the department wishes to continue the appointment or recommend termination.

e. Result of second faculty vote:

iv. Continuation of Appointment is Recommended

When the appraisal is combined with a reappointment/merit review, the department must make a recommendation regarding reappointment and merit advancement. Reappointment with merit advancement indicates that sufficient work has been completed during the review period to justify merit advancement, and the potential exists for an appointee to make marked improvements prior to consideration for promotion. Reappointment without merit advancement indicates there has not been sufficient work completed in the review period to justify merit advancement, but the potential exists for an appointee to make marked improvements prior to consideration for promotion.

v. Termination of Appointment is Recommended

Termination should be considered if the majority of voting faculty are convinced the substantial deficiencies cannot be corrected in time for consideration for promotion and therefore further effort will not result in promotion. The department letter should discuss the justification for the recommendation to terminate, as well as the details of the vote.

vi. Promotion

If, as a result of the appraisal process, the department wishes to recommend promotion, the department must conduct a promotion review and solicit letters from external referees.

In cases where a promotion is proposed at a time when a 4th year appraisal would normally be carried out, the promotion file should still include an appraisal.

vii. Campus Review

Campus Review Committee review of appraisals is in accordance with the Authority and Review Chart.

6. Final Reappointment/Merit Review

The third reappointment/merit review of an assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the sixth year of appointment. Absent an extension of the probationary period or a prior deferral of an academic review, an academic appointee's third reappointment/merit review is the academic appointee's final reappointment/merit review at the assistant rank.

Three outcomes are possible in the final reappointment/merit review, and the eligible faculty must vote on the proposed action.

a. Promotion is Recommended

If the department is convinced that an academic appointee's record meets or exceeds the University's expectations for promotion, the department may vote to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full level, effective the following July 1st.

b. Postponement of Promotion Review is Recommended

If the department believes there is significant work in progress that cannot be completed in time to justify promotion, but which should be completed within the reappointment period (either one or two years) and, when completed, would likely suffice for promotion, the department may propose postponement of the promotion review. The department must demonstrate that the academic appointee's academic record is strong and that they are making active and timely progress on substantial work that:

i. Should be completed prior to the promotion review (the anticipated completion date must be indicated); and

ii. Would likely suffice for promotion

If the department proposes postponement of the promotion review, a reappointment file must be submitted in accordance with the campus deadline for submission of reappointment and merit advancement files.

c. Non-reappointment

If the department believes than an academic appointee's overall career achievements do not justify promotion, and that a postponement of the promotion review is not warranted, no promotion file is prepared and the appointee will not be reappointed. In accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date. In cases of non-reappointment, the department chair should consult with the dean.

If promotion is proposed and denied, or if the department does not propose promotion and/or reappointment, in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

i. Notice of Non-Reappointment

Although notice of non-reappointment is not normally required, the department should provide written notice of non-reappointment whenever possible, as detailed in APM 137.

7. Joint Appointees – Reviews

Related Manual Sections:	**2.3.1**	**2.4.5**	**3.2.24**	**3.4.8**

When an academic appointee holds joint appointments in two or more departments, all departments should be involved in the academic appointee's academic review, however, only one academic review file should be submitted. The home department should take the lead in preparing the file (e.g., gathering material from the appointee, soliciting external letters, gathering teaching evaluations, obtaining a completed and signed UC San Diego Academic Biography and Bibliography Form, gathering publications, etc.). Each department, however, should act independently in arriving at its recommendation for inclusion in the academic review file.

About Joint Appointment Memorandums of Understanding (MOU)

An MOU is required to be included in the review file for all joint appointments in which a faculty member holds a salaried appointment in more than one department. MOUs for non-salaried secondary appointments are encouraged, but not required. The MOU shall include expectations as to teaching load, research expectations, academic reviews, and any other applicable conditions of employment.

The home department chair initiates the secondary department's participation by soliciting from the other department chair the department's evaluation, recommendation, and, if applicable, faculty vote. The department preparing the academic review file should send the secondary department the basic file materials. After each department has made its decision, copies of the departmental recommendations

should be exchanged by the departments. If so desired and agreed to, departments may submit a joint letter with appropriate endorsement from each participating department.

In cases where one department includes an ad hoc committee review, the department should share the ad hoc report with the appointee prior to a departmental vote and recommendation in order to obtain the appropriate candidate certification and maintain procedural safeguards.

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 collected 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 ac 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 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 – It is expected all new items listed in Section A of the bibliography will accompany the academic review file in either physical or electronic (publication link) form. If an academic appointee prefers to provide their publication(s) in physical form, they may submit physical publications to the dean's office when the academic review file is submitted.

   When submitting publications as part of an academic review file, the corresponding citation on the bibliography must be asterisked (*) to signal its inclusion for reviewers. This applies to Section A, B, and/or C for both new items from the review period and old items being included as an example of an academic appointee's seminal works during a career review.

   Additionally, it is important accompanying publications be numbered to correspond with the entry on the bibliography (see biobib instructions for details).

   In scenarios where an academic appointee does not provide a copy of all new Section A items or decides inclusion is not relevant to the review, they are encouraged to explain how and why the selected included publication(s) represent their most important accomplishment during the review period.

   Academic appointees should be aware reviewers may request a copy of publication(s) by issuing a request for additional information (RFI).

   Academic appointees and AP staff are encouraged to review the biobib instructions for additional 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), 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.

4.0 Appendix A: Retention Actions (Full & Preemptive)

1. General

a. Full Retentions

A full retention may occur if a faculty member has received a formal offer of employment, letter of intent, or a detailed proposal letter from a designated hiring official (dean or higher) with authority to extend such an offer of, that includes proposed terms such as rank, salary, start up support, etc. With pre-approval from the Senior Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs (Sr. AVC-AA), departments may prepare a full retention file for a faculty member who is being recruited by a comparable educational institution in order to counter the outside offer in an effort to retain the appointee.

b. Preemptive Retentions

A preemptive retention may occur when a faculty member has advanced far enough in the process of being recruited by another institution to be identified as a finalist but not yet received an offer of employment, letter of intent, or detailed proposal letter. Evidence to support a preemptive retention may include an invitation to an on-campus finalist interview in an open search, or the equivalent, from a comparable educational institution.

With pre-approval from the Sr. AVC-AA, departments may prepare a preemptive retention file if there is evidence of a credible threat of a potential or pending offer from a comparable educational institution. Requests for pre-approval of a preemptive retention action need to occur before the date of the appointee's on-campus finalist interview and the preemptive retention file should immediately follow pre-approval. Preemptive retention request after the date of a candidate's on-campus finalist interview will not be considered.

c. Timing

Retention files may be submitted at any time during the academic year.

Retention action files are typically urgent and departments are encouraged to contact their school dean's office as soon as the need to submit a file arises to ensure its rapid review. If the appointee must respond to an outside offer by a specific date, the departmental recommendation letter should indicate this deadline and also note it on the Review Summary Form.

d. Foreign Offers

Foreign offers are presumed to be on a fiscal year basis.

The department chair is responsible for ensuring the proper conversion of a foreign offer to an academic year basis. A salary conversion should be performed using foreign exchange rates in effect on the date of the outside offer letter.

A copy of the salary conversion should be included in the file.

See APM 600 for salary conversion guidance.

2. Pre-Approval

Pre-approval is required when requesting a new or increased market off-scale salary component (MOS) in the form of a retention action. Pre-approval from the Sr. AVC-AA for consideration of a retention action grants departments and schools permission to submit an action for review.

a. Department Pre-Approval Requests

- When made aware of a retention scenario, a department chair will contact their dean and provide the following information via the Kuali Retention Request Form.
    - Discussion of how the competing institution compares to UC San Diego.
    - A copy of the outside offer letter, letter of intent, or detailed proposal letter (full retention), or evidence of credible threat (preemptive retention), such as an invitation to an on-campus finalist interview.
    - Discussion of the impact of the individual's loss to the department, school, and/or UC San Diego.

b. Dean Review

- If a dean agrees that a market off-scale salary is justified, they will forward the request to the Sr. AVC-AA. In addition to addressing the scholarly contributions of the faculty member and the value they bring to the UC San Diego community, the dean discussion should include an analysis of the competing offer or imminent external threat as presented by the department, and how the educational institution/department's disciplinary ranking compares to UC San Diego. Importantly, the dean should address whether the proposed salary increase will create salary inequity or compression within the department and any applicable remedies.

c. Sr. AVC-AA Review

If in agreement, the Sr. AVC-AA will sign the Kuali Retention Request Form to indicate pre-approval to submit a retention file for review. The signed Kuali Retention Request Form should be included in the retention file when submitted for review.

About Pre-Approvals

Pre-approval from the Sr. Associate Vice Chancellor for the submission of a retention action grants departments and schools the ability to submit a retention action for review.

Pre-approval from the Sr. Associate Vice Chancellor **DOES NOT** constitute a final approval of a specific retention action outcome.

- Retention and preemptive retention files will follow established campus review procedures.

3. Retention File Components

a. Departmental Letter

When submitting a full retention and/or preemptive retention file, department chairs are responsible for ensuring that the departmental recommendation letter includes a discussion of how the competing institution's disciplinary ranking compares to UC San Diego and demonstrate how the loss of a candidate would be significant.

b. Proof of Outside Offer or Evidence of Credible Threat

Offer letters, letters of intent, and detailed proposal letters, for the purposes of inclusion in a full retention file, are defined as a letter issued by a senior administrator at the rank of dean or higher, with the authority to extend such an offer at a competing institution. The offer should include all major terms of employment (rank, step, salary, effective date).
In a preemptive retention, the primary form of evidence is an invitation to an on-campus finalist interview from a search committee, chair or dean.

c. Sr. AVC-AA Pre-Approval

Documentation showing pre-approval from the Sr. Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, should be included as part of the file when submitting a full retention or preemptive retention file for review.

d. Special Considerations

i. Intercampus Transfers

Proposals for both full retentions and preemptive retentions for faculty recruited by other University of California campuses will adhere to the parameters set by APM 510 - Intercampus Transfers.

ii. Bonus Off-Scale (BOS) Salary Components and Career Milestone Salary Incentives (CMSI)

When proposing a retention salary, departments and schools should consider all aspects of the candidate's current salary, including a pre-existing bonus off-scale (BOS) component and the effective date of the new overall salary.

Departments and schools should specify the new or increased market off-scale salary component being proposed as well as the proposed final total salary. When a retention action is proposed for an appointee with an existing BOS, it should be noted the BOS will end at the next academic review. Similarly, if an appointee is eligible to receive a CMSI as a result of a concurrent academic review action, the retention action proposal should clearly state whether the proposed final salary is inclusive of the CMSI. Regarding effective dates, departments should note if the new proposed salary is inclusive of an upcoming (anticipated) range adjustment.

4. Full Retention and Preemptive Retention Embargos and Limits

a. Full Retentions

Effective July 1, 2024, full retentions, regardless of monetary value, impose a nine (9) year embargo period during which no additional full or preemptive retention actions may be awarded, regardless of the final retention amount.

Additionally, UC San Diego academic appointees may not be proposed for a full retention prior to the completion of at least one (1) academic review following the initial appointment in their current academic series.

b. Preemptive Retentions

Effective December 15, 2025 academic appointees are limited to requesting, and departments & schools proposing, no more than one (1) preemptive retention action at the assistant/associate rank (combined), one (1) preemptive retention action at full rank Step I through V, and one (1) preemptive retention action at full rank Step VI through Above Scale (AS).

Preemptive retentions may not exceed a MOS increase of $30,000 and they will impose a six (6) year embargo period during which no additional full or preemptive retention actions may be awarded, regardless of the final approved preemptive retention amount.

Additionally, UC San Diego academic appointees may not be proposed for a preemptive retention prior to the completion of at least one (1) academic review following the initial appointment in their current academic series.

About Retention Limits and Embargos

Full Retention Actions
Nine (9) year embargo per Full Retention Action

Preemptive Retention Actions*		
No more than one (1) at Assistant/Associate Rank (Combined)	No more than (1) at Full Rank Step I through V	No more than (1) at Full Rank Step VI through Above Scale (AS)
Preemptive Retentions Cannot Exceed $30,000		
Six (6) year embargo per Preemptive Retention Action		

***Effective 12/15/2025, preemptive retention embargos were expanded to allow one (1) preemptive retention at the assistant/associate rank (combined), one (1) at full rank Step I through V, and one (1) at full rank Step VI through Above Scale (AS). Prior to that, preemptive retentions were limited to one (1) at the assistant/associate rank (combined) and one (1) at full rank.**

c. APM 510 – Intercampus Transfers

UC San Diego is obligated to abide by the limitations set forth in Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 510, Intercampus Transfers when proposing retention actions in response to interest from another UC institutions.

Per APM 510, a recruiting UC campus may offer advancement and/or a salary increase of no more than one (1) step, or the equivalent of one step, above an academic appointee's current step and salary (regardless of any proposed pending personnel action at the home campus). If an academic appointee's current salary is an off-scale salary, the recruiting campus may offer the next higher step along with the same off-scale dollar amount.

a. Pre-Emptive Retentions

While pre-emptive retentions in response to non-UC institutions may not exceed $30,000, pre-emptive retentions in response to another UC institution will be limited to the difference between an academic appointee's current home campus step's base salary and the next higher step. Regular embargo periods apply.

b. Retentions

Retentions in response to another UC institution may not exceed the recruiting campus' offered step and salary. Regular embargo periods apply.

c. Exceptions

As an exception to above APM 510 imposed limits on retention actions, if an academic appointee is being courted simultaneously by both a non-UC and UC institutions, UC San Diego may propose a retention action higher than the above limits to compete with a bona fide outside (non-UC) threat.

5. Additional Retention Resources

For additional guidance please refer to the July 1, 2024, Academic Affairs Guidelines for Retention Actions (Full & Preemptive), the December 2024 UC San Diego Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ), and the March 2026 Pre-emptive Retention + APM 510 Advisory.

4.1 Appendix B: COVID-19 Extension of the Probationary Period and Academic Deferral Toolkit

PLEASE NOTE: This section of the process manual serves as a historical documentation and reference material for the COVID-19 automatic extension of the probationary clock offered in 2020 for eligible assistant rank appointees hired on or before June 30, 2020.

1. General

In light of the COVID-19 crisis and the potential impact on academics' scholarly and creative work during the Spring quarter, on March 24, 2020, Chancellor Khosla and EVC Simmons, in consultation with the UC San Diego Academic Senate, announced that effective immediately:

- UC San Diego will automatically extend the probationary period by one year for each assistant-level appointee whose appointment began on or before June 30, 2020 and who is subject to an eight-year clock, provided that the individual has not previously been granted two such extensions. While individuals with two previous extensions will not receive the extension *automatically*, they may request an exception for a third extension due to COVID-19.
- The automatic extension of the probationary period includes those who will begin their 6th (sixth) year of service in 2020-2021.

- The automatic extension of the probationary period does not include those who had a promotion review during or before the 2019-2020 academic year and who had an outcome of postponement or terminal year.

- Senior faculty and academics whose scholarly work has been affected by the COVID-19 crisis may choose to defer their academic review for one year. This deferral will not impact established departmental expectations for achievement during a normal two-, three-, or four-year review cycle. Academic review following a deferral will not be considered off-cycle. Appointees must be reviewed at least once in every five-year period, per UCOP APM 200-0.

Extensions to the probationary period (also known as Stop-the-Clocks) may result in a decoupling of merit reviews on the normal two year cycle from appraisals and promotion reviews. The latter are always seen by CAP, but decoupled merit reviews that result from COVID-19 related extensions of the probationary period that do not involve an acceleration or BOS will be treated as Dean's authority actions.

Individual review cycles should be discussed annually with department chairs and AP staff to determine the most beneficial trajectory for an assistant level appointee. On the one hand, candidates whose research has been significantly delayed by COVID-19-related disruptions may decide that their prospects for tenure would be more accurately judged by CAP if their appraisal were delayed for a year and thus uncoupled from the normal merit review, which would proceed under the dean's authority. On the other hand, candidates often benefit from CAP's candid assessment of their files through the appraisal process, and it may therefore be in the candidate's best interest to receive the benefit of CAP's judgment sooner rather than later on the path to promotion.

Departments may decide to utilize the optional "opt-out" form provided by the office of Academic Personnel Services to assist with review timeline planning.

2. Process

Extensions to the probationary period will be automatic. There are many scenarios impacted by an extension to the probationary period, depending on the appointee's review history and remainder of time "on the clock". In general, an academic appointee may "opt out" of the automatic extension to their probationary period at any time by submitting a promotion file. An appointee may also "opt out" by submitting a 4th year appraisal at the standard review time and may later choose to "opt back in" when considering promotion readiness.

Merit and Reappointment reviews de-coupled as a result of COVID-19 related extensions to the probationary period are considered normal on-time merits at the Dean level of authority. These decoupled merit/reappointment files will not be reviewed by CAP.

Merit and reappointment deferrals are not automatic. Any desired deferral will require a memo relating the connection of the request to the COVID-19 pandemic and be routed for consideration according to standard practice/process. Authority level for a deferral is contingent on whether the request constitutes a first or second consecutive deferral request.

3. Frequently Asked Question (FAQ)

a. General

- **Q: How will these automatic extensions of probationary periods related to COVID-19 be implemented?**

  A: Automatic extensions of the probationary period due to COVID-19 are to be applied now, as a one-time solution for real and potential difficulties appointees may experience this academic year (AY 2019-20) and moving forward as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Academic Personnel (AP) staff at the department level will use the campus-wide personnel database (AP Data) to enter new end dates and to track review timelines for individual appointees. On an annual basis, each department will inform faculty of review eligibility per its normal department procedures.

- **Q: Whom do they impact?**

  A: COVID-19 related automatic extensions of the probationary period are applicable to academic appointees who are subject to an eight-year probationary period with a hire date previous to July 1, 2020.

- **Q: When will these be implemented?**

  A: The probationary period extension is effective immediately. Impacted academic appointees should meet with their department AP staff before Fall of 2020, to discuss their individual clock and potential deferral requests.

- **Q: If the campus COVID-19 crisis continues past Spring Quarter 2020, will these guidelines be revised to include individuals hired after June 30, 2020?**

A: This may be re-evaluated at a later date.

- **Q: Will the October 15 deadline for academic review materials eligible to be reviewed be adjusted?**

  A: No.

b. Assistant Professor Review Impacts

- **Q: My appointment date is July 1, 2020. How might this emergency measure affect me?**

  A: While an additional year will not be automatically applied to the probationary period for individuals appointed on or after July 1, 2020, campus reviewers remain aware that COVID-19 may impact future reviews and additional measures may be necessary. Academic appointees appointed July 1, 2020, and thereafter will have an opportunity to explain any extenuating circumstances, including effects of the COVID-19 crisis, in their academic review file.

- **Q: I have a promotion review currently in progress with a July 1, 2020 effective date; how will this extension of the probationary period be applied to me?**

  A: Individuals who are currently under review for promotion with an effective July 1, 2020 date and who have not yet completed their 8-year probationary period, will continue to have their review file processed as normal. Once that review is complete, the extension of the probationary period will be applied unless: 1) the current review results in a promotion, 2) the final outcome is determined to be a postponement for one-year, or 3) the final outcome is a terminal reappointment file.

- **Q: I did not undergo a full promotion review. My department solicited letters, determined I wasn't ready, and subsequently proposed postponement of a promotion. My file is currently in progress with a July 1, 2020 effective date; how will this extension of the probationary period be applied to me?**

  A: Individuals who did not undergo a full promotion review will automatically receive an extension of the probationary period.

- **Q: What if I received a terminal reappointment and am serving my terminal/final year?**

  A: If you are adversely impacted by COVID-19 during your terminal year and the pandemic has been causal to additional delays for what you anticipated would be a viable promotion appeal file, you may request an extension to the due date for submitting a promotion reconsideration file.

  Your request should document events that have interfered with your ability to complete the body of work to be reviewed for promotion (e.g. academic press temporary and/or long-term closures, lab results unable to be processed, publications paused that would

justify promotion, artistic performances cancelled, academic reviewer illnesses or inaccessibility, etc.).

- **Q: I don't need or want this extension. If I want to opt out of the automatic extension to my probationary period, what is the deadline by which I need to notify my department?**

  A: To allow timely preparation of a promotion file, you should inform your department chair or equivalent as soon as possible during the spring quarter before an upcoming fall review.

- **Q: What will happen when I opt out of the automatic extension of the probationary period?**

  A: Your probationary clock will remain the same as it is now. Your academic review schedule will also remain the same as it is now.

- **Q: What if in the future, I decide that I don't wish to wait another year to be considered for promotion?**

  A: As has always been the case, assistant-level appointees may put forward a file requesting a promotion whenever they deem they are ready for such advancement.

- **Q: What happens if accepting this automatic extension of the probationary period causes me to reach my two extension maximum and I have a qualifying family accommodation event in future? Would I be eligible to request a third extension of my probationary period?**

  A: You would be able to request a third extension of your probationary period. Please know that any request for an exception to allow a third one-year extension will require approval by the UCOP Provost and Executive Vice President.

c. All Ranks

- **Q: I am an Assistant level appointee. Does this automatic extension of the probation period defer the timing of my next merit or reappointment review file?**

  A: The timing of your next merit/reappointment review will not be altered unless you also choose to defer your review in conjunction with the automatic extension of the probationary period. The extension will alter the timing of a 4th year appraisal file and your mandatory promotion date (i.e., your "must be promoted by x/xx/xx" date).

- **Q: This new COVID-19 related extension has decoupled my merit and 4th year appraisal or upcoming 6th year file; how do I request a deferral of my merit/reappointment to align my reviews?**

A: A memo may be sent forward requesting that a deferral be granted in conjunction with the COVID-19 related extension of the probationary period.

- **Q: Are Research Scientists and Project Scientists eligible to defer reviews?**

  A: Reviews for Research Scientists and Project Scientists may be deferred due to COVID – 19 related reasons. The academic appointee should submit a memo requesting that a deferral be granted in conjunction with the COVID-19 related extension of the probationary period. The current end date of the appointment will also be extended for one year, to coincide with the deferral period.

- **Q: What if I am undergoing a "Barrier Review" Case (Promotion to Full, Advancement to Step VI and Advancement to Above Scale)?**

  A: Senior faculty and academics whose scholarly and/or creative work has been affected by the COVID-19 crisis may choose to defer their academic review for one year. This deferral will not impact established departmental expectations for achievement during a normal two-, three-, or four-year review cycle. Academic review following a deferral will not be considered off-cycle. Appointees must be reviewed at least once in every five-year period, per policy.

- **Q: What if it is determined that I am ineligible for a deferral due to multiple consecutive no-change actions?**

  A: A request for an exception to policy may be made in some cases if, and only if, events have transpired as a result of COVID-19. Any exception request should document progress made toward advancement as well as events that have interfered with an academic appointee's chances for advancement (e.g. academic press temporary and/or long-term closures, lab results unable to be processed, publications paused that would justify promotion, artistic performances cancelled, academic reviewer illnesses or inaccessibility, etc.).

d. Additional Consideration FAQ

- **Q: I am a represented Assistant Research Scientist or Assistant Project Scientist. How does this new crisis extension impact my reviews?**

  A: You are eligible for the automatic extension of your probationary period. If you would like this probationary period extension, no action is necessary; however, you may opt out if desired. Academic Researchers in the Research Scientist or Project Scientist Series may reach out to their departmental Academic Personnel analyst if they have any questions related to the calculation of their probationary period or how this may impact their review cycles.

- **Q: What, if anything, should I be mindful of as an Assistant Adjunct or an Assistant HS Clinical Professor?**

A: If you are an Assistant Adjunct Professor or an Assistant Health Sciences Clinical Professor who has been hired on a fiscal-year basis (Health Sciences), your normal eight-year probationary period consists of ninety-six (96) months of completed service, and any appointment in this series above 50% time will count toward the calculation of the probationary period. This extension automatically extends your probationary period by 12 calendar months, provided you meet stated eligibility requirements. Please reach out to your departmental Academic Personnel analyst if you have any questions related to the calculation of your probationary period, or how this calculation may impact your review cycle.

- **Q: What, if anything, should I be mindful of as an Assistant Professor In Residence, Assistant Professor of Clinical X, Assistant Teaching Professor, or Assistant Ladder-Rank Professor?**

  A: As a member of the Academic Senate, you will need to be reviewed for promotion at least one year prior to the end of your probationary period. If you have any questions with regard to how this extension impacts your review cycle, please contact your departmental Academic Personnel analyst.

4. Expanded COVID-19 Extensions of the Probationary Period Options

Based on recommendations made by the 2021 Senate-Administration Workgroup on Academic Advancement in the Wake of COVID-19 (SAWAA), the option to extend the probationary period by tenure-track/security of employment faculty owing to COVID-19 impacts were made available to faculty appointed between 7/1/2020 – 6/30/2021 if supported by the exigent circumstances of the pandemic and its impact on their academic file.

Candidates, in coordination with their department and dean, must make the case that exigent circumstances related to the COVID-19 pandemic support the proposed clock extension request.

Clock extension opportunities for appointees hired between 7/1/2020 through 6/30/2021 represent an extension of the COVID-19 probationary period extension and academic deferral program, see Section 2.1.2 above.

COVID-19 clock extensions for appointees hired between 7/1/2020 through 6/30/2021 are not automatic and appointees have to make a formal request.

5.0 Revision History

- April 26, 2023 — Initial issuance and online posting.
- August 25, 2023 — Technical edit to Appendix B to add retention and pre-emptive retention embargo years and amounts.
- February 3, 2024 — Technical edits to section 2.4 and 4.1
- March 10, 2025 — Extensive and technical edits resulting from 2024 Call.
- October 22, 2025 — Technical edits to section 2.2.7 to clarify zero-year option eligibility.
- September 2026 — Overall technical edits and updates to the following:
  - New 3.2.6 – Promotion Crosswalk
  - Updated 3.2.20.a.ii – Augmentation of Senate Promotion Files through April 30th
  - Updated 3.4.26.a – Materials that Accompany the Review File
  - Updated Appendix 4.0 – Retention Actions