Academic Merit/Promotion Procedure and Timeline

October 1st
Create a list of all academics (research series, specialists, project scientists) who are scheduled for a merit or promotion review or may be considered for an acceleration. Include the following information: name, present title and step, history of employment (hire date, dates of merits/promotions), next review date (for normal merit), and comments. Discuss this list with the Director and touch base with each individual listed (involving Director in meetings) to see if they plan on requesting normal or accelerated review, or delaying review for a year (note: mandatory reviews required at least once every five years per Red Binder III-8). Discuss with each candidate their progress and their goals for the review, including salary goals (possible off-scale). This information will be relayed to the Director (if not involved in meetings) and review committee members. Prior to contacting any individuals in the Specialist or Project Scientist series, first contact their PI to request a letter supporting their merit or promotion. If their PI does not feel the advance is warranted, other options may need to first be discussed.

Provide all review candidates background on the review process and copies of APM 160 Academic Personnel Records (Attachment A), APM 310 Appointment and Promotion Professional Research Series (Attachment B) (or 311 Project Scientist, 330 Specialists), along with a copy of the ICESS Guidelines for Academic Review Committee (see attachment C). Additionally, provide copies of the relevant Red Binder sections (included as Attachment D): RB III-8 (Types of Reviews), RB III-12 (Professional Research Series), RB III-14 (Project Scientist Series), RB III-16 (Specialist Series).

October 15th
Provide the Director with an updated list indicating proposed action for each individual. Also provide a listing of proposed review committees. For academics in the Research Series, a committee is comprised of a chair and two committee members, each at a level higher than the individual being reviewed. For Specialists or Project Scientists, a committee is comprised of a chair and a single member. Adjust this committee membership list in consultation with the Director. Contact the proposed chairs to verify they are willing and able to serve. Once the chairs have agreed, contact the proposed committee members.

For each individual seeking review/promotion, prepare Academic Review memo (see attachment E) requesting their packets by November 10th. For individuals seeking promotion, meet with them to verbally explain that merit increases are based on the academic record since the time of last review while promotions are based on the career academic record (see RB III-8, Attachment D) and provide access to documents, as necessary (APM 310, 311, 330, RB III-8, RB III-12, RB III-14, RB III-16, ICESS Guidelines for Academic Review Committee). Reinforce to the review candidate the importance of deadlines in the review process. Encourage candidates to create a web link for their documents so both internal and external reviewers have the option of reviewing on-line, should they choose to do so.

November 10th
Prioritize incoming packets, looking at promotion/acceleration individuals first. Provide Director and committee chair with Bio-bib form and listing of possible external reviewers as
provided by the candidate. Once Director and committee chair have determined the appropriate possible external reviewers, contact each requesting completion of a review letter by January 15th. Follow-up as appropriate. Once the correct number of external reviewers has been obtained, prepare a letter from the Chair (See Attachment F - note: check the AP website for language updates to Red Binder I-49 or I-50 prior to sending) and send along with the candidate’s packet.

Prior to sending packets out to committees or external reviewers, complete the following:
1. Review candidate letter. Does it address the appropriate time period? Are details provided re: the achievements during the review period?
2. Review the Bio-bib form (See attachment G) for the following:
   - Is it in the proper form (see AP website, Forms, Bio-bibliography)?
   - Is the list of publications cumulative with a line drawn separating new items from those on the last bio-bib?
   - Are the publications listed correctly (titles, page numbers)?
   - Are items that were in-press, submitted, or in progress during the last review indicated as such?
   - Do the publications indicate “referred”??
3. Are all new publications listed on the Bio-bib also included in the candidate’s packet?
4. If this is a promotion, did the candidate supply a list of eight publications that include the entire promotion period vs. publications since the last review?

Once the packet has been review for correctness and completeness, prepare copies for the committees and include a cover memo explaining the candidate’s history (see Attachment H), Procedural Safeguard Statement Instructions to the Chair (Red Binder I-24, Attachment I), Documents to be Submitted by the Chair (Red Binder III-9, Attachment J), and ICESS Guidelines for Academic Review Committee (see attachment C).

**November 10th – January 31st**
As they come in, forward external letters to committees. At time of receipt, send thank you letter to external reviewers (see attachment K). Follow-up with committee chairs and external reviewers in order to keep the process on the campus schedule.

**February 1st**
Receive committee recommendations. Review to be sure the recommendations are accurate, provide sufficient detail, and are an analytical representation of the candidate’s accomplishments. If necessary (e.g. no details in letter), ask the chair to provide additional information. Once the committee’s letter has sufficient detail, forward to the Director for review/comment. Once approved, and working from the committee letter, draft the letter from the Director (see Attachment L).

**February 15th**
Finalize (after approval), letter from Director. Make a copy of the letter and a redacted copy of any external letters. Meet with the candidate, providing him/her with the letters. Go over the Procedural Safeguard Statement (Temporary Academic Titles) (Red Binder III-5, Attachment M) and have the candidate check the appropriate boxes, sign, and date.
Compile the package as follows (one copy of each item): *(due in O.R. by March 1st)*

1. Researcher/Specialist Review Form (Attachment N, Check Red Binder III-4 for updates prior to sending)
2. Procedural Safeguard statement
3. Merit recommendation letter from Director
4. External letters & CV forms from reviewers
5. Memo from candidate
6. CV & Bio-bib forms
7. Publications
8. RB III-9 Documents to be submitted by the Chair
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160-0 Policy

a. The policy set forth in this section is intended to define the rights of individuals and entities to have access to academic personnel records. This policy is intended to protect academic employees from unwarranted invasion of their personal privacy, as well as to specify their rights of access to their own personnel records; and to make corrections, deletions, or additions to these records.

See also:


Appendix B — Additional Academic Personnel Policies Pertaining to Academic Records.

160-20 Access to Academic Personnel Records

a. Protection of the Individual’s Right to Privacy

University policy and State and Federal laws recognize the individual’s rights to privacy, as well as the public’s right to know about the governance of public institutions.

The State of California Information Practices Act of 1977 guarantees certain legal rights to privacy by establishing strict limits to access to information about an individual which is maintained by a public entity, such as the University of California, whether that access is by a governmental agency, a private corporation, a member of the public, or an employee of the same public entity.

Under the California Public Records Act, records maintained by the University generally are public records and are subject to inspection by any person upon request unless specifically exempted under the law from disclosure. One of the exemptions includes records the disclosure of which would involve an unwarranted invasion of an individual’s personal privacy. The Faculty Code of Conduct (Part II.D.3.) as approved by the Assembly of
b. **Definition of Types of Records and Information Maintained by the University about Academic Employees**

(1) “Confidential academic review records” are:

(a) A letter of evaluation or other statement pertaining to an individual received by the University with the understanding that the identity of the author of the letter or statement will be held in confidence to the extent permissible by law.

(b) A letter from the chairperson (or equivalent officer) setting forth a personal recommendation in connection with an academic personnel action concerning the individual, such as appointment, promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment, nonreappointment, or terminal appointment.

(c) Reports, recommendations, and other related documents from campus and departmental *ad hoc* committees concerning evaluations of the individual under applicable University criteria in connection with an academic personnel action, such as appointment, promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment, nonreappointment, or terminal appointment.

(d) Information placed in the review file by a department chair that provides reference to the scholarly credentials of individuals who have submitted letters of evaluation or their relationship to the candidate.
(2) “Non-confidential academic review records” are:

(a) A letter from the chairperson (or equivalent officer) setting forth a
departmental recommendation in connection with an academic
personnel action concerning the individual, such as appointment,
promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment,
nonreappointment, or terminal appointment.

(b) Reports, recommendations, and other related documents from
administrative officers and standing personnel committees
concerning evaluation of the individual under applicable University
criteria in connection with an academic personnel action, such as
appointment, promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment,
nonreappointment, or terminal appointment.

(3) “Confidential information,” although generally not a part of an academic
review file, is occasionally maintained by the University, and includes,
but is not limited by law to, medical, psychological, or health care
information about an individual.

(4) “Non-personal” academic personnel information is limited to that
information which could not, in any reasonable way, reflect or convey
anything detrimental to an individual’s rights, benefits, or privileges,
such as:

(a) Individual’s name
(b) Date of hire or separation
(c) Current position title
(d) Current rate of pay
(e) Organizational unit assignment including office address and
telephone number
(f) Full-Time, part-time, or other employment status
(g) Certain other employment information required to be released to the
public as determined on a case-by-case basis by the General Counsel
and the Senior Vice President—Academic Affairs

(5) “Personal” information is any information about an individual that is not
defined as “confidential” or “non-personal,” and the disclosure of which
would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy of the
individual.
c. Access by the Individual

(1) In any of the academic personnel records pertaining to an individual, including the individual’s personnel review file, all documents other than confidential academic review records as defined in APM - 160-20-b(1) shall be accessible at reasonable times for inspection by the individual to whom the record pertains (including the right to receive the first copy of such material free, and subsequent copies at reasonable cost). Confidential academic review records shall be accessible, upon request, in redacted form as defined in APM - 160-20-c(4). Access to confidential information as defined in APM - 160-20-b(3) shall be in accord with legal requirements.

(2) During the departmental review of an academic personnel action, an individual’s opportunity to inspect all documents to be included in the personnel review file is governed by APM - 220-80-d.

(3) In an ongoing personnel action, during the period between a departmental recommendation in a personnel action concerning the individual and the final administrative decision in that personnel action, access by the individual undergoing review to any letter of evaluation or report submitted by an individual, administrator, or committee shall be governed by APM - 220-80-d, -e, -h, and -i.

(4) When an individual requests access to confidential academic review records (as defined in APM - 160-20-b(1)), the records shall be subject to redaction as follows:

- For a letter of evaluation or statement from an individual evaluator, redaction shall consist of the removal of name, title, organizational/institutional affiliation, and relational information contained below the signature block of the letter of evaluation.

- For reports or recommendations of an ad hoc committee, redaction shall consist of the removal of the names of individual members of the committee.

- For information that references the scholarly credentials or relationship to the candidate of the authors of letters of evaluation, no access shall be provided to the individual.
(Note: For confidential documents (including individual, departmental, and administrative letters, as well as committee reports and recommendations) placed in an academic personnel review file prior to September 1, 1992, campuses may either (a) redact such documents to remove the identifiers such as name, title, date, and organizational/institutional affiliation, or any relational statement or comment that would serve to identify the author(s) of the document, or (b) prepare a comprehensive summary.)

(5) An individual’s rights to access “confidential” information about himself or herself referred to in APM - 160-20-b(3) shall be in accordance with the legal requirements of the Information Practices Act of 1977.

(6) The provisions of APM - 160-20-c(2), (3), (4) apply only to the following academic personnel titles and title series: Professor, Professor in Residence, Acting Professor, Adjunct Professor, Visiting Professor, Clinical Professor, University Professor, Professor of Clinical ______, Agronomist, Astronomer, Lecturer, Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Lecturer with Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer, Senior Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment, Professional Research, Specialist, Cooperative Extension Specialist (Advisor), Supervisor of Physical Education, Librarian.

d. Access by Third Parties to “Confidential” and “Personal” Information

(1) Access by University Officers and Employees

Access by University officers and employees to confidential academic review records, non-confidential academic review records, “confidential” information or “personal” information as defined in APM - 160-20-b(1), (2), (3), (5) shall be strictly limited to those officers and employees who need such access in the performance of their officially assigned duties, provided that such access is related to the purpose for which the information was acquired.
(2) **Access by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure**

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure may request access to academic personnel records, including confidential academic review records, non-confidential academic review records, and “confidential” and “personal” information, to the extent necessary to permit thorough consideration of cases brought before it. The Chancellor shall provide to the Committee access to all such academic personnel records requested by the Committee, including confidential documents. Confidential documents provided to the Committee are subject to the provisions regarding maintenance of confidentiality set forth in APM - 160-20-a and 160-20-b. In considering a specific case, in conducting a hearing on a specific case, and in making its report and recommendations, the Committee shall not disclose to the individual or to any other persons, other than to University employees with an official need to know, the identities of persons who have supplied confidential academic review records, or “confidential” or “personal” information included in the individual’s academic personnel records. (The Privilege and Tenure Committee’s jurisdiction and procedures are described by Academic Senate Bylaws 195 and 335 and do not extend to evaluation of academic qualifications or professional competence.)

(3) **Access by Governmental Agencies**

Governmental agencies shall have access to confidential academic review records, non-confidential academic review records, and “confidential” and “personal” information when required by State or Federal law. The Senior Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs and Administration shall jointly issue procedural guidance for such access as needed.

(4) **Access by the Public and Non-Governmental Entities**

Members of the public and non-governmental entities shall not have access to confidential academic review records, or non-confidential academic review records, “confidential” or “personal” information, except as required by law.
c. **Access to “Non-Personal” Information**

“Non-personal” information is public information and is available upon request to any person or entity without limitation.

160-30 **Opportunity to Request Corrections or Deletions in Academic Personnel Records and to Make Additions to Such Records**

a. An individual may address to the Chancellor, or other appropriate administrative officer, a written request 1) that a statement of fact in an academic personnel record pertaining to the individual be corrected, 2) that a statement by the individual in response to material in an academic personnel record pertaining to the individual be included in that record, and/or 3) that specific material be deleted from such a record because that material is improperly included in the record and because neither correction nor responsive statement will adequately deal with the impropriety. Within a reasonable time period not to exceed 30 calendar days, the Chancellor, or other appropriate administrative officer, shall determine whether a requested correction in a statement of fact or a requested deletion will be made. The individual shall, in any event, have the right to have inserted in the appropriate record any statement the individual wishes in response to or commenting upon the challenged material.

b. Material included in the personnel review file of an individual shall not be deleted from academic personnel records pertaining to the individual pursuant to the preceding subsection unless the appropriate administrative officer has first solicited the advice of the Committee on Academic Personnel or equivalent committee.

c. If an individual has requested access to academic personnel records pertaining to the individual, material shall not be deleted from such records without the consent of the individual other than in accordance with the provisions of APM - 160-0 and 160-20.

d. If material is deleted from academic personnel records in accordance with the preceding subsections, care shall be taken to ensure that the same material is also deleted from copies of those records in all locations where such copies are maintained.
Supplemental Information Regarding Academic Policy
Including Interpretive Material Regarding the Need for
“Confidential Academic Review Records” and Provisions for Procedural
Safeguards Designed to Assure Fairness in the Academic Personnel Process

The use of “confidential academic review records” as set forth in APM - 160 is justified by two factors: (a) the need in the academic personnel process for candid evaluations of individuals under review, and (b) the provision of safeguards in the process to assure that confidentiality does not cloak abuse or unfairness.

(a) The University must, in the appointment, advancement, and retention of academic personnel, make informed and objective judgments about their qualifications and performance. This is especially important in decisions on the granting or withholding of tenure. Judgments and evaluations are here involved, as distinguished from determinations of issues of fact. All who participate in the multi-tiered academic personnel review process in the University will best be able to perform their functions if the degree of confidentiality set forth in APM - 160 is recognized, for without such confidentiality the candid judgments of the best qualified evaluators would no longer be as extensively available. Experts in an academic field, able to provide useful appraisals of the qualifications and performance of an academic appointee in the University, are less likely to provide these indispensable critical evaluations if their written statements are not considered to be confidential documents. Many valuable intramural and extramural sources of expert judgment would be, quite understandably, anxious to avoid impairing personal relationships with professional colleagues by making candidly critical evaluations. An intramural source of expert judgment concerning an individual may, under the University’s peer review process, in turn be evaluated in the future by the individual under review. An extramural source of expert judgment does not have an obligation, in the sense of being a member of the University community, to respond to a request for an evaluation of an individual, and may also, in the future, have professional relationships with or be evaluated (e.g., through national scientific review panels) by the individual under review. Without the degree of confidentiality described in APM - 160 there is substantial likelihood that qualified evaluators would refuse to provide evaluations, or would provide bland and non-candid, and, therefore, far less useful evaluations. Confidential evaluations are, then, necessary in order to make effective the continuing effort and obligation to preserve and increase the quality of the academic personnel of the University.
There are several elements in the academic personnel process of the University which provide safeguards to assure that the use of confidential documents in that process, as described in APM - 160, does not cloak abuse. There are understandable concerns that the use of confidential evaluations may sometimes produce unjust results. Various elements in the personnel process provide safeguards against potential injustice, while retaining the benefits to that process from the receipt of confidential evaluations.

These safeguards are:

1. An academic personnel process in which, as set forth in APM - 200-30, final administrative decisions are based solely upon the personnel review file, which contains only documentary material relevant to consideration of personnel actions concerning the individual under applicable University criteria.

2. A multi-tiered process of academic review, as set forth in APM - 220, typically involving (and in particular in cases of decisions concerning tenure) three different faculty review agencies (departmental faculty, campus ad hoc committee, and standing Committee on Academic Personnel or equivalent Committee), and two or three different administrative reviews (department chairperson, Dean or Provost, and Chancellor’s Office). Thus this is a process in which there are many participants, including the individual’s colleagues. It is a process in which evaluations received in confidence are considered by various reviewing agencies and weighed with other evaluations (those of departmental faculty, administrative officers, and campus ad hoc and standing committees). All of the persons involved in the academic personnel review process (departmental faculty, departmental chairperson, Dean or Provost, members of campus ad hoc and standing committees, Chancellor’s Office), in considering confidential letters from extramural evaluators, are entitled to know the identities of those evaluators. All participants in the review process are required to base their judgments solely on official University criteria. Under Part II.D. of the Faculty Code of Conduct, it is unacceptable conduct to evaluate the professional competence of faculty members “by criteria not directly reflective of professional performance,” or to discriminate against a faculty member “on political grounds, or for reasons of race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, ethnic origin, national origin, ancestry, marital status,
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medical condition*, status as a Vietnam-era veteran or disabled veteran, or, within the limits imposed by law or University regulations because of age or citizenship, or for any other arbitrary or personal reasons.”

3. Opportunity for the individual to receive, upon request, a redacted copy of all confidential academic review records in the personnel review file, as provided in APM - 160-20-c(1), (2) and (3).

4. Opportunity for the individual to contribute to the personnel review file, as set forth, for example, in APM - 220-80 and 220-84.

5. Clearly defined grievance procedures through which individuals can have their complaints inquired into concerning allegations of failure to comply with applicable procedural requirements in the academic personnel process, or allegations of the use of impermissible criteria in the process.

APM - 160-20-c(1), (2) and (3) provide the opportunity for an individual to receive, upon request, a redacted copy of all confidential academic review records in the individual’s academic personnel records which are described in APM - 160-20-b(1). This opportunity to receive redacted copies provides a means for the individual to learn the content of confidential documents in the individual’s academic personnel records.

The recognition in APM - 160 of the limited use of “confidential academic review records” as described above is confined to the academic personnel process and the review in that process of the qualifications and performance of individuals.

In addition to the recognition in APM - 160-20-b and -c(1) of the use in the academic personnel process of the described confidential academic review records, APM - 160-20-b(1)(a) is also intended to include other types of documents pertaining to an individual which occasionally can, for good reason, be received by the University in confidence. An example would be an unsolicited letter from a student, describing allegedly inappropriate (though not necessarily unprofessional) conduct by a member of the faculty. The author of such a letter may request that his or her identity be held confidential, because of fear of retaliation. (The identity of an individual who makes allegations of unprofessional conduct by a faculty member leading to invocation of formal disciplinary procedures is not held confidential.) The University has a responsibility to receive such letters, and to take

------------

*Medical condition, according to the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, means “health impairment related to or associated with a diagnosis of cancer, for which a person has been rehabilitated or cured.”
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whatever investigatory and corrective steps may be wise. Investigation may establish that the alleged conduct did not occur, or that the conduct was not inappropriate. Such documentary material, if irrelevant to the academic personnel process, would not, and could not, be made part of the personnel review file. But the material may nevertheless responsibly be retained, to provide for the future, if needed, a record of the complaint and the inquiry made. Circumstances in which confidential academic review records described in APM - 160-20-b(1)(a), (b), and (c) will be maintained—other than for inclusion in the personnel review file—are unusual.

APM - 160-20-d(2) describes access by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure to academic personnel records including confidential documents.

An academic appointee has a right to request that the campus Committee on Privilege and Tenure or other appropriate body inquire into whether, in the course of a personnel review of that individual, the procedures followed were in consonance with applicable requirements (e.g., APM - 220) and whether the decision was based on impermissible criteria, including (but not limited to) race, sex, or political conviction. Such an individual may also complain that the provisions of APM - 160, related to access to personnel records, have not been complied with. This right to make a complaint may lead to a formal investigation and hearing in appropriate cases. (See By-Law 335 of the Academic Senate and APM - 140.)

APM - 160-20-d(2) sets forth the power of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure to have access to academic personnel records, including confidential academic review records, to the extent necessary to permit thorough consideration of the complaint. (APM - 140-80-c(5) makes the provisions of APM - 160-20-d(2) applicable to hearing procedures in grievances of non-Senate academic appointees.)

APM - 160-30 contains provisions concerning the opportunity for an individual to request corrections or deletions in academic personnel records and to make additions to such records.
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Additional Academic Personnel Policies Pertaining to Academic Personnel Records

APM - 200-30  **Academic Personnel Actions — Personnel Review Files**

This section defines “personnel review file” and sets forth the basic principles that final administrative decisions in personnel actions shall be based solely upon the material contained in the individual’s personnel review file, and that the personnel review file shall contain only material relevant to consideration of personnel actions under applicable University criteria set forth in the Academic Personnel Manual.

In addition to the personnel review file, other academic personnel records, pertaining to an individual as an employee of the University, may include materials such as miscellaneous correspondence, leave records, and documents related to administrative appointments, employment history, retirement, payroll, Academic Senate matters concerning the individual, and the like. Such materials shall not be referred to or considered in connection with a recommendation or decision in a personnel action involving an individual unless they are made part of the individual’s personnel review file by an appropriate administrative officer.

APM - 210  **Appointment and Promotion — Review and Appraisal Committee**

APM - 210-1-b(1) Reports of the Review Committee are “confidential.”

APM - 210-1-c(2), 210-1-c(3) Requirement for letters of evaluation.

APM - 220  **Professor Series, Appointment and Promotion**

APM - 220-80-c, 220-80-d, 220-80-e, 220-80-h, 220-80-i, 220-84-b. These sections of the Academic Personnel Manual set forth the rights of an individual to be informed about and to contribute to the academic personnel process in connection with specific personnel actions concerning the individual. The principle embodied in these sections is that at the departmental level the individual should have the opportunity to be informed about the content of the personnel review file, including to receive, upon request, a redacted copy of confidential academic review records in the file and to comment on the file; and subsequently, to have access, upon request, to records in the file as augmented during later stages of the review. Provisions are added to other sections of the Manual to make these portions of APM - 220 applicable to other academic personnel titles or title series in which criteria and procedures are similar to those for the Professor series.

APM - 158  **Rights of Academic Appointees Including Rights Regarding Academic Records**
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310-4 Definition

a. The Professional Research series is used for appointees who engage in independent research equivalent to that required for the Professor series and not for appointees whose duties are limited to making significant and creative contributions to a research project or to providing technical assistance to a research activity. Appointees with Professional Research titles do not have teaching responsibilities.

b. Appointees can with campus approval be Principal Investigators and have the major responsibility and leadership for their research programs.

Appointments in this series may also be made to individuals who are not Principal Investigators, if they meet the research qualifications and demonstrate the accomplishment and the independence of research equivalent to that required for the Professorial ranks. For example, these individuals may be funded from a large center or collaborative program grant on which many independent investigators are working, or they may hold a Visiting title.

The ability to secure independent funding does not automatically qualify individuals for appointment to the Professional Research series.

c. Appointees may serve full-time, part-time, or without salary, provided they are actively engaged on a research project in accordance with APM - 310-4-b.

d. Professional Research titles may be supported by State and/or non-State funds.

310-8 Types of Appointments

a. Titles (and ranks) in this series are:

   (1) Assistant Research (e.g., Physicist)

   (2) Associate Research (e.g., Physicist)

   (3) Research (e.g., Physicist)
b. An appointment (as distinguished from a promotion) occurs when a person is employed in one of the three ranks listed above, if the individual’s immediately previous status was:

(1) not in the employ of the University; or

(2) in the employ of the University but not with a title in this series.

c. A promotion is an advancement from one rank to a higher rank within this series, usually to the next rank as listed above.

d. A merit increase is an advancement either in salary step or to an above-scale salary rate without change of rank. [See APM - 615]

e. The term reappointment means the renewal of an appointment in this series. If the renewal of an appointment does not immediately follow the ending date of the previous appointment, the action is an appointment, not a reappointment. A reappointment may or may not be accompanied by a promotion or a merit increase.

310-10 Criteria

A candidate for a title in this series must have earned a doctorate or its equivalent. The Chancellor may grant an exception to this requirement.

A candidate for appointment, reappointment, merit increase, or promotion in this series shall be judged by the criteria specified below:

a. Research qualifications and accomplishments equivalent to those for the Professor series

b. Professional competence and activity equivalent to those for the Professor series

c. University and/or public service

An Assistant Research (e.g., Physicist) is not required to participate in service activities. An Associate Research (e.g., Physicist) and a Research (e.g., Physicist) are expected to engage in University and/or public service, such as service on research review boards.
An appointee in this series must demonstrate continuous and effective engagement in independent and creative research activity of high quality and significance, equivalent to that expected of the Professor series. Proposed merit increases and promotions in the Professional Research series shall be reviewed with the same rigor accorded to proposed merits and promotions in the Professor series. See APM - 210-1.

### 310-16 Restrictions

a. Appointees in this series who teach must hold concurrently an appropriate faculty title, following campus review procedures for such appointment.

b. The appointment letter shall set forth any funding requirements for the position.

### 310-17 Terms of Service

a. An appointment or reappointment to the title of Assistant Research (e.g., *Physicist*) shall have a specified ending date. For written notification, see APM - 137-17.

b. An appointment or reappointment to the title of Associate Research (e.g., *Physicist*) or Research (e.g., *Physicist*) may be made in one of two ways:

1. **With a specified ending date**

   For written notification, see APM - 137-17.

2. **With no specified ending date**

   An appointment with no specified ending date should be made only when there is a reasonable expectation of long-term funding.

   The appointee shall be notified in writing that the appointment does not carry either tenure or security of employment.

   For provisions concerning termination see APM - 310-20-c.
c. Appointments and reappointments may have shorter terms than the maximums described below. The normal periods of service at each step in this series coincide with those of the Professor series as described in APM - 220-18-b.

(1) An appointment or reappointment in the Assistant Research (e.g., Physicist) rank shall be for a period of two years or less. Ordinarily, appointees serve in the first four steps with the corresponding salary levels. Steps V and VI may be used in exceptional situations, with proper justification, consistent with campus practice. Service at Assistant Research (e.g., Physicist), Step V, may be in lieu of service at Associate Research (e.g., Physicist), Step I, for which the published salary is slightly higher. Likewise, service at Assistant Research (e.g., Physicist), Step VI, may be in lieu of service at Associate Research (e.g., Physicist), Step II.

When service at Assistant Research (e.g., Physicist), Step V, is followed by service at Associate Research (e.g., Physicist), Step I, the normal period of combined service with both titles at the steps indicated is two years. The same normal two-year period of combined service applies when service at Assistant Research (e.g., Physicist), Step VI, is followed by service at Associate Research (e.g., Physicist), Step II.

There is an eight-year limit for an appointee who holds the Assistant Research (e.g., Physicist) title, either in that title alone or when combined with a Visiting Assistant Research (e.g., Physicist) title, with or without salary. The Chancellor may grant an exception to the eight-year limitation of service.

(2) For appointments with specific ending dates, an appointment or reappointment in the Associate Research (e.g., Physicist) rank at any one of the first three steps shall be for a period of two years or less. The normal period of service in the rank of Associate Research (e.g., Physicist) is six years. Steps IV and V may be used in exceptional situations, with proper justification, consistent with campus practice. Service at Associate Research (e.g., Physicist), Step IV, may be partly or entirely in lieu of service at Research (e.g., Physicist), Step I, for which the published salary is slightly higher. Likewise, service at Associate Research (e.g., Physicist), Step V, may be partly or entirely in lieu of service at Research (e.g., Physicist), Step II.
The normal period of service at Associate Research (e.g., Physicist), Step IV, is three years if such service is fully in lieu of service as Research (e.g., Physicist), Step I. In those instances of service at Associate Research (e.g., Physicist), Step IV, followed by service at Research (e.g., Physicist), Step I, the normal period of combined service is three years. The situation for Associate Research (e.g., Physicist), Step V, and Research (e.g., Physicist), Step II, is exactly analogous to that for Associate Research (e.g., Physicist), Step IV, and Research (e.g., Physicist), Step I.

(3) For appointments with specific ending dates, an appointment or reappointment in the Research (e.g., Physicist) rank may be for a period of three years or less. The normal period of service at step is three years in each of the first four steps. Service at Step V may be of indefinite duration. Advancement to Research (e.g., Physicist), Step VI, usually will not occur after less than three years of service at Step V, and will be granted on evidence of highly distinguished scholarship. In interpreting these criteria, reviewers should require evidence of excellence and high merit in original scholarship or creative achievement; and, in addition, great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, in scholarly or creative achievement. Service at Research (e.g., Physicist), Step VI, or higher may be of indefinite duration. Advancement from Research (e.g., Physicist), Step VI to Step VII, from Step VII to Step VIII, and from Step VIII to Step IX, usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the lower step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step VI.

Advancement to an above-scale salary is reserved for scholars of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at Step IX. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not a justification for further salary advancement. The record must demonstrate additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step IX was based. A further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an above-scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Continued good service 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 at intervals shorter than four years be approved.
d. Every member of the Professional Research series shall be reviewed at least every five years. In exceptional circumstances, the Chancellor may defer the review one year.

e. Rules concerning effective dates of appointments are set forth in APM - 200-17, except that an appointment period normally will coincide with the University’s fiscal year of July 1 through June 30 or with the end date of funding. The effective date of a promotion or merit increase is normally July 1. However, exceptions may be granted by the Chancellor. (See APM - 310-24.)

310-18 Salary

a. Authorized salary scales are issued by the Office of the President.

b. For off-scale salaries, see APM - 620.

310-20 Conditions of Employment

a. Appointees to this series are not members of the Academic Senate.

b. Neither tenure nor security of employment is acquired by appointment to a title in this series.

c. Expiration of an appointment, layoff, and termination

(1) Appointments which have specific ending dates are subject to APM - 137 (Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Term Appointment). For layoff or involuntary reduction in time before the end date, see APM - 145. For dismissal for unsatisfactory performance before the end date, see APM - 150.

(2) Appointments with no specific ending date are subject to the following policies:

(a) When an appointment in this series is terminated because of budgetary reasons, lack of work, or programmatic needs, APM - 145 (Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Layoff and Involuntary Reduction in Time) shall apply.
(b) Termination for unsatisfactory performance shall occur only after appropriate academic review, in accordance with APM - 150 (Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Corrective Action and Dismissal).

d. An appointee with a title in this series is eligible for leave with pay under APM - 758 when the leave is in the interest of the University and to the extent that funds are available in the source(s) from which the salary is paid. Appointees are not eligible for sabbatical leave (APM - 740).

e. APM - 140 (Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Grievances) shall apply to appointees in this series.

310-24 Authority

a. Authority to approve appointments, reappointments, merit increases, promotions, and terminations in this series, following appropriate review, rests with the Chancellor, except for certain above-scale salaries. The Chancellor has authority to approve above-scale salary levels up to and including the Regental compensation threshold. For salaries beyond the Regental compensation threshold, authority rests with The Regents on recommendation of the President, after appropriate review, and as prescribed in Section 101.2(a)(2) of the Standing Orders of The Regents.

b. An initial appointment or subsequent reappointment of any person following retirement may be made on a year-to-year basis and with specific approval of the Chancellor.

c. The Chancellor’s authority as stipulated in APM - 310-24-a extends to the approval of promotions and merit increases having effective dates other than July 1.

d. The Chancellor’s authority as set forth in APM - 310-24-a also extends to the approval of appointments, merit increases, and promotions which are retroactive (that is, with the beginning date prior to the date of approval).

310-80 Recommendations and Review

The provisions of APM - 220-80-c, -d, -e, -h, -i, -j, and 220-84-b, modified as appropriate in specific circumstances, apply to this series.
Definition

a. Project (e.g., Scientist) series titles are given to those appointees who make significant and creative contributions to a research or creative project in any academic discipline. Appointees with Project (e.g., Scientist) titles may engage in University and public service. They do not have teaching responsibilities.

b. Appointees in this series may be ongoing members of a research team or may be employed for a limited period of time to contribute high-level skills to a specific research or creative program.

c. Appointees in this series are not required to carry out independent research or develop an independent research reputation. Ordinarily, appointees in Project (e.g., Scientist) series titles will carry out research or creative programs with supervision by a member of the Professor or Professional Research series.

d. The Project (e.g., Scientist) series differs from the Professional Research series in that the former need not demonstrate the same capacity for fully independent research or research leadership required of the Professor series and Professional Research series.

e. Appointees in the Project (e.g., Scientist) series are expected to have a broader range of knowledge and competency and a higher level of independence than appointees in the Specialist series, whose appointment and advancement depend on the technical contributions that they make to the work of the research team.

f. An appointee in the Project (e.g., Scientist) series does not usually serve as a Principal Investigator. See campus policies for Principal Investigator and Co-Principal Investigator status. For titles that do not automatically qualify as Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator, the Chancellor may grant an exception. Serving as a Principal Investigator is not required or expected for an appointment, merit increase, or promotion.

The designation as Principal Investigator does not in itself justify an appointment to the Professional Research series.

g. Appointees may serve full-time, part-time, or without salary.

h. Project (e.g., Scientist) series titles may be supported by State and non-State funds.
Types of Appointments

a. Titles (and ranks) in this series are:
   (1) Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist)
   (2) Associate Project (e.g., Scientist)
   (3) Project (e.g., Scientist)

b. An appointment (as distinguished from a promotion) occurs when a person is employed in one of the three ranks listed above, if the individual’s immediately previous status was:
   (1) not in the employ of the University; or
   (2) in the employ of the University but not with a title in this series.

c. A promotion is an advancement from one rank to a higher rank within this series, usually the next rank as listed above.

d. A merit increase is an advancement in salary step or to an above-scale salary rate without change of rank. [See APM - 615]

e. The term reappointment means the renewal of an appointment in this series. If the renewal of an appointment does not immediately follow the ending date of the previous appointment, the action is an appointment, not a reappointment. A reappointment may or may not be accompanied by a promotion or a merit increase.

Criteria

The candidate for a title in this series must have earned a doctorate or its equivalent. The Chancellor may grant an exception to this requirement.

A candidate for appointment, reappointment, merit increase, or promotion in this series shall be judged by the criteria specified below:

a. Demonstrated significant, original, and creative contributions to a research or creative program or project
b. Professional competence and activity

Appointees in this series need not demonstrate the same independence or scholarly breadth as members of the Professor or Professional Research series. University and public service are encouraged but not required.

311-16 Restrictions

a. Appointees in this series who teach must hold concurrently an appropriate faculty title, following campus review procedures for such appointment.

b. The appointment letter shall set forth any funding requirements for the position.

311-17 Terms of Service

a. An appointment or reappointment in the Project (e.g., Scientist) series shall have a specified ending date. The appointee shall be advised in writing that the appointment is for a specific period and that the appointment ends at the specified date. [See APM - 137]

When there is a reasonable expectation of long-term funding, the Chancellor, by exception, may make an appointment in the Associate Project (e.g., Scientist) and Project (e.g., Scientist) title with no specific ending date. The appointee shall be advised in writing that the appointment does not carry tenure or security of employment.

Appointments and reappointments may have shorter terms than the maximums described below.

(1) An appointment or reappointment in the Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist) rank shall be for a period of two years or less. Ordinarily, appointees serve in the first four steps with the corresponding salary levels. Steps V and VI may be used in exceptional situations, with proper justification, consistent with campus practice. Service at Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist), Step V, may be in lieu of service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step I, for which the published salary is slightly higher. Likewise, service at Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist), Step VI, may be in lieu of service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step II.
When service at Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist), Step V, is followed by service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step I, the normal period of combined service with both titles at the steps indicated is two years. The same normal two-year period of combined service applies when service at Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist), Step VI, is followed by service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step II.

For campuses that adopt an eight-year limitation of service, there is an eight-year limit for an appointee who holds the Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist) title, either in that title alone or when combined with an Assistant Research (e.g., Physicist) title and Visiting Assistant Research (e.g., Physicist) title.

(2) For appointments with specific ending dates, an appointment or reappointment in the Associate Project (e.g., Scientist) rank at any one of the first three steps, shall be for a period of two years or less. The normal period of service in the rank of Associate Project (e.g., Scientist) is six years. Steps IV and V may be used in exceptional situations, with proper justification, consistent with campus practice. Service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step IV, may be partly or entirely in lieu of service at Project (e.g., Scientist), Step I, for which the published salary is slightly higher. Likewise, service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step V, may be partly or entirely in lieu of service at Project (e.g., Scientist), Step II.

The normal period of service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step IV, is three years if such service is fully in lieu of service as Project (e.g., Scientist), Step I. In those instances of service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step IV, followed by service at Project (e.g., Scientist), Step I, the normal period of combined service is three years. The situation for Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step V, and Project (e.g., Scientist), Step II, is exactly analogous to that for Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step IV, and Project (e.g., Scientist), Step I.

(3) For appointments with specific ending dates, an appointment or reappointment in the Project (e.g., Scientist) rank may be for a period of three years or less. The normal period of service at step is three years in each of the first four steps. Service at Step V and higher may be of indefinite duration.
b. Rules concerning effective dates of appointments are set forth in APM - 200-17, except that an appointment period normally will coincide with the University’s fiscal year of July 1 through June 30 or with the end date of funding. The effective date of a promotion or merit increase is normally July 1. However, exceptions may be approved by the Chancellor. (See APM - 311-24)

311-18 Salary

Authorized salary scales are issued by the Office of the President.

For off-scale salaries, see APM - 620.

311-20 Conditions of Employment

a. Appointees to this series are not members of the Academic Senate.

b. Neither tenure nor security of employment is acquired by appointment to a title in this series.

c. When an appointment in this series is terminated because of budgetary reasons, lack of work, or programmatic needs, APM - 145 (Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Layoff and Involuntary Reduction in Time) applies.

d. APM - 150 (Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Corrective Action and Dismissal) applies to this series.

e. An appointment which has a specific ending date is subject to APM - 137 (Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Term Appointment).

f. An appointee with a title in this series is eligible for leave with pay under APM - 758 when the leave is in the interest of the University and to the extent that funds are available in the source(s) from which the salary is paid.

Appointees are not eligible for sabbatical leave APM - 740.

g. APM - 140 (Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Grievances) applies to appointees in this series.
311-24 Authority

a. Authority to approve appointments, reappointments, merit increases, promotions, and terminations in this series, following appropriate review, rests with the Chancellor, except for certain above-scale salaries.

The Chancellor has the authority to approve above-scale salary levels up to and including the Regental compensation threshold. For salaries beyond the Regental compensation threshold, authority rests with The Regents on recommendation of the President, after appropriate review, and as prescribed in Section 101.2(a)(2) of the Standing Orders of The Regents.

b. An initial appointment or subsequent reappointment of any person following retirement may be made on a year-to-year basis and with specific approval of the Chancellor.

c. The Chancellor’s authority as stipulated in APM - 310-24-a extends to the approval of promotions and merit increases having effective dates other than July 1.

d. The Chancellor’s authority as set forth in APM - 310-24-a also extends to the retroactive approval of appointments, merit increases, and promotions (that is, with the beginning date prior to the date of approval).
330-4 Definition

The Specialist series is used for academic appointees who are engaged in research in specialized areas and who do not have any teaching responsibilities.

330-6 Responsibility

a. For Specialists in the Agricultural Experiment Station

Responsibility for reviewing personnel and for recommending appointments and promotions rests with the department chairperson, dean of the college or school (or Director of the Citrus Experiment Station acting in the capacity of Assistant Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station) and the Chancellor.

b. For Specialists in the Scripps Institution of Oceanography

Responsibility for reviewing personnel and for recommending appointments and promotions rests with the director or department chairperson, the Director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, and the Chancellor.

c. For Specialists in all Other Departments

Responsibility for reviewing personnel and for recommending appointments and promotions rests with the director or department chairperson, the dean of the school or college involved, and the Chancellor.

330-8 Types

Appointment and promotion in this series may be made to the following ranks:

a. Junior Specialist

b. Assistant Specialist

c. Associate Specialist

d. Specialist
330-10 **Criteria**

In judging a candidate for appointment or promotion to a position in this series, the following criteria are used:

a. Performance in research in specialized areas

b. Professional competence and activity

c. University and public service

330-18 **Salary**

a. An authorized salary scale established for this series is issued by the Office of the President.

b. New appointees are normally paid at a minimum salary rate for the rank to which appointment is made. (See also APM - 310-12-c.)

See also APM - 615-24.

330-20 **Conditions of Employment**

The normal periods of service for each step of the ranks listed in APM - 330-8 are as shown in the Academic Salary Scale:

a. Junior Specialist
   - Step I: 1 year
   - Step II: 1 year

b. Assistant Specialist
   - Step I: 2 years
   - Step II: 2 years
   - Step III: 2 years

c. Associate Specialist
   - Step I: 2 years
   - Step II: 2 years
   - Step III: 2 years
   - Step IV: No normal period of service
d. Specialist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step I</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step II</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step III</td>
<td>No normal period of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step IV</td>
<td>No normal period of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step V</td>
<td>No normal period of service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

330-24 Authority

Authority to approve appointments, reappointments, merit increases, promotions, and terminations in this series, following appropriate review, rests with the Chancellor except as noted below.

Specialist at an above-scale salary:

The Chancellor has the authority to approve above-scale salary levels up to and including the Regental compensation threshold. For salaries beyond the Regental compensation threshold, authority rests with The Regents on recommendation of the President, after appropriate review and as prescribed in Section 101.2(a)(2) of the Standing Orders of The Regents.

330-80 Recommendation and Review

The provisions of APM - 220-80-c, -d, -e, -h, -i, -j, 220-84-b, modified as appropriate in specific circumstances, apply to this series.
ERI Guidelines for Academic Review Committee

1. Purpose and Responsibility of the Review Committee
   The quality of our professional researchers, specialists, and project scientists is maintained primarily through objective and thorough appraisal of each candidate for appointment or promotion. Responsibility for this appraisal falls largely upon the review committee, made up of competent faculty members, researchers, specialists, and project scientists, all appointed by the Director. It is the responsibility of these committees to determine the present professional status of each candidate and the likelihood of future professional productivity and effectiveness. Implied in the committee’s responsibility for helping to maintain a group of professional researchers of the highest quality is also a responsibility to the candidate for just recognition and encouragement of achievement.
   The membership, deliberations, recommendations and report of the review committee are confidential.
   A written report of findings is made to the Director.

2. Procedure
   Promotions – Promotions are based on merit; they are not automatic. Achievement, as it is demonstrated, should be rewarded by promotion. Promotions should be based on consideration of comparable work in the candidate’s own field, or in closely related fields, and should consider the work of the candidate since the time of last promotion. The review committee should consider how the candidate stands in relation to others in the field outside the University who might be considered as alternative candidates for the position. Letters from distinguished extramural referees shall be solicited.

   Merit Increases – The review committee shall assess the adequacy of the evidence submitted and seek additional information as needed to make a fair recommendation for the period covered by the review.
   If, in assessing all evidence, the candidate fails to make normal progress, the committee should not recommend a merit increase. If, on the other hand, there is evidence of unusual achievement and exceptional promise of continued growth, the committee should not hesitate to endorse a recommendation for accelerated advancement.

3. Criteria for Promotion and Merit Increases
   The review committee shall judge the candidate with respect to the proposed rank and duties, considering the record of the candidate’s performance in (1) research, (2) professional activity, (3) University and public service, and (4) teaching, as applicable. In evaluating the candidate’s qualifications within these areas, the review committee shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. The review committee must judge whether the candidate is engaging in a program of work that is both sound and productive. As the University enters new fields of endeavor and refocuses its ongoing activities, cases will arise in which the proper work of faculty members departs markedly from established academic patterns. In such cases the review committees must take exceptional care to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. However, flexibility does not entail a relaxation of high standards. Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced in research or other creative achievement, is essential for promotion and
merit increases. Insistence upon this standard of excellence is necessary for maintenance of the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

The criteria set forth below are intended to serve as guides in judging the candidate, not to set boundaries to the elements of performance that may be considered.

(1) Research – Evidence of creativity and productivity of the highest quality should be sought in the candidate’s published research.

Research publications and other creative accomplishment should be evaluated, not merely enumerated. There should be evidence that the candidate is continuously and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance. Work in progress should be assessed whenever possible. When published work in joint authorship (or other product of joint effort) is presented as evidence, it is necessary to establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in the joint effort. Appraisals of publications or other works in the scholarly and critical literature provide important testimony.

Textbooks, reports, circulars, and similar publications normally considered evidence of teaching ability or public service should be judged creative work when they present new ideas or incorporate scholarly research.

Professional Competence and Activity – The candidate’s professional activities should be scrutinized for evidence of achievement and leadership in the field and of demonstrated progress in the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems.

University and Public Service – Academics plays an important role in the administration of the University and in the formulation of its policies. Recognition should therefore be given to scholars who prove themselves to be able administrators and who participate effectively and imaginatively in the Institute and the campus. Services by professional researchers to the community, state, and nation, both in their special capacities as scholars and in areas beyond those special capacities should likewise be recognized as evidence for promotion when the work done is at a sufficiently high level and of sufficiently high quality. Similarly, contributions to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees and as advisors to student organizations should be recognized as evidence.

Teaching – Effective teaching should be judged as it is for faculty. In judging the effectiveness of a candidate’s teaching the committee should consider such points as the following: the candidate’s command of the subject; continuous growth in the subject field; ability to organize material and to present it with compellingly and logically; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; grasp of general objectiveness; spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize the candidate’s learning and teaching; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students to creative work; personal attributes as they affect teaching and students.
This criterion is only applicable when professional researchers have accepted lecturer appointments in departments or participated extensively in a professor’s class.

4. **The Report**

   The report of the review committee forms the basis for the Director’s recommendation to the Administration. Consequently, the report should include an appraisal of all significant evidence, favorable and unfavorable. It should be specific and analytical and should include the review committee’s evaluation of the candidate with respect to each of the qualifications specified above. It should be adequately documented by reference to the supporting material.

   The review committee has the responsibility of making an unequivocal recommendation. No member should subscribe to the report if it does not represent that member’s judgment. If the committee cannot reach a unanimous decision, the division of the committee and the reasons therefore should be communicated either in the body of the report or in separate concurring or dissenting statements by individual members, submitted with the main report and with the cognizance of the other committee members.
III-8
TYPES OF REVIEW
(Revised 10/10)

On-time merit advancement
A merit action is considered on-time when the departmental recommendation is for a normal advance in step that does not increase or decrease the off-scale salary supplement and does not involve a special step or mandatory review.

On-time merit advancement at the Assistant and Associate levels occurs after two years at step, and at the Full level after three years at step.

The Vice Chancellor for Research has approval authority for on-time merits. Upon review and approval, the Vice Chancellor for Research will forward the completed case to the Office of Academic Personnel for post-audit. The Office of Academic Personnel will remain the office of record for maintenance of personnel files.

Other reviews

1. Accelerated actions
   Departments should not hesitate to propose accelerated advancement to reward cases of superior performance. Early advancement to the next step or rank is the appropriate form of acceleration. The addition of, or an increase in, off-scale supplement will also be considered an acceleration. However, off-scale salaries are most commonly used to respond to "market pressures", as described in Red Binder I-8. Departments should review candidates performing at a superior level in advance of their normal eligibility for merit increase or promotion. As with any on time advancement, the individual’s next eligible date for advancement will be based on the effective date of the accelerated advancement if an advancement in step occurs.

II. Decelerated actions
   A case will be considered decelerated if the candidate has been at the current step for longer than the normal years at step. The departmental letter should give an explanation for the deceleration.

III. Promotion to the Associate level
   Professional Research Series:
   The principal criterion for promotion to Associate Researcher is superior intellectual attainment in research or other creative achievement. The most useful critical assessment of "superior intellectual attainment" must come primarily from those who are established figures in the field, primarily from colleagues in the department as well as faculty in comparable departments and programs nationally and internationally. (In this connection, departments may wish to provide an operational interpretation of the phrase "superior intellectual attainment" which they consider appropriate to the particular discipline or subject-area). Candid, thorough, documented and concise assessment on this level is clearly essential if reviewing agencies are to perform their proper analytical and evaluative task. Furthermore, it is essential that a candidate's performance be measured by the highest standards of excellence that are currently recognized by a given intellectual discipline or subject-area. The level of research independence expected for promotion to Associate Researcher is equivalent to the expectation of research independence for a ladder faculty member being promoted to Associate Professor. Promotion to Associate Researcher will normally take place at the beginning of the seventh year of service and must occur no later than the end of the eighth year of service.

   Project Scientist and Specialist Series:
   Advancement from Assistant Project Scientist to Associate Project Scientist requires competency and an expanding level of independence. Advancement from Assistant Specialist to Associate Specialist requires the candidate to provide independent input into the planning and execution of the research.

IV. Promotion to Full
   Professional Research Series:
   Promotion to Researcher requires an accomplished record of research that is judged to be excellent within the larger discipline or field. Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for advancement to Researcher.

   Project Scientist and Specialist Series:
Advancement to Project Scientist requires competency and an expanding level of independence. Advancement to Specialist requires the candidate to provide independent input into the planning and execution of the research.

V. Merit to a special step.
Assistant Researcher V, Associate Researcher IV, Assistant Project Scientist V and Associate Project Scientist IV are "special" steps in the sense that these steps may be utilized for advancement when a candidate shows clear evidence of completed work that is likely to lead to promotion in the near future when published, but whose established record of accomplishment has not yet attained sufficient strength to warrant promotion. Service at the special steps is in lieu of service at the first step of the next rank. Once advanced to a special step, the normal progression is for promotion to the next rank. Further advancement within the special step will happen only in very rare and unusual circumstances. Upon advancement to a special step, the candidate is eligible for promotion the following year. If promoted earlier than the normal years at step for Step I of the higher rank, promotion should be lateral and eligibility for future merit will be determined based on the combination of years at the special step and years at Step I at the higher rank.

Professional Research Series only:

VI. Terminal Appointments
If, during a review of an Assistant Researcher, a preliminary decision is made for a terminal appointment, the procedures outlined in Red Binder I-39 must be followed. Appropriate notification and opportunity for response must be provided.

VII. Mandatory reviews
Researchers at all levels must undergo a performance review at least once every five years. This review may not be deferred. Non-submission of materials by the candidate will not constitute automatic deferral in the case of a mandatory review. If a Researcher does not turn in materials by the departmental due date, the department will conduct the review based on the materials available in the department as of the due date.

VIII. Merit to Researcher VI
Advancement to Researcher VI is based on evidence of highly distinguished scholarship. In addition, great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally in scholarly or creative achievement is required for merit to Researcher VI. This is a career review and therefore is based on a review of the individual's entire academic career.

IX. Merit to or within Researcher Above Scale
Advancement to Researcher Above Scale is reserved for scholars of the highest distinction whose work has received international recognition. Advancement to Researcher Above Scale will normally occur after at least four years of service at Researcher IX with the individual's complete academic career being reviewed.

A merit increase for a candidate already serving at an Above Scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction appropriate to this highest level. Continued good service is not an adequate justification. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinite. Merit increases normally range between 5-7%, where 5% reflects new evidence of merit and distinction, and 7% is reserved for outstanding accomplishment. Cases for merit increases at the higher percentage must be justified by evidence of significant new achievement, such as the publication of a book, or significant recognition such as distinguished awards, prizes or elections. Only in the most exceptional cases, where there is strong and compelling evidence, will accelerated increases at intervals shorter than four years or merit increases above 7% be approved.

The Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel will have final approval authority for Professional Researcher promotions, advancement to Researcher VI and advancement to or within Above Scale. The Vice Chancellor for Research will have final approval authority for all other cases.
I. Definition

The titles in this series are given only to those who engage in independent research equivalent to that required for the Professor series. Individuals whose duties are defined as making significant and creative contributions to a research project, or to providing technical assistance to research activity should not be appointed in this series. For use of the Visiting prefix with this series, see Red Binder III-23.

II. Ranks and Steps

A. Assistant Researcher II – V (Steps V is considered a “special step”)
B. Associate Researcher I – IV (Step IV is considered a “special step”)
C. Researcher I – IX

The normal time of service at each step within the Assistant and Associate rank is 2 years, except for service at the special steps of Assistant Researcher V and Associate Researcher IV (Red Binder I-4, II). Within the Researcher rank normal service at Steps I-IV is 3 years. Service at Step V and above may be for an indefinite time: however, normal service is 3 years at Steps V through VIII and 4 years at Step IX. Eligibility for normal advancement occurs after the normal time of service at each step. If not advanced in step at that time, the candidate will continue to be eligible each year until advancement in step occurs.

III. Appointment and Advancement Criteria

The candidate must possess a doctorate or its equivalent at the time of initial appointment. The candidate will be judged based on the following criteria:

A. Research qualifications and accomplishments equivalent to those for the Professor series, including demonstrated continuous and effective engagement in independent and creative activity of high quality and significance.

B. Professional competence and activity equivalent to those for the Professor series.

C. University and/or public service at the Associate Researcher and Researcher ranks.

IV. Term of Appointment

A. Service as Assistant Researcher is limited to eight years of service. Six months or more of service within any fiscal year, either paid or without salary, as an Assistant Researcher or Visiting Assistant Researcher counts towards the eight year limit.

B. Appointments or reappointments may be for up to two years at the Assistant Researcher and Associate Researcher level and for up to three years at the Researcher level if guaranteed funding is available.

V. Compensation

A. Individuals appointed to this series are compensated on the salary scales established for the Professional Research series on a fiscal year (11 months) basis. The Economics/Engineering Professional Research salary scale will be used when either:

1. The unit is an Engineering unit (departments and research units reporting to the Dean of Engineering) or the Department of Economics

or:

2. The unit is multi or interdisciplinary and includes both engineering or economics and other
disciplinary activity (for example: CNSI, ICB, MATP). In this case two additional criteria must be met: a) The individual’s background and training is in engineering or economics, and b) The project with which the individual is associated is an engineering or economics project.

When option #2 is used, the justification for use of the Engineering scale must be clearly stated in the departmental appointment recommendation.

B. Salaries are subject to range adjustment.

C. Each source which provides compensation for service in this series must permit research.

D. Off-scale salaries are allowed within the same limits and policies as ladder faculty off-scale salaries. Off-scale salaries for Assistant Researchers may be between $100 above the designated step and $100 below the equivalent step in the next rank. Off-scale salaries for Associate Researchers may be between $100 above the designated step and $100 less than one step higher in the next rank. Off-scale salaries for Researchers below Step VI may be between $100 above the designated step and $100 less than four steps above, with a maximum of $100 below Step VI. For Researchers at Steps VI through IX, no off-scale salary in excess of 10 percent above Step IX will be approved. (Red Binder I-8)

VI. Requests for Appointment, Reappointment, and Advancement

Appointment
Appointment cases are to be prepared using the Temporary Academic Appointment Form Letter (Red Binder III-3) and the checklist of documents to be submitted by the Chair for appointments (Red Binder III-7). Particular attention should be paid to sections N & O, which require justification demonstrating the equivalence of the requested position to the same level faculty position, and an analytical evaluation of the candidate and his or her accomplishments.

Reappointment
Reappointments are to be prepared using the Temporary Academic Appointment Form Letter (Red Binder III-3). The timing of the reappointment will be based on the original start date of the appointment and/or the availability of funding.

Advancement: Merit and Promotion
Advancement cases are to be prepared using the Research Title Review Form (Red Binder III-4) and the checklists of documents to be submitted by the chair for research reviews (Red Binder III-9). Red Binder I-22, Departmental Checklist for Academic Advancement may also be used as a guideline for departmental review. All advancement actions are based on the individual’s achievements. Normal advancement will occur after 2 years at step at the Assistant or Associate level and after 3 years at the Full Research level. Merit increases are based on the academic record since the time of last review while promotions are based on the career academic record. Any advancement requested prior to that time will be considered an acceleration and must be justified as such.

All merits and promotions will be effective July 1. Completed cases must be submitted to the Office of Research by March 1, preceding the effective date. Cases received after the due date will be returned to the Department and will not be processed. A missed deadline may not be used as justification for retroactivity in a future review.

Deferral will be automatic if a Researcher does not submit material by the departmental due date and no case is forwarded by the department, with the exception of mandatory reviews.

Appointees in the Research series must undergo a performance review at least once every five years, including an evaluation of the researcher’s record in all review areas. This review may not be deferred. If the candidate does not turn in materials by the departmental due date, the department will conduct the review based on the materials available in the department as of the due date.

In cases where the final decision is a lesser advancement than recommended by the department, a reconsideration may be requested. Procedures outlined in Red Binder I-10 must be followed.

Chair/Director Letters of Recommendation
The Chair/Director's letter of recommendation for appointment or advancement should include an evaluation of the candidate's record in all review areas (see III Appointment and Advancement criteria, above). The evaluation is expected to meet the standards set forth in APM 310 which prescribes that candidates for appointment or advancement in the Research series have research qualifications equivalent to those of the corresponding ladder faculty rank. Each unit should establish set procedures for evaluation of Research appointments and advancements and development of the letter of recommendation. While a full review completed by a departmental committee knowledgeable of the candidate’s field is preferred, in cases where this is not appropriate, a review done solely by the Chair, Director or P.I. is acceptable. If a committee is not formed, an explanation should be provided in the letter of recommendation. Red Binder I-35 provides additional guidance on developing the letter of recommendation.

External Evaluation

External letters of evaluation will be required in cases of: appointment as Associate Researcher, appointment as Researcher, promotion to Associate Researcher, promotion to Researcher, merit to Researcher, Step VI and merit to Researcher Above Scale. A minimum of 4 letters must be included at the Associate level, a minimum of 6 at the Full Researcher level. In addition to the foregoing, recommendations for promotion or advancement to Researcher, Step VI must include at least 6 extramural evaluations from references. At least half of the letters submitted with the case should come from references chosen by the Department or Program independent of the candidate. Letters from faculty or researchers at other UC campuses are essential for appointment/advancement to Research VI, preferably from individuals already at the senior ranks. Solicitations of extramural evaluations should not merely ask for opinions regarding the suitability of the candidate for promotion, but should invite analytical evaluations of the candidate's research with respect to quality and significance. Reviewing agencies reserve the right to request letters be solicited in any advancement case if it is determined that more information is necessary to support the proposed action.

In all cases of solicitation of outside letters, the sample letter for solicitation of extramural letters (Red Binder I-49) is to be used.

For promotion or appointment to Associate Researcher, the following wording should be inserted as appropriate:

_______ is being considered for (an appointment/promotion to) Associate Researcher in the (department/unit). Appointment (or promotion) to Associate Researcher within the UC system requires a research record equivalent to that of an Associate Professor. Superior intellectual attainment in research is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to Associate Researcher. [Sample wording for evaluation request: e.g., I would greatly appreciate your evaluation of _______'s work.]

For promotion or appointment to full Researcher, the following wording should be inserted as appropriate:

_______ is being considered for (an appointment/promotion to) Researcher in the (department/unit). Appointment (or promotion) to Researcher within the UC system requires a research record equivalent to that of a Professor. A candidate for this position is expected to have an accomplished record of research that is judged to be excellent by his or her peers within the larger discipline or field. [Sample wording for evaluation request: e.g., I would greatly appreciate your evaluation of _______'s work]

For a merit advancement to Researcher, Step VI or appointment at Step VI or above, the following wording should be inserted as appropriate:

_______ is being considered for advancement to Researcher [specify step] in the (dept/unit). In the UC system there are 9 steps within the rank of Researcher. The normal period of service is three years in each of the first five steps. Service at Research, Step V, may be of indefinite duration. Advancement to Step VI will be granted on evidence of highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellence in research, and in addition, great distinction recognized nationally or internationally, in research. [Sample wording for evaluation request: e.g., I would greatly appreciate your evaluation of _______'s work]
For appointment as, or merit advancement to Researcher Above Scale, the following wording should be inserted as appropriate:

___________ is being considered for (an appointment as/ advancement to) Researcher Above Scale in the Department of __________. In the University of California, there are nine steps within the rank of Researcher. Steps VI, VII, VIII, and IX are reserved for highly distinguished scholars. (Appointment/advancement) to an Above Scale salary is reserved for scholars of the highest distinction, whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed. [Sample wording for evaluation request: e.g., I would greatly appreciate your evaluation of ____________’s work.]

VII. Approval Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asst appts, re-appts, merits</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc, Full appts</td>
<td>AVC, Academic Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc, Full, re-appts, merits</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>AVC, Academic Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit to Researcher VI or to Above Scale</td>
<td>AVC, Academic Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Engineering scale in non-Engineering unit</td>
<td>AVC. Academic Personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Definition

The titles in this series are given only to those who make significant and creative contributions to a research or creative project. Appointees may be ongoing members of a research team, or may contribute high-level skills to a specific project for a limited time. Demonstrated capacity for fully independent research or research leadership as required in the Researcher series are not required in this series. However, a broad range of knowledge and competency and a higher level of independence than appointees in the Specialist series are expected. See APM 311 for System Wide policy on Project Scientists. See Red Binder III-23 for procedures for Visiting appointments in this series.

II. Ranks and Steps

A. Assistant Project Scientist I – V (Steps V is considered a “special step”)
B. Associate Project Scientist I – IV (Step IV is considered a “special step”)
C. Project Scientist I – IX

The normal time of service at each step within the Assistant and Associate rank is 2 years, except for service at the special steps of Assistant Project Scientist V and Associate Project Scientist IV (Red Binder I-4, II). Within the Project Scientist rank normal service at Steps I-IV is 3 years. Service at Step V and above may be for an indefinite time: however, normal service is 3 years at Steps V through VIII and 4 years at Step IX.

III. Appointment and Advancement Criteria

The candidate must possess a doctorate or its equivalent at the time of initial appointment. The candidate will be judged based on the following criteria:

A. Demonstrated significant, original, and creative contributions to a research or creative program or project

B. Professional competence and activity

University and public service are encouraged but not required.

IV. Term of Appointment

Appointments or reappointments may be for up to two years at the Assistant Project Scientist and Associate Project Scientist level and for up to three years at the Project Scientist level if guaranteed funding is available.

V. Compensation

A. Individuals appointed to this series are compensated on the salary scales established for the Project Scientist series on a fiscal year (11 months) basis. The Economics/Project Scientist salary scale will be used when either:

1. The unit is an Engineering unit (departments and research units reporting to the Dean of Engineering) or the Department of Economics or:

2. The unit is multi or interdisciplinary and includes both engineering or economics and other disciplinary activity (for example: CNSI, ICB, MATP). In this case two additional criteria must be met: a) The individual’s background and training is in engineering or economics, and b) The project with which the individual is associated
is an engineering or economics project.

When option #2 is used, the justification for use of the Engineering scale must be clearly stated in the departmental appointment recommendation.

B. Salaries are subject to range adjustment.

C. Each source which provides compensation for service in this series must permit research.

D. Off-scale salaries are allowed within the same limits and policies as ladder faculty off-scale salaries. Off-scale salaries for Assistant Project Scientists may be between $100 above the designated step and $100 below the equivalent step in the next rank. Off-scale salaries for Associate Project Scientists may be between $100 above the designated step and $100 less than one step higher in the next rank. Off-scale salaries for Project Scientists below Step VI may be between $100 above the designated step and $100 less than four steps above, with a maximum of $100 below Step VI. For Project Scientists at Steps VI through IX, no off-scale salary in excess of 10 percent above Step IX will be approved. (Red Binder I-8)

VI. Requests for Appointment and Advancement

Appointment cases are to be prepared using the Temporary Academic Appointment Form Letter (Red Binder III-3). Particular attention should be paid to section N and O, which requires justification for the level of appointment and analytical evaluation of the candidate and his or her accomplishments.

Advancement cases are to be prepared using the Research Title Review Form (Red Binder III-4) and the checklist of documents to be submitted by the chair for research reviews (Red Binder III-9). All advancement actions are based on the individual’s achievements. Normal advancement will occur after 2 years at step at the Assistant or Associate level and after 3 years at the Full Project Scientist level. Merit increases are based on the academic record since the time of last review while promotions are based on the career academic record. Any advancement requested prior to that time will be considered an acceleration and must be justified as such.

Chair/Director Letters of Recommendation

The Chair/Director's letter of recommendation for appointment or advancement should include an evaluation of the candidate's record in all review areas (see III Appointment and Advancement Criteria, above). Each unit should establish set procedures for evaluation of Project Scientist appointments and advancements and development of the letter of recommendation. While review done solely by the Director or PI is acceptable at the Assistant Project Scientist level, a fuller review, including input from other equal or higher ranking individuals in the unit is preferable for Associate Project Scientist and Project Scientist level actions. Red Binder I-35 provides additional guidance on developing the letter of recommendation.

External Evaluation

External letters of evaluation are desirable in cases of: appointment as Associate Project Scientist, appointment as Project Scientist, promotion to Associate Project Scientist, and promotion to Project Scientist. A minimum of 4 letters at the Associate level, and 6 at the Full Project Scientist level should be included if letters are solicited. Due to the nature of Project Scientist positions, it is possible that in some cases solicitation of external letters is inappropriate, or internal letters of evaluation are more helpful. In these cases, the decision to either not solicit or to solicit from internal sources should be clearly discussed in the departmental letter. Reviewing agencies reserve the right to request that letters be solicited in any advancement case if it is determined that more information is necessary to support the proposed action. When letters are solicited, the sample letter for solicitation of extramural evaluators (Red Binder I-49) should be used, with the following wording inserted as appropriate.

Appointment (or Promotion) to Associate Project Scientist/Project Scientist requires evaluation in the areas of: 1) Demonstrated significant, original, and creative contributions to a research or creative program or project, 2) Professional competence and activity.

VII. Approval Authority
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All actions</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Definition

The Specialist series is used for academic appointees who assist in research in specialized areas and who do not have any teaching responsibilities. See APM 330 for System Wide policy on Specialists.

II. Ranks and Steps

A. Jr. Specialist I-II
B. Assistant Specialist I - III
C. Associate Specialist I - IV
D. Specialist I - V

III. Appointment Criteria

Specialist appointments may be made to provide research projects with special skills, experience, and knowledge. At the Junior and Assistant levels, the appointee enables research as part of a team. At the Associate and full level, the appointee provides considerable independent input into the planning and execution of research and may work under the direction of a member of the Project Scientist, Professional Research or Professorial series. A few individuals are appointed to the Specialist Series to provide specialized skills in support of research, rather than conducting research as the principle responsibility.

In judging a candidate for appointment or promotion to a position in this series, the following criteria are provided as guidelines and may be used flexibly where deemed necessary.

1. Performance in research in specialized areas.
2. Professional competence and activity.
3. University and public service

IV. Term of Appointment

A. There are no limits on service at any level in this series.
B. Appointments may be made for up to one year at a time.

V. Compensation

A. Individuals appointed to this series are compensated on the salary scales established for the Specialist Series on a fiscal year (11 month) basis.
B. Off-scale salaries are not allowable in the Specialist series.
C. Salaries are subject to range adjustment.
D. Each source that provides compensation for service in this series must permit research.

V. Advancement

Appointment cases are to be prepared using the Research appointment checklist (Red Binder III-7). Particular attention should be paid to section O, which requires analytical evaluation of the candidate and his or her accomplishments.

Advancement cases are to be prepared using the Research Title Review Form (Red Binder III-4) and the checklist of documents to be submitted by the chair for research reviews (Red Binder III-9). All
advancement actions are based on the individual’s achievements and the availability of funding. Normal advancement will occur after 1 year at step at the Junior level, 2 years at step at the Assistant and Associate level and after 3 years the Full Specialist level. Merits are based on the academic record since the time of last review while promotions are based on the career academic record. Any advancement requested prior to that time will be considered an acceleration and must be justified as such.

Chair/Director Letters of Recommendation

The Chair/Director's letter of recommendation for merit or promotion should include an evaluation of the candidate's work and an evaluation of the candidate's contributions to the group effort, if relevant. In addition to the foregoing, recommendations for promotion must provide documentation of the scientific, technical, or otherwise creative contributions of the candidate (as contrasted to contributions to a group effort). Each unit should establish set procedures for evaluation of Specialist series appointments and advancements and development of the letter of recommendation. While review done solely by the Director or PI is acceptable, a fuller review, including input from other equal or higher ranking individuals in the unit is preferable.

External Evaluation

While extramural letters of evaluation are not required for appointment or promotion in the Specialist series they may, in some cases, be helpful in evaluating the candidate’s record. When letters are solicited, the sample letter for solicitation of extramural evaluators (Red Binder I-49) should be used, with the following wording inserted as appropriate:

Appointment (or Promotion) to Associate Specialist/Specialist requires evaluation in the areas of:
1) research in a specialized area, 2) professional competence and activity, 3) university and public service.

Reviewing agencies reserve the right to request that letters be solicited in any advancement case if it is determined that more information is necessary to support the proposed action.

VI. Approval Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All actions</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Earth Research Institute is in the process of reviewing your academic progress for the period 7/1/2010 through the present time for possible merit increase effective 7/1/2012. Your review will be conducted within the context of criteria set forth in the UC Academic Personnel Manual:

1. Research and other creative work;

2. Professional competence and activity;

3. University and public service;

4. Teaching as applicable.

Would you please update your Curriculum Vitae using the form required by campus (if you don’t have from a prior review, please go to http://ap.ucsb.edu/forms.and.information/ and choose the Bio-bibliography form). The following items should be included and updated on your CV; be sure to indicate clearly new items:

1. Publication list. The type of publication must be indicated (referred journal, non-referred journal, poster, etc.). Items on list should be identified as "published," "in press" (accepted), "submitted" (under editorial review), "work in progress." Be sure to include a copy of each contribution for the review file. Also be sure to list items in chronological order. Please see the sample form at: http://www.eri.ucsb.edu/administrative/forms AcademicMeritProcedures

2. Grant proposals (awarded, pending).

3. Courses taught if applicable. (Include a brief description of the course and teaching evaluation forms.)

4. University service (e.g., seminars, committee service, student advising, and student committee service).

5. Public and professional service (e.g., lectures; committees; service on editorial boards; professional societies; educational or governmental agencies; refereeing of grant proposals; manuscript reviews for journals or books).
Academic Review - Cont'd

6. Professional activities (e.g., lectures, professional meetings, research at other institutions).

7. Awards (e.g., prizes, honors, fellowships).

8. Other pertinent information (e.g., shipboard and other field activities).

Please submit the following materials to Kathy Scheidemen by Thursday, November 10, 2011 to assure a fair academic evaluation:

1. Cover letter describing contributions to research field and detailing importance of publications (by paper and listing your contribution to each).

2. Updated CV (guidelines as above).

3. Copies of publications and completed manuscripts since last review.

4. For promotion or acceleration only, provide:
   a. Copies of all publications since your last promotion, as promotions are based on the academic record since the time of last promotion.
   b. Names, addresses, telephone numbers and FAX numbers of 6 persons who could be solicited for letter of evaluation.
   c. Names of persons who might not objectively evaluate your performance.
   d. List of up to 8 publications that you would like included in package sent to external reviewers.

I encourage you to create a web page of your merit package and to provide the url to Kathy in order to assist with the merit process. If you should have any questions regarding this review process, please contact Kathy Scheidemen at x7615.

David Siegel
Director
I-49
SAMPLE LETTER FOR SOLICITATION
OF EXTRAMURAL EVALUATION
(Revised 02/10)

Current Date

Name
Department
University

Dear Dr. _____,

[Opening remarks: e.g., I am writing to ask for your assistance in an important matter.]

[INSERT APPROPRIATE PARAGRAPH FROM SAMPLES THAT FOLLOW:

A. Appointment to Assistant Professor
B. Appointment or Promotion to Associate Professor
C. Appointment to Professor I-V
D. Promotion to Professor
E. Appointment at Professor VI - IX
F. Merit to Professor VI
G. Appointment or Merit to Professor Above Scale
H. Thank You Letter for Unsolicited Comments
I. Restricted Materials (Non-UC Placement Files)
J. Appointment to Lecturer PSOE
K. Appointment or Promotion to Lecturer SOE
L. Appointment or Promotion to Sr. Lecturer SOE
M. Continuing Lecturer Excellence review
N. Continuing Lecturer promotion to Sr. Lecturer
O. To Letter Writers from a Prior Review for Amendment or New Letter

[Sample wording for evaluation request: e.g. I would greatly appreciate your evaluation of _____’s work.] While you may not be familiar with all aspects of the record, we appreciate your comments related to those areas with which you are familiar. Please also indicate whether or not you would support the recommended action based on your knowledge of _____ and his/her record.

Although the contents of your letter may be passed on to the candidate at prescribed stages of the review process, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will lack the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the latter. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.

[Closing remarks: e.g., I realize what an imposition on your time these request are. I want to thank you in advance for your willingness to assist in this matter.]

Sincerely,

Department Chair
Each faculty member is responsible for updating his or her bio-bibliography (bio-bib) on an annual basis to assist the department chair in the annual review of all faculty (APM 220-80 b). The annual bio-bib update is maintained in the departmental file and an updated bio-bib must be submitted with each personnel review.

BIO-BIBLIOGRAPHY
University of California, Santa Barbara

Name  Susie Green
Academic Title  Assistant Researcher
Date 11/18/04

Last update filed on February 2004
This update refers to the period February 2004 - present

PART I. RESEARCH

Cumulative List of Publications (or Creative Activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title and Authors</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Authors in pub order, Title of publication</td>
<td><em>Journal of Geophysical Research</em></td>
<td>Refereed journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Authors in pub order, Title of publication</td>
<td><em>Journal of Climate</em></td>
<td>Refereed journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Authors in pub order, Title of publication</td>
<td><em>Journal of Geophysical Research</em></td>
<td>Refereed journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Authors in pub order, Title of publication</td>
<td><em>Journal of Geophysical Research</em></td>
<td>Refereed journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Authors in pub order, Title of publication</td>
<td><em>Journal of Physical Oceanography</em></td>
<td>Refereed journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Authors in pub order, Title of publication</td>
<td>Journal/Title</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Authors in pub order, Title of publication</td>
<td><em>Journal of Physical Oceanography</em></td>
<td>Refereed journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Authors in pub order, Title of publication</td>
<td><em>Oceanography</em></td>
<td>Refereed journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Authors in pub order, Title of publication</td>
<td><em>Journal of Geophysical Research</em></td>
<td>Refereed journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Authors in pub order, Title of publication</td>
<td><em>Journal of Marine Systems</em></td>
<td>Refereed journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Authors in pub order, Title of publication</td>
<td><em>Oceanography</em></td>
<td>Refereed journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Authors in pub order, Title of publication</td>
<td><em>Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society</em></td>
<td>Refereed journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Authors in pub order, Title of publication</td>
<td><em>Journal of Climate</em></td>
<td>Refereed journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Authors in pub order, Title of publication</td>
<td><em>Journal of Marine Research</em></td>
<td>Refereed journal article</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work In Press

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title and Authors</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Authors in pub order, Title of publication</td>
<td><em>Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology</em></td>
<td>Refereed journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Authors in pub order, Title of publication</td>
<td><em>Journal of Physical Oceanography</em></td>
<td>Refereed journal article</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Work Submitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Yr Subm.</th>
<th>Title and Authors</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Authors in pub order, Title of publication</td>
<td><em>Fisheries Bulletin</em></td>
<td>Refereed journal article</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Work In Progress (optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and Authors</th>
<th>Potential Publisher</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Previously listed as Work In Press
**Previously listed as Work Submitted
*** Previously listed as Work In Progress

### Graduate Degree Committees

#### MA Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Yr Deg. Compl.</th>
<th>Chair/Member</th>
<th>Optional Info (e.g., Current Employment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>2003 Member</td>
<td>Scripps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PhD Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Yr Deg. Compl.</th>
<th>Chair/Member</th>
<th>Optional Info (e.g., Current Employment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Postdoctoral Scholars Supervised**

**Year**  
none

**Other Teaching Contributions** (course improvements, new courses, honors seminars, etc.)

---

**PART III. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES**

### Lectures Presented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month/Yr</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Meeting/Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2, 2002</td>
<td>Authors in order, Title</td>
<td>2002 AGU/ASLO Ocean Sciences meeting, Honolulu, HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 2002</td>
<td>Authors in order, Title</td>
<td>2002 LAPCOD meeting, Ley Largo, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 2003</td>
<td>Authors in order, Title</td>
<td>EPIC/PACS meeting, NCAR, Boulder, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 2003</td>
<td>Authors in order, Title</td>
<td>EPIC/PACS meeting, NCAR, Boulder, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 2003</td>
<td>Authors in order, Title</td>
<td>2003 EPOC meeting, Catalina Island, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grants and Contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amt.</th>
<th>PI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-</td>
<td>National Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>In PI order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-</td>
<td>National Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>In PI order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reviewing and Refereeing Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity and for Whom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7, 2002</td>
<td>Reviewed manuscript for <em>JOURNAL</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 2002</td>
<td>Reviewed manuscript for <em>JOURNAL</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 2003</td>
<td>Reviewed manuscript for <em>JOURNAL</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 2003</td>
<td>Reviewed proposal for National Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 2003</td>
<td>Reviewed manuscript for <em>JOURNAL</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2004</td>
<td>Reviewed manuscript for <em>Journal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 2004</td>
<td>Reviewed manuscript for <em>Journal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 2004</td>
<td>Reviewed proposals for National Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Special Appointments (e.g., Editorships, Officer of Prof. Organization)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Professional Contributions (e.g., Consulting or other application of your professional expertise)

### PART IV. SERVICE

#### University Service (Including administrative posts held)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Public Service (Including service to K-12 Education)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
December 12, 2005

TO: Dr. Monkey, Chair
    Dr. Lion
    Dr. Tiger

FM: David Siegel

RE: Merit review for Dr. Davey Jones

As you know, the Earth Research Institute appoints professional researchers who are eligible for periodic merit/promotion based upon their contributions to research, professional activities, and public service. Davey Jones was appointed as an Assistant Researcher I in October 1992, merited to Assistant Researcher II in July of 1997, to step III in July of 1990, to step IV in July of 2001, and promoted to Associate I in July of 2003. He is currently eligible for normal merit to Associate Researcher II.

I appreciate your willingness to serve on the review committee to evaluate his academic progress, and recommend a course of action: no increase, next step, accelerated increase. We have placed his merit packet on the web at: WEB URL, including the following:

1) Procedural Safeguard Statement - Instructions to the Chair
2) Departmental Checklist for Academic Advancement
3) ICESS Guidelines for Academic Review Committee
4) Letter from Dr. Jones outlining his achievements during the review period
5) Updated CV and bio-bib form
6) Publications (8) as provided by Dr. Jones

Should you feel that acceleration is warranted, please contact Kathy Scheidemen as quickly as possible as XX external letters would be required (Note: four at associate, six at full).

If you have any questions on the process, please contact Kathy Scheidemen (kathys@eri.ucsb.edu or x7615). There is also a written procedure for merits included on the ERI website (see Academic Merit Procedure link on http://www.eri.ucsb.edu/administrative/forms) if you would prefer.

Your recommendation is needed by February 15, 2016, in order to complete the merit paperwork by the Office of Research deadline. Should you need any additional information, please contact Kathy at x7615.
SAFEGUARDS IN THE REVIEW PROCESS
(Revised 06/04)

The following procedures represent established mechanisms at UCSB and within the University of California system for the protection of the rights of individuals who are under review for merit or promotion.

1. The right to timely notification from the department for non-tenure ladder faculty.
   
   Reference: Red Binder I-22

2. The right of being informed in detail about the "departmental recommendations and of the substance of departmental evaluations" in all reviews for merit, appraisal or promotion, "orally or, upon request, in writing."
   

   Procedural Safeguard Statement
   Right to respond in writing to the departmental recommendation

3. In the process of review of an Assistant Professor for formal appraisal, reappointment or promotion, should the Academic Vice Chancellor's tentative decision be to not reappoint or promote, or contrary to the departmental recommendation, the individual (and department chair, by copy of the letter) will be notified of this recommendation. The individual will also be notified of the opportunity to request copies of reviewing agency reports, at which time the department chair will also receive copies. (APM 220-84b)

   The candidate and the Department Chair, after appropriate consultation within the department, shall then have the opportunity to respond in writing and to provide additional information and documentation within 10 working days of notification.

4. After the final administrative decision has been communicated to the candidate, the candidate shall have the right, upon written request, to receive from the Chancellor, or other designated administrative officer, a written statement of the reasons for that decision, including a copy of non-confidential documents and a redacted copy of the confidential academic review records in the personnel review file. (APM 220-80h) The Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel will act as the Chancellor's designee for the purpose of supplying access to reviewing agency report. Supplying the comments from reviewing agencies will fulfill the campus' obligation to provide a written statement of the reasons for the final decision.

5. If a candidate believes that standard procedures have been violated in the handling of an academic personnel matter, the candidate has a right to submit a grievance to the Academic Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure.
Attachment J – See Red Binder III-9
March 15, 2006

Dr. Frank N. Stein
University of California, San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive, Dept. 0224
La Jolla, California  92093-0224

Dear Dr. Stein,

Thank you, once again, for your time and effort in reviewing Dr. Davey Jones for advancement to Associate Researcher in the Earth Research Institute (ERI) at the University of California, Santa Barbara. The internal committee at ERI unanimously agreed with your recommendation and we have put forth a promotion package on Davey’s behalf.

As someone who receives requests for external review on a regular basis, I realize what an imposition these requests are. While we all are aware of the need for peer review, it’s not always easy to find the time or prioritize completing a comprehensive evaluation. I truly appreciate you having done so.

Sincerely,

David A. Siegel
Director
April 19, 2004

To: Steve Gaines
   Acting Vice Chancellor for Research

FM: David A. Siegel, Director
    Earth Research Institute

RE: Accelerated promotion of Fred Frank to Associate Researcher II, effective July 1, 2004

The Earth Research Institute (ERI) recommends an accelerated promotion for Dr. Fred Frank from Assistant Researcher IV to Associate Researcher II, effective July 1, 2004. Dr. Frank was advanced to Assistant Researcher IV on July 1, 2002, so the recommendation is for an accelerated promotion. An Ad Hoc committee (two Professors, one Assistant Professor) reviewed Dr. Frank’s file and unanimously recommended the acceleration. The recommendation is based on Dr. Frank’s research activities, grant proposals, professional service, and publications.

The letters sent requesting external review (copy attached) stated that Dr. Frank was being considered for advancement to Associate Researcher and specifically listed step 1, thus the letters received from the external reviewers also mentioned the step. In completing their review, the ad hoc committee felt that Dr. Frank’s scientific advancements, publications, service, and funding levels clearly warranted the acceleration. While the recommendation of the committee does not match the step listed in two of the external letters, we feel that the step indicated in the letters was due only to our statement in the first line of the request for review. In order to avoid this type of confusion in the future, we will no longer indicate a step in the letters requesting external review.

Research

Dr. Frank is a biological oceanographer who is interested in primary productivity, chromophoric dissolved organic carbon, and biogeochemical cycles. Research on these problems requires understanding the underwater light field, the absorption properties of different pigments, and the pathways of electrons in photosynthesis. While doing his Ph.D., Dr. Frank looked in depth at absorption properties of phytoplankton of different species and its implications for primary productivity and determination of primary productivity by remote sensing. Ten publications resulted from his Ph.D. and collaborations with others in Dr. Smith’s (Dr. Smith was his advisor) laboratory (refs 13, 15, 17-22).

After finishing his Ph.D. in 1993, Dr. Frank was an Assistant Scientist at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute for six years. At that time, he began to work on chromophoric dissolved organic matter, also known as CDOM, recognizing its potential implications for ocean biogeochemical cycles. CDOM is important in the ocean because, like phytoplankton, it absorbs irradiance and therefore influences the penetration of light in the water column. It attenuates irradiance required for phytoplankton growth as well as damaging ultraviolet light. It is also involved in photochemical reactions including ones that release or destroy trace gases that influence climate warming. It had not traditionally been studied since it was believed to co-vary with algal biomass and its concentration is low. Dr. Frank’s studies have been influential in illustrating its significance within the Sargasso Sea, one of the ocean’s large oligotrophic gyres and representative of much of the surface ocean (ref. 9). While Siegel and Michaels (1996) had shown that phytoplankton absorb only 50% of the blue light in optically clear oceanic waters, Dr. Frank determined that it is CDOM, not detrital organic matter that absorbs the remainder. In addition, he used correlative evidence to show the seasonal patterns in CDOM concentration were mediated by bacteria and photobleaching. Dr. Frank’s work with CDOM has had major implications for analysis of remotely sensed data from the ocean. Neglect of CDOM causes large errors in the algorithms used to calculate chlorophyll from remotely sensed data. Hence, algorithms needed to be rewritten, with Dr. Frank contributing to this effort (ref. 3, other publications). In addition to his studies of CDOM, Dr. Frank used remotely sensed data to quantify primary productivity (ref. 7) and to determine implications of hurricanes in the
open ocean (refs. 8, 10, 11, 14). He also contributed to the long term studies of the Sargasso Sea using bio-
optical moorings (ref. 6).

Since coming to UCSB in 2000, Dr. Frank has conducted more in depth studies of CDOM and remote sensing in
the Sargasso Sea. He has shown experimentally that CDOM production is mediated by microbes and
zooplankton and its distribution is independent of the dissolved organic matter produced by phytoplankton (refs.
1, 4 and two articles in press). He has quantified its influence on trace gases, UV absorption, and is developing
algorithms to allow estimation of its concentration from remotely sensed data (refs. 3, 2, 6). His work on remote
sensing is allowing primary productivity to be estimated from proxies and illustrates both spatial and interannual
variability (ref. 7 and one article in submission). These studies are critical for quantifying the implications of
global warming in the open ocean. He has also used remotely sensed wind and sea surface temperature data to
quantify carbon fluxes and thereby estimate the magnitude of the carbon sink in the Sargasso Sea (ref. 5).

During his career, Dr. Frank has published twenty-three papers and currently has two in press. On ten he is the
first author. All are in high quality peer-reviewed journals. In addition, he has been author or co-author of six
technical reports. These include reports on the Bermuda Bio-optics Project, the main project enabling the
collection and interpretation of remotely sensed data for the Sargasso Sea. He has given 25 presentations at
national or international meetings. Since finishing his Ph.D., Dr. Frank has been PI or co-PI on eight research
grants from NASA or NSF. His three current grants total two million dollars and attest to his grantmanship and
the significance of his research program in the areas of remote sensing and the global carbon cycle.

External Letters
We received four letters (attached) from internationally recognized scientists. All the letters are highly
complimentary of Dr. Frank’s research. One (referee #1) states unequivocally that Dr. Frank has made a name
for himself internationally through the study of chromophoric dissolved organic matter and application of
remote sensing to the study of biogeochemical processes in the ocean. The other letters support this view.
Referee #3 stresses that Dr. Frank has a strong record of producing research that is valued and respected by his
peers. He continues that Dr. Frank is producing first-rate work, that his choice of topics is strategic, and that his
work on the dynamics of CDOM is solid, well designed, and fundamentally important to our understanding of
ocean biogeochemistry and optics. Three of the reviewers point out that his findings have led to revision of the
algorithms used to obtain algal biomass from remotely sensed data. These corrections are essential for
understanding global ocean primary productivity and factors leading to its spatial and temporal variability. The
external reviewers further point out that Dr. Frank’s studies lead to large scale interdisciplinary studies and
hence a comprehensive understanding of the biogeochemistry of the Sargasso Sea.

Reviewer #2 points out that many of Dr. Frank’s early papers and a few of his more recent ones are multi-
authored and that it could be difficult to recognize Dr. Frank’s contribution. However, because the quality of
Dr. Frank’s first authored papers is high, he believes his contribution is substantial in all cases. In fact, this
reviewer points out that Dr. Frank’s work, unlike that of his many of his peers, has a high degree of rigor with
results interpreted quantitatively.

The ad hoc committee similarly found Dr. Frank’s work to be rigorous with in depth, quantitative analyses. His
ability to collaborate with others is a major strength.

Teaching, University, and Professional Service
Dr. Frank’s has been a panel member for NSF’s Division of Ocean Sciences, he regularly reviews grant
proposals and manuscripts, is a member of the Science Team for NASA SeaWiFS and NASA SIMBIOS, and is
the remote sensing working group leader for Sargasso Sea Ocean/Atmosphere Observatory. In addition, he has
been chief scientist and a UCSB team leader on major research expeditions. These activities attest to his
leadership and his recognition in the scientific community.

Teaching is not a requirement for professional researchers, however, Dr. Frank has been teaching EEMB 192B
(formerly EEMB 125A) for the last three years. This course is a core course for the Aquatic Biology Major and
regularly has sixty to seventy students. Dr. Frank’s teaching covers photosynthesis and chemosynthesis, the
major groups of autotrophs, and biogeochemical studies in the Sargasso Sea. His exposition is clear and his
problem sets help develop students develop their analytical skills and thinking across disciplines. Student evaluations attest to the clarity of his lectures and indicate a wish that more courses were similarly designed to allow professors to share their expertise. In addition, since coming to UCSB, he has served on one Ph.D. committee in Geography and one in EEMB and is currently on one student’s committee in Geography. He voluntarily teaches an upper division seminar on photosynthesis. While in Bermuda, Dr. Frank was a PI for NSF’s REU Site Program in Bermuda and taught two courses, Biological Oceanography and Remote Sensing and Environmental Monitoring, for a joint program between Bermuda Biological Station and Duke University’s Marine Lab. He has supervised eight research projects by undergraduates. The committee found Dr. Frank’s teaching to be exemplary.

In summary, Dr. Frank’s research is ground-breaking. His writing style is clear and engaging. His analyses are rigorous and illustrate his in depth understanding of a wide range of chemical, physical and biological processes. Dr. Frank is a strong team player and is well respected by his colleagues at UCSB and at other institutes. Based on the ever increasing impact of his research and his exemplary activity in teaching, strong grantsmanship, and high level of professional service, ERI strongly recommends that Dr. Frank be promoted with an acceleration to Associate Researcher II. I look forward to your favorable response to this request.

Attachments: Curriculum Vitae
Copies of Publications
Attachment L
Reviewer #1, Name, Title Institution *Selected by candidate.*

Reviewer #2, Name, Title Institution *Selected by Committee and Director.*

Reviewer #3, Name, Title Institution. *Selected by Committee and Director.*

Reviewer #4 Name, Title Institution. *Selected by candidate.*
PRIOR TO DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW:

1. I was informed that I was to be reviewed for this personnel action and of the process as described in APM 160, 310, 311, 330, 340 and 375 as appropriate.

2. I had the opportunity to ask questions, supply information and evidence, and add material to my file in preparation for the review.

3. I was informed whether or not letters of evaluation were to be sought as part of this personnel action.

4. If letters were sought (e.g., for promotion)
   A. I had an opportunity to suggest names of evaluators; and
   B. I had the opportunity to submit, in writing, names of persons who, for reasons set forth by me, might not provide objective evaluations.

5. I was informed whether or not there were confidential documents (i.e. external letters, minority opinion reports) in my department review file and of my right to review a summary of any such documents.
   - [ ] Yes, there are confidential documents in my file (proceed to #6)
   - [ ] No, there are not any confidential documents in my file (proceed to #7)

6. If yes to #5, I was provided the contents of the confidential documents (i.e. external letters, minority opinion reports) in my file by means of:
   - [ ] A. Redacted copy
   - [ ] B. Oral Summary
   - [ ] C. Chose not to receive contents

7. I had the opportunity to inspect all non-confidential documents in the review file.

8. I had the opportunity to provide a written statement in response to or comment upon all materials in the file.

FOLLOWING THE DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS:

9. I was informed of the departmental recommendation and the substance of the evaluation under each of the applicable review criteria by means of:
   - [ ] A. Copy of the departmental recommendation
   - [ ] B. Oral Summary
   - [ ] C. Chose not to be informed
10. I was informed whether or not the department vote for the recommendation was unanimous or by a strong or a narrow majority.

11. I was informed of my right to make written comments, within five working days, to the Chair (or appropriate person) regarding the departmental recommendation. I was aware that these comments would be included in the file and made available to other voting faculty in the department.

12. I was informed of my right to make written comments regarding the departmental recommendation to the dean and that these comments would be included in the file and available to other reviewing agencies outside of the Department.

I HAVE SUBMITTED THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL MATERIALS:

☐ Suggested names of evaluators (in accordance with 4A above).

☐ Names of persons who might not provide objective evaluations (in accordance with 4B above).

☐ A written statement in response to materials in the file (in accordance with 8 above).

☐ A written statement about the departmental recommendation to the Chair (in accordance with 11 above).

☐ A written statement about the recommendation to the dean (in accordance with 12 above).

SIGNED _______________ DATED ____________

PRINT NAME ___________________ DEPARTMENT ___________________
RESEARCH TITLE REVIEW FORM
(Revised 10/10)

(Attach this form as a cover sheet to departmental letter)

Contact information: Kathy Scheidemen, x7615, kathys@eri.ucsb.edu

Administrative Comments: (Note change of Title/series, shared appointment, or other information of importance):

In order to meet sustainability goals (reduction of unnecessary printing), review files are on-line. Please see: http://www.URL) for full file provided to reviewers.

Name: David Munchkin Department: Earth Research Institute

PRESENT STATUS

Rank and Step: Associate Researcher I II
Current Salary: $84,900.00
O/S Supplement: $0.00
Years at Rank: 8 yr 0 mos

PROPOSED STATUS

Rank and Step: Researcher I
Proposed Salary: $90,200.00
O/S Supplement: $0.00
Years at Step: 4 yr 0 mos
Effective Date: 7/1/11

Departmental vote, if taken, and statement of review process:

Vote: The recommendation of this committee (comprised of two Professors and one Researcher) was 3-0 in favor of a promotion.

Process: The Director appoints a three-member review committee of faculty and research staff appointed at a level higher than the individual being reviewed. The review committee reviews the file and prepares a recommendation to the Director. The Director reviews the file and the review committee recommendation and prepares a letter to Office of Research.

CHECK ONE:

On time merit (advancement within rank)
Promotion
Acceleration (including addition of off-scale)
Mandatory Review
To Researcher VI
To or within Researcher Above Scale
Special Step (Asst. V; Assoc. IV)
Deceleration

Indicate with a check mark documents submitted. Include explanation for any missing documents.

X Signed Safeguards Statement (Note: Candidate traveling, scanned form included)
X Completed Bio-bibliographical Update
X Extramural Letters if proposed action is a promotion:
Total # of letters solicited 6; # suggested by candidate 2
X Sample Solicitation Letter;
X List of Referrees (final page of Director letter), including brief biography CVs attached to letters and indication of who nominated referees (see final page of letter)
X Copies of publications as required
X Copy of redacted materials provided to the candidate, if any
X Other: List Letter from candidate outlining accomplishments during review period, CV, Candidate email recommending reviewers