
2013: APPOINTMENT

An appointment (as distinguished from a reappointment, merit increase, or promotion) occurs when a person is employed with the University for the first time, or when a University employee is appointed to a title in a different personnel program or academic series. This section will cover some of the University and campus policies pertaining to the appointment of members of the Academic Senate; however, all persons involved in the appointment review process must also refer to policies contained in the **Academic Personnel Manual (APM)** and pertinent sections of this manual for more detailed statements of policies affecting use of titles, criteria for appointment, affirmative action, the review process, etc.

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF ACADEMIC APPOINTMENT FILES

A. SALARIES (APM 600)

Academic Salary Scales

Academic salaries are based upon salary scales. These are published and issued through the University of California Office of the President Academic Personnel Office and can be found [here](#).

Rank and Step

When establishing the rank and step for a proposed appointee, a Unit should give due consideration to the candidate's experience, accomplishments, and standing relative to others at the same level in the same discipline at other UC campuses.

Off-Scale Salaries

Off-scale salaries may be used when necessary to meet competitive conditions. Per **APM 620-14**, all academic titles except students may be eligible for off-scale salaries. Off-scale salaries for acting appointees are determined administratively in the same manner as for regular ranks. If counter offers arise during the course of negotiations, the Unit should document these offers.

Effective Date of Employment

The effective date of an appointment for purposes of payroll and other record-keeping is the first day on which salary commences. The beginning date of service for a new appointee, or of service in a new title for a continuing appointee, is the first day on which the appointee is required to be on duty under the terms of the appointment. The effective date is always either **July 1** or **January 1**. An academic-year appointment is also known as a nine-month appointment and refers to the period in which an academic appointee renders services, i.e., the academic year, from the beginning of the fall term through the end of the spring term (**APM 600-4-c**).

B. POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST

If the Search Chair and the candidate proposed for appointment are close collaborators, the Search Chair should not participate in the preparation of the appointment case file. Another independent senior faculty member should oversee the process and prepare the Case Analysis.

If a recommended appointment will result in a near relative being employed in the same Academic Unit as an existing faculty member, the existing faculty member may not participate in any academic review actions affecting the near relative. (For the definition of "near relative," refer to **APM 520: Employment of Near Relatives**.) The Transmittal Memo for the appointment case should state that the existing faculty member did not participate in the recruitment or vote on the appointment of the near relative, and will not participate in any future academic review decisions for the candidate if he or she is appointed.

If the Unit Chair or any faculty member contributing to the file has a financial interest in a company employing a potential faculty member, that information should be included in the file, and such individuals should recuse themselves from contributing to the appointment case file.

APPOINTMENT FILE DOCUMENTATION & PROCEDURES

The documentation required to support a recommendation for appointment to an Academic Senate title includes recruitment data, candidate's documents, extramural letters of reference, the Case Analysis, the Dean's Letter, the Salary Justification memo and the Transmittal Letter.

Appointment files should be documented as carefully as promotion files, addressing all the relevant criteria and providing reviewers with appropriate evidence of excellence in all categories of review.

A. RECRUITMENT DATA

Detailed recruiting and equal opportunity and diversity procedures are described in **MAPP 2012**.

- Search Report
- Advertisements

Note: CAP finds it useful when the Unit includes in the Case Analysis a statement about the scope of the search.

B. CANDIDATE'S DOCUMENTS

The candidate provides the following key documents:

1. Curriculum Vitae
2. Publications - Publications should be listed on the Curriculum Vitae and should be numbered in sequence to the extent possible. Copies of the most significant publications, reviews, and/or exhibits, should be included whenever possible, in either printed or electronic form. For easy reference, each publication should be numbered as it is numbered on the Curriculum Vitae.
3. Student Evaluations - Copies of individual student evaluations should be included if possible.
4. Other documents requested by the Unit (e.g., Statement of Teaching Philosophy, Statement of Research).
5. Statement of Contributions to Diversity (**APM 210-1.d**)

C. EXTRAMURAL LETTERS

Extramural letters of evaluation should be from qualified and distinguished authorities.¹ When letters are handwritten, the Unit is asked to prepare a typed version. Letters in foreign languages should be translated into English.

a. Soliciting Extramural Letters

The solicitation of letters for appointments is done by the School staff working with the Search Committee Chair and the Unit Chair. For appointments at the level of Assistant Professor, Steps I-III, three to five letters from candidate-suggested reviewers are required. For appointments at the levels of Assistant Professor, Step IV and above (including all Associate and Full Professor levels), three to four letters from candidate-suggested reviewers and at least three letters from School-suggested reviewers are preferred. Of the School-suggested letters, at least one should be from a UC campus whenever possible. In rare cases, candidates may identify individuals whom they prefer not be solicited. Should the Unit

¹ **Suggestions for Increasing Response Rate for Letters of Reference**

- a) Start soliciting letters as early as possible
- b) Informal requests are encouraged
- c) Send request from known personage (i.e., Dean or Unit Chair)
- d) Do not wait until case materials are perfect

PROFESSORIAL SERIES (PROFESSOR, ASSOCIATE, ASSISTANT)

decide to solicit from any individual whom the candidate has requested not be contacted, the Case Analysis should explain why that individual was contacted despite the candidate's request (e.g., best or most knowledgeable in the field).

The Search Chair should solicit evaluations from individuals who are experts in the candidate's field and who are able to provide an objective evaluation of the candidate's work.

For candidates just completing degree or postdoctoral work and being proposed for entry-level positions, letters from supervisors are appropriate. For appointments at higher levels, however, it is desirable to avoid excessive use of external referees whom the reviewers may not regard as objective evaluators either because they are too close to the candidate professionally (e.g., close collaborators, doctoral supervisors), or because they have a personal relationship with the candidate. Contact between the Chair and individuals from whom letters are being solicited is permissible in order to encourage response after the formal request has been sent, but great care must be taken not to bias or influence the judgment of the referee.

Letters soliciting such external evaluations must contain the following:

- A description of the nature of the position to be filled; e.g., probationary or tenured professorship,
- An explanation of the significance of the level of the position so that the referee can evaluate achievement in relation to UC criteria for appointments, especially at the top steps of the series (VI, VII, VIII and Above Scale),
- A request for analytical review of the candidate's performance under the applicable criteria and comparison to other scholars in the field at similar rank, and
- The following confidentiality statement:

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 the confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.

Referees should be urged to provide critical evaluation and analysis. The letter soliciting evaluations must not contain leading suggestions (e.g., "we need your help to persuade our reviewers that our candidate...").

b. Sample Letters of Solicitation

Include a sample of the letter sent soliciting outside evaluations in the Case File. If the letters soliciting evaluations from different sources (i.e., for candidate-suggested vs. School-suggested letters) are substantially different, include samples of all such letters.

Exhibits A, B, C, and D contain examples of typical letters soliciting external evaluations. **Exhibit A** concerns the appointment of an Assistant Professor. **Exhibit B** was written for the recruitment of an Associate Professor; thus it refers to tenure. Exhibits **C, D** and **E** are for high-level professors, and as such outline UC criteria for appointment to those levels.

c. List of Reviewers

Extramural reviewers who have provided confidential letters of evaluation should not be identified in the case materials except by means of a coded list which indicates the names and qualifications of all those from whom letters were solicited. It is also important to list letter writers who were asked to supply an evaluation but did not respond. It should not be assumed that non-response means non-support for the candidate. When referring to a particular letter in the Case Analysis or any other case

PROFESSORIAL SERIES (PROFESSOR, ASSOCIATE, ASSISTANT)

materials, the letter writer should only be identified by the code assigned on the list (e.g., “Reviewer A”). Sample Lists of Reviewers may be found [here](#) and [here](#).

D. CASE ANALYSIS

The **Case Analysis** is prepared by the Search Committee, all of whose members must sign it to certify agreement. Before preparing the Case Analysis, writers should consult the “Instructions to the Review Committee” for the appropriate series (**APM 210**).

The Case Analysis should 1) set out and explain the recommendation of the Search Committee for appointment, and 2) should support the recommendation by evaluating analytically, not merely describing, the candidate’s performance and/or potential in each of the areas of responsibility expected from UC faculty: teaching; research and creative activity; professional competence and activity; and University and public service. The candidate’s past or potential contributions to diversity should also be addressed (**APM 210-1.d**). The Case Analysis should be professional, objective, balanced and concise. The assessment put forth in the Case Analysis should be supported by evidence from extramural letters, although excessive quotation, as well as rhetorical statements, should be avoided.

The candidate’s scholarly and/or creative activities should be critically evaluated. The evaluation should provide a careful assessment of the craftsmanship, originality, significance and impact of the candidate’s work. The assessment should not merely state that the work is significant or has had impact. It should indicate what is significant about the work and the nature and extent of impact. Writers should also indicate the relative stature of the candidate in his or her field.

Performances or other creative activities should not merely be listed, they should be evaluated by the Committee. In certain fields such as art, architecture, dance, music, literature, and drama, distinguished creation should receive consideration equivalent to that accorded to distinction attained in research. In evaluating artistic creativity, the Committee should attempt to define the candidate’s merit in light of such criteria as originality, scope, richness, and depth of creative expression. It should be recognized that in music, drama and dance, distinguished performance, including conducting and directing, is evidence of the candidate’s creativity (**APM 210.1.d.2**). Reviews of the work and publications or other outside evaluation should be discussed and copies included in the Case File.

The placement of publications should be addressed. The quality of journals or presses in which work appears can be an important measure of the impact and quality of the candidate’s work. Where the placement is unusual, or may seem so to reviewers outside the Unit, the Case Analysis should discuss the implications of this. For those works that appear in conference proceedings, information about the publication is needed as there is large variation within and amongst disciplines. The information may include, as appropriate, the conference’s acceptance and publication rates, whether the paper was accepted on the basis of title or abstract only, and the archival status of the conference proceedings.

In assessing the types of contracts, grants, or fellowships awarded to the candidate, the Case Analysis should address the importance and the expectations of such support for the particular discipline.

Any Case Analysis proposing Professor, Step VI or above must include a discussion of the candidate’s impact and stature, including national and/or international honors received, election to distinguished societies, and other evidence of the individual’s outstanding leadership in the profession.

E. FACULTY VOTE

The Case Analysis and supporting materials are made available for faculty review for a length of time determined by the Unit, after which the Search Chair (or designee) presents the Case Analysis to the faculty and allows for a full discussion. The discussion should focus on the academic merits of the case, and not on any extraneous issues. Affirmative action policies should be adhered to. [**UCM AA Policy** and **UC AA Policy**]. At the conclusion of this discussion, a vote is taken according to the Unit’s bylaws and voting procedures. Comments

PROFESSORIAL SERIES (PROFESSOR, ASSOCIATE, ASSISTANT)

are not permitted on the ballots, as all points of discussion should have been raised beforehand during the group meeting.

Academic Units should develop policies that encourage the maximum number of faculty members to participate in the evaluation of candidates. Excessive abstentions or a small number of votes relative to the total number of faculty eligible to vote are likely to raise concerns for other reviewers evaluating the file.

F. TRANSMITTAL LETTER

The vote and the faculty discussion are recorded in the **Transmittal Letter**.

The Transmittal Letter is a critical component of the appointment case file as it is the record of faculty opinion and should include any pertinent discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the case, as well as a recommendation for the step and effective date of the proposed appointment.

In cases of abstentions or recusals, the Transmittal Letter should provide a reason for these actions whenever possible. Appropriate reasons for abstention concern the voter's circumstances, such as a lack of familiarity with the field, being prevented from reviewing due to travel or other commitments, or a potential conflict of interest. Inappropriate reasons for abstaining include concerns with the case itself, such as "It is not a strong case," or "this case should be postponed."

G. DEAN'S RECOMMENDATION LETTER

The Dean assesses the Transmittal Letter, Case Analysis and other evidence provided in the Case File to ensure that the Unit's review is fair and rigorous in maintaining University standards. The **Dean's Letter** should be an independent assessment of the case. In the Letter, the Dean puts forth his or her recommendation regarding the appointment and provides additional analysis as needed.

H. SALARY JUSTIFICATION

In a separate memo, the Dean provides a recommendation as to the salary associated with the proposed appointment, based on the University of California **Academic Salary Scales** plus any off-scale increment.

OTHER APPOINTMENTS**A. SPLIT APPOINTMENTS**

Whenever a candidate has a split appointment (with the FTE split between two Academic Units), a joint committee comprised of faculty from both Units decides which will be the lead Unit. The lead Unit will write the single Case Analysis. The Case Analysis covers the candidate's research, teaching, professional activity, University and public service, and contributions to diversity from both Schools' perspectives. Each Academic Unit will vote separately and prepare separate Transmittal Letters. Each School Dean will write a separate Dean's Recommendation Letter and Salary Justification Letter.

B. APPOINTMENTS WITHOUT SALARY

An individual appointed to a faculty title in one Unit may be invited to hold a joint appointment without salary in another Unit. Such appointments may be renewed in tandem with the individual's regular personnel review. Renewal of such an appointment requires a transmittal memo with the vote of the faculty of the Unit in which the without salary appointment is held.

C. TRANSFER TO ANOTHER UNIT THROUGH FTE REASSIGNMENT

Instances may arise in which a faculty member requests that his or her position be transferred from one Unit to another on campus. Cases of requests to transfer an FTE will be addressed on an *ad hoc* basis, and decisions will

PROFESSORIAL SERIES (PROFESSOR, ASSOCIATE, ASSISTANT)

be made by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor after thorough examination of the request and the potential impact on each Unit. The process of reviewing the request will minimally include:

- Consent of the Unit and Dean that would be receiving the transfer conveyed via Dean's memo and Transmittal memo to Provost/EVC via APO.
- Consultation with the Dean of the Unit from which the individual is transferring, if in a different School. Dean's memo conveyed to Provost/EVC via APO.