



UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A-Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

Section: 230-28

Effective: 09/01/2015

Rescinded: 07/01/2017

Supersedes: 09/01/2013

Review Date: Not Applicable

Issuance Date: 09/03/2015

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

ACADEMIC ADVANCEMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENTS

I.	REFERENCES AND RELATED POLICIES.....	3
II.	INTRODUCTION.....	3
III.	GLOSSARY OF TERMS.....	3
IV.	GENERAL ADVANCEMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT POLICIES.....	3
	A. Department Chair Responsibilities.....	3
	B. External Referee Letters.....	5
	C. Academic Appointee Responsibilities.....	6
	D. Potential Conflict of Interest.....	7
	E. Retentions.....	7
	F. Joint Appointments.....	7
	G. Interdisciplinary Programs/Units.....	8
V.	EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE.....	8
	Chart: Performance Review Criteria at UC San Diego.....	7
	A. Professor (Ladder-Rank) Series and Professor In Residence Series.....	9
	B. Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine) Series.....	13
	C. Adjunct Professor Series.....	15
	D. Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series.....	16
	E. Clinical Professor, Voluntary Series.....	16
	F. Professor of Practice.....	16
	G. Lecturer with Security of Employment Series.....	17
	H. Lecturer and Senior Lecturer Series (Unit 18).....	19
	I. Professional Research (Research Scientist) Series.....	19
	J. Project Scientist Series.....	19
	K. Specialist Series.....	19
	L. Other Series.....	20
	1. Academic Administrator Series.....	20
	2. Academic Coordinator Series.....	21
	3. Librarian Series.....	21
	4. Continuing Educator Series and Coordinator of Public Programs Series..	22
	M. Acting Titles.....	22
	N. Visiting Titles.....	22
	O. Recall Titles.....	22
	P. Non-salaried Instructional Titles.....	23
	1. For individuals whose primary employment is not at the University.....	23
	2. For individuals with full-time salaried positions at the University.....	23
VI.	PREPARING THE ACADEMIC REVIEW FILE.....	23

VII.	DETERMINING DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS	24
A.	Computation of Rank and Step to Determine Eligibility for Advancement	24
1.	Normal Periods of Service	24
2.	Special Considerations	26
B.	Formal Recommendation	26
1.	Deferral	26
2.	Appointee Not Recommended for Advancement (No Change)	27
3.	Appointee Recommended for Merit Advancement or Promotion	28
4.	Appointee Recommended for Accelerated Merit Advancement or Accelerated Promotion	28
5.	Appointee Recommended for an Off-Scale Salary Component	30
C.	Career Equity Review	31
D.	Evaluation of Senate Assistant-Rank Appointees	33
E.	Evaluation of Non-Senate Assistant-Rank Appointees	39
VIII.	VOTING AND CONSULTATION WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT	43
A.	Faculty Consultation and Voting	43
B.	Proposed Actions Not Covered by Senate Bylaw 55	44
IX.	SUBMISSION OF ADVANCEMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT FILES	44
A.	Timely Submission	44
X.	ACADEMIC FILE REVIEW AND FINAL AUTHORITY	44
A.	The Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)	44
B.	Other Reviewers	44
	Supplement I, Guidelines for the Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine) Series	45
	Supplement II, Guidelines for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series	51
	Supplement III, Guidelines for the Professor of Clinical X (i.e., Pharmacy) Series	54

ACADEMIC ADVANCEMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENTS

I. REFERENCES AND RELATED POLICIES

[Academic Personnel Manual \(APM\)](#)

[UC San Diego Policy and Procedure Manual \(PPM\), 230-20, Academic Appointments](#)

[UC San Diego Policy and Procedure Manual \(PPM\), 230-29, Policies and Procedures to Assure Fairness in the Academic Personnel Review Process](#)

[UC San Diego Policy and Procedure Manual \(PPM\), 230-11, Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of Academic Personnel Records](#)

[Memorandum of Understanding, University of California and University Federation of Librarians University Council – American Federation of Teachers, Professional Librarian Unit](#)

[Memorandum of Understanding, University of California and University Council – American Federation of Teachers, Non-Senate Instructional Unit](#)

II. INTRODUCTION

This section of the Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM) contains the campus policies and procedures pertaining to academic advancement actions and the reappointment of academic personnel at the University of California, San Diego.

This PPM section incorporates and implements provisions of the University of California Academic Personnel Manual (APM). For additional information, contact the appropriate divisional dean's office, or refer directly to the [Academic Personnel Manual](#).

This PPM section is not applicable to appointees in series covered by a Memorandum of Understanding with an exclusive bargaining agreement, except when the Memorandum of Understanding specifically states that certain section(s) of the PPM apply.

III. GLOSSARY OF TERMS

A complete glossary of academic personnel terms is available on the [Academic Personnel Services](#) Web site.

IV. GENERAL ADVANCEMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT POLICIES

A. Department Chair Responsibilities

1. Annual Informal Assessment

The department chair (or equivalent officer) is responsible for making certain that there is an annual informal assessment of the status and performance of each academic appointee in the department, unit, program, or division (hereafter referred to as department), including those who are not eligible for advancement. This annual assessment may include an interview with the academic appointee.

2. Submission of Academic Review Files

The department chair should ensure that an academic review file is prepared and forwarded for review and approval for each appointee who is due for advancement consideration, and for each appointee with a specified ending date if reappointment with or without advancement is recommended by the department. Academic review files may also be submitted for appointees who are judged by the department as deserving of accelerated advancement.

If an appointee does not provide updated material for the academic review file, the department chair should proceed with the review based upon the information that is available to the department. In this case, the academic review file submitted should document the department's efforts to obtain file materials from the appointee (e.g., copies of written requests/reminders).

3. Deadlines

The department chair may establish departmental deadlines for submission of academic review file materials as early as necessary to enable the department to submit files by the campus deadlines (set forth in the [Campus Deadlines Schedule](#)). Departmental deadlines may not be later than October 15. An appointee may not add bibliographic or other documentation reflecting activities or accomplishments beyond October 15.

4. Policy to Ensure Fairness in the Academic Review Process

Policy and Procedure Manual Section 230-29 sets forth the University's policies to ensure fairness in the academic review process. The department chair is responsible for ensuring compliance with the provisions of PPM 230-29 for each academic review file prepared.

5. Departmental Recommendation Letter

The department chair is responsible for drafting the departmental recommendation letter, which is a presentation of the department's advancement and/or reappointment recommendation based upon an evaluation of the appointee by all eligible members of the department.

The letter should include:

- a. The proposed action, title, rank, step, salary, and proposed effective date.
- b. A statement specifying the degree of departmental consultation and any dissenting opinion. Academic Senate Bylaw 55 must be observed for all applicable cases.
- c. A statement regarding any conflicts of interest in the file.
- d. An evaluation of the appointee's performance and achievements in each area of responsibility to the University, as specified by the series criteria. The appointee's performance in each area should be evaluated in terms of the department's established performance norms and expectations, using established departmental evaluation methods.
- e. Justification for the award of bonus or market off-scale salary components.
- f. A statement regarding external referees' recommendations. External referee letters should be referenced by code only. Comments that might identify external referees must not appear in the department letter; excessive quotations from external referee letters are discouraged.

The department chair may also write a separate, confidential letter setting forth his or her personal recommendation, if desired.

B. External Referee Letters

External referee letters are required as follows:

1. Five (5) external referee letters are required for promotion to the Associate level.
2. Three (3) external referee letters are required for promotion to the Full level and advancement to Above Scale.

For advancement to Step VI, external referee letters are not required, but may be solicited at the department's discretion when they are needed to demonstrate evidence of nationally or internationally recognized and highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, or excellent teaching.

Depending on the discipline of the appointee under review, additional evidence provided in lieu of external letters may include, but is not limited to: published reviews of the candidate's work; Readers' Reports from publishers; or presentations of the research in competitive and prestigious venues.

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

In all other cases, external referee letters should not be solicited unless there is no department faculty member with sufficient expertise to evaluate the appointee.

[Sample solicitation letters](#) are provided on the Academic Personnel Services Web site.

External referees should be individuals who are independent of the appointee, who are expert in the appointee's field, and who are able to provide an objective appraisal of the appointee's work. Referees should be urged to provide an objective and analytical evaluation with specific comments about the appointee's abilities and accomplishments, rather than uncritical praise.

Use of external referees whom the reviewers may not regard as objective or independent evaluators, either because they are too close to the appointee professionally (e.g., collaborators, thesis supervisors, etc.) or because they have a personal relationship with the appointee, may be included if they shed light on collaborations. Non-independent letters do not count toward the minimum number of required external letters.

1. For advancement in the LPSOE/LSOE series, external evaluation letters must be solicited from individuals who are professionally independent from the appointee; however, additional evaluation letters may be solicited from referees from within UC San Diego as a tool to assist the effective evaluation of an appointee's contributions to pedagogy on campus.
2. For advancement in the Project Scientist and Specialist series, external evaluation letters may be solicited from individuals who are not professionally independent from the appointee; however, additional letters from more independent sources should be obtained if possible.

External referee letters should be solicited from senior scholars who are at the same rank as that proposed for the appointee, or higher.

If external referees are not senior scholars and/or are not sufficiently independent of the appointee, the department should explain why they were selected as the best-qualified referees. *This information should only appear on the Referee I.D. form.*

External referee letters may be solicited from academic appointees at other University of California campuses. Under special circumstances, evaluations by other department

members may be appropriate, but in general, external referee letters should not be solicited within the appointee's department. For advancement in the Project Scientist and Specialist series, evaluation letters may be solicited from within UC San Diego; however the majority of required letters should be obtained from individuals external to UC San Diego.

The department chair must give the appointee the opportunity to suggest names of persons to be solicited for letters of evaluation. Other names should be added to this list by the department chair in consultation with a departmental review committee. Normally, no more than one out of three external letters (when three are required for the file) or two out of five (when five are required for the file) should be from referees selected solely by the appointee. This number may be exceeded if the appointee's list includes all of the recognized experts in the field. Appointees may not solicit their own evaluation letters.

Solicitation letters must include appropriate wording describing the proposed action and explaining to external referees the nature of the proposed advancement. For advancement to any level for which external letters are required, the department chair should explain in the solicitation letter the significance of the advancement and note the degree of acceleration, if applicable, so that the referees may evaluate the appointee's achievements in relation to the University's criteria for advancement.

Solicitation letters must include the University's confidentiality statement.

External letters may be solicited and received electronically, but they must be submitted with an electronic cover letter from the referee as evidence of their authenticity.

All external referee letters received must be included in the file, regardless of the action ultimately proposed by the department.

Unsolicited Letters of Evaluation

Unsolicited letters of evaluation that are added to the file by the appointee are not considered confidential.

Unsolicited letters received by the department but NOT added to the file by the appointee may be included in the file at the department chair's discretion. Before including an unsolicited letter in the appointment file, the department chair must send the University's confidentiality statement to the letter writer and obtain a signed or electronic authorization to use the unsolicited letter in the file. The authorization, the unsolicited letter, and the department chair's letter transmitting the confidentiality statement should be included in the file.

C. Academic Appointee Responsibilities

Academic appointees must provide evidence of achievement in each of the criteria specified for their series. Appointees are also responsible for meeting the department's deadlines for submission of academic review file materials.

Appointees are expected to submit (if applicable):

- An updated and signed UC San Diego Academic Biography and Bibliography Form (also referred to as the biobib form)
- Evidence of teaching effectiveness (syllabi, evaluations, testimonials, thank-you letters, etc.)
- Copies of publications from the review period
- Other items that the department chair may request

Appointees are encouraged to provide a personal statement describing their research and creative activity, teaching, and service within the review period (which may include more detail than the biobib form). They may explain any extraordinary responsibilities and accomplishments and the significance of their research and creative activity and its impact on their field.

Appointees undergoing career reviews should include scholarly accomplishments since their last career review, as well as a description of significant work produced earlier in their academic careers.

Appointees with teaching responsibilities should provide information on the courses they have taught and graduate student mentoring. If the teaching involved the establishment of a new course, major revision of a course, new innovations in teaching, or other extraordinary efforts, these should be described. Appointees should also describe their service contributions, indicating whether they chaired any committees and detailing their committee responsibilities and workloads.

If eligible, appointees may initiate a Career Equity Review (CER). An appointee is responsible for requesting a CER at the time of his or her regular, on-cycle academic review (see section VIII.C.).

D. Potential Conflict of Interest

If the department chair and the appointee under review are close collaborators, the department chair should not prepare the academic review. The vice chair or another independent senior faculty member should oversee the academic review and prepare the departmental recommendation letter.

An academic appointee may not participate in any academic review affecting a near relative. (For the definition of “near relative,” refer to [APM 520, Appointment of Near Relatives](#).) If an academic appointee would have participated in the review if the reviewee were not a near relative, the departmental recommendation letter should state that the academic appointee did not participate in the review.

If the department chair or any academic appointee in the department has a financial interest in a company employing an appointee under review, that information should be included in the academic review file, and such individuals should recuse themselves from participating in the academic review.

E. Retentions

A department may need to prepare a retention file for a faculty member who is being recruited by another institution. Retention files typically are urgent and may be submitted any time of year. Departments are encouraged to contact their divisional dean’s office as soon as the need to submit a retention file arises to ensure its rapid review. The department must include a copy of the outside offer letter in the retention file.

F. Joint Appointments

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

The determination as to which department takes the lead in preparing the academic review file is made as follows:

- If the appointee holds an appointment in a salaried instructional title in one department and in a salaried research title in another, the department in which the teaching title is held should prepare the file.
- If the appointee holds salaried appointments in two departments, the department in which he or she has the greater percentage of appointment should prepare the file.
- If the appointee holds a salaried appointment in one department and a non-salaried appointment in another, the department in which the appointee is salaried should prepare the file.
- If the joint appointments are split equally between the departments, the “home” department should prepare the file. This designation should be agreed upon by the academic units and appointee involved when the appointment is being proposed, and the home department should be reflected in the Payroll Personnel System.

Once it is determined which department will prepare the file, the chair of the preparing department initiates the secondary department’s participation by soliciting from the other department chair the department’s evaluation, recommendation, and, if applicable, faculty vote. The department preparing the academic review file should send the secondary department the basic file materials. After each department has made its decision, copies of the departmental recommendations should be exchanged by the departments.

G. Interdisciplinary Programs/Units

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

V. EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE

Advancement is contingent upon demonstration of achievement in each of the criteria specified for the appointee’s series. A thorough assessment of the appointee’s performance is required when formulating the departmental recommendation and must be documented in the departmental letter of recommendation.

Advancement of a part-time appointee in the Professor series will depend on the quality of performance, which should be at a level of distinction comparable to that expected of a full-time appointee, although, when circumstances warrant it, a lesser rate of scholarly accomplishment will be acceptable. Teaching assignments and departmental, committee, and other service are to be kept in proportion to the percentage of time of the appointment, but the same quality of performance is expected as for full-time appointees.

The four main performance criteria at UC San Diego are research and creative activity, teaching, professional competence and activity, and University and public service. The chart below indicates the specific criteria required for each series used at UC San Diego. Accomplishments in each of these areas, as well as other performance-related information, must be discussed in the departmental recommendation letter.

In addition to the information presented in this section, departments are encouraged to review [APM 210, Review and Appraisal Committees](#). This APM section sets forth the criteria and standards used by review committees when advising on actions concerning a number of academic series.

The policies for evaluating Senate and non-Senate assistant-rank appointees are set forth in section VII. D. (Senate appointees), and E. (Non-Senate appointees).

PERFORMANCE REVIEW CRITERIA AT UC SAN DIEGO				
	Research & Creative Activity	Teaching	Professional Competence & Activity	University & Public Service
Professor (Ladder-Rank) Series	X	X	X	X
Professor In Residence Series	X	X	X	X
Professor of Clinical X Series	X	X	X	X
Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series	X(a)	X	X	X
Adjunct Professor Series	X	X(b)	X	X
Professor of Practice	X	X	X	X
Lecturers with Security of Employment (SOE) Series		X	X	X
Professional Research (Research Scientist) Series	X		X	X(c)
Project Scientist Series	X		X	
Specialist Series	X		X	
Academic Administrator Series and Academic Coordinator Series	(d)		X	X
Librarian Series	X		X	X
Continuing Educator Series & Program Coordinator Series			X	X

- a) Appointees in this series are expected to engage in *some* scholarly or creative activity appropriate to the clinical discipline.
- b) Equivalent to at least one course per year.
- c) Appointees at the Associate and Full level are expected to engage in University and/or public service in accordance with Section V.I.
- d) Although an Academic Administrator or Coordinator may oversee a program involving research, responsibility for engaging in research, while desirable, is not required for this series.

A. Professor (Ladder-Rank) Series and Professor In Residence Series

The criteria set forth below are intended to serve as guides for minimum standards in judging the appointee, not to set boundaries to exclude other elements of performance that may be considered.

The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Teaching, research, and professional and public service contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of the appointee’s qualifications. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms, including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of California’s diverse population, or research in a scholar’s area of expertise that highlights inequalities. Mentoring and advising of students or new faculty members are to be encouraged and given recognition in the teaching or service categories of academic personnel actions.

1. Research and Other Creative Activity

Research publications and other creative accomplishments should be evaluated, not merely enumerated. There should be evidence that the appointee is continuously and effectively engaged in research and creative activity of high quality and significance.

- When published work of joint authorship (or any other product of joint effort) is presented as evidence, the department should describe the appointee's role in the joint effort. This is crucial for work judged most significant to the case, or when much of the work submitted is multi-authored. When the appointee's contributions to collaborative work are unclear, the department may:
 - Request a personal statement from the appointee describing his or her individual contributions to collaborative research, and/or
 - Solicit feedback from the appointee's collaborators regarding the nature and extent of the appointee's contributions to specific works.
- The type and quality of creative activity normally expected in the candidate's field should be specified.
- Textbooks, reports, and similar publications normally are considered evidence of teaching ability or public service. However, contributions by faculty members to the professional literature or to the advancement of professional practice or professional education, including contributions to the advancement of equitable access and diversity in education, should be regarded as creative work when they present new ideas or original scholarly research.
- In certain fields, such as art, dance, music, literature, and theater, distinguished creation should receive consideration equivalent to that accorded to distinction attained in research. In evaluating artistic creativity, the appointee's merit should be defined in the light of such criteria as originality, scope, richness, and depth of creative expression. It should be recognized that in music, theater, and dance, distinguished performance, including conducting and directing, is evidence of an appointee's creativity.
- Special cases of collaboration occur in the performing arts, and the contribution of a particular collaborator may not be readily discernible by those viewing the finished work. It is the responsibility of the department chair to provide an evaluation of the appointee's contribution to the work and to obtain outside opinions based on observation of the work while in progress.
- The departmental recommendation letter should indicate the standing of the journals in which publications have appeared; in particular, the letter should state whether the journals are refereed.
- Indices of the stature of journals (e.g., journal ratings by professional societies, acceptance/rejection rates, etc.) should be provided for key pieces of work, particularly if they are published in journals that are not likely to be familiar to campus reviewers.
- The appointee's success in obtaining support for research and other creative activity, including support for graduate students, should be addressed. The appointee's role on grants should be indicated (e.g., Principal Investigator, Co-Principal Investigator, or Co-Investigator, with the number of other co-investigators specified). While evidence of successful grant funding may be an *indicator* of research productivity or impact, grants are not required as a measure of productivity or impact.
- Although Assistant-level faculty must demonstrate independence from early-career mentors or advisors in order to advance to the Associate level, evidence is not restricted to independent research papers, other independent creative accomplishments, or garnering sole-P.I. grants, particularly if the

faculty member's research or creative activity takes place in a large-scale, collaborative team. However, if a traditional demonstration of independence is absent, more substantial documentation is needed to explain and support the case that promotion to the Associate level is warranted. In such a case, letters from non-independent referees (e.g., research team members) may be provided in addition to the usual complement of independent letters.

If the department chair is not able to evaluate the appointee's research and other creative accomplishments, assistance should be secured from someone within the department or University, or from experts outside the University.

A mere listing of publications is inadequate; the work must be analyzed with regard to its nature, quality, importance, and impact on the appointee's field. Departmental recommendation letters for Health Sciences faculty should make clear whether clinical case reports are merely historical or whether they contain new ideas or results.

2. Teaching

Clear evidence of high-quality teaching is required for advancement and promotion in the Professor and Professor in Residence series. Departments should develop appropriate procedures for evaluating the teaching performance of faculty at the undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral levels.

a. Definition of Teaching

By its broadest definition, teaching is the transmission of knowledge. This embraces a wide range of activities, including classroom and laboratory training, mentoring students outside the classroom, directing or participating in graduate student dissertation work, directing reading groups, and overseeing clinical apprenticeships in Health Sciences. It also includes studio teaching, seminar and symposium presentations, tutorials, supervision and training of teaching assistants, and independent study endeavors, as well as the writing of textbooks and software.

b. Assessing Quality of Teaching

In assessing the effectiveness of teaching, consideration should be given to the appointee's:

- (1) Command of the subject
- (2) Continuous growth in the subject field
- (3) Ability to effectively organize and present material
- (4) Capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge
- (5) Ability to foster student independence and capacity to reason
- (6) Spirit and enthusiasm, which vitalize the appointee's teaching
- (7) Ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students
- (8) Ability to encourage high standards
- (9) Ability to stimulate superior students to pursue graduate work
- (10) Personal attributes as they affect teaching and students

- (11) Quality of participation in the general guidance, mentoring and advising of students
- (12) Effectiveness in creating an academic environment that is open and encouraging to all students, including development of particularly effective strategies for the educational advancement of students in various underrepresented groups.

The departmental recommendation letter should include a meaningful assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness at both the undergraduate and graduate levels of instruction, accompanied by a concise statement of the amount and type of undergraduate and graduate teaching done during each year of the review period, and a statement of whether this is a normal pattern of teaching for someone at that rank and step in that department. Any extraordinary effort or extenuating circumstances, such as the newness, difficulty, or popularity of the course or its content, also should be evaluated. If the teaching assignment appears unusually heavy or light, the letter should explain why. In Health Sciences, the departmental recommendation letter should indicate the number of students for each elective course offered by the appointee.

c. **Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness**

At least one kind of evaluation each for undergraduate and graduate teaching, such as Course and Professor Evaluations (CAPE) reports, is required in each academic review file. More than one form of evaluation is encouraged and may be particularly critical in career reviews. In addition to evaluations, other significant evidence of teaching effectiveness includes:

- (1) Opinions of other faculty members knowledgeable in the appointee's field, particularly if based on class visits, on attendance at public lectures or lectures before professional societies given by the appointee, or on the performance of students taught by the appointee in courses that are prerequisite to those of the assessor.
- (2) Opinions of current graduate and undergraduate students (non-CAPE evaluations).
- (3) Opinions of graduates who have achieved notable professional success since leaving the University.
- (4) Creation of new and effective techniques of instruction, including techniques that meet the needs of students from groups that are underrepresented in the field of instruction.
- (5) Course materials such as the syllabus and reading lists, a description of the course and its goals, and a self-evaluation statement on the achievement of these goals by the appointee. The input of colleagues in team-teaching situations also would be valuable.
- (6) Documentation of any teaching awards received during the review period.

Note: Those who provide opinions on teaching should first be solicited and provided with the University's confidentiality statement.

In addition to an evaluation of regularly scheduled undergraduate and graduate classes, the departmental recommendation letter should include an assessment of the appointee's non-structured activities, which the appointee has documented on the biobib form, including discussion of:

- undergraduate research students, master’s and doctoral candidates, postdoctoral or medical fellows, interns and residents, and any other students mentored outside of the structured classroom setting; and
- the appointee’s role (e.g., thesis adviser, research adviser) for each student.

3. Professional Competence and Activity

In the professional schools, such as Engineering, Health Sciences, etc., a demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to the field and its characteristic activities should be recognized as a criterion for advancement. The appointee’s professional activities should be scrutinized for evidence of achievement and leadership in the field and of demonstrated progressiveness in the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems, including those that specifically address the professional advancement of individuals in underrepresented groups in the appointee’s field. It is the responsibility of the department chair to provide evidence of the appointee’s achievements in this area.

In the Health Sciences, faculty at the Associate rank or above who have clinical responsibilities should be certified by one of the medical specialty boards or demonstrate equivalent achievement and recognition.

4. University and Public Service

Academic appointees play 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 faculty government, University committees, and the formulation of departmental, college, divisional, school, and University policies.

Service by appointees to the community, state, and nation, both in their special capacities as scholars and in areas beyond those special capacities when the work done is at a sufficiently high level and of sufficiently high quality, should likewise be recognized as evidence for advancement. Academic service activities related to the improvement of elementary and secondary education represent one example of this kind of service. Similarly, contributions to student welfare through service on student–faculty committees and as advisors to student organizations should be recognized as evidence, as should contributions furthering diversity and equal opportunity within the University through participation in such activities as recruitment, retention, and mentoring of scholars and students. The departmental recommendation letter should also indicate whether the appointee holds appointed or elective office in professional organizations, on professional publications, or within community, state, national, or international organizations in which professional standing is a prime consideration for appointment.

The departmental recommendation letter should specify and evaluate the appointee’s administrative service within the department, on the campus, and within the University of California.

B. Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine) Series

The departmental recommendation letter must document the appointee’s division of effort among the four areas of activity listed below and indicate the appropriateness of this division to the position. Clinical teaching, professional activity, and creative work may differ from standard professorial activities, but can be judged on the basis of professional competence, intellectual contribution, and originality.

1. Teaching

Excellent teaching is an essential criterion for advancement. Clinical teaching is intensive tutorial instruction carried on amid the demands of patient care and is usually characterized by pressure on the teacher to cope with unpredictably varied problems, by patient-centered immediacy of the subject matter, and by the necessity of preparing the student to take action as a result of the interchange. Nevertheless, the teaching criteria listed for the regular professor series above are applicable.

In addition, the clinical teacher should be successful in applying knowledge of basic health science and clinical procedures to the diagnosis, treatment, and care of a patient in a manner that will not only assure the best educational opportunity for the student but also provide high-quality care for the patient.

For promotion to the Professor rank, the appointee should be recognized as an outstanding clinical teacher. Most appointees will have designed educational programs at a local level, and some will have designed such programs at a national level.

2. Professional Competence and Activity

There must be appropriate recognition and evaluation of professional activity. Exemplary professional practice, organization of training programs for health professionals, and supervision of health care facilities and operations comprise a substantial proportion of the academic effort of many health sciences faculty. In decisions on academic advancement, these are essential contributions to the mission of the University and deserve critical consideration and weighting comparable to those for teaching and creative activity.

In the Health Sciences, faculty at the Associate rank or above who have clinical responsibilities should be certified by one of the medical specialty boards or demonstrate equivalent achievement and recognition.

a. Standards for Promotion

For promotion to the Associate Professor rank, an appointee should be recognized at least in the local metropolitan health-care community as an authority within a clinical specialty. A clinician normally will have a regional reputation as a referral physician; another health professional normally will have a regional reputation as evidenced in such work as that of a consultant.

For promotion to the Professor rank, the appointee will have a national reputation for superior accomplishments within a clinical specialty and may have a leadership role in a department or medical center. The appointee may receive patients on referral from considerable distances, serve as a consultant on a nationwide basis, serve on specialty boards, or be a member or officer of clinical and/or professional societies.

b. Evaluation of Clinical Achievement

Evaluation of clinical achievement is both difficult and sensitive. In many cases, evidence will be testimonial in nature, and therefore its validity should be subject to critical scrutiny. The specificity and analytic nature of such evidence should be examined; the expertise and sincerity of the informant should be weighed.

Comparison of the individual with peers at the University of California and elsewhere should form part of the evidence provided. Letters from external authorities, when based on adequate knowledge of the individual and written to conform to the requirements cited above, are valuable contributions.

External evaluation or review by peers within the institution is necessary; evaluation by departmental members is not considered an appropriate or acceptable substitute for external/independent evaluation. The department chair also should seek evaluations from advanced clinical students and former students in academic positions or clinical practice.

3. Creative Work

Many faculty in the health sciences devote a great proportion of their time to the inseparable activities of teaching and clinical service and therefore have less time for formal creative work than most other scholars in the University. Some clinical faculty devote this limited time to academic research activities; others utilize their clinical experience as the basis of their creative work.

An appointee is expected to participate in investigation in basic, applied, or clinical sciences. In order to be promoted to the Associate or Full Professor rank, an appointee must have made a significant contribution to knowledge and/or practice in the field. The appointee's creative work must have been disseminated, for example, in a body of publications, in teaching materials used in other institutions, or in improvements or innovations in professional practice adopted elsewhere.

Evidence of achievement in this area may include clinical case reports. Clinical observations are an important contribution to the advancement of knowledge in the health sciences and should be judged by their accuracy, scholarship, and utility. Improvements in the practice of health care result from the development and evaluation of techniques and procedures by clinical investigators. In addition, creative achievement may be demonstrated by the development of innovative programs in health care itself or in transmitting knowledge associated with new fields or other professions.

Textbooks and similar publications, or contributions by appointees to the professional literature and the advancement of professional practice or of professional education, should be judged as creative work when they represent new ideas or incorporate scholarly research. The development of new or better ways of teaching the basic knowledge and skills required by students in the health sciences may be considered evidence of creative work.

The quantitative productivity level achieved by an appointee should be assessed with the knowledge of the time and institutional resources allotted to the individual for creative work.

4. University and Public Service

Both the amount and the quality of the appointee's service to the department, the school, the campus, the University of California, and the public must be evaluated, paying particular attention to service that is directly related to the appointee's professional expertise and achievement. The departmental recommendation letter must provide both a list of service activities and an analysis of the quality of this service.

For more information on the Professor of Clinical X series, please see Supplement I, ["Guidelines for the Professor of Clinical X \(e.g., Medicine\) Series."](#)

C. Adjunct Professor Series

The performance criteria for the Adjunct Professor series are the same as for the Professor series (teaching, research and creative work, professional competence and activity, and university and public service). However, evaluation of the appointee with respect to these criteria will appropriately take into account the nature of the University assignment of duties and responsibilities, and the emphasis to be placed on each of the

criteria will be adjusted accordingly. For example, an appointee may have a heavy workload in research and a relatively light workload in teaching.

The departmental recommendation letter must describe and document clearly how the appointee has fulfilled each of the performance criteria.

The productivity rate expected for advancement and promotion is proportionate to the percentage of appointment, and the relative distribution of responsibilities among the four review criteria as defined for the individual at the time of appointment.

In accordance with PPM 230-20, for Adjunct Professors whose appointments are primarily based on their professional distinction, the continuing value of their professional distinction to the University's teaching mission may be considered in the evaluation of an appointee's research and creative work.

In the Health Sciences, faculty at the Associate rank or above who have clinical responsibilities should be certified by one of the medical specialty boards or demonstrate equivalent achievement and recognition.

D. Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series

The criteria for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series and information on evaluating the criteria are detailed in Supplement II, "[Guidelines for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series.](#)"

E. Clinical Professor, Voluntary Series

Clinical competence and excellence in teaching are the primary criteria for reappointment and promotion in this series.

F. Professor of Practice

Criteria for advancement and reappointment in this series are:

1. Professional competence and activity

The appointee's professional competence and activity and exemplary professional practice and leadership in the field should be evaluated by comparison to peers in the field and with regard to the viewpoints, skills, and experience the appointee brings to the teaching mission (including research training).

At the time of review, the department must demonstrate the appointee's continued trajectory of professional competence and activity, exemplary professional practice, and leadership in the field.

2. Teaching of truly exceptional quality and so specialized in character that it cannot be done with equal effectiveness by ladder-rank faculty members or by strictly temporary appointees.

The teaching requirements may be satisfied by meaningful engagement in and significant contributions to the graduate or undergraduate instructional program, including efforts in the research and professional training of students, and/or the development and instruction of specialized courses. Appointees in the Professor of Practice series teach primarily at the graduate level. Instruction at the undergraduate level is permissible when an appointee's individual expertise and professional skills warrant such a teaching assignment; however, it is not expected that Professors of Practice teach core courses at the undergraduate level.

3. Contributions to the research and/or creative mission of the University, with emphasis on professional practice and leadership contributions.

4. Service contributions

The departmental recommendation letter must provide a description of service activities and an analysis of the quality of this service, paying particular attention to

that service which is directly related to the appointee's professional expertise and achievement.

Professional activity, teaching, and creative contributions may differ from standard ladder-rank professorial activities, and can also be judged on the basis of professional competence, intellectual contribution, originality, and the total value of the appointee's engagement with the department. Evaluation of the candidate with respect to these criteria should take into account the nature of the University assignment of duties and responsibilities. Appointees in the Professor of Practice series may contribute predominantly to the University's instructional program, with lesser contributions to the University's research and/or creative programs; or, they may contribute primarily to the University's research and/or creative programs, and have limited responsibility in teaching. In all cases, however, successful reappointment and/or advancement in the Professor of Practice series is contingent upon documented contributions in all four criteria as listed above (professional competence and activity, teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service). At the time of review, the department must demonstrate that the appointee has maintained a significant presence in the department during all periods of active service. Active and meaningful participation and excellence with respect to the duties assigned upon appointment are essential for reappointment and eligibility for a merit increase. The department must fully document the appointee's contributions and demonstrate the quality of work performed and its impact on the department. A change of duties to a different mixture from those within the above categories may be requested as part of consideration for reappointment.

Upon successful performance as Professor of Practice, the appointee will be eligible for a standard salary increase of 5% of the current salary.

Visiting Professors of Practice may serve a maximum of two consecutive years and may not be reappointed.

G. Lecturer with Security of Employment (Teaching Professor) Series

The criteria for advancement in this series are:

- Teaching of truly exceptional quality and so specialized in character that it cannot be done with equal effectiveness by ladder-rank faculty members or by strictly temporary appointees
- Professional achievement and activity
- University and public service
- Educational leadership recognized beyond the campus and contributions to instruction-related activities (e.g., conducting teaching assistant training, supervision of student affairs, development of instructional materials)

Advancement of a part-time appointee in this series will depend on performance at a level of distinction comparable to that demanded of a full-time appointee; however, when circumstances warrant it, a lesser rate of professional achievement and activity will be acceptable. Teaching assignments and departmental, committee, and other service should be in proportion to the percentage of time of the position, but the same quality of performance is expected as for a full-time appointee.

a. Lecturer and Senior Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment (LPSOE)

An appointee with the title of Lecturer or Senior Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment (LPSOE or Senior LPSOE) is subject to and should be evaluated in accordance with the provisions of Section VII. D., Evaluation of Senate Assistant-Rank Appointees.

For merit advancements, there should be evidence of the professional achievement required for an equivalent salary in the Professor series.

For advancement to Senior LPSOE, the proposed salary must be equal to or above that of a Professor, Step I. The appointee's services must be of exceptional value to the University.

For promotion from Senior LPSOE to Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment, the appointee's services must be of exceptional value to the University, and the proposed salary must be at the Professor level. An appointee with the title of Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment (LPSOE) may use the working title "Assistant Teaching Professor."

b. Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE)

Appointees with the title of Lecturer or Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE or Senior LSOE) should be reviewed for salary advancement every two to four years, depending upon the normal period of service for the rank and step in the Professor series to which their current salaries correspond. For example, an LSOE paid a salary equivalent to that of an Associate Professor, Step II, should be reviewed for salary advancement every two years. An appointee with the title of Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) may use the working title "Associate Teaching Professor."

c. Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment (Senior LSOE)

Promotion to Senior LSOE is not normally expected, but may occur when warranted. Review for promotion to the Senior LSOE title will normally occur only after a minimum of six years in the title of LSOE.

Senior LSOEs will be reviewed every three years for merit advancements, until the salary is equivalent to that of Professor, Step V. Service at that level and higher may be of indefinite duration, and review for advancement will not usually occur after less than four years. An appointee with the title of Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) may use the working title "Teaching Professor."

Advancement to a salary level equivalent to that of Professor, Step VI, may be granted on evidence of great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, in the areas of professional achievement and educational leadership, teaching, and University and public service.

d. Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment Above Scale

Senior LSOEs of the highest distinction, whose work has been nationally or internationally acclaimed and who demonstrate a level of distinction equivalent to that required of Distinguished Professors, are eligible for salaries above the top of the range. Files for such actions must contain an analysis of the appointee's achievements throughout his or her career, as well as an assessment of recent achievements; evidence of documented and assessable work of the highest distinction that contributes to the development of the field and/or pedagogy; and letters from external referees. Mere length of service and continued good performance at the top of the salary range are not a justification for further salary advancement. The academic review file must reflect a critical career review.

Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement to a base salary above the top of the salary range should not occur after less than four years at the top of the salary range. Further, acceleration to this high level should be a rare event requiring evidence of extraordinary performance beyond the already exceptional standard required for advancement to the top of the range.

Files proposing a full merit advancement to a base salary above the top of the salary range, or a full merit advancement further above the top of the salary range, must demonstrate exemplary performance in all areas (teaching, service,

educational development and professional competence and activity). Instructions for calculating salary increases for Senior LSOEs above the salary range are available on the [Academic Personnel Services](#) website.

An appointee with the title of Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment with a base salary above the top of the salary range may use the working title “Distinguished Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment,” or “Distinguished Teaching Professor.”

H. Lecturer and Senior Lecturer Series (Unit 18)

The terms and conditions of appointment in the Lecturer and Senior Lecturer series are covered by a [Memorandum of Understanding](#) (MOU) entered into by the Regents of the University of California and the University Council, American Federation of Teachers (UC-AFT).

I. Professional Research (Research Scientist) Series

The performance criteria for the Professional Research (Research Scientist) series (hereafter referred to as the Research Scientist series) are the same as for the Professor (Ladder-Rank) series in the area of research and creative activity. The appointee must be continuously and effectively engaged in independent research and creative activity of high quality and significance, equivalent to that expected of the Professor series.

Associate and Full Research Scientists are expected to engage in University and/or professional service, within the constraints of the applicable funding source(s). This service requirement can be interpreted flexibly; service activities may be focused on the professional development of the appointee. If there are limitations on potential service contributions due to constraints imposed by a funding source, this should be discussed.

Assistant Research Scientists are not required to participate in service activities.

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

J. Project Scientist Series

Criteria for advancement and reappointment in this series are demonstrated significant, original contributions to a research project or creative program. Appointees in this series need not demonstrate the same leadership ability, independence, or scholarly breadth as members of the Research Scientist or Professor series. University and public service are encouraged but not required.

At the time of academic review, the Project Scientist’s supervisor (normally the principal investigator) should evaluate the Project Scientist and submit his or her written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.

K. Specialist Series

Criteria for advancement and reappointment in this series are:

- Performance of research in specialized areas
- Professional competence and activity

At UC San Diego, advancement to Specialist, Above Scale, is reserved for Specialists with records of outstanding, distinguished performance, judged in an arena substantially broader than the particular research groups with which they are associated. Testimonials from outstanding extramural research groups in the same or related fields will be necessary in order to document the level of performance required for advancement to Specialist, Above Scale. In some instances, advancement to the Above Scale level may

be justified on the basis of the Specialist's publications, or on his or her own scientific, technical, or otherwise creative contributions (as compared to contributions to a group effort).

Mere length of service and continued meritorious performance at the top step of the Specialist series are not sufficient justification for further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of exceptional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step V was based. Advancement to Specialist, Above Scale, following service of less than three years as Specialist, Step V, will be considered an acceleration.

Once an appointee has been advanced to Above Scale, a merit advancement occurring at an interval of less than four years is considered an acceleration.

Appointees in the Specialist series are not eligible for off-scale salaries.

At the time of academic review, the Specialist's supervisor (normally the principal investigator) should evaluate the Specialist and submit his or her written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.

The department chair must specify in the departmental recommendation letter the role of the Specialist in the research project.

L. Other Series

1. Academic Administrator Series

a. Criteria for Evaluating Performance

Merit advancements and promotions are based on administrative performance, professional competence and activity, and University and public service. Although the function of an Academic Administrator may include oversight of a program involving research, responsibility for engaging in research, while desirable, is not implied by appointment to this series. The Level of Administrative Responsibility form should be included in all Academic Administrator review files. A job description must be provided, along with an explanation of the appointee's role in the program and within a larger unit, if appropriate.

There are three separate title codes for this series with ascending levels of responsibility. Promotion from one title code to another within the series will not normally occur until the appointee has served at least six years in the lower title code, including at least two years at the top step for that title code.

A performance review, in the absence of a merit advancement or promotion review, must take place at least every four years. Formal review by the appropriate campus committee is required every six years.

b. Normal Periods of Service at Salary Steps

Recommendations for merits and advancements normally will be reviewed every second year until an appointee reaches the level of Academic Administrator IV, Step 5, after which review for merit advancement will take place every three years. Once the appointee reaches the level of Academic Administrator VI, Step 7.0, review for merit advancement will take place every four years. Service as Academic administrator VII, Step 8.0, may be of indefinite duration, and appointees at this step will be reviewed every four years for reappointment.

2. Academic Coordinator Series

a. Criteria for Evaluating Performance

Merit advancements are based on administrative performance, professional competence and activity, and University and public service. Professional accomplishment and scholarly achievement should also be considered, if required by the position. The Level of Administrative Responsibility form should be included in all Academic Coordinator review files.

Materials submitted in support of merit advancement or a change in level must provide a comprehensive assessment of the appointee's qualifications and performance in the areas specified below. A job description must be provided, along with an explanation of the appointee's role in the program and within a larger unit, if appropriate.

(1) Coordination of Academic Programs

In most instances, Academic Coordinators will have primary responsibility for the administration and coordination of one or more programs. This may include academic program planning and development, assessment of program and constituency needs, evaluation of academic program activities and functions, development of proposals for extramural funding of campus programs and identification of support resources, serving as liaison with other agencies and institutions in the public and private sector, and supervision and leadership of other academic appointees or staff.

(2) Professional Competence

Academic Coordinators will provide intellectual leadership and scholarship to their programs.

(3) University and Public Service

Academic Coordinators will participate in the administration of their units and the University through appropriate roles in governance and policy formulation. In addition, they may represent the University in their special capacity as scholars during the discharge of their responsibilities.

b. Normal Periods of Service at Salary Steps

Temporary appointments of Academic Coordinators may be made for up to a one-year period and may not exceed a total of two consecutive years without formal campus review.

Recommendations for merit advancements will be reviewed every second year for an Academic Coordinator I or II, and every third year for an Academic Coordinator III. A performance review must precede any reappointment. There is no expectation of movement between levels without significant changes in the scope and complexity of the program being administered. Academic Coordinator appointments may be made for up to a three-year period (depending on the level) and may not exceed a total of two consecutive appointments/reappointments without formal campus review.

3. Librarian Series

The Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs has delegated responsibility for the Librarian Series to the University Librarian.

Refer to [APM 360](#) for the Librarian Series advancement and reappointment policies.

For those appointees in the Librarian series covered by the [Memorandum of Understanding](#) (MOU) entered into by the Regents of the University of California and University Council, American Federation of Teachers (UC-AFT), the terms and conditions of appointment may be found in the MOU.

4. Continuing Educator Series and Coordinator of Public Programs Series

The Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs has delegated responsibility for the Continuing Educator Series and Coordinator of Public Programs Series to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Public Programs and Dean of University Extension.

Refer to [APM 340](#) for the Continuing Educator advancement and reappointment policies.

Information about the Continuing Educator series and Coordinator of Public Programs series may be obtained from Extended Studies and Public Programs.

5. Student Academic Series

The Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs has delegated responsibility for student academic series to the Dean of Graduate Division.

Information about student academic series may be obtained from the [Graduate Division](#).

M. Acting Titles

An academic review file must be submitted in order to reappoint an individual to a new term under an Acting title.

Since the Acting prefix may be used only in the Professor (Ladder-Rank) series, the departmental recommendation letter should discuss the individual's performance based on the criteria for the Professor series.

N. Visiting Titles

An academic review file must be submitted to reappoint an individual to a new term under a Visiting title.

Although no steps are assigned to Visiting appointees, the departmental recommendation letter must justify the salary level recommended. Visiting appointments may be made for a period of up to one year; total service is limited to two consecutive years.

The criteria for evaluation of an appointee for reappointment in a Visiting title are the same as for the corresponding regular title. Because the appointment is temporary, reasonable flexibility may be employed in the application of these criteria.

The departmental recommendation letter should describe clearly the special expertise that the visitor brings to the campus and should clearly state that the individual will be returning to the home institution upon completion of the visiting appointment.

O. Recall Titles

The policies and procedures for recall appointments are set forth in [PPM 230-20, Appointment of Academic Personnel](#).

P. Non-salaried Instructional Titles

1. For individuals whose primary employment is not at the University:

- Reappointment may be made for a period of two or three years, depending on the appointee's rank (e.g., two years for the Assistant rank).
- Reappointment files should include the same documentation required for salaried appointees in the title or series.

2. For individuals with full-time salaried positions at the University:

Reappointment may be made for two to three years, corresponding to the appointment period in the appointee's salaried title. In such instances, only one academic review file should be submitted for both the reappointment in the non-salaried instructional title and the recommendation for action in the salaried title. The departmental recommendation letter must evaluate the service in each area and clearly outline the type and amount of teaching the appointee will do.

VI. PREPARING THE ACADEMIC REVIEW FILE

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

The department chair is responsible for ensuring compliance with [PPM 230-29, Policies and Procedures to Assure Fairness in the Academic Personnel Review Process](#).

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

Detailed [instructions on preparing academic advancement and reappointment review files](#) are available on the Academic Personnel Web site.

FILE DOCUMENTS	REAPPOINTMENT	MERIT	ACCELERATED MERIT	PROMOTION/ CAREER REVIEW
Academic Recommendation Summary	X	X	X	X
UC Academic Employment History	X	X	X	X
Departmental Recommendation Letter	X	X	X	X
Certification A/ Certification B	X	X	X	X
Departmental Ad Hoc Report	To be submitted whenever a departmental ad hoc is convened			
Appointee's Personal Statement (if any)	Optional	Optional	Optional	Optional
External Referee Solicitation Letter (1 copy)				X**
Identification and				X

Qualifications of External referees				
Number of External Referee Letters				5 for promotion to Associate 3 for promotion to Full and advancement to Above Scale; optional for advancement to Step VI
Course Load/Case Load Form	X *	X	X	X
Teaching Evaluations	Required for all instructional titles			
Level of Administrative Responsibility (LAR) Form	Required for Academic Administrators and Academic Coordinators			
Updated Biography and Bibliography Form	X	X	X	X
Sabbatical Leave Report, if applicable	X *	X	X	X
Publications/Reviews/Creative Work	X *	X	X	X

* Not required for temporary files

** External referee letters are not required if the departmental recommendation is termination.

VII. DETERMINING DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Computation of Rank and Step to Determine Eligibility for Advancement

Normal periods of service are assigned to the various steps in the published academic salary schedules. When reviewing each academic appointee within a department, the department chair is responsible for computing the number of years the appointee has served at rank and step in order to determine whether he or she is eligible for normal advancement.

Every academic appointee must be reviewed at least every five years.

1. Normal Periods of Service

The normal period of service at each step in the Assistant Professor rank is two years, although it may be one year at steps V and VI. In most cases, promotion to the Associate level occurs following two years of service at step IV; however, when an Assistant-level appointee completing service at step IV is not ready for promotion, but is otherwise performing adequately, he or she may be considered for advancement to step V or step VI. In case of subsequent promotion to Associate Professor, previous service at steps V or VI and the conclusions of a career review are used to determine the entry step in the Associate rank. Service at Assistant, Step V, may be in lieu of service at Associate, Step I; service at Assistant, Step VI, may be in lieu of service at Associate, Step II.

The normal total period of service at the Associate rank is six years. The normal period of service at any of the first three steps in the Associate rank is two years. In most cases, promotion to the Full level occurs following two years of service at step III; however, when an Associate-level appointee completing service at step III is not ready for promotion, but is otherwise performing adequately, he or she may be considered for advancement to step IV or step V. The normal period of service at steps IV and V is three years. In case of subsequent promotion to the Full level, previous service at steps IV or V and the conclusions of a career review determine the entry step in the Full rank. Service at Associate, Step IV, may be in lieu of service at the Full level, Step I; service at Associate, Step V, may be in lieu of service at the Full level, Step II.

For the Full rank, the normal period of service is three years in each of the first eight steps. A career review is required for advancement beyond Step V. Service at Step V may be of indefinite duration, though a review must be conducted every three years. Advancement to 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, highly meritorious service, and excellent University teaching. There must be evidence of continuing achievement in all areas at the prescribed level. Continuing great distinction in scholarly and creative achievement should be recognized nationally or internationally.

Advancement to Steps VII, VIII, and IX usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the previous step and only will be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step VI.

Advancement to Above Scale is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed and whose performance in all areas is excellent. (The honorary title of Distinguished Professor will be conferred on those who advance to Above Scale in the Professor [Ladder-Rank] Series; the title "Distinguished Research Scientist" will be conferred on those who advance to Above Scale in the Research Scientist Series; and the title "Distinguished Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment" ("Distinguished Teaching Professor") will be conferred upon those who advance above the top of the salary range in the LSOE series.) Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at the top of the salary scale (Step IX in the Professor and Research Scientist Series). Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at the top of the salary scale are not a justification for further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step IX was based. The academic review file must reflect a critical career review.

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 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 increases at intervals shorter than four years be approved.

The normal salary increase for a person in the Above Scale category is either 50% or 100% of the difference between the top two steps of the salary scale (i.e., 50% or 100% of the salary increase between Steps VIII and IX for the Professor and Research Scientist series.) Files proposing 100% of the difference between the top two steps must demonstrate exemplary performance in all areas (research and creative activity, teaching, service, and professional competence and activity). Files proposing more than 100% of the difference between the top two steps will be considered acceleration files.

Assistant Professor:	
Assistant Professor I Assistant Professor II Assistant Professor III Assistant Professor IV	Two years at each step
Assistant Professor V Assistant Professor VI	1 or 2 years
Associate Professor:	
Associate Professor I Associate Professor II Associate Professor III	Two years at each step
Associate Professor IV Associate Professor V	1, 2 or 3 years
Professor:	
Professor I Professor II Professor III Professor IV	Three years at step
Professor V Professor VI Professor VII Professor VIII	3 years or indefinite
Professor IX	4 years or indefinite
Professor, Above Scale	4 years at each salary level or indefinite

2. Special Considerations

- a. Academic year: An academic-year appointee who has served at least two full quarters in any fiscal year (July 1 through June 30) will receive credit for one year of service at rank and step. An academic-year appointee who has served just one quarter in any fiscal year (July 1 through June 30) will not receive credit for that year's service at rank and step.
- b. Fiscal year: A fiscal-year appointee who is appointed during the period July 1 through January 1 will receive credit for one year of service at rank and step. A fiscal-year appointee who is appointed during the period January 2 through June 30 will not receive credit for that year's service at rank and step.

Refer to [PPM 230-20](#) for additional information on calculating years at rank and step.

B. Formal Recommendation

After determining the years at rank and step and complying with the requirement for consultation with other members of the faculty or with the principal investigator, etc., a department chair may recommend one of the following actions:

1. Deferral

With appropriate justification, an appointee may request that his or her regularly scheduled academic review be deferred. An appointee may request a maximum of two consecutive deferrals. Obtaining approval of a deferral request is the only alternative to recommending a no-change action.

An appointee may request a deferral of his or her academic review when:

- 1) there is evidence that work in progress will come to fruition within the year and that having the additional year

will make a difference in the result of the next review; or

- 2) circumstances beyond the appointee's control have impacted his or her productivity (i.e., illness, family member's illness, etc.).

The appropriate dean has the authority to approve the first deferral request. The Executive Vice Chancellor must approve a second consecutive deferral request. In general, the following appointees are not eligible to defer academic reviews: Assistant-rank appointees (except when approved as a family accommodation; see [PPM 230-15, Family Accommodations](#)), non-salaried Adjunct Professors, and appointees with established ending dates (term appointments).

Deferral requests must be submitted to the appointee's department(s) no later than October 15.

2. **Appointee Not Recommended for Advancement (No Change)**

An academic review file must be prepared and submitted for review for an appointee serving in the final year of the normal period at step¹, even if the appointee is not recommended for advancement. A department should propose a no-change action if productivity is not sufficient to justify advancement, or if the appointee is unresponsive to departmental requests to submit updated file materials. For appointees subject to [APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment](#), the department may allow the appointment to expire instead of recommending a no-change action.

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

After a no-change action takes effect, the appointee's review cycle will be reset for the normal two-, three-, or four-year cycle. Should the department propose advancement prior to the end of the appointee's normal review cycle, this action will not be considered an acceleration.

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

Consecutive No Change Actions

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

- a. **Full Service at a Barrier Step**
An appointee's failure to advance resulting from insufficient career accomplishments to pass through a barrier step, while continuing to provide full service to the University. For example, an appointee may continue to be productive in research and/or creative activities, teaching, and service at a level that would support normal merit advancement, but may not be sufficiently productive at a level that would support promotion, advancement to Step VI, or advancement to Above Scale.
- b. **Extenuating Circumstances**
An appointee's failure to advance resulting from extenuating circumstances, such as the appointee's own illness, the illness of a family member, or other significant event outside of his or her control that impacted productivity and/or performance.
- c. **Insufficient Contributions**

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

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

- i. When an appointee is proposed for a consecutive no change action due to insufficient contributions, the department or subsequent reviewers may propose the reduction or elimination of a market off-scale salary component at the time of future range adjustment actions. See PPM 230-28.VII.B.5.
- ii. In cases in which an appointee receives a second consecutive no change action due to insufficient contributions:
 - The department chair, in consultation with the dean, must meet with the appointee to develop a plan to correct the deficiencies in the record contributing to the lack of advancement. This plan must be included in the next academic review file.
 - The appointee is ineligible to defer a regularly scheduled review until deficiencies in the record are corrected and the appointee advances.

Proposals for consecutive no change actions generally require committee review. See the UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) for complete information.

3. Appointee Recommended for Merit Advancement or Promotion

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

A merit advancement is an advancement in step and salary rate (or advancement to a further-above-scale salary) without a change in title or rank. Normal years at rank and step are outlined above and in the Academic Salary Scales located on the [Academic Personnel Services](#) Web site.

A promotion is an advancement from one rank to a higher rank within a series and requires a full career review. Other advancements that require career reviews include advancement to and through Professor, Step VI (and comparable titles), and to Above Scale.

4. Appointee Recommended for Accelerated Merit Advancement or Accelerated Promotion

Accelerated advancement is early advancement to a higher step and/or rank. For series lacking established ranks and/or steps, accelerated advancement is an early increase in salary, or an increase greater than is expected based on the time since the appointee's last review.

Criteria for Accelerated Advancement

An appointee whose performance is at an exceptional level over a period may be considered for accelerated advancement. Exceptional performance is defined as work that significantly exceeds the normal departmental expectations in one or more of the areas of review: research and other creative activities, teaching, professional competence and activities, and university and public service. The candidate for acceleration must also meet the departmental criteria for advancement in every area of review. Acceleration proposals should not be made if there is any evident weakness in the case.

Acceleration proposals must address the department standards for normal merit advancement and articulate the manner in which the candidate's performance is exceptional. In parallel with normal merit advancement progress, the criteria for both good and exceptional performance become more rigorous with rank and step.

a. Series requiring research and/or creative activity:

For series in which research and/or creative activity is among the performance criteria, above-average research and/or creative activity is a prerequisite to accelerated advancement.

Evidence that a candidate's productivity is double that which is expected for normal advancement in the review period is typically sufficient to demonstrate a candidate's performance is exceptional for purposes of a one-step acceleration. In cases in which research productivity is greater than that required for normal advancement, but falls short of twice the expected rate, extraordinary achievements in additional performance criteria are necessary to justify accelerated advancement.

An acceleration case based on exceptional productivity in research must be documented with evidence of the appointee's contributions and their impact using norms appropriate to the research field. The department recommendation should articulate the grounds for acceleration beyond simple numerical tabulation of papers and citations; for example, demonstration of the special impact of research, the quality of publications, the awarding of prizes or election to national or international learned academies.

b. Other series:

An acceleration proposal based primarily on the quality and quantity of contributions other than research and/or creative activity must contain documentation and evidence of these extraordinary achievements and of their impact characterizing their exceptional nature of effort and outcomes. Documentation substantiating the significant and extraordinary nature of the achievements and their impact is needed; for example, the awarding of prizes, exceptional service of significant duration and/or importance (not otherwise rewarded or compensated), or professional recognition of contributions.

Timing of Accelerated Advancement

Except in remarkable circumstances (such as in the case of the appointee's receipt of an extraordinary award during the review period, or in the case of a parallel retention review) accelerated advancement should be proposed only at the time of the regularly scheduled review.

Normally, the activities considered for acceleration pertain to the complete review period only. Acceleration proposals occurring before the normal time for a merit review are discouraged unless extraordinary circumstances, such as the awarding of a major prize or an off-cycle review due to retention, warrant their consideration.

Accelerations may also be proposed as part of a case for recalibration of rank and step at the time of career review; e.g., tenure, promotion, or advancement to Step VI. Such a case requires documentation of activity and impact spanning the expanded review period and must contain evidence supporting the case for

acceleration.

Normally, either the candidate or the department will propose accelerated advancement. When a candidate requests to be considered for acceleration, this must be stated in the departmental recommendation letter. In addition, any campus reviewer may propose acceleration and all subsequent campus reviewers must provide comment on this proposal with regard to these acceleration criteria.

General Considerations

The previous award of bonus off-scale salary is immaterial to the consideration of any acceleration proposal.

Acceleration proposals based on unpublished work or work yet to be evaluated by scholarly review are inappropriate.

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

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

For Professors at Step IX and Above Scale, a merit advancement is an acceleration if it becomes effective after the individual has spent less than four years at the current step. There must be rare and compelling reasons for accelerated advancement to or as Professor, Above Scale, and departments must address the rare and compelling reasons when proposing such advancement.

5. Appointee Recommended for a Bonus or Market Off-Scale

Salaries should be on scale to the greatest extent feasible. Nevertheless, off-scale salaries are a necessary component of the University of California salary structure, as they allow flexibility in recruiting and retaining faculty and rewarding outstanding performance. Appointees in all academic series covered by PPM 230-28 are eligible for off-scale salary components, except as excluded in PPM230-28.II.

Bonus Off-Scale

A bonus off-scale is a temporary increase in salary which is generally awarded in recognition of outstanding achievements exceeding what is required for normal merit advancement, but insufficient to support accelerated advancement. [See PPM 230-28.VII.B.4]. In limited circumstances, a bonus off-scale may be awarded in conjunction with a no change action, when an appointee's achievements in the review period demonstrate both full service to the University and progress in all series criteria, but fall short of what is required for advancement.

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

Bonus off-scales are equivalent to half of the amount of the salary increase associated with normal advancement to the next higher step (or equivalent in series without formal steps). Bonus off-scales are paid over a single review period. Payments occur monthly for each year of the review period, and end on the effective date of the next review.

- For bonus off-scale salary components awarded 7/1/15 or earlier, if an appointee is not advanced at the next review, the bonus off-scale will be reduced at the time of annual salary range adjustments and/or future advancements until it is eliminated.
- For bonus off-scale components awarded 7/1/2016 or later, if an appointee is not advanced at the next review, the bonus off-scale will end as scheduled, which may result in a reduction in salary.

Information regarding the calculation and implementation of off-scale salary components may be found on the [Academic Personnel Services](#) website.

Market Off-Scale

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

- Departments may propose a market off-scale when an academic appointee receives a competing offer from a peer academic institution for appointment in a similar position. Departments should specifically address how the competing institution compares to UC San Diego and take this information into consideration when determining the proposed value of a market off-scale salary component. Whenever possible, departments should discuss the ranking of the department of the competing institution relative to their own ranking. [See PPM 230-28.IV.E.]
- Market considerations within a specific discipline may also justify an off-scale salary. Supporting information may include salary data from academic institutions of comparable stature and/or discipline-based salary studies by national organizations.

Market off-scale salary components are typically maintained indefinitely and do not require rejustification following the initial award; however, when there is evidence that an academic appointee with a market off-scale salary component has failed to sustain his or her career trajectory or stature in the field, the department or subsequent reviewers may propose reduction or elimination of the market off-scale salary component. [See PPM 230-28.VII.B.2.]

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

An off-scale salary must be a multiple of \$100 when the scale salaries of the relevant title series are multiples of \$100. A market off-scale salary may not be the same as any salary on the published salary scale for the particular title or series. Information regarding the calculation and implementation of off-scale salary components, including information regarding proposals to reduce or eliminate a market off-scale may be found on the [Academic Personnel Services](#) website.

C. Career Equity Review

A Career Equity Review (CER) is an evaluation to determine whether a faculty member's rank and step are correctly calibrated. It is not a means of appeal for or expression of disagreement with a single personnel decision. The CER process examines cases in which normal personnel actions, from the initial hiring onward, may have resulted in an

inaccurate rank and/or step designation. When warranted, a CER review may result in the recalibration of the faculty member to a higher rank and step consistent with prevailing UC San Diego standards.

A CER is available to Senate faculty members (excluding those at the LPSOE, Assistant, or Above Scale levels). A CER may be requested only once while the faculty member is at the Associate Professor level, once while at the Full Professor level prior to advancement to Professor, Step VI, and once after advancement to Professor, Step VI, prior to advancement to Above Scale.

The decision to initiate a CER rests solely with the faculty member. A CER may be initiated by a faculty member only at the time of his or her regular on-cycle academic review by submitting a written request to the department chair or to the appropriate dean. If the request is submitted to the department chair, a copy should also be submitted to the dean.

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

The faculty member must identify the specific area(s) of the record that he or she believes should be reevaluated. The faculty member may submit selected publications from earlier review periods that he or she considers relevant to the CER request.

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

The department should assess the appointee's accomplishments during the review period and determine its recommendation regarding the regular action (e.g., merit advancement). This should be done by a vote of the eligible faculty, if this is the normal department practice. The department should then determine its recommendation regarding recalibration on the basis of a CER, and this must be determined by a vote of eligible faculty. This recommendation should be based upon the appointee's overall record and the University's established criteria for the requested rank and step, with one exception: If a significantly higher rank or step is requested, the case will not require demonstration of the basis for an accelerated advancement. The purpose of the CER is to assess rank and step, and therefore recommendation of a bonus off-scale salary award in lieu of recalibration is not appropriate.

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

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

CERs are intended to supplement regular academic reviews, and they neither replace nor affect existing procedures for regular reviews.

The Executive Vice Chancellor's decision on the CER is not subject to appeal and is not retroactive.

D. Evaluation of Senate Assistant-Rank Appointees

This section applies to appointees in the Professor (Ladder-Rank), Professor In Residence, and Professor of Clinical X series.

1. Probationary Period

At UC San Diego, promotion consideration typically occurs in the sixth year of appointment at the Assistant rank. The period of time prior to consideration for promotion is referred to as the probationary period. During the probationary period, Assistant-rank appointees are expected to produce work sufficient to justify promotion.

There are limited circumstances in which the probationary period may be extended, most commonly as a family accommodation (see [PPM 230-15, Family Accommodations Policy](#)).

2. Procedural Safeguards

PPM 230-29, Policies and Procedures to Assure Fairness in the Academic Personnel Review Process, sets forth procedural safeguards to ensure the academic review process is fair and consistent. When conducting an evaluation of a Senate Assistant-rank appointee, particular attention should be paid to PPM 230-29 Section III. D. (procedural safeguards) and Section III. E. (additional safeguards for Assistant-level appointees).

3. Terms of Service

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

- a. An appointment or reappointment with an effective date other than July 1 must end on the second June 30 following the appointment date.
- b. A promotion or merit advancement may become effective before the end of a two-year term and will mark the beginning of a new term of appointment.
- c. When the status of an Acting or Visiting Assistant Professor is changed to Assistant Professor, the new appointment will normally end on the second June 30 following the effective date of the Acting or Visiting appointment. The combined initial period of service in the Acting or Visiting Assistant Professor title and the Assistant Professor title should not exceed two years.
- d. A reappointment to a terminal period of service may be for a term of less than two years, provided adequate notice is provided (see Section 9 below).

There is no assurance of reappointment, merit advancement, or eventual promotion. Decisions about reappointment and advancement are based upon careful reviews of an appointee's achievements and promise for continued progress, in accordance with the [UC San Diego Authority and Review Chart](#).

4. First Reappointment/Merit Review

The first reappointment/merit review of an Assistant-rank appointee normally occurs during the second year of appointment. As a result of the first reappointment/merit review, the department should submit one of the following recommendations:

Reappointment with Merit Advancement

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

Reappointment without Merit Advancement

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

Non-Reappointment

If an appointee is not making acceptable progress, the eligible department faculty² may vote to recommend non-reappointment at the end of the first two-year appointment period.

When appointment at the Assistant rank is not to be renewed, an appointee must receive written notice from the Executive Vice Chancellor in advance of the expiration date in accordance with the following schedule:

- (1) An appointee who will have accrued less than one year of University service by the end of the current appointment must receive four months' notice.
- (2) An appointee who will have accrued at least one complete year but not more than two years of University service by the end of the current appointment period must receive six months' notice.

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

5. Second Reappointment/Merit Review

The second reappointment/merit review of an Assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the fourth year of appointment. The second reappointment/merit review is usually combined with an appraisal (see Section 6 below).

As a result of the second reappointment/merit review, the department should submit one of the following recommendations:

Reappointment with Merit Advancement

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

Reappointment without Merit Advancement

² Department faculty voting rights are set forth in University of California Academic Senate Bylaw 55.

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

Termination

If an appointee's performance is unacceptable, the department may consider termination. A recommendation to terminate an assistant-rank appointee requires a vote of the eligible department faculty and may only be recommended after the department has conducted an appraisal (see Section 6 below).

6. Appraisal

An Assistant-rank appointee must receive an appraisal, which is a formal evaluation of his or her achievements and progress toward promotion. The appraisal also identifies appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence expected for faculty.

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

a. Timing

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

No appraisal is required if, prior to the normal occurrence of the appraisal, an appointee is recommended for a promotion that will take effect within a year, or has given written notice of resignation, or has been given written notice of non-reappointment.

b. Department Consideration

The following factors should be evaluated when conducting an appraisal:

- An appointee's published research and other completed creative activity and his or her potential for continued research and creative activity.
- At least one type of student or faculty evaluation each for undergraduate and graduate-level instruction, and other evidence of teaching effectiveness, such as course syllabi, reading lists, and statements of course goals.
- An appointee's departmental, University and community service contributions.
- Expertise and achievement in clinical activities, if applicable
- An appointee's self-evaluation (if any)

If the appointee has made significant scholarly contributions (such as research or teaching) in another academic unit, the department should

solicit input from the unit on the appointee’s contributions.

External letters are not required for an appraisal.

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

c. Appraisal Vote

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

FAVORABLE	Indicates that promotion is likely, contingent on maintaining the current trajectory of excellence and on appropriate external validation.
FAVORABLE WITH RESERVATIONS	Indicates that promotion is likely, if identified weaknesses or imbalances in the record are corrected.
PROBLEMATIC	Indicates that promotion is possible if substantial deficiencies in the present record are remedied.
UNFAVORABLE	Indicates that substantial deficiencies are present; promotion is unlikely.

If the vote results in an Unfavorable rating:

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

- (1) *Result of second faculty vote: Continuation of Appointment is Recommended*

When the appraisal is combined with a reappointment/merit review, the department must make a recommendation regarding reappointment and merit advancement (see Section 5 above).

Reappointment with merit advancement indicates that sufficient work has been completed during the review period to justify merit advancement, and the potential exists for an appointee to make marked improvements prior to consideration for promotion.

Reappointment without merit advancement indicates there has not been sufficient work completed in the review period to justify merit advancement, but the potential exists for an appointee to make marked improvements prior to consideration for promotion.

- (2) *Result of second faculty vote: Termination of Appointment is Recommended*

Termination should be considered if the majority of voting faculty are convinced the substantial deficiencies cannot be corrected in time for consideration for promotion and therefore further effort will not result in promotion.

The departmental letter should discuss the justification for the recommendation to terminate, as well as the details of the vote.

d. **Promotion**

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

e. **Campus Review**

The Committee on Academic Personnel must review appraisals. An ad hoc review committee may be appointed if deemed necessary by the Executive Vice Chancellor or the Committee on Academic Personnel.

The Executive Vice Chancellor has authority to determine the final outcome of appraisals.

At the conclusion of the campus review process, the Executive Vice Chancellor will inform the department of the final outcome of the appraisal, as well as any information or advice resulting from the appraisal. The department chair must discuss the results of the appraisal with the appointee and provide the appointee a copy of the Executive Vice Chancellor's letter.

7. Final Merit/Reappointment Review

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

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

a. **Promotion is Recommended**

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

b. **Postponement of Promotion Review is Recommended**

If the department believes there is significant work in progress that cannot be completed in time to justify promotion, but which should be completed prior to the promotion review and, when completed, would likely suffice for promotion, the department may propose postponement of the promotion review.

The department must demonstrate that the appointee's academic record is strong and that he or she is making active and timely progress on substantial work that:

- should be completed prior to the promotion review (the anticipated completion date must be indicated); and
- would likely suffice for promotion.

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

c. Termination is Recommended

If the department believes an appointee's overall career achievements do not justify promotion, the department may vote to recommend termination with notice.

External letters of reference are not required if the department recommendation is termination. However, the departmental recommendation letter must include information on the appraisal rating and should indicate how an appointee failed to improve sufficiently or declined in performance such that promotion is not justified.

8. Tenure or Security of Employment

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

9. Notice of Termination

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

If adequate notice of termination cannot be provided due to error or oversight, the Executive Vice Chancellor may authorize an extension of the appointment for a period not to exceed one year.

Neither the failure to provide the required notice nor extension of the appointment will afford tenure, security of employment, or promotion.

10. Reconsideration

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

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

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

11. Five-Year Prohibition of Appointment

When there has been an academic review of an Assistant Professor, an Assistant Professor in Residence, an Assistant Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine), or a Lecturer PSOE or Senior Lecturer PSOE appointed at more than 50% time, and the review has resulted in a decision not to continue the individual's appointment in that series (non-reappointment or termination), the individual may not be appointed for a period of five years at any campus of the University of California to the following academic series and titles:

- Professor series
- Acting titles
- Visiting titles
- Professor In Residence series
- Adjunct Professor series
- Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) series
- Health Sciences Clinical Professor series
- Research Scientist series
- Supervisor of Physical Education series
- Supervisor of Teacher Education
- Lecturer
- Senior Lecturer
- Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment
- Senior Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment
- Lecturer with Security of Employment
- Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment
- Coordinator of Field Work
- Field Work Supervisor
- Field Work Consultant

Note: The title Lecturer in Summer Session and the Clinical Professor, Voluntary series are not included in this list.

E. Evaluation of Non-Senate Assistant-Rank Appointees

This section applies to assistant-rank appointees in non-Senate series, including the Adjunct Professor, Health Sciences Clinical Professor, Professional Research (Research Scientist), Project Scientist, and Specialist series.

1. Probationary Period

At UC San Diego, promotion consideration typically occurs in the sixth year of appointment at the Assistant rank. The period of time prior to consideration for promotion is referred to as the probationary period. During the probationary period, Assistant-rank appointees are expected to produce work sufficient to justify promotion.

There are limited circumstances in which the probationary period may be extended, most commonly as a family accommodation (see [PPM 230-15, Family Accommodations Policy](#)).

2. Procedural Safeguards

PPM 230-29, Policies and Procedures to Assure Fairness in the Academic Personnel Review Process, sets forth procedural safeguards to ensure the academic review process is fair and consistent. When conducting an evaluation of a non-Senate Assistant-rank appointee, particular attention should be paid to PPM 230-29 Section III. D. (procedural safeguards) and Section III. E. (additional safeguards for Assistant-level appointees).

3. Terms of Service

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

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

4. Reappointment/Merit Review

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

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

Reappointment with Merit Advancement

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

Reappointment without Merit Advancement

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

5. Appraisal

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

Departments may conduct appraisals for appointees in other non-Senate series if the department believes such an assessment would be valuable to the department and/or appointee.

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

a. **Timing**

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

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

b. **Department Consideration**

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

- An appointee's published research and other completed creative activity and his or her potential for continued research and creative activity.
- At least one type of student or faculty evaluation each for undergraduate and graduate-level instruction, and other evidence of teaching effectiveness, such as course syllabi, reading lists, and statements of course goals, as applicable.
- An appointee's departmental, University, community or professional service contributions, as applicable.
- Professional (clinical) competence and activity (patient care)
- An appointee's self-evaluation (if any)

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

External letters are not required for an appraisal.

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

c. **Appraisal Vote**

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

A department may form a departmental ad hoc committee in order to assess the appointee's achievements and activities.

The departmental recommendation letter should discuss the nature and extent of department consultation on the appraisal, as well as the result

of a vote, if taken.

d. **Promotion**

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

6. Final Merit/Reappointment Review

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

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

a. **Promotion is Recommended**

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

b. **Postponement of Promotion Review is Recommended**

If the department believes there is significant work in progress that cannot be completed in time to justify promotion, but which should be completed within the reappointment period (either one or two years) and, when completed, would likely suffice for promotion, the department may propose postponement of the promotion review.

The department must demonstrate that the appointee's academic record is strong, and that he or she is making active and timely progress on substantial work that:

- should be completed prior to the promotion review (the anticipated completion date must be indicated); and
- would likely suffice for promotion

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

c. **Non-reappointment**

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

If promotion is proposed and denied, or if the department does not propose promotion and/or reappointment, in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate

Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

7. Notice of Non-Reappointment

Although notice of non-reappointment is not normally required³, the department should provide written notice of non-reappointment whenever possible.

VIII. VOTING AND CONSULTATION WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT

A. Faculty Consultation and Voting

Certain actions require a faculty vote, as described in [Academic Senate Bylaw 55](#).

Once the department has compiled the academic review file and the appointee has been provided the opportunity to contribute to and view the file as stipulated in PPM 230-29, Section D (before the departmental recommendation is determined), a vote should be solicited in accordance with Bylaw 55 and the following guidelines:

Except in unusual circumstances, whenever University or departmental policy requires a vote on a proposed action, the action must be supported by at least 50% of the members eligible to vote and in residence on campus in the quarter when the vote is taken. Unusual circumstances may make it impossible to comply with this rule. In such cases, it is incumbent upon the department chair to explain the circumstances in the departmental recommendation letter.

Mail ballots are permissible at any time and may be necessary to ensure a sufficient number of votes on the proposed action.

Ideally, the faculty voting should be familiar with the case through attendance at a department meeting. If this is not possible, faculty should familiarize themselves with the appointee's academic file in order to render an informed vote.

Faculty should be notified that the file is available for review and that voting will be conducted for a designated period of time. Ballots should be prepared and the complete file should be placed in a location convenient to faculty. The file should be available for review in a location where its integrity and confidentiality will be preserved.

After reviewing the file, each faculty member should mark a ballot and place it in a ballot box or return it via mail. Alternatively, voting may be conducted via e-mail, if the department faculty agree and understand e-mail does not provide complete confidentiality. The votes should be counted at the end of the voting period and the results recorded on the Academic Recommendation Summary and discussed in the departmental recommendation letter.

Except for appraisals, votes should be "for," "against," "abstain," or "absent," as defined below:

FOR	The voter is in favor of the proposed action.
AGAINST	The voter is not in favor of the proposed action.
ABSTAIN	The voter is available, but has elected to refrain from voting.

³ In accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, notice is not required for appointees who have served fewer than eight consecutive years in the same academic title or title series on a campus. If an appointee has served more than eight consecutive years, notice is required as specified in APM 137.

ABSENT	The voter is unavailable for voting due to an approved leave or other absence from campus.
---------------	--

B. Proposed Actions Not Covered by Senate Bylaw 55

Departments may develop their own rules, if necessary, for consultation or voting on academic personnel actions not covered by Academic Senate Bylaw 55. The department chair must make clear in the departmental recommendation letter the degree of consultation with faculty.

Note: Though Bylaw 55 does not require it, full faculty voting (by those eligible to vote) on advancements to Step VI and Above Scale is recommended to ensure a clear departmental mandate for such actions, rather than leaving the determination to a departmental ad hoc committee or the department chair, as is sometimes done. Departmental votes are also helpful in evaluating proposals for step advances, including accelerations, and bonus off-scale salary components. For example, a proposed acceleration backed by a unanimous departmental vote carries more weight than one without a vote recorded.

IX. SUBMISSION OF ADVANCEMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT FILES

A. Timely Submission

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

All academic review files are due in the UC San Diego Academic Personnel office on or before the due dates set forth in [Campus File Deadlines](#) on the Academic Personnel Services Web site.

Files received after the stipulated deadline will be returned to the department for submission the following year.

[Instructions for preparing and submitting academic review files](#) are available on the Academic Personnel Web site.

X. ACADEMIC FILE REVIEW AND FINAL AUTHORITY

No advancement or reappointment is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the advancement or reappointment.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.



UC San Diego

Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

Section: 230-28 SUPPLEMENT I

Effective: 09/01/2013

Rescinded: 07/01/2017

Supersedes: 07/02/2012

Review Date: Not Applicable

Issuance Date: 09/01/2013

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

GUIDELINES FOR THE PROFESSOR OF CLINICAL X (e.g., MEDICINE) SERIES

These guidelines are intended to provide additional, detailed information on the Professor of Clinical X (e.g., [Medicine](#)) series (hereafter referred to as Clinical X) at UC San Diego, to assist in the evaluation of the appropriateness of appointment to and advancement within the Clinical X series.

Definition of the Professor of Clinical X series

The Professor of Clinical X series should be reserved for those faculty who have demonstrated expertise, dedication and achievement in clinical and educational activities within and outside Health Sciences. Appointment in this series should represent recognition by the institution of an individual's commitment to the clinical and educational activities that are of utmost importance to the mission of Health Sciences. Thus, appointment in this series should reflect high institutional esteem for the selected individual, and advancement should be based on well-documented contributions toward this mission. Criteria for appointment and promotion in this series should be rigorously applied.

Candidates for the Professor of Clinical X series should demonstrate excellence in both teaching and clinical practice, as well as documented scholarship that has an impact beyond UC San Diego. This requirement is intended to distinguish Clinical X faculty from faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, who are required only to demonstrate excellence in teaching and clinical activity with scholarly or creative activities related to their clinical practice at UC San Diego. In achieving beyond the criteria set forth for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, candidates in the Professor of Clinical X series should be able to demonstrate 1) accomplishments of increasing geographic scope as they advance through the series, from local to regional to national to international levels, and 2) areas of recognized clinical expertise, whether in general or specialty practice.

The Professor of Clinical X series should be available at all levels of professorship, to candidates who have demonstrated focus, ability, and commitment towards a career of clinical education and practice. This should be considered as specific as the criteria for the Ladder-Rank series. The Professor of Clinical X should not be used as a series into which to transfer faculty from other series because of insufficient research productivity. It is preferable that a candidate demonstrate desire for a continuous career in clinical education and practice from the time of his or her first appointment, although well-substantiated changes in career goals do occur and should be taken into consideration.

Criteria and Methods of Evaluation for Appointment and Advancement

Candidates for the Professor of Clinical X series will be required to demonstrate excellence in teaching and clinical activity and creativity in these areas or in research. It is essential that the candidate demonstrate early in his or her career a desire to participate and advance in this series through continuous achievement. The guidelines should therefore be clear and unequivocal such that candidates are fully aware of the level of achievement expected of them prior to appointment or advancement at each level. When a candidate approaches the time of consideration for appointment or advancement in the series, the individual has the primary responsibility for documenting success in reaching the required level of achievement. The department has the responsibility to ensure that appropriate teaching assessment is performed.

A) Teaching and Educational Activity

The level at which excellence in educational activity is recognized for appointment or advancement in the Professor of Clinical X series should be:

- 1) Assistant Professor: recognition at the local school and medical center level.
- 2) Associate Professor: recognition at the institutional and regional level.

Full Professor: recognition at the institutional and national level.

Method of Evaluation:

The following methods are not all-inclusive and should be used only where appropriate.

- 1) Documentation of the types of teaching carried out, the time involved, the primary teaching role (e.g., clinic or ward attending, lecturer, or mentor), the average number and type of students per year, and the average number of contacts per year. Descriptions of the teaching environment and workload are important.
- 2) Documentation of special courses taught, including the type and setting. These could include, e.g., the physiology section of OPP, a dog laboratory on the use of pulmonary artery catheters or transesophageal echocardiography, the American Heart Association ACLS Course, or a postgraduate course for community physicians on laparoscopic cholecystectomy or management of diabetes. The course could be for medical or allied health students, house officers, or postgraduate physicians. Also documented should be the continuity of the course (year-to-year, for example). Attendance, growth of attendance, and participant evaluations of the course should be included.
- 3) Letters or standardized teaching evaluations from students who have been taught at the individual, group, and conference levels. Students may be required to submit evaluations of their teachers for completion of a course of studies. There must be more than one kind of teaching assessment.
- 4) Recommendations and critical reviews from fellow educators at the parent institution or from other institutions, outside physicians and other health care personnel, including unsolicited commendations. These should be based on personal observation of the candidate's teaching (including peer review). Letters from patients may be included, but would receive less weight if not critically written.
- 5) Documentation of teaching leadership in the department, medical centers or Health Sciences; in some cases may be indicated by title (e.g., Director of Training Program), in all cases by extent of responsibility and recognition.
- 6) Description of teaching awards received and the basis for the recognition.
- 7) Documentation of the number of invitations to participate in conferences and CME courses. The type of conference and sponsoring institution should be recorded. Teaching ratings and comments from the participants should be included. If available, ratings of other lecturers (with identity undisclosed) should be included with this information for comparison.
- 8) Roles in educational organizations (e.g., offices, committees, or boards of directors). The duties performed and the innovations accomplished should be outlined. Leadership contributions to the organization of educational activities in Health Sciences may also be considered and evaluated here, beyond ordinary participation as university service.
- 9) Documentation of a role in running a scientific or clinical meeting locally, nationally,

or internationally. This should include factual and evaluative documentation as above. It is also recommended that candidates review their objective evaluations from the sources indicated when consulting with the department chair.

B) Professional Competence and Clinical Activity

These criteria concern the extent and quality of the candidate's clinical performance.

1) The Assistant Professor level:

The candidate must demonstrate an understanding of the subject of his or her clinical activity, as well as an appropriate quality and volume of activity as judged using the methods described below. This evaluation may be based on activity at the UC San Diego Medical Center or the Veterans Administration San Diego Healthcare System (VASDHS). Clinical services beyond our own institutions, such as at regional or national levels, can serve as further evidence of the candidate's standing. In addition to routine individual patient care, clinical activity may take the form of developing or sustaining specific clinical care programs or programs involving applications of new techniques or new uses of existing therapeutic modalities. These could include, but are not limited to, developing a model program for a diagnostic or therapeutic procedure or a successful clinical program that could be implemented in a new setting. It is important that the candidate demonstrate promise and a desire to progress in the acquisition and application of clinical expertise.

2) The Associate Professor Level:

For appointment or promotion to the associate level, the candidate must be clinically active in the local institution and, in applicable disciplines, at the community or regional levels. The latter are more likely to involve program development, supervision, or consultation, rather than individual patient care, although a regional referral record would certainly qualify. Activities at the national level are desirable but not required. A demonstration of creativity is important in documenting superior clinical achievement.

3) The Professor Level:

For appointment or promotion to full professor, the candidate's clinical influence must be recognized beyond the parent institution and, in applicable disciplines, at the regional and national levels. Activities at the international level are desirable, but not required. A clear demonstration of creativity is important in evaluating clinical achievement, to afford proper recognition and reward.

Methods of Evaluation:

The following list is not all-inclusive. Each method should be used only where appropriate. In each case, the goal is to document excellence, and the data should be evaluated accordingly.

- 1) Testimony from peers and faculty of higher rank. It is important to obtain such testimony from practitioners of the same and related disciplines. This is solicited by the department chair, who would send to prospective evaluators forms that address the quality of critical aspects of practice in that clinical discipline, as explained below. These forms may be similar to ones used to evaluate residents. Also important for perspective are evaluations from outside the department. For example, radiologists could evaluate internists, and vice versa; surgeons could evaluate anesthesiologists, and vice versa.
- 2) Documentation of the pattern of referral, e.g., the extent and number of referrals, as well as the area from which they are drawn--hospital, community, regional, national, or international. A summary of referrals, with names of referring physicians, the number of patients referred by each physician, and a description of the areas of San Diego city and county, California, the nation, and other countries from which they are drawn would be

especially useful. A clinician who treats patients from all over the world is probably excellent.

In specialties that entail the performance of procedures, such as surgery or radiology, documentation of the quality of the candidate's practice (e.g., the number of difficult cases performed or the complication rates) would provide a measure of excellence. In anesthesia, for example, huge databases are being accumulated that can provide a detailed profile of the excellence of a clinician's practice.

- 1) In specialties that render consultations, documentation of the helpfulness or the frequency of error in the rendering of expert opinion would also provide a measure of clinical excellence. These evaluations would usually be obtained outside the candidate's specialty. In particular, primary care physicians may evaluate the quality of consultations by specialists, while specialists can evaluate the quality of referrals by primary care physicians.
- 2) In the case of primary care physicians, documentation of the thoroughness of patient workup and the appropriateness of the requests for consultation by specialists and consultants would serve as a measure of clinical excellence. Chart reviews are also commonly useful in this assessment.
- 3) Establishing or running a clinical service, either inpatient or outpatient. This could include, e.g., trauma, intensive care, ECG, cardiac catheterization, diabetes, child abuse, or drug abuse. The pattern of referral should be documented, as described below.

The success of a service in attracting referrals from outside the University system is an important factor in measuring excellence. Documentation of excellence when the candidate establishes or runs a clinical service should be relatively straightforward. A successful clinical service that attracts a large patient population denotes excellence; after all, one of the reasons for this series is to reward clinicians who can help the medical school, and hence the University.

We realize that evaluating, quantifying, and establishing clinical excellence can be difficult, but several mechanisms exist whereby this is possible. Some data will be more appropriate for procedural specialties than for consulting specialties. To use the example of anesthesia again, in analyzing procedural data, there are certain "flags" that trigger an entry into the anesthesiologist's database. If the anesthesiologist is significantly below the norm — currently only a local norm — counseling is advised. If the candidate is strikingly above that norm, this could serve as one criterion to help establish excellence.

Outcome data, especially a particularly low rate of complications, could also indicate excellence. Evidence that physicians are continually sending their difficult cases to the candidate is an outstanding endorsement of his or her clinical excellence.

As mentioned above, another possibility for establishing excellence is evaluation forms. The following gives examples of evaluation forms that can be used. Note that there are short forms and long forms. The use of the short form is encouraged, since it is more likely to be filled out by the large number of people required to make any evaluation credible. If the short form is used, the department should carefully define each category for the evaluator. Each department should develop its own set of evaluation forms, since the problems and characteristics for each department are different. Similarly, each department should develop different forms for each set of evaluators: students, house officers, members of the department, members of other departments, physicians outside UC, any physician who consults with the candidate, nurses, patients, etc.

Nurses can make excellent evaluators. They pick up subtle factors in clinical performance that most others cannot. For example, they are often the first to spot a decrement in performance in an impaired physician.

The following should be regarded as an example only:

Example of an evaluation form

Rate each of the following according to your experience with the candidate.

Use the appropriate descriptor (extremely effective, very effective, moderately effective, moderately ineffective, totally ineffective, NA).

Communication skills
Accessibility/availability
Clinical skills
Clinical judgment
Creativity
Leadership
initiative
Personal
qualities

Would you want yourself or a member of your family to be treated by this physician?

C) Creative Work

Many faculty in the health sciences devote a large proportion of their time to the inseparable activities of teaching and clinical service and therefore have less time for formal creative work than most other scholars in the University. Some clinical faculty devote this limited time to academic research activities; others utilize their clinical experience as the basis of their creative work. Nevertheless, an appointee to the Professor of Clinical X series is expected to participate in scholarly pursuits in applied clinical sciences. This includes activities which may be independent or collaborative, and may focus on formal clinical or laboratory research, scholarly publications, or creative educational work.

1) The Assistant Level:

For advancement at the Assistant level, a candidate's achievement and contribution to scholarship in the applied or clinical sciences should include at a minimum active participation in such pursuits.

2) The Associate Level:

For appointment or promotion to Associate rank, a candidate's achievement and contribution to scholarship in the applied or clinical sciences should have resulted in a significant contribution to knowledge or clinical or educational practice. Independence or leadership in some of these creative activities must also be demonstrated.

3) The Professor Level:

For appointment or promotion to the Professor rank, a candidate's achievement and contribution to scholarship in the applied or clinical sciences should manifest continued involvement and leadership in activities such as those described above.

Method of Evaluation:

The candidate's creative work must have been disseminated, e.g., in a body of publications, in teaching materials used in other institutions, or in improvements or innovations in professional practice. For appointment or promotion to higher levels, there should be evidence that these have been adopted or had an influence elsewhere.

- 1) Evidence of achievement may include clinical case reports. Clinical observations are an important contribution to the advancement of practice and knowledge in the health sciences and should be judged by their accuracy, scholarship, and utility.

- 2) The development and evaluation of techniques and procedures by clinical investigators constitute significant and valuable pursuits in the clinical sciences. These activities are necessary for improvement in the practice of health care. Creative achievement may be demonstrated by the development of innovative programs in health care or in transmitting knowledge associated with new fields or other professional activity.
- 3) Textbooks and reference publications, or contributions by candidates to the literature for the advancement of professional education or practice, should be judged as creative when they contain original scholarly work, manifest an innovative approach, or include new information such as research results.
- 4) The development of new or better ways of teaching the basic knowledge and skills required by students in the health sciences may be considered evidence of creative work. This may be demonstrated in written materials, novel approaches to teaching, or, for example, the development of computer methods that can be used for teaching, clinical care, or research.
- 5) Acquisition of extramural resources for clinical or educational programs, including research or practice, is usually an indication of successful creative effort.

The significance of the quantitative productivity level achieved by a candidate should be assessed realistically, with knowledge of the time and institutional resources available to the individual for creative work, and the nature of the individual's professional discipline.

D University and Public Service

Service is an important component of the activity of faculty in the Professor of Clinical X series. In many cases, this service will have a direct bearing on the education and clinical care missions of the University, and will therefore be best listed and evaluated under the categories of teaching and professional or clinical activity, which take precedence as criteria for advancement. For example, invited service on QA boards would be useful in evaluating a candidate's clinical expertise.

With increasing rank, greater participation and leadership in service are expected, although formal criteria are not specified. The extent and significance of service at the department, school, campus, University, community, and national or profession-wide level should be evaluated.

September 2013



UC San Diego

Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

Section: 230-28 SUPPLEMENT II

Effective: 09/01/2013

Rescinded: 07/01/2017

Supersedes: 07/02/2012

Review Date: Not Applicable

Issuance Date: 09/01/2013

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

GUIDELINES FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES CLINICAL PROFESSOR SERIES

These guidelines are intended to provide additional, detailed information on the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series at UC San Diego to assist in the evaluation of the appropriateness of appointment to and advancement within this series.

The guidelines also are intended to provide information on the distinctions between this series and the Professor of Clinical X series.

It should be noted that the diversity of talents and accomplishments required in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series are such that the criteria for appointments and advancement must be applied with some degree of flexibility. These guidelines create a better understanding of the series at UC San Diego and the flexible application of the series criteria.

The four criteria for appointment and advancement in the regular professorial series at UC San Diego are:

1. Performance in teaching
2. Scholarly and creative accomplishments (research)
3. Professional (clinical) competence and activity (patient care)
4. University and public service

However, the combined demands of teaching, research, patient care and community service are such that it is unrealistic to expect that all faculty members in a clinical department can excel in each of these endeavors.

Faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series are appointed for the primary purpose of filling roles in patient care services and in the clinical teaching programs. These functions should be identified and documented by the department in preparing the candidate's file for review.

The criteria and the frequency of review in judging candidates for appointment or advancement in this series are the same as those specified for the regular professorial series, except that each of the criteria must be appropriately weighted to take into account the primary emphasis on direct patient care services and clinical teaching activities.

Documentation should be compiled as for other academic series, including documentation of teaching and clinical performance as described in the Professor of Clinical X series criteria.

The Health Sciences Clinical Professor series should not be regarded as an escape or contingency appointment for faculty in other series who fail to receive promotion.

Professional Competence and Activity

Professional competence and activity generally focus on the quality of patient care. A doctoral degree in a clinical discipline, as well as a demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to the field and its characteristic activities, is a criterion for appointment. The candidate should also demonstrate evidence of achievement, leadership, or progress in the development or utilization of

new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems.

Although it need not be as extensive as that required for the other professorial series (e.g., Clinical X), some evidence of scholarly or creative activity appropriate to the clinical discipline, as determined by the individual department, is expected in this series at UC San Diego. Scholarly activities such as participation in collaborative research, publications in the medical literature (e.g. case reports, book chapters, reviews, letters to the editor), published articles for the lay population (e.g. newsletters, newspapers, magazines) presentations at scholarly meetings or continuing education courses are desirable and should be encouraged. Development of innovative clinical procedures, teaching methods, new courses, clinical guidelines, and instructional materials for teaching patients should also be recognized as creative accomplishment.

1. Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor

For an initial appointment to the rank of Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor, the departmental recommendation letter should describe the candidate's present position and the likelihood that the candidate will be a competent teacher and develop an excellent professional practice.

For appointment as Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor, Step I or II, the candidate should:

- have high-quality postgraduate clinical training providing eligibility for one of the medical specialty boards (a minimum of three years post–M.D.);
- demonstrate teaching ability or have a clear potential as a clinical teacher; and
- demonstrate clinical ability of high quality commensurate with his or her experience in a branch of medicine.

For appointment at a Step III or above, the candidate must also:

- be board eligible in the specialty appropriate to the clinical care and teaching activities, or have appropriate equivalent recognition;
- demonstrate ability as a clinical teacher; and
- demonstrate continuing achievement in clinical care and teaching.

2. Health Sciences Associate Clinical Professor

In addition to proven competence in teaching, a candidate for appointment to the rank of Health Sciences Associate Clinical Professor should demonstrate evidence of excellence in professional practice. Such evidence may include, but is not limited to, evaluations that demonstrate:

- a. provision of high-quality patient care;
- b. a high level of competence in a clinical specialty;
- c. expanded breadth of clinical responsibilities;
- d. significant participation in the activities of clinical and/or professional groups;
- e. effective development, expansion, or administration of a clinical service;
- f. recognition or certification by a professional group; or
- g. evidence of scholarly or creative activities appropriate to this series.

Further, the candidate must:

- h. be certified by one of the medical specialty boards, or demonstrate equivalent achievement and recognition;
- i. be recognized as a consistently effective clinical teacher by undergraduate, graduate, or postgraduate students and by faculty;
- j. have excellent clinical skills and abilities and apply them in the management of clinical problems, as evidenced by the opinion of the faculty, house staff and appropriate professional groups;
- k. serve effectively as a clinical consultant to house staff, faculty, and members of the community; and
- l. actively and effectively participate in the affairs of professional organizations, UC San Diego Medical Center or VASDHS committees, School of Medicine committees, University and administrative committees, and community programs.

3. **Health Sciences Clinical Professor**

A candidate for appointment to the rank of Health Sciences Clinical Professor should satisfy the above qualifications for Health Sciences Associate Clinical Professor. In addition, the candidate must:

- a. demonstrate superior clinical teaching;
- b. demonstrate superior clinical skills and abilities;
- c. provide documentation that his or her clinical service and/or teaching are of great importance to the academic or healthcare missions of the University; and
- d. demonstrate appropriate scholarly or creative activities.

Transfer of faculty from one series to another, especially from the regular professorial series to the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, should occur only in exceptional cases. Requests for such transfers must carefully document the specific achievements and future responsibilities in clinical care and teaching that qualify the candidate for such a transfer.

Faculty who demonstrate sustained, substantial scholarship that has an impact beyond UC San Diego should be considered for transfer to the Professor of Clinical X series. Examples of sustained, substantial scholarship include, but are not limited to development of new diagnostic or therapeutic approaches and procedures that have been adopted regionally or nationally, publication of clinical case studies, creative design of teaching materials or textbooks used regionally or nationally, active participation in collaborative and joint research programs, or demonstrated effectiveness in establishing and supervising major teaching or clinical service programs, development of innovative health care programs that have had regional or national impact, or development of innovative computer software.

September 2013



UC San Diego

Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

Section: 230-28 SUPPLEMENT III

Effective: 03/01/2014

Rescinded: 07/01/2017

Supersedes: New

Review Date: Not Applicable

Issuance Date: 03/01/2014

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

GUIDELINES FOR THE PROFESSOR OF CLINICAL X (i.e., PHARMACY) SERIES

These guidelines are intended to provide additional, detailed information on the Professor of Clinical X (i.e., Pharmacy) series (hereafter referred to as Clinical X) at UC San Diego, to assist in the evaluation of the appropriateness of appointment to and advancement within the Clinical X series in the Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences (SSPPS).

Definition of the Professor of Clinical X series

The Professor of Clinical X series should be reserved for those faculty who demonstrate, or have the strong potential to demonstrate expertise, dedication and achievement in clinical and educational activities within and outside the Health Sciences. Appointment in this series should represent recognition by the institution of an individual's commitment to the clinical and educational activities that are of utmost importance to the mission of the Health Sciences. Thus, appointment in this series should reflect high institutional esteem for the selected individual, and advancement should be based on well-documented contributions toward this mission. Criteria for appointment and promotion in this series should be rigorously applied.

Candidates for the Professor of Clinical X series should demonstrate excellence in both teaching and clinical practice, as well as documented scholarship that has an impact beyond UC San Diego. This requirement is intended to distinguish Clinical X faculty from faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, who are required to demonstrate excellence in teaching and clinical activity with scholarly or creative activities related to their clinical practice. In achieving beyond the criteria set forth for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, candidates in the Professor of Clinical X series should be able to demonstrate 1) accomplishments of increasing geographic scope as they advance through the series, from local to regional to national to international levels, and 2) areas of recognized clinical expertise.

The Professor of Clinical X series should be available at all levels of professorship to candidates who have demonstrated focus, ability, and commitment towards a career of clinical education and practice. The criteria should be considered as specific as the criteria for the Ladder-Rank series. The Professor of Clinical X should not be used as a series into which to transfer faculty from other series because of insufficient research productivity. It is preferable that a candidate demonstrates desire for a continuous career in clinical education and practice from the time of his or her first appointment, although well-substantiated changes in career goals do occur and should be taken into consideration.

Criteria and Methods of Evaluation for Appointment and Advancement

Candidates for the Professor of Clinical X series will be required to demonstrate excellence in teaching, professional competence, clinical activity and creativity. It is essential that the candidate demonstrate early in his or her career a desire to participate and advance in this series through continuous achievement. The guidelines should therefore be clear and unequivocal such that candidates are fully aware of the level of achievement expected of them prior to appointment or advancement at each level. When a candidate approaches the time of consideration for appointment or advancement in the series, the individual has the primary responsibility for documenting success in reaching the required level of achievement. The school has the responsibility to ensure that appropriate teaching assessments are performed.

A) Teaching and Educational Activity

The level at which excellence in educational activity is recognized for appointment or advancement in the Professor of Clinical X series should be:

- 1) Assistant Professor: recognition at the institutional and local level.
- 2) Associate Professor: recognition at the institutional and regional level.
- 3) Full Professor: recognition at the institutional and national level.

Methods of Evaluation:

The following methods are not all-inclusive and should be used only where appropriate.

- Documentation of the types of teaching carried out, the time involved, the primary teaching role (e.g., preceptor, lecturer or mentor), the average number and type of students per year, and the average number of contacts per year. Descriptions of the teaching environment and workload are important.
- Documentation of special courses taught, including the type and setting. Also documented should be the continuity of the course (year-to-year, for example). Attendance, growth of attendance, and participant evaluations of the course should be included.
- Letters or standardized teaching evaluations from students who have been taught at the individual, group and conference levels.
- Recommendations and critical reviews from fellow educators at the parent institution or from other institutions, outside pharmacists and other health care professionals, including unsolicited commendations. These should be based on personal observation of the candidate's teaching (including peer review). Letters from patients may be included, but would receive less weight if not critically written.
- Documentation of teaching leadership in the department, medical centers or pharmacy school; in some cases may be indicated by title (e.g., Director of Training Program), in all cases by extent of responsibility and recognition.
- Description of teaching awards received and the basis for the recognition.
- Documentation of the number of invitations to participate in conferences and continuing education courses. The type of conference and sponsoring institution should be recorded. Teaching ratings and comments from the participants should be included. If available, ratings of other lecturers (with identity undisclosed) should be included with this information for comparison.
- Roles in educational organizations (e.g., offices, committees, or boards of directors). The duties performed and the innovations accomplished should be outlined. Leadership contributions to the organization of educational activities in the health sciences schools may also be considered and evaluated here, beyond ordinary participation as university service.
- Documentation of a role in running a scientific or clinical meeting locally, nationally, or internationally. This should include factual and evaluative documentation as above. It is recommended that candidates review their objective evaluations from the sources indicated when consulting with the department chair or equivalent.

B) Clinical Activity and Professional Competence

Pharmacy practice in the health care system is in constant evolution. Faculty in this series should have clinical activity that is innovative and creative and expands the scope of pharmacy practice.

The impact may be on the care of individual patients or on the care of patient populations depending on the type and scope of the practice environment.

1) Assistant Professor:

The candidate must demonstrate an understanding of the subject of his or her clinical activity, as well as an appropriate quality and volume of activity as judged using the methods described below. This evaluation may be based on activity at UC San Diego or its affiliated institutions. In addition to the provision of individual patient care, clinical activity may take the form of developing and/or administrating specific clinical care programs or programs involving applications and quality improvement of new methodologies in the delivery and use of medications and clinical pharmacy services. These may include, but are not limited to, developing, implementing or administering a successful clinical program (e.g. medication-therapy management program, pharmacist-physician collaborative practice, therapeutic drug monitoring service, etc.). It is important that the candidate demonstrates promise and a desire to progress in the acquisition and application of clinical expertise.

2) Associate Professor:

The candidate must be clinically active in the local institution and, in applicable disciplines, at the community or regional levels. The latter are more likely to involve program development, supervision, or consultation, rather than individual patient care. Activities at the national level are desirable but not required. A demonstration of creativity is important in documenting superior clinical achievement.

3) Full Professor:

The candidate's clinical influence must be recognized beyond the parent institution, at the regional and national levels. Activities at the international level are desirable, but not required. A clear demonstration of creativity is important in evaluating clinical achievement.

Examples of Clinical Activity:

Clinical activity is distinct from research and creative work in that it impacts individual patients and/or patient populations in the care of the candidate. The following examples are not all-inclusive:

- Consulting pharmacist in medical center in- and/or outpatient specialty services such as infectious disease rounds, emergency medicine service, anti-coagulation clinics, etc. wherein complex cases of patients with multiple conditions are reviewed for situations such as, contraindicated medication combinations, most effective medications to use among a number of alternatives, etc.
- Contributions to Drug Utilization Review or Formulary Consultations to determine the most effective medication based on what is available in a hospital formulary.
- Medication reconciliation services wherein patient medications are reviewed to identify such things as contraindicated combinations of medications, assessment of more effective medications than those currently prescribed, etc.
- Development and implementation of medication prescribing systems in medical centers (e.g., computerized tracking of medicines using bar codes) to reduce medication errors.
- Development, implementation, and participation in new clinical practice sites.
- Development and implementation of new models of pharmacy care delivery.

Examples of Professional Competence:

The following examples are not all-inclusive:

Invited service on editorial boards, as a peer reviewer for scientific publications, or as a peer reviewer for scientific grant applications are indications of an established or developing professional competence.

Invitations to speak at local, state, national or international scientific meetings or to serve on or lead panel discussions are an indicator of professional competence.

Methods of Evaluation:

The following methods are not all-inclusive. Each method should be used only where appropriate. In each case, the goal is to document excellence, and the data should be evaluated accordingly.

- Testimony attesting to clinical competence from peers and faculty of higher rank (or equivalent rank for full Professors). It is important to obtain such testimony from practitioners of the same or related disciplines. For the evaluation of clinical activity, testimony may be from individuals from within and outside the institution. For appointments above the entry level (Steps I & II at the Assistant rank) such testimony should preferably be from reviewers independent of the candidate (e.g., outside the School of Pharmacy).

Documentation of excellence when a candidate develops or implements a clinical service should be gathered. This should include comments from other healthcare professionals attesting to the impact of the faculty member's practice on patient care and/or the practice environment. When appropriate, evaluators should be asked to comment on the candidate's communication skills, accessibility and availability, clinical skills, clinical judgment, creativity, leadership, personal qualities and/or the effect of the candidate's practice on patient care.

For faculty whose practice does not directly impact individual patients, information should be provided that demonstrates the faculty member's work to improving patient care overall.

- Evaluation forms completed by students, members of the department, practitioners outside UC San Diego, any clinician who consults with the candidate, nurses, patients, etc.
- Documentation of the patient population and pharmacotherapeutic interventions using quantitative and qualitative measures.
- In specialties that render consultations, documentation of the helpfulness or the frequency of error in the rendering of expert opinion would also provide a measure of clinical excellence. These evaluations would usually be obtained outside the candidate's specialty or discipline.

Demonstration of excellence in establishing or running a clinical pharmacy service, either inpatient or outpatient. This could include, e.g., mental health, cardiology, critical care, diabetes, general medicine, chronic kidney disease, liver disease, or pain and palliative care.

Clinical, economic, and humanistic outcomes data could be an indicator of excellence. Evidence of consultations or referrals from other healthcare professionals is outstanding endorsement of a candidate's clinical excellence. Another example of strong evidence of clinical expertise is that the candidate is frequently asked to provide input to committees or organizations that are making decisions influencing the use of medications in patient populations.

As the impact of the candidate's practice may influence patient care in a variety of ways, the total impact on patient care should be evaluated and not just the impact on individual patients.

C) Creative Work

Many faculty in the health sciences devote a large proportion of their time to the inseparable activities of teaching and clinical service and therefore have less time for formal creative work than most other scholars in the University. Some clinical faculty devote this limited time to academic research activities; others utilize their clinical experience as the basis of their creative work. Nevertheless, an appointee to the Professor of Clinical X series is expected to participate in scholarly pursuits in applied clinical sciences. This includes activities which may be independent or collaborative, and may focus on formal clinical or laboratory research, scholarly publications, or creative educational work.

Creative work is distinct from clinical activity in that it indirectly impacts 1) patient populations that are not in the care of the candidate, 2) the practice of other health professionals, 3) the education of students or trainees beyond those for whom the candidate is responsible for teaching, or is in other ways unrelated to the candidate's direct clinical, educational, administrative activities.

1) Assistant Professor:

A candidate's achievement and contribution to scholarship in the applied or clinical sciences should include at a minimum active participation in such pursuits.

2) Associate Professor:

A candidate's achievement and contribution to scholarship in the applied or clinical sciences should have resulted in a significant contribution to knowledge or clinical or educational practice. Although collaboration with other faculty in the health sciences is expected, independence or leadership in some of these creative activities must also be demonstrated.

3) Full Professor:

A candidate's achievement and contribution to scholarship in the applied or clinical sciences should manifest continued involvement and leadership in activities such as those described above.

Methods of Evaluation:

The candidate's creative work must have been disseminated, e.g., in a body of publications, in teaching materials used in other institutions, or in improvements or innovations in professional practice. For appointment or promotion to higher levels, there should be evidence that these have been adopted or had an influence elsewhere.

For the assessment of research and creative work, testimony should be obtained from independent reviewers from outside the institution.

The following methods are not all-inclusive. Each method should be used only where appropriate.

- 1) Evidence of achievement may include clinical case reports. Clinical observations are an important contribution to the advancement of practice and knowledge in the health sciences and should be judged by their accuracy, scholarship, and utility.
- 2) The development and evaluation of techniques and procedures by clinical investigators constitute significant and valuable pursuits in the clinical sciences. These activities are necessary for improvement in the practice of health care. Creative achievement may be demonstrated by the development of innovative programs in health care or in transmitting knowledge associated with new fields or other professional activity.

- 3) Textbooks and reference publications, or contributions by candidates to the literature for the advancement of professional education or practice, should be judged as creative when they contain original scholarly work, manifest an innovative approach, or include new information such as research results.
- 4) The development of new or better ways of teaching the basic knowledge and skills required by students in the health sciences may be considered evidence of creative work. This may be demonstrated in written materials, novel approaches to teaching, or, for example, the development of computer methods that can be used for teaching, clinical care, or research.
- 5) Acquisition of extramural resources for clinical or educational programs, including research or practice, is usually an indication of successful creative effort.

The significance of the quantitative productivity level achieved by a candidate should be assessed realistically, with knowledge of the time and institutional resources available to the individual for creative work, and the nature of the individual's professional discipline.

D) University and Public Service

Service is an important component of the activity of faculty in the Professor of Clinical X series. In many cases, this service will have a direct bearing on the education and clinical care missions of the University, and will therefore be best listed and evaluated under the categories of teaching and professional or clinical activity, which take precedence as criteria for advancement. For example, invited service on pharmacy and therapeutics committees or similar activities would be useful in evaluating a candidate's clinical expertise. Examples of University and Public Service include, but are not limited to, the Space Committee, the Research Committee, the Admissions Committee, service in professional organizations, community outreach, etc.

With increasing rank, greater participation and leadership in service are expected, although formal criteria are not specified. The extent and significance of service at the school, campus, University, community, and national or profession-wide level should be evaluated.

March 2014