# UCI Academic Personnel Review Process Overview

* A Workshop for Assistant Professors, Assistant Professors of Clinical _, Assistant Professors In Residence, Acting Professors of Law, and Assistant Professors of Teaching, Assistant Clinical Professors of Law

May 17, 2022 • 9:00 – 10:30 a.m. • Zoom Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Welcome and Introductions</td>
<td>Diane K. O’Dowd, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Inclusive Excellence</td>
<td>Douglas Haynes, Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions &amp; Answers</td>
<td>Diane K. O’Dowd, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, Lisa Naugle, Chair, Council on Academic Personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|            | Survey                                        | Junior Faculty Survey – Office of Inclusive Excellence  
Survey Link: [https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/9MV7ZKC](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/9MV7ZKC) |
# Academic Series Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Ladder Rank</th>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Eligible/ Tenure/SOE</th>
<th>8 Year Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Titles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Professor of Law/Professor of Law</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor In Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Clinical _______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Clinical Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Assistant Professor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Associate Professor/Acting Professor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer with Security of Employment w/100% appointment *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer with Security of Employment holding less than 100% appointment *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer (Unit 18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 qtrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Titles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Researcher **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Scientist **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral Scholars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The combined years as Lecturer PSOE and the years in the title of Lecturer/Sr. Lecturer may not exceed a total of eight years of service. (See [APM 133](#))

** The combined years as Assistant Project Scientist and the years in the title of Assistant Researcher may not exceed a total of eight years of service. (See [APM 311-17](#))
**Academic Personnel Review Process**

1. Candidate submits information for review
2. Department makes a recommendation
3. Department Chair makes independent recommendation (optional)
4. Dean makes recommendation on promotions & non-delegated merits
   - Office of Academic Personnel reviews dossier for completeness
   - Council on Academic Personnel (elected by the Academic Senate) makes a recommendation
   - If CAP's tentative recommendation differs from that of the Department or Dean, the appropriate person/unit is notified in case there is further information. Copy of Notice provided to candidate.
   - Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor/Vice Provost
     - If Provost and EVC tentative decision is different from CAP's recommendation, CAP will be notified in case there is further information before a final decision is made.
     - Ad hoc review committee (optional). Nominated by the CAP; approved and appointed by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor. May be called for promotions, non-reappointments, advancement to above scale, major acceleration, and tenured appointments.

**NOTE:** Starting with the 2019-2020 review cycle, the tentative decision process following the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) review will be optional, not mandatory, when there is disagreement at one or more levels of review. CAP has elaborated on its processes via the CAP Tentative Decision FAQ, which can be found at: https://ap.uci.edu/wp-content/uploads/CAP-Tentative-Decision-FAQ.pdf

5. Decides normal merits that have been delegated to the Deans (CAP review waived)
6. Recommends to Chancellor on promotions and non-reappointments
7. Chancellor
8. Appointments, merits, and advancements
September 7, 2021

ACADEMIC DEANS
VICE CHANCELLOR FOR RESEARCH


This memo is the "Annual Call" for academic personnel review actions to be effective July 1, 2022. Annual Progress Reports are attached for each department to review, annotate, and return to Academic Personnel no later than Tuesday, September 28, 2021.

Please work with your department chairs to meet the deadlines listed below, especially for tenure cases. Please note that postponement of tenure files require significant documentation—those cases are subject to an earlier deadline of November 1. Guidelines for postponement of tenure review are located in the Academic Personnel Procedures, Section 3-50 (APP 3-50, located at: http://ap.uci.edu/policies-procedures/app/3-50/).

Campus Deadlines for the 2021-2022 Academic Review Cycle:

November 1  Postponement of Tenure/Promotion Review
December 1  Merits, including accelerations
           No Change
           Reappointments
           Midcareer Appraisals
January 3  Fifth Year Reviews
           Advancements to Professor VI
February 1  Promotions
           Non-reappointments
           Above Scale actions
March 1  Merits, Dean Delegated
           All other actions, including non-Senate actions
June 30  Deferrals (Associate rank and above) should be submitted by June 30, 2022

Deans should set deadlines for their units that allow them sufficient time to review cases before forwarding the files to Academic Personnel. Guidelines outlining this process are located in the Academic Personnel Procedures, Section 3-30 (APP 3-30, located at: http://ap.uci.edu/policies-procedures/app/3-30/).

AP Review is now mandatory for ALL ACTIONS, excluding appointments and non-reappointments.

Review files that fall under any of the categories below cannot be run through AP Review:
- Reviews representing split appointments (split titles or split schools/departments).
- Reviews for Department Chairs (requiring a "surrogate" Department Chair) Deans, and CAP members.

If you have any questions regarding the Annual Progress Report, please contact your assigned Academic Personnel analyst.

Sincerely,

Diane K. O'Dowd
Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

Attachments
INTRODUCTION

Revised June 2021

The Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) is an advisory body representing the Academic Senate in the faculty personnel review process. Rather than repeating criteria and processes explained elsewhere, these FAQ address issues CAP repeatedly encounters or that appear to be sources of confusion. They are not meant to be comprehensive and will be updated annually.

More comprehensive Academic Personnel procedures and practices are available at:

- **APM: University of California Academic Personnel Manual** (systemwide policies)
- **APP: Academic Personnel Procedures** (UCI's application of systemwide policies)
- **Academic Personnel Guidance for Faculty on Preparing Files**
- **COVID-19 FAQs for Academics**
- **COVID-19 Stop the Clock (October 2020 Revision)**

REVIEW STANDARDS

How will review practices account for the impact of COVID-19?

CAP has worked extensively with the Office of Academic Personnel to respond to COVID-19 interruptions to accomplishments through both policy and practice changes, as described in this [joint statement](#). The most up-to-date information will be listed on the [COVID-19 FAQ page](#).

What are the criteria for acceleration?

The criteria for a full step acceleration are far-above-typical accomplishments in both the primary and one secondary area of review, and acceptable work otherwise. For the Professor series, this means unusually vigorous and accomplished research or creative activity beyond the specific disciplinary norm in the period of review, coupled with noteworthy excellence in teaching and/or service, and no substandard work in any area. A doubled number of publications, for instance, with simply adequate teaching and service would not constitute a strong case for acceleration. For the Professor of Teaching series, this would mean exceptional teaching above assigned standards, as well as particularly outstanding scholarly productivity or service. Accelerations of a full step or more have been denied more often than granted. Acceleration in advancement files (to Above Scale and to/over Step 6) have particularly high expectations.
CAP will also strongly consider excellence in activity related to diversity and broad impacts of inclusivity as a criterion for acceleration if all other areas of review are similarly strong. CAP encourages the candidate to include their work in inclusive excellence and diversity where appropriate within the AP-10, and it is helpful if these contributions are also highlighted in the letters from other levels of review. CAP is interested in understanding the work UCI faculty do to promote student and faculty diversity and wants to receive evidence of work having broader impacts within the campus community and society.

What are the standards for receiving an Above Scale merit?

As the highest merit in the review process, Above Scale (Distinguished Professor) merits have a higher standard than a typical merit, but do not require the same exceptional work as Advancement to Above Scale career reviews. Generally, CAP requires evidence of continued significant research output and impact, very good teaching, and ongoing professional and campus service. An Above Scale Merit before the normal four year review period requires a particularly exceptional file and is very rare. See APM 220-18 (b.(4)) and APP 3-40 (Note 4).

A new set of standards for Above Scale merits has been implemented, effective for the 2020-2021 school year. See them here: APP 3-40, Appendix I, Note 4.

What are the standards for a Satisfactory Fifth Year Review?

Professor Step 5 and above are indefinite steps – faculty can remain in good standing without proceeding further through the step system. However, APM 200 requires that “every faculty member shall be reviewed at least every five years.” In lieu of recommending a merit, at the five-year point, this review can result in a Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory recommendation.

To be deemed Satisfactory at an indefinite step, CAP expects to see evidence of contributions in both teaching and research (with effort commensurate to the faculty’s primary area of emphasis), as well as evidence of meaningful service to the university. Faculty who are doing little to no significant work in one or more categories of review (research, teaching, service) are likely to be judged Unsatisfactory. Faculty who are negatively contributing to the university through substandard teaching or service might also be judged Unsatisfactory, even if they are producing meritorious research.

How does CAP view Diversity, Equity, and Inclusive Excellence (DEI) statements?

CAP values impactful DEI work as a positive contribution to research/creative activity, teaching, and service activities. This could include anti-racist, anti-sexist, or anti-white supremacy efforts; activities that directly work to increase inclusion and success of underrepresented students, staff, or faculty; or the work on programs, policies, or practices that challenge structural inequities. Such work should always be listed on the AP-10 and are the only activities where individual contributions can be listed under multiple categories (research, teaching, and service) on the AP-10. If this work can be adequately described on the AP-10, a separate DEI statement is not required.
CAP members most want to see DEI statements when faculty have substantive work to describe that does not fully lend itself to a discrete “bullet-point” listing on the AP-10. If included, a separate DEI statement should add helpful context and detail and allow CAP to fully credit work done in this arena.

CAP finds DEI statements less useful when the faculty member has not done substantial, proactive work. Interacting with traditionally underrepresented people on a majority minority campus in the course of fulfilling one’s duties is generally not evidence of proactive DEI work. For example, statements such as “I wrote a recommendation letter for a woman,” “many minorities take my classes,” or “I provide clinical care to Asian Americans” do not display convincing efforts at diversity, equity or inclusive excellence. Likewise, listing names of underrepresented students and postdocs as evidence of a faculty member’s own accomplishments can be problematic insofar as it risks reproducing an appearance of exploitation. Faculty should be cautious not to include personal details of others (family or medical history, personal struggles, etc.) in their statements.

In contrast, describing specific activities designed to increase equity, be more inclusive, or explicitly work towards the success of underrepresented community members are effective statements. DEI statements in review files should focus on actual efforts and accomplishments rather than personal beliefs or life histories.

For additional information on writing an effective DEI statement, please refer to the section on Contributions to Inclusive Excellence in Research, Teaching and/or Service for resources.

**RESEARCH**

UCI has many truly exceptional researchers. Why shouldn’t they be rewarded for their research accomplishments, rather than being expected to also do significant teaching and service? Isn’t this a poor use of their time?

Research is the primary area of review in the Professor and corresponding series. Professors of Teaching have a primary area of review in teaching, and a secondary research criterion. However, UCI is a research university, not a research institute. As such, faculty have responsibilities beyond their research, and the university depends on their contributions to teaching and service as well as research. Consistent with APM 210 and 285 policy, CAP’s view generally is that we review faculty on three required areas: research, teaching, and service.

**What are “Completed Parts of Larger Works”? When can work in progress be submitted?**

The category of Completed Parts of Larger Works (AP-10, Section III.C.) is primarily aimed at faculty in book disciplines as a way to recognize that completing a book manuscript often takes far longer than a single review period. Accordingly, faculty can submit completed chapter(s) from a monograph for a merit review, with the understanding that these chapters, when the book is published, cannot count in a second merit review. In a rank review (for promotion or advancement), all previous materials, including completed parts of larger works submitted for merits at that rank, will be considered.
How does CAP view grants and outside funding? Can it replace publications as a form of research?

The awarding of a grant is not itself sufficient for advancement; rather, CAP primarily considers a grant to be a promise of future productivity and an indicator of the potential impact of research, especially if the grant is highly competitive. Peer-reviewed national grants such as NIH, NSF, NEH, DoD, Guggenheim, ACLS, Rockefeller, etc., are considered particularly strong recognition of research excellence. In some scientific fields, grant funding or renewal of funding greatly enhances a tenure case or advancement at higher levels. A lack of funding in a discipline that typically requires grant support for doing research may raise questions about the research effort and quality, as well as the stature of the individual in their field of study.

How do you evaluate the professional/creative activity requirement for Professors of Teaching? Do Professors of Teaching have to do research/creative work? Does it have to be in pedagogy? Are there standards for the published research for the Professors of Teaching series?

Professors of Teaching series faculty are expected to produce recognizable work in their area of expertise, such as creative activities, scholarship, professional accomplishments, etc. Like all faculty, Professors of Teaching may choose to do basic, applied, pedagogical, or any other generally accepted form of research in their field. See faculty guidance for more details.

Professors of Teaching faculty are not required to engage in research only related to pedagogy; published and/or experiential work that has a presentation component in their technical specialty is acceptable as well. Research/creative activity is required for all faculty in the Professor of Teaching series. The quality of the work and its impact are the most important factors; quantity less so.

Are external letters necessary when an Assistant Professor of Teaching goes up for tenure, and should those letters focus on classroom teaching or published research on teaching?

External letters are required for all promotion files. Ideally, the letter writers should address all aspects of the file, including classroom teaching, contributions to pedagogy, published research, and professional service. Teaching-related activities and performance are the most important areas for the letters to focus on, but CAP also relies on letter writers’ evaluation of the scholarly activity and service.

Particularly for tenure cases, the best practice is to solicit letters from tenured faculty who are also in the Professor of Teaching series at other UCs, or in similar positions elsewhere. CAP understands that this is a relatively small group of individuals to choose from so letters from tenured faculty in the Professor series may be necessary. In either case, be sure that the solicitation is clear about UCI's expectations for Professors of Teaching faculty, as explained in APM 210.

TEACHING
How do I write an effective Reflective Teaching Statement (RTS)?

CAP appreciates when faculty are truly reflective in describing how they create success in the classroom. CAP also understands that sometimes a well-intended teaching technique does not always get the desired results. The reflective teaching statement should describe both a candidate’s successes and where things may not have gone as well as hoped. CAP appreciates teaching statements that directly address negative comments that may have been received during the review period. A description of improvements the faculty member seeks to employ for future classes is helpful, but evidence of on-going improvements and engagement with student feedback is given more weight than possible future efforts. CAP and AP jointly wrote a guidance page for writing a reflective teaching statement.

How worried should I be about a negative set of teaching evaluations?

CAP members understand that classes sometimes do not go as planned, whether because of individual circumstances or failed attempts at new pedagogies. It can be helpful if faculty address such issues in their reflective teaching statement. Generally, blaming students’ lack of preparation or behavior is not seen as an effective strategy. Explaining how you might change your pedagogy to teach the students you have is more persuasive. Most persuasive is demonstrating improvement in teaching practices over time.

How does CAP use teaching evaluations when extensive research shows their biases?

CAP takes a holistic viewpoint of teaching evaluations (aka Student Evaluations of Teaching [SET] or Student Feedback on Teaching [SFT]) alongside a reflective teaching statement or other materials such as peer reviews. We discuss research on biases and best practices, and are generally skeptical of self-selected positive or negative student comments.

Individual CAP members may have varied viewpoints on the value of teaching evaluations, but in general, CAP pays more attention to students’ comments, especially those that are repeated over time (e.g., disorganized, lack of feedback, misses multiple classes; best class, exceptionally clear lectures, inspired me), rather than numerical evaluation scores.

In addition, CAP considers response rates and values faculty efforts to encourage students to fill out evaluations. Starting in 2020-2021, CAP strongly encourages all programs to use standardized student feedback forms as endorsed by the Academic Senate, found on Eater Evals.

Can a lack of graduate teaching and mentoring be seen as unsatisfactory teaching?

CAP members understand that graduate student teaching and mentoring expectations vary across campus. Generally, CAP looks for teaching across the undergraduate and graduate curriculum. In some disciplines, graduate mentoring is an integral part of research productivity, while in others, graduate students do not work jointly with faculty on research projects. CAP also knows that some departments do not have graduate programs, or have small graduate programs in which only some faculty will have the opportunity to work with graduate students.
On the other hand, faculty in fields with graduate mentoring and funding expectations who do not have their own advisees is a potential cause for concern. Candidates and departments are encouraged to explain their local situation to help CAP properly evaluate the candidate’s contributions within that context.

**How are teaching contributions in Self-Supporting Degree Programs (SSDP) counted?**

Faculty who teach in self-supporting programs should include any relevant teaching materials and the student evaluations in their files. The department teaching assignments/workload should be explained so CAP and other levels of review can understand how the candidate is fulfilling their broader teaching responsibilities. Additional comments regarding faculty teaching in self-supporting programs may be included in the candidate’s Reflective Teaching Statement, the Department letter, the Chair’s letter, and/or the Dean’s letter with context that helps CAP better understand how the candidate’s efforts in the self-supporting program impact the department, school, and/or campus.

**SERVICE**

**Is Academic Senate service required?**

For higher levels of the professoriate, especially, university service outside the department and to the wider campus is expected. Academic Senate service specifically is not required at any level, though significant service to faculty governance is appreciated. CAP recognizes that faculty can contribute to their schools and to the campus through many means, of which Senate service is just one.

**How much service is required for each step?**

The higher the professorial rank, the more service CAP expects, both in quantity and expansiveness (beyond the department). This is not an absolute rule – being a department chair is seen as significant service, even though it is department-based. The most effective files illustrate how engaged the candidate has been at service assignments: for what period of time did they serve; do they accept an assignment and never show up; do they show up but rarely contribute; or do they take leadership roles?

It is also helpful for the department to include whether there was compensation (e.g. teaching release, summer funding – but do not include detailed pay information) for various service roles. Compensation does not negate service (for example, CAP members are compensated with teaching release, but also consider that work as significant, meaningful service) but it does help CAP understand the extent of the extra effort involved.
Should I ask a CAP member…

- how my case is going or if my case has been reviewed yet? No.
- for advice on a colleague’s case? No.
- why they negatively voted on my or a colleague’s case? No.

If you have review-related questions when your file is in preparation or under review, you can consult with your Chief Personnel Officer, School Equity Advisor, or Chair. If they cannot answer your questions they should be able to direct you to the appropriate person to consult. CAP members may not talk with individuals about specific personnel cases, including specific cases cloaked as “hypotheticals.” All personnel file details and CAP deliberations are confidential.

My department knows me and my work much better than CAP. Why does CAP’s decision on my case differ from my department’s decision?

CAP’s role is to provide a campuswide faculty perspective. CAP reviews approximately 400 cases annually at all levels of the professoriate. This broader experience aims to promote equity across the campus.

What does an ideal department letter look like?

An ideal department letter does not repeat what the candidate has already presented; instead, it offers an analytic evaluation of the faculty member. CAP does not need to see lists of accomplishments or specific details that are already listed on the AP-10. It is more effective to explain in the aggregate, for example: Faculty Y’s research is good, judging by the two articles that make significant contributions to understanding ABC. Faculty Z’s teaching is exceptional, as evidenced by their serving as a pedagogical expert to multiple programs; revamping the introductory series in ways that increased student learning; and regularly teaching an overload of independent studies to graduate students. Faculty X’s campus service is very good as evidenced by chairing a department search committee and serving on a Senate committee for three years. Faculty X’s professional stature is outstanding, as evidenced by three article awards, five keynotes, and service as president of a national organization. External letters for Faculty X are positive, with several calling the work some of the best in the field, and four of five explicitly stating that this promotion is overdue.

For merits and accelerations, two pages of text is generally plenty for a department evaluation. For career reviews, it is rarely necessary for departments to present more than four pages of text, and less is often more effective.

CAP members do not need to see excerpts of student evaluations, external letters, or other materials that are already included in the personnel file. These are generally ineffective and come across as cherry picking rather than as a thoughtful analysis of the case.
Are there specific criteria for a promotion file that the department can include when requesting letters from external letter writers?

There is no specific criteria for promotions as it varies widely by discipline. Very generally, useful letters identify the impact of the candidate's scholarly work and whether it is consistent with someone who would receive promotion at their own institution.

Sample letters for promotions, including language to include pertaining to the effects the pandemic may have had on the normal review of files, may be found here.
Midcareer Appraisal

Midcareer Appraisal - All appointees undergo some form of performance evaluation. An appraisal is a formal evaluation, which is made in order to arrive at a preliminary assessment of the candidate’s prospect for eventual promotion as well as to identify appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence expected. For the timing of this appraisal, see APM - 220- 83 and campus procedures.

Department chairs are responsible for conducting midcareer appraisals of assistant professors and persons in equivalent ranks during the third or fourth year of service under the eight-year rule. The purpose of the midcareer appraisal is for the department to provide the assistant professor with a careful, considered analytical evaluation of his or her performance to date in the areas of teaching, research and creative work, professional competence and activity, and university and public service, and to make a candid prediction concerning the probability or improbability of a favorable promotion decision based upon the evidence. Outside letters may be obtained but are not required if members of the department have the expertise to make the assessment.

Midcareer appraisal files often include a recommendation for reappointment or for a merit increase. If this is the case, the reappointment/merit recommendation must be separate from the midcareer appraisal, with separate letters and separate department votes for each.

The department should assess the complete record-to-date (including work in progress), and it should carefully and frankly assess the prospects for the individual’s achieving promotion based upon continuation of that record. The appraisal should note specific areas of deficiency (if any) and should recommend actions to be taken by the individual and/or the department and chair.

The midcareer appraisal should be clearly labeled as "Positive," “Provisional Positive,” “Guarded,” or "Negative."

1. **Positive**: on the current trajectory the probability of a positive tenure decision is good.
2. **Provisional Positive**: with improvements that address specific noted concerns, the probability of a positive tenure decision is good.
3. **Guarded**: improvements that address moderate concerns in research/scholarship and/or teaching and service will be required to change the trajectory toward a positive tenure decision.
4. **Negative**: improvement to address major weaknesses in research/scholarship and/or teaching and service will be required to change trajectory, and candidate cannot request postponement of tenure case.

The department or a designated committee should have reviewed the appraisal (with notation that a copy has been provided to the candidate.) The letter should assess the candidate’s prospects for promotion; contain a report of the faculty opinion and vote and an evaluation of the candidate’s performance in the following areas:

a. Teaching
b. Research or creative work
c. Professional competence and activity
d. University and public service

The chair must also convey to the candidate, in writing, the substance of the midcareer appraisal, along with any recommendations for changes in activities or emphasis. (A copy of this written statement should be included in the file.) The Council on Academic Personnel urges that the midcareer assessment be prepared by a departmental sub-committee instead of the department chair. After approval by the departmental faculty, the candidate should be given the opportunity to examine and comment on the assessment.

---

Mid-Career Appraisal Review Period for an Assistant Professor

- From initial appointment at UCI (July 1, 2020) to September 30\textsuperscript{th} (2023) of the fourth year
- End of Fourth Year – June 30, 2023

Hire Date: July 1, 2020

End of Fourth Year: June 30, 2024

Review Period: July 1, 2020 – September 30, 2023
Midcareer Appraisal, Postponement of Tenure Review, and Promotion to Tenure (cont’d)

Because the midcareer appraisal is directed primarily to the candidate, it is in the best interest of the candidate and the department that the midcareer appraisal be careful, cautious and candid, addressing problems where they exist while there is still time for adjustment and improvement. It is important that the faculty member is made thoroughly aware, in a formal way, of his or her situation in regard to eventual promotion.

The midcareer appraisal should be forwarded to Academic Personnel through the appropriate dean. The Council on Academic Personnel will review the midcareer appraisal and decide whether it wishes to conduct further review. Academic Personnel will notify the chair (via the dean) of CAP’s decision, and at that time the chair should forward to the candidate any comments received from subsequent reviewers.

Postponement of the Tenure Review - Review for promotion to tenure normally takes place in the sixth year of service under the eight-year limit; however, postponement is possible. In the latter half of an assistant professor’s fifth year (under the eight-year rule), the department should determine whether the tenure review should take place, as normal, in the sixth year or whether circumstances exist which justify postponement of the tenure review until the seventh year. Postponement of the tenure review will be justified if the candidate has significant work in progress, the evaluation of which will occur within a year but not in time to be included in a sixth-year review.

Postponement may be justified in the case of an assistant professor who has a childrearing extension, and is making sustained progress, even if it is at a slower pace. A postponement may also be appropriate under exceptional circumstances, such as when serious illness has disrupted the candidate's normal progress, but there is still sufficient evidence that a seventh-year tenure review will be successful.

Postponement of the tenure review is not appropriate for an assistant professor whose midcareer appraisal was negative, or for an assistant professor who has been reappointed without a merit increase.

To request postponement, the assistant professor should provide tangible evidence to the department that the record will change significantly in the sixth year. The department should discuss the evidence and vote for or against postponement of the tenure review.

The postponement file must be accompanied by the candidate's full merit or reappointment file, which will normally be required for continuation beyond the sixth year. Form UCI-AP-38 itemizes the documentation required for the postponement of tenure review. The postponement file, accompanied by the merit or reappointment file, is forwarded to the appropriate dean's office for recommendation, for further review by the Council on Academic Personnel and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.

DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION TO ACADEMIC PERSONNEL — November 1st.

Promotion to Tenure - If the department determines that the assistant professor’s record meets or exceeds the university's expectations for promotion to the rank of associate professor, the department will recommend promotion to tenure.

Promotion Review Period of an Assistant Professor

- Review period begins from initial appointment as an Assistant Professor
- Curriculum Vitae & Addenda dates are through September 30th of the review year
- Initial appointment effective July 1, 2020
- Promotion to be effective July 1, 2026
- Review Period includes July 1, 2020 – September 30, 2025
# Summary of University of California Access to Records Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Record</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Access by Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside Letters of Evaluation Solicited by School</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>May receive redacted copies (1) before departmental recommendation or (2) after the final decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Qualifications of Outside Letter Writers (AP-11)</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>No Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal or External Unsolicited Student/Colleague Letters Requested by Candidate (usually not by formal letter)</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>May receive copy intact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Letter</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>May receive copy intact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Teaching Evaluations</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>May receive copy intact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Vote</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>Vote to be disclosed in department letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Certifies Access Rights have been granted (AP-50)</td>
<td>Non-Confidential and Confidential</td>
<td>May receive a copy of the departmental letter and vote May receive a copy of redacted confidential material May request opportunity to respond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFTER THE DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Record</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Access by Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair’s Personal Letter</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>May receive intact copy after the final decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Letter</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>May receive intact copy after the final decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DURING THE COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL’S REVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Record</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Access by Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor’s Ad Hoc Committee Report</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>May receive redacted copy after the final decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from CAP for Additional Information or in response to tentative recommendation</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>May receive copy and has opportunity to respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Outside Letters of Evaluation Solicited by School (may be needed for further review)</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>May receive redacted copies (1) before departmental recommendation or (2) after the final decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Qualifications of Outside Letter Writers (AP-11)</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>No Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Letter response to request from CAP</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>May receive copy intact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Information submitted by Department or by Chair on behalf of the Department and certified by candidate (AP-50-A)</td>
<td>Non-Confidential and Confidential</td>
<td>May receive a copy of additional information submitted for further consideration May receive a copy of redacted confidential material May request opportunity to respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair’s Personal Letter</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>May receive intact copy after the final decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Letter</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>May receive copy intact after the final decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFTER THE COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL’S RECOMMENDATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Record</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Access by Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council on Academic Personnel Report</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>May receive copy intact after the final decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrators’ Recommendation Letters</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>May receive copy intact after the final decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair’s Personal Letter</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>Receives copy after the final decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor or Designee’s Final Decision</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>Receives copy after the final decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAIR’S GUIDE FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEWS

This checklist was prepared as an aid for chairs in complying with Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Policy 220-80-c.

Section I  Notifying Candidate

☐ Inform candidate of eligibility for advancement or other mandatory review.

☐ Inform candidate of criteria for advancement as set forth in APM Policy 210.

☐ Inform candidate of the nature of the review process as set forth in APM Policies 210 and 220 and in the supplementary Academic Personnel Procedures (APP) Sections 1-12.

☐ Inform candidate of the University’s policies regarding academic personnel records as set forth in APM Policy 160 and in APP Sections 1-11.

☐ Ask candidate to supply all pertinent information and materials relevant to criteria for advancement by a specified deadline.

☐ Ask candidate to suggest (perhaps 3 to 5) names of persons who could be solicited for letters of evaluation, if needed, and allow candidate to set forth in writing the names of persons who, in the view of the candidate, for reasons set forth, might not objectively evaluate the candidate’s qualifications or performance.

Section II  Developing a Recommendation

☐ Where required, solicit confidential extramural letters of recommendation (promotions, major accelerations, advancements to Professor, Step VI and to Above Scale).

☐ Assemble, in accordance with instructions set forth in the APP Section 3-60, all pertinent information; such as, Vitae, Addendum, Review Profile, publications, teaching evaluations, solicited letters, candidate’s statement, etc.

☐ Provide candidate an opportunity to inspect all non-confidential documents to be included in the personnel review file.

☐ Provide candidate an oral or, if requested, a redacted copy of the confidential letters of evaluation to be included in the file.

☐ Allow candidate an opportunity to include a written statement in response to or commenting upon material in the file.

☐ After completion of the steps above, consult with department members, making certain to extend to all eligible colleagues the voting rights established by Senate By-Law 55 and approved department voting procedures (See APP Section 1-14).

☐ Write a letter setting forth the departmental recommendation in compliance with APM Policy 220-80-e, and APP Section 3-60. This letter may be written by a departmental subcommittee.

☐ Make draft letter available to voting members or a departmental committee for review.

Section III  Forwarding Materials

☐ Inform candidate orally or, upon request, provide the candidate with a copy of the department letter including the vote.

☐ Inform candidate of the right to make a written statement or comment upon the departmental recommendation.
### CHAIR'S GUIDE FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEWS

#### Section III  
**Forwarding Materials - Continued**

- Obtain a certification statement ([Form UCI-AP-50](#)) from the candidate that the non-confidential materials in the review file have been inspected and any redacted copies of the confidential materials have been provided.
- Inspect packet to ensure that all materials are included and that the dossier conforms to the appropriate form.
- Add Chair’s personal recommendation, if desired. The Chair may include a recommendation on the case that is independent of the department recommendation. Normally, this recommendation will constitute the vote of the Chair, who may have participated in the departmental discussion but not voted in the department.
- Forward materials to Dean’s Office.

**After materials have been forwarded by the Dean’s Office, the following 3 sections clarify the possible types of subsequent departmental input**

#### Section IV  
**Additional Information Requested by Reviewers**

- Memo will be forwarded to the Department (through the Dean’s Office) from the Office of Academic Personnel soliciting additional information (e.g., publications, additional letters of evaluation, etc.).
- The Department will collect the information requested by reviewers and comment on the new material. This letter may be written by a departmental subcommittee or the Chair on behalf of the Department.
- The candidate will have an opportunity to access and respond to the new material governed by APM 220-80-d, -e, -h, and -i.
- Obtain a “Certification Statement for Additional Information Added to the Academic Review” ([Form UCI-AP-50A](#)) from the candidate indicating that the non-confidential materials in the review file have been inspected and all redacted copies of the confidential materials have been provided, if requested by the candidate.
- The Chair may add a personal statement (optional – does not replace required response from the Department or Chair’s response on behalf of the Department)
- The Departmental letter, the additional information, any response by the candidate, the signed [UCI-AP-50A](#) form, and the Chair’s personal statement (if provided) will be forwarded to the Dean’s Office for review. The Dean’s response and the additional materials will be forwarded to the Office of Academic Personnel.

#### Section V  
**Tentative decision by reviewers prior to the final decision**

The tentative decision, when it differs from that of prior levels of review, affords the Department an opportunity to clarify matters, to correct mistakes, or to emphasize overlooked aspects of review. The tentative decision is sometimes reversed in the review of the response to the tentative decision. If during the course of the review, a recommendation is made which is different from the department recommendation, a notification will go back to the level of disagreement.

- If the level of disagreement is at the Department level, a memo will be forwarded from the Office of Academic Personnel to the Department (through the Dean’s office) requesting a response to the tentative decision.
- Additional information may be submitted on behalf of, or, by the candidate.
- The Chair is responsible for ensuring that the candidate is informed of the Department response, including any additional information that is added to the file.
Section V  Tentative decision by reviewers prior to the final decision - Continued

The candidate shall be afforded the opportunity to make a written response for inclusion in the personnel review file. This may include updates to the vitae or addendum, submission of publications requested by reviewers, personal statements, etc.

Obtain a “Certification Statement for Additional Information Added to the Academic Review” (Form UCI-AP-50A) from the candidate indicating the non-confidential materials in the review file have been inspected and all redacted copies of the confidential materials have been provided, if requested by the candidate.

The Chair may add a personal statement (optional – does not replace required response from the Department or Chair’s response on behalf of the Department)

The Departmental response, any additional information, any response by the candidate, the signed UCI-AP-50A form and the Chair’s personal statement (if provided) will be forwarded to the Dean’s Office for review. The Dean’s response and the additional materials will be forwarded to the Office of Academic Personnel.

Section VI  Preliminary Negative Assessment during a Tenure Review or non-reappointment of an Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor in Residence, or Assistant Professor of Clinical X

The Dean, Chair, and candidate are notified of the preliminary assessment in writing by the Vice Provost.

The Dean, Chair, and candidate shall be provided redacted copies of all confidential and non-confidential materials added to the candidate’s review file after the departmental recommendation.

After receipt of the notice of preliminary assessment, the candidate will have five days to respond to the department and will have the opportunity to provide, in writing, any additional information and documentation. The Chair, after appropriate consultation within the department, shall have the opportunity to respond in writing and to provide additional information and documentation on behalf of the department. In addition, the candidate will have the opportunity to review additional information submitted on his/her behalf by the department.

The “Certification Statement for Additional Information Added to Academic Review” (Form UCI-AP-50A) must be completed by the candidate for any subsequent additions to their personnel review file (e.g., publications, additional letters of evaluation, responses to tentative decisions by the departments, etc.).

The Chair may add a personal statement (optional – does not replace required response from the Department or Chair’s response on behalf of the Department)

The Departmental response, any additional information, the signed UCI-AP-50A form and the Chair’s personal statement (if provided), will be forwarded to the Dean’s Office for review. The Dean’s response with the materials will be forwarded to the Office of Academic Personnel.

Note: For faculty with split appointments between two departments, the same procedures apply, but both the home and the split School/Department must respond and/or acknowledge the additional information that is provided either by the candidate or Department.
Any faculty member at the Assistant level, which falls under the provisions of APM 133, have the right, under certain circumstances provided for in policy APM 133-17-h, to initiate a stop the clock during the pre-tenure review time (the probationary period).

**Requesting a "Stop the Clock"**

A faculty member may request to stop the clock during the probationary period for personal reasons:

1. **Childbearing or Childrearing:** care for any child who is, or becomes part of the faculty member’s family. A faculty member at the Assistant level must be responsible for 50 percent or more of the care of the child.
2. **Serious Health Condition Including Disability or Bereavement:** A faculty member may request to stop the clock during the probationary period, when his or her ability to pursue his or her duties is significantly disrupted by a serious health condition or disability, by the need to care for a close family member who is seriously ill, or by the death of a close family member. This provision also covers other persons residing in the faculty member’s household or cases involving close personal connection or interdependence.
3. **Significant Circumstances or Event:** A faculty member may request to stop the clock during the probationary period, for reasons due to a significant circumstance or event beyond the faculty member’s control that disrupts the faculty member’s ability to pursue his or her duties.

A faculty member may be granted no more than two years of extension during the probationary period. The birth or placement of one or more children at the same time constitutes a single event of birth or placement. An academic appointee must provide notice of his or her intent to stop the clock before July 1 of the academic year in which a promotion review is to occur. To initiate a Stop the Clock, complete the Stop the Clock Certification Form (UCI-AP-92).

- “Stop the Clock” is not a leave; it is a stoppage of the tenure clock and will automatically defer a mid-career appraisal and/or promotion review by one year. Please note, faculty at the Assistant level have the option to still submit a Mid-Career Appraisal and/or promotion/promotion to tenure review during its normal time.
- In order to automatically defer a Mid-Career Appraisal, the notification to “Stop the Clock” must be submitted by the end of the faculty member’s third year (by June 30). If the notification to “Stop the Clock” is submitted after the Mid-Career Appraisal, the notification of intent to “Stop the Clock” must be made before July 1 of the academic year in which a tenure or promotion review is to occur.

**NOTES:**

1. Quarters "off the clock" due to a combination of Childbearing Leave, Parental Leave, and/or Primary Child-rearing Responsibility may not exceed one year for each event of childbirth or adoption. (2) Because the review cycle is conducted in terms of full, not partial, years, and partial years count toward the next full year, exclusion of one or two quarters for an academic year appointee or up to three quarters for a fiscal year appointee will not necessarily affect the timing of the tenure or promotion review.

* The child may be the appointee’s child or that of the appointee’s spouse or domestic partner.
UC Irvine’s Family Friendly Policy is intended to assist academic appointees in balancing the needs of work and family. Here are the four types of Family Friendly Policies that are available to academic appointees:

1. Childbearing Leave (APM 760-25)
2. Active Service-Modified Duties (APM 760-28)
3. Parental Leave (APM 760-27)
4. Stopping the clock for the care of a child or children (APM 760-30 & APM 133-17)

### SUMMARY OF CHILDBEARING AND CHILDRearing LEAVE POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Pay Status</th>
<th>University Duties</th>
<th>Time to Count Toward Sabbatical If Employee Is Eligible</th>
<th>Time to Count Toward 8-yr. Clock*</th>
<th>Duration/ Limitations</th>
<th>Primary (50% or more) Responsibility Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childbearing Leave</td>
<td>May be with or without salary</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>See APM 760-35-d</td>
<td>No, if leave equal to or greater than one quarter, time is automatically excluded</td>
<td>Normally up to 8 weeks</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Service - Modified Duties</td>
<td>Normal salary</td>
<td>Modified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Combined total of Act. Serv./Mod. Duties plus Childbearing, for birth mothers, not to exceed 3 qtrs/2 semesters. for each birth or adoption</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Bonding Leave</td>
<td>Without salary</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, if leave equal to or greater than one quarter, time is automatically excluded</td>
<td>FML - up to 12 work weeks</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Leave</td>
<td>Eff. 7/1/21, PFCB pay option²</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing Stop the Clock</td>
<td>Normal salary</td>
<td>Normal duties</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximum of two years total extension</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Periods less than one full year may not affect the tenure/promotion review date.

2 Effective July 1, 2021, Pay for Family Care and Bonding (PFCB) provides a pay option for block leave taken in minimum one workweek block increments for family and medical leave (FML) qualifying reasons (APP 7-45).
APP 7-41 Childbearing Leave (APM 760-25)

1. Childbearing Leave may be granted by request to eligible academic appointees for disabilities or medical conditions related to pregnancy and childbirth before, during and/or after childbirth. It usually lasts about six weeks but may be extended due to medical reasons.
2. During a childbearing leave, no duties shall be required by the University (APM 760-25-a).
3. If eligible for Family and Medical Leave (FML), up to 12 workweeks of the childbearing leave will run concurrently with FML (APM 760-25-d).
4. Central funding for the purpose of providing ladder rank faculty teaching replacement is allocated to the affected academic department.
5. Who is eligible: Birth Mothers
6. How to request for a Childbearing Leave:
   a. Complete the Leave of Absence form UCI-AP-76.
      i. Provide the actual dates of the childbearing leave.
      ii. Final Approval Authority:
         i. Seven calendar days or less: Department Chair
         ii. Eight calendar days or more: Vice Provost

Notes:
   a. The aggregate duration of all leaves, plus periods of Active Service-Modified duties, may not exceed one year per single birth/adoption.
   b. Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA): See the UCI Family and Medical Leave Guidelines for Academics.
   c. In addition, disability information is available from Human Resources at UC Disability Benefits.

APP 7-42 Active Service-Modified Duties (APM 760-28)

1. The appointee remains in service to the University, but with modified duties. For most appointees, this means a period in which the faculty member does not teach. This is not a leave.
2. Eligibility for a period of active service-modified duties (ASMD) shall normally extend from 3 months prior to and up to 12 months following the birth or adoption of a child and may be granted to any academic appointee who has 50% or more responsibility for the care of the child. Appointees may apply for ASMD to care for a child of any age.
3. The total period of Childbearing Leave plus Active Service-Modified Duties (ASMD) for a birth mother, who has a full-time appointment for at least one full academic year, may not exceed three quarters/two semesters for each birth. The first quarter of ASMD must run concurrently with the quarter in which a childbearing leave is taken. If she gives birth during the summer she is eligible for a total period of active service-modified duties of three quarters/two semesters.
4. All other eligible academic appointees are eligible for a total period of Childbearing Leave plus Active Service-Modified Duties (ASMD) of one quarter (APM 760-28).
5. Central funding for the purpose of providing ladder rank faculty teaching replacement is allocated to the affected academic department.

6. Who is eligible: Birth, adopting and foster parents
   a. Appointee must certify that they have at least 50% of the primary responsibility for the care of the child in order to be eligible for Active Service Modified Duties.

7. What is Active Service Modified Duties
   a. Modified duties for a ladder faculty appointee are normally relief from teaching; however, other arrangements are possible.
   b. During a period of Active Service-Modified Duties, the appointee is on active status.
   c. Active Service-Modified Duties is not a leave of absence.
   d. For restrictions and timing, see APM 760-28.

8. How to request for Active Service Modified Duties:

9. How to complete the form:
   a. Specify the quarter(s) requested for ASMD: Policy allows three quarters/two semesters quarters of combined childbearing leave plus ASMD for a birth mother who has a full-time appointment for at least one full academic year; with one quarter of combined childbearing leave plus ASMD allowed for other appointees;
   b. Describe the modified duties as agreed between the appointee and department chair, subject to the dean's review and endorsement.

10. The department can request for Funding for Teaching Release for Professor and Lecturer with Security of Employment series.
    a. In order to minimize the financial impact this might place on the instructional program of the department, central funding for replacement teaching will be provided to the affected department. Funding for teaching release request will have a maximum number of courses that will be approved per birth or adoption:
       1. Professor series: eligible to receive up to a maximum of three courses.
       2. Professor of Teaching series: eligible to receive up to a maximum of four courses. The department can request for Funding for Teaching Release for Professor and Professor of Teaching series.
       3. Estimated cost for funding requested per course will be increased from $5,500 to $6,000, which will be effective for all requests initiated July 1, 2019 or after.
    b. This request is initiated by the faculty member at the time the period of leave or active service-modified duties is requested, by completing the "Funding for Teaching Release For Birth or Adoption of Child(ren) — for Professor and Lecturer with Security of Employment series," form UCI-AP-93.
c. The Department Chair provides information on the individual’s teaching load and the form is forwarded through the Dean to the Office of Academic Personnel for review and approval.

---

3 Academic appointees in their first-year of appointment will be eligible for this benefit if they have been appointed for full time for the entire year. For example, a newly appointed academic appointee in her first year of full-time full-year appointment will be eligible to request ASMD if she meets the criteria specified for ASMD.

4 This group includes: Fathers with full-time/full-year appointments, adoptive or foster parents, academic appointees with part-time appointments one-year or less, or full-time appointment for less than one full year.

5 Does not apply to Health Sciences Compensation Plan faculty members.

---

APP 7-43 Childrearing Leave (APM 760-27)

1. Parental Bonding Leave is leave without salary granted for the purpose of caring for and bonding with a newborn child or a child newly placed for adoption or foster care, and to attend to matters related to the birth, adoption, or placement of the child.
   a. Normally, this leave combined with Childbearing Leave and/or Active Service-Modified Duties may not exceed one year for each birth or adoption (APM 760-27, and 760-35).
   b. If eligible for Family and Medical Leave (FML), up to 12 workweeks of the parental leave will run concurrently with FML, (APM 760-27-b).
   c. Parental Bonding Leave must be concluded within twelve (12) months following the birth or placement of the child or children.
   d. The aggregate duration of all leaves, plus periods of Active Service-Modified duties, may not exceed one year per single birth/adoption.

2. Parental Leave is normally without salary. Full-time and part-time Parental Leave without pay for one year to care for a child (Parental Leave). The child may be the appointee’s child or that of a spouse or domestic partner.

3. Pay Option: Effective July 1, 2021, Pay for Family Care and Bonding (PFCB) provides a pay option for block leave taken in minimum one workweek block increments for family and medical leave (FML) qualifying reasons (APP 7-45). Appointee have the option to use accrued sick or vacation leave may be used, during a Parental Bonding Leave or Parental Leave that would otherwise be unpaid.

4. Who is eligible: Birth, adopting and foster parents.

5. How to request for a Parental Bonding Leave or Parental Leave:
   a. Complete the Leave of Absence form UCI-AP-76.
      i. Specify start and end dates; for academic year appointees, these should correspond with the beginning and end of a quarter.
ii. Final Approval Authority:
   i. Seven calendar days or less: Department Chair
   ii. Eight calendar days or more: Vice Provost

b. Complete Family Medical Leave Form

Note: Family and Medical Leave (FML): See the UCI Family and Medical Leave Guidelines for Academics

APP 7-44 Stopping the clock for the care of a child or children (APM 760-30) & (APM 133-17)

1. What is Stopping the Clock
   a. It is a stoppage of the eight-year clock in certain titles for purposes of:
      1. childbearing or childrearing (must be responsible for 50 percent or more of the care of the child who is, or becomes part of the faculty member's family),
      2. serious health condition including disability or bereavement, or
      3. significant circumstance or event beyond the faculty member's control that disrupts the faculty member's ability to pursue his or her duties.
   b. An academic appointee must provide notice of his or her intent to stop the clock before July 1 of the academic year in which a promotion review is to occur.
   c. The Notification of Intent to Stop the Clock may not be made after the sixth year has begun. Also, a Stop the Clock will not be granted for a faculty member who has primary responsibility for a child when that child is born or adopted during the year of the tenure or promotion review.
   d. Refer to Special Timing of the Promotion/Promotion to Tenure Review for Faculty with Stop the Clock in APP 3-50 Appendix III.
   e. Stop the Clocks are normally granted for a period of one year for each event, totaling no more than two years during the probationary period. The birth or placement of one or more children at the same time constitutes a single event of birth or placement.
   f. A faculty member is eligible to stop the clock even if the faculty member does not take a formal leave or have a modification of duties. Time off the clock is limited to one year per birth or adoption, subject to a total allowable option period of two years for all reasons (APM 133-17 and APM 760-30).

2. Who is eligible: Any faculty member at the Assistant level, which falls under the provisions of APM 133, and is not currently undergoing review for promotion to tenure, may initiate a stoppage of the tenure clock on the limitation of service as provided in the relevant policies.

3. How to provide Notification of Intent to Stop the Clock:
   a. Complete the "Stop the Clock Certification Form" UCI-AP-92. In order to automatically defer a Mid-Career Appraisal, the notification to “Stop the Clock” must be submitted by the end of the faculty member's third year (by June 30). If the notification to “Stop the Clock” is submitted after the Mid-Career Appraisal, the notification of intent to “Stop the Clock” must be made before July 1 of the academic year in which a tenure or promotion review is to occur.
b. Once the notification of intent has been acknowledged, the tenure clock (or probationary period) will **automatically** be stopped.

**Note:** Refer to APP 3-50, Appendix III for a more detailed explanation of the Stop the Clock process.

---

Quarters or semesters “off the clock” due to Childbearing leave, Parental Leave, and/or Primary Responsibility may not exceed one year for each event of childbirth or adoption. Because the review cycle is conducted in terms of full, not partial years, and partial years count toward the next full year, exclusion of one or two quarters (one semester) for an academic appointee or up to three quarter for a fiscal year appointee will not necessarily affect the timing of the tenure or promotion review.
Family Friendly Resources

Federal Resources:
- U.S. Department of Labor — Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA)

UC Systemwide Resources:
- UC Office of the President — Family friendly practices and policies
- Academic Personnel Manual (APM)
  - APM 715 - Leaves of Absence/Family and Medical Leave
  - APM 760 - Family Accommodations for Childbearing and Childrearing

UC Irvine Resources:
UC Irvine Academic Personnel Website
- Academic Personnel Procedures (APP) 7 — Leaves and Family Friendly Policies
  - APP 7-12 Family and Medical Leave
  - APP 7-40 Family Friendly Policies
  - APP 7-41 Childbearing Leave
  - APP 7-42 Active Service-Modified Duties
  - APP 7-43 Parental Leave
  - APP 7-44 Stopping the Clock
- APP 3-50 Assistant Professors — Special Considerations in the Academic Personnel review process

Family Friendly Forms
- Leave of Absence Form (UCI-AP-76)
- Instructions for Completion of "Family Friendly" Forms (UCI-AP-90)
- Active Service-Modified Duties Request/Certification Form (UCI-AP-91)
- Stop The Clock Certification Form (UCI-AP-92)
- Request for Funding for Ladder Rank Faculty Teaching Release For Birth or Adoption of Child(ren) Form (UCI-AP-93)
- Family Friendly Checklist for Academic Appointees (UCI-AP-94)
A. **Systemwide Policies and Procedures**

**Academic Personnel Manual (APM)**

*Website:*  [https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/academic-personnel-policy/index.html](https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/academic-personnel-policy/index.html)

1. **APM 245 – Department Chairs**
   Guidelines of the duties and responsibilities of the Department Chair as the leader and administrative head of the Department.

2. **APM 220 – Professor Series**
   A starting point for policies on appointments and promotions of Regular Ranks faculty. APM 220-18, Salary, clarifies the UC criteria for advancement to Professor, Step VI, and Professor, Above Scale.

3. **APM 210 – Review and Appraisal Committees**
   General review criteria for teaching, research, professional activity, and service. Chairs are responsible for submitting review of faculty teaching with merit and promotion files.

4. **APM 035 – Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination in Employment**
   Contains UC policy on nondiscrimination, sexual harassment complaints, and affirmative action.

5. **APM 160 – Academic Personnel Records/Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of**
   Defines “confidential academic review records” and who has access to those records.

6. **APM 025 – Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members**
   Guidelines for the compensated and uncompensated outside professional and non-professional activities of faculty, along with annual reporting guidelines.

7. **APM 015 – The Faculty Code of Conduct**
   Sets forth professional rights of faculty, both general ethical principles for faculty and examples of unacceptable faculty conduct, and rules and recommendations for the enforcement of the Faculty Code.

8. **APM 016 – University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline**
   General policy regarding faculty discipline. It specifies the penalties that may be imposed for violations of the Faculty Code of Conduct, what types of faculty behaviors are covered under the Faculty Code, and which academic appointees are governed by the Faculty Code.

9. **APM 150 – Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Corrective Action and Dismissal**
   Standards and procedures for instituting corrective action or dismissal of a non-Senate academic employee (who is not covered by a collective bargaining agreement) in the case of misconduct, unsatisfactory work performance, or dereliction of academic duty.

10. **APM 140 – Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Grievances**
    Provides non-Senate academic appointees the opportunity to present grievances.

*Updated May 16, 2022*
11. **APM 190 – Selected Presidential Policies**
   Selected University of California policies having Universitywide application to faculty, students, and/or staff.
   A. Whistleblower Policy and Whistleblower Protection Policy
   B. Integrity in Research
   C. Substance Abuse
   D. Travel to Scholarly Meetings and Field Research Travel
   E. Faculty Recruitment Allowance Program
   F. Use of Non-19900 Fund Sources to Support Ladder-Rank faculty
   G. Retirement Contributions on Academic Appointee Summer Salary
   H. Endowed Chairs and Professorships

**B. UCI Policies and Procedures**

**Academic Personnel Procedures Manual (APP)**

**Website:** [http://www.ap.uci.edu/](http://www.ap.uci.edu/)

1. **APP, Section 3 – Appointment and Review, Academic Senate Titles**
   - **APP 3-10 – Appointment Policies**
   - **APP 3-20 – Appointment File Documentation for Academic Senate Titles**
   - **APP 3-30 – Responsibility of the Department Chair in the Academic Personnel Review Process for Academic Senate Titles**
   - **APP 3-40 – Types of Actions for Academic Senate Titles**
   - **APP 3-50 – Assistant Professors—Special Considerations in the Review Process**
   Guidelines for the responsibilities of the Department Chair in the review process and describes the different types of review outcomes and file documentation.

2. **APP, Section 2 – Recruitment Guidelines for Senate and Non-Senate Faculty**
   - **APP 2-10 – General Recruitment Guidelines**
   - **APP 2-30 – Non-Senate Recruitment Guidelines**
   - **APP 2-40 – Non-Senate Recruitment Procedures**
   Explains the process to be used for recruitments in order to follow our policies on affirmative action and equal employment opportunity.

3. **APP 1-14 – Departmental Voting Procedures**
   Summarizes the Academic Senate Bylaw governing faculty voting rights in departments and indicates the importance of the faculty vote in the academic personnel review process.

4. **APP 1-12 – Academic Personnel Review Process**
   Provides guidelines to be followed by the chair, candidate, and department to assure fairness in the review process.
C. UCI Academic Personnel Policies and Websites

UCI Academic Personnel Website

Chairs Guide for Personnel Reviews, UCI-AP-15

Council on Academic Personnel (CAP)

• CAP’s Frequently Asked Questions & Responses

Academic Delegations
A. **ADVANCE Program for Equity and Diversity**: [https://inclusion.uci.edu/advance/](https://inclusion.uci.edu/advance/)

B. **About Equity Advisors**

C. **Current Equity Advisors**
November 4, 2013

DEANS AND DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

RE: Diversity in the Review Process: Guidelines for Faculty

Dear Colleagues:

Faculty activity that advances access, diversity and equal opportunity is an important part of the mission of the University of California. The Academic Personnel Manual (APM) recommends that faculty be encouraged and recognized for contributing to this vital priority of the university. The relevant section of APM 210.1-d is provided below.

The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Teaching, research, professional and public service contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of the candidate’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.

The personnel process at UCI provides for faculty to discuss their activity in at least two places. These are the self-statement and the MyData Review Profile. The narrative and summary formats permit faculty to detail the nature and impact of their activity and its relevance to the field, the department, school, campus or wider public. In providing context to faculty activity, the self-statement and the review profile enhances the quality of the evaluation of their contributions to diversity at the different levels of review—i.e. department, school, and campus.

Attached are guidelines designed to ensure that such faculty activity is appropriately evaluated and rewarded. Please review and share them with your department and school faculty.

Howard Gillman
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Attachment

C: Chancellor Drake
Vice Provost Killackey
Associate Vice Provost Haynes
Diversity in the Review Process: Guidelines for Faculty

The Academic Senate adopted in 2009 the following broad definition of diversity.

Diversity—defining features of California’s past, present and future—refers to a variety of personal experiences, values, and worldviews that arise from differences of culture and circumstance. Such differences include race, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, language, abilities/disabilities, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, geographic region and more. (For the complete statement, please visit the website http://diversity.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity.)

Use the Self-statement to describe and the Review Profile to document your activities. This will assist the department faculty and chair, school dean, CAP, provost and chancellor to understand and appreciate the significance of your activity. Be specific when describing the nature and impact of the research, teaching, and service activity that advances access, diversity and equal opportunity.

Your descriptions should address:

- **How the activity advances equal opportunity and diversity:** the ways it explores underrepresented or understudied populations or communities, cultures and practices; or illuminates societal inequalities or disparities.

- **What the significance or impact of the activity is:** how it builds or extends research problems or areas; raises awareness in local or state or national or international contexts; contributes to equitable access to education and broadens participation in higher education through outreach or mentoring or recruitment or student placement; addresses societal disparities or inequalities; or aligns with Category 7 (Multicultural Studies) of the General Education requirements.

- **The extent the activity has been recognized:** document and describe any and all of the following: competitive funding; any appearance in a peer reviewed journal or publication as a book; significant contribution to high impact online journalism such as a blog or curated web-page; selection for commendation by campus unit, professional association or public service organization; or has the faculty member served on a taskforce or been elected to a leadership position in an affinity group organization or a committee within a professional organization.