



UC San Diego

Policy & Procedure Manual

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

PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

Section: 230-210

Effective: 07/01/2017

Supersedes: New

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 03/31/2020

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION REVIEW AND APPRAISAL COMMITTEES

PPM 230-210, Review and Appraisal Committees, relates to matters subject to [Academic Personnel Manual \(APM\) Section 210](#), Review and Appraisal Committees. For reference, subsections of PPM 230-210 include citations to associated subsections of the APM; in all cases, the APM is operative where referenced.

PPM 230-210-0 Policy

APM 210-0

PPM 230-210-1 Instructions to Review Committees which Advise on Actions Concerning Appointees in the Professor and Corresponding Series

The following instructions apply to review committees for actions concerning appointees in the Professor series and the Professor in Residence series; and, with appropriate modifications, for appointees in the Adjunct Professor series.

APM 210-1. a – **Purpose and Responsibility of the Review Committee**

APM 210-1. b – **Maintenance of the Committee's Effectiveness**

APM 210-1. c – **Procedure**

PPM 230-210-1. d - **Criteria for Appointment Promotion and Appraisal**

The review committee shall judge the candidate with respect to the proposed rank and duties, considering the record of the candidate's performance in (1) teaching, (2) research and other creative work, (3) professional activity, and (4) University and public service. In evaluating the candidate's qualifications within these areas, the review committee shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing when the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. The review committee must judge whether the candidate is engaging in a program of work that is both sound and productive. As the University enters new fields of endeavor and refocuses its ongoing activities, cases will arise in which the proper work of faculty members departs markedly from established academic patterns. In such cases, the review committees must take exceptional care to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. However, flexibility does not entail a relaxation of high standards. *Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions.* Insistence upon this standard for holders of the professorship is necessary for maintenance of the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge. Consideration should be given to changes in emphasis and interest that may occur in an academic career. The candidate may submit for the review file a presentation of their activity in all four areas.

The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. 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 and faculty members, particularly from underrepresented and underserved populations, should be given due recognition in the teaching or service categories of the academic personnel process.

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

(1) – 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.

Clearly demonstrated evidence of high quality in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion. Under no circumstances will a tenure commitment be made unless there is clear documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role. Evidence of teaching may vary according to the level of the appointment and the extent of the candidate's previous teaching experience. In exceptional cases where no such evidence is available, the candidate's potential as a teacher may be indicated by closely analogous activities. The departmental recommendation letter should also clearly state how the candidate will be expected to contribute to the department's teaching program. Departments should develop appropriate procedures for evaluating the teaching performance of faculty at the undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral levels.

In judging the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching, the committee should consider such points as the following: the candidate's command of the subject; continuous growth in the subject field; ability to organize material and to present it with force and logic; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; fostering of student independence and capability to reason; spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize the candidate's learning and teaching; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students, to encourage high standards, and to stimulate advanced students to creative work; personal attributes as they affect teaching and students; extent and skill of the candidate's participation in the general guidance, mentoring, and advising of students; 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 committee should pay due attention to the variety of demands placed on instructors by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels, and should judge the total performance of the candidate with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities. The committee should clearly indicate the sources of evidence on which its appraisal of teaching competence has been based.

In those exceptional cases when no such evidence is available, the candidate's potentialities as a teacher may be indicated in closely analogous activities. In preparing its recommendation, the review committee should keep in mind that a redacted copy of its report may be an important means of informing the candidate of the evaluation of their teaching and of the basis for that evaluation.

It is the responsibility of the department chair to submit meaningful statements, accompanied by evidence, of the candidate's teaching effectiveness at lower-division, upper-division, and graduate levels of instruction. 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. Among significant types of evidence of teaching effectiveness are the following: (a) opinions of other faculty members knowledgeable in the candidate's field, particularly if based on class visitations, on attendance at public lectures or lectures before professional

societies given by the candidate, or on the performance of students in courses taught by the candidate that are prerequisite to those of the informant; (b) opinions of students; (c) opinions of graduates who have achieved notable professional success since leaving the University; (d) number and caliber of students guided in research by the candidate and of those attracted to the campus by the candidate's repute as a teacher; and (e) development 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.

All cases for advancement and promotion normally will include: (a) evaluations and comments solicited from students for most, if not all, courses taught since the candidate's last review; (b) a quarter-by-quarter or semester-by-semester enumeration of the number and types of courses and tutorials taught since the candidate's last review; (c) their level; (d) their enrollments; (e) the percentage of students represented by student course evaluations for each course; (f) brief explanations for abnormal course loads; (g) identification of any new courses taught or of old courses when there was substantial reorganization of approach or content; (h) notice of any awards or formal mentions for distinguished teaching; (i) when the faculty member under review wishes, a self-evaluation of their teaching; and (j) evaluation by other faculty members of teaching effectiveness. When any of the information specified in this paragraph is not provided, the department chair will include an explanation for that omission in the candidate's dossier. If such information is not included with the letter of recommendation and its absence is not adequately accounted for, it is the review committee chair's responsibility to request it through the Chancellor.

(2) - Research and Creative Work

Evidence of a productive and creative mind should be sought in the candidate's published research or recognized artistic production in original architectural or engineering designs, or the like. Publications in research and other creative accomplishment should be evaluated, not merely enumerated. There should be evidence that the candidate is continuously and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance. Work in progress should be assessed whenever possible.

When published work in joint authorship (or other product of joint effort) is presented as evidence, it is the responsibility of the department chair to establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate 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 their 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.

It should be recognized that special cases of collaboration occur in the performing arts and that the contribution of a particular collaborator may not be readily discernible by those viewing the finished work. When the candidate is such a collaborator, it is the responsibility of the department chair to make a separate evaluation of the candidate's contribution and to provide outside opinions based on observation of the work while in progress. Account should be taken of the type and quality of creative activity normally expected in the candidate's field. Appraisals of publications or other works in the scholarly and critical literature provide important testimony. Due consideration should be given to variations among fields and specialties and to new genres and fields of inquiry.

Textbooks, reports, circulars, 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 judged creative work when they present new ideas or original scholarly research.

In certain fields, such as art, architecture, dance, music, literature, and drama, distinguished creation should receive consideration equivalent to that accorded to distinction attained in

research. In evaluating artistic creativity, an attempt should be made to define the candidate's merit in the light of such criteria as originality, scope, richness, and depth of creative expression. It should be recognized that in music, drama, and dance, distinguished performance, including conducting and directing, is evidence of a candidate's creativity.

The standing and importance of the journals in which publications have appeared should be indicated; in particular, the letter should state whether or not 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 candidate's success in obtaining research support, including support for graduate students, should be addressed. The role of the candidate on grants should be indicated (e.g., Principal Investigator, Co-Principal Investigator, or Co-Investigator, with the number of other investigators indicated). Evidence of successful grant funding may provide calibration of research impact and capacity for research training, and may be an *indicator* of research productivity or impact; however, grants are not required as a measure of productivity or impact. In large teams, the expectation of grant success should be moderated based on role in the team.

For appointment at or advancement to the Associate level or higher, independent academic and intellectual leadership in the field must be demonstrated. Although candidates must demonstrate independence from early-career mentors or advisors in order to be appointed at the Associate level, evidence is not restricted to independent research papers, other independent creative accomplishments, or garnering sole-P.I. grants, particularly if the candidate'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 appointment at 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 unable to evaluate the candidate's research and other creative accomplishments, assistance should be obtained 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 its field.

Department chairs in Health Sciences should make clear whether clinical case reports are merely historical or whether they contain new ideas or results.

(3) - Professional Competence and Activity

A candidate for appointment to this series must possess a Ph.D. degree or equivalent. In certain positions in the professional schools and colleges, such as architecture, business administration, dentistry, engineering, law, medicine, etc., a demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to the field and its characteristic activities should be recognized as a criterion for appointment or promotion. In Health Sciences, candidates with clinical responsibilities must have a doctorate in a clinical discipline. If required for the position, the candidate must possess and maintain an appropriate valid license and active membership as a Medical Staff member, or the equivalent. Those appointed at the Associate rank or above should be certified by one of the medical specialty boards or demonstrate equivalent achievement and recognition.

The candidate's professional activities should be scrutinized for evidence of achievement and leadership in the field and of demonstrated progressiveness in the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems, including those that specifically address the professional advancement of individuals in underrepresented groups in the candidate's field. It is responsibility of the department chair to provide evidence that the position in question is of the type described above and that the candidate is qualified to fill it.

4) University and Public Service

The faculty plays an important role in the administration of the University and in the formulation of its policies. Recognition should therefore be given to scholars who prove themselves to be able administrators and who participate effectively and imaginatively in faculty government and the formulation of departmental, college, and University policies. Services by members of the faculty 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 promotion. Faculty 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 advisers 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 Standing Orders of The Regents provide: “No political test shall ever be considered in the appointment and promotion of any faculty member or employee.” This provision is pertinent to every stage in the process of considering appointments and promotions of the faculty.

APM 210-1. e – The Report

APM 210-1 - Appendix A

PPM 230-210-2 Instructions to Review Committees which Advise on Actions Concerning Appointees in the Professor of Clinical X (e.g., *Medicine*) Series

APM 210-2. a

PPM 230-210-2. b

The review committee shall judge the candidate with respect to the proposed rank and duties, considering the record of the candidate’s performance in (1) teaching, (2) professional competence and activity, (3) creative work, and (4) University and public service.

The department chair is responsible for documenting the faculty member’s division of effort among the four areas of activity. The chair should also indicate the appropriateness of this division to the position that the individual fills in the department, school, or clinical teaching faculty. Appointees in the Professor of Clinical (e.g., *Medicine*) series are to be evaluated in relation to the nature and time commitments of their University assignments.

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

Clinical teaching, professional activity, and creative work may differ from standard professorial activities in the University, but can be judged on the basis of professional competence, intellectual contribution, and originality.

APM 210-2. b. (1) – Teaching

PPM 230-210-2. b. (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 of 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.

PPM 230-210-2 b.2.(a) Standards for Appointment or Promotion

For entry-level positions, the individual should have three or more years of training and/or experience post M.D., Ph.D. or equivalent terminal professional degree. In addition, an appointee should show evidence of a high level of competence in a clinical specialty. If required for the position, the candidate must possess and maintain an appropriate valid license and active membership as a Medical Staff member, or the equivalent.

For promotion to or appointment at 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. Appointees at the Associate rank or above should be certified by one of the medical specialty boards or demonstrate equivalent achievement and recognition. Appointees may receive patient referrals at the community and institutional levels. A physician 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 or appointment at 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 hospital. Appointees may receive patients on referral from considerable distances, serve as consultants on a nationwide basis, serve on specialty boards, or be members or officers of clinical and/or professional societies.

APM 210-2. b. (2) (b) Evaluation of Clinical Achievement

APM 210-2. b. (3) **Creative Work**

APM 210-2. b. (4) **University and Public Service**

PPM 230-210-3 Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on Actions Concerning the Lecturer with Security of Employment Series

APM 210-3. a

PPM 230-210-3. b

The review committee shall judge the candidate with respect to the proposed rank and duties considering the record of the candidate's performance in (1) teaching, (2) professional achievement and activity, (3) University and public service, and (4). Educational leadership beyond the campus and contributions to instruction-related activities

PPM 230-210-3. c

The criteria set forth below are intended to serve as guides for minimum standards by which to judge the candidate, not to set boundaries to exclude other elements of performance that may be considered, as agreed upon by the candidate and the department.

APM 210-3. c (1) **Teaching**

APM 210-3. c (2) **Professional Achievement and Activity**

APM 210-3. c (3) **University and Public Service**

PPM 230-210-3. c (4) **Educational Leadership and Contributions to Instruction-Related Activities**

A demonstrated record of educational leadership beyond the campus and contributions to instruction-related activities (i.e., conducting TA training, supervision of student affairs, development of instructional materials/multimedia) is one of the criteria for advancement or promotion.

The Standing Orders of The Regents provide: “No political test shall ever be considered in the appointment and promotion of any faculty member or employee.” This provision is pertinent to every stage in the process of considering appointments and promotions of the faculty.

PPM 230-210-4 Instructions to Review Committees which Advise on Actions Concerning Appointees in the Librarian Series

APM 210-4

PPM 230-210-5 Instructions to Review Committees which Advise on Actions Concerning Appointees in the Supervisor of Teacher Education Series

APM 210-5

PPM 230-210-6 Instructions to Review Committees which Advise on Actions Concerning Appointees in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series

APM 210-6

PPM 230-210-24 Authority

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

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.

REVISION HISTORY

July 01, 2017	This policy was made effective.
April 18, 2018	Minor technical edits to update policy hyperlinks.
March 31, 2020	Technical edits to remove gendered language.