

Faculty Merit and Promotion Cases

Check List of Required Items

The following items should be reviewed before submitting merits, promotions, or other faculty cases to the Deans' Office. The checklist below is organized by section in the Cases tab in AP Bears.

Before you begin, review the appropriate check sheet from APO's website to determine what is required for the case; make sure each required element is present in the file in AP Bears. <http://apo.berkeley.edu/CheckSheets.html>

| Overview | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Job Appointments, Information, Analysts, Case Notes, and Competing Offer/Retention</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicable sections should be complete. Note that the "Job Appointments" field does not auto-populate and requires Department Analysts to enter the appropriate FTE. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Review Period</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For promotions and threshold cases, the review period should encompass activities since the last promotion/threshold case. Review periods almost always start July 1 of the year PRIOR to the effective date of the last case (i.e., if the last review took effect July 1, 2013, the review period likely begins July 1, 2012). There are a few exceptions (ex. Spring start dates), so if you are unsure, check with the Deans' Office. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Case Action Type</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correct case action type is listed for action requested |
| Candidate Summary | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Teaching – Courses Taught</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Course evaluation statistics provided where needed (usually LEC and SEM courses) Departmental comparison statistics, along with an explanation of methodology provided Explanation for any missing evaluations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Sabbaticals, Leaves, and Releases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any sabbaticals, leaves, and course releases should be reflected in this section so it is clear to reviewers the reason for any gaps in teaching. A sabbatical report is required for any sabbatical taken. This should be a full sabbatical report, not simply a couple of sentences entered into the text field. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Curriculum Vitae (required)</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Publications List (required)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a complete Bibliography uploaded as a document for use in a review action. The list should be sorted by major categories, i.e. books, refereed articles, etc. as expected for a review. Publications completed during the current review period should be clearly marked. Campus has asked that this list be provided in Word format. Check the submitted pub list against the pub list from the last review to ensure that publications being submitted for credit are correct. |
| Salary Recommendation | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Salary and decoupled increment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please confirm that the salary entered is correct, and that it matches the salary and step in the Chair's recommendation. Note that salaries are rounded to the nearest hundred. |
| Routing Log | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check to be sure that the case documents in the Documents tab have not been deleted and re-uploaded following the candidate's signoff. If the date/time of the candidate's signoff falls BEFORE the date/time of the corresponding document in the Documents tab, the case will need to be returned to the department to have the candidate complete the signoff again. |

Documents – All reviews (Merits, Promotions & Thresholds)

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Departmental Recommendation <p>A Chair's recommendation needs to be submitted with every case. For joint appointments, both departmental chairs must submit a recommendation, or a joint recommendation can be prepared with both Chairs' signatures.</p> <p>Make sure the recommendation includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The rank/step, salary, and effective date• Justification for larger-than-normal recommendations (if applicable)• Explanation of lateness (if applicable) |
|--------------------------|---|

Documents – Promotion & Threshold Cases

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | External Letters <ul style="list-style-type: none">• External review letters should be uploaded in redacted and unredacted format. Letters should be combined into one file containing all letters as opposed to uploading letters individually. Label each letter "External Reviewer A", "External Reviewer B" and so forth. If an external reviewer did not sign his/her letter, please include a pdf of the email that the reviewer sent with the letter attached in the file with the letters.• APO has requested that the body of external review letters not be redacted. Redactions should follow the campus confidentiality policy, which defines redaction as the removal of identifying information (including name, title, institutional affiliation, and relationship to the candidate) contained either at the top or bottom of the letterhead or within and below the signature block of the letter of evaluation. http://apo.berkeley.edu/evalltr.html |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Code Key of External Reviewers <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The code key of external reviewers needs to be uploaded. The code key should clearly state each reviewer's affiliation (which institution they are from), their standing (rank, title, etc.), whether they were suggested by the department, candidate, or both, whether a letter was received, and if the reviewer declined, a brief summary of the reason (ex. "too busy", or "on leave").• At least half of the external review letters should come from the Department's list. The policy on external review letters is available at http://apo.berkeley.edu/external_letters_guidelines_12.09.pdf. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Copy of Solicitation Letter (Redacted) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Upload a copy of the letter of solicitation that was sent to external reviewers for this case. The UCB Confidentiality policy needs to be included in this letter. Please redact any identifying information from this letter – it should not contain the identity of any reviewers. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Departmental Ad Hoc Report <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The departmental ad hoc report (if any) should be submitted in both redacted and unredacted format. Make sure the unredacted copy is signed by all committee members. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Departmental Recommendation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Departmental recommendations should be in redacted format (do not mention either reviewers, or departmental faculty members by name). External reviewers and faculty discussants should only be mentioned by code in the departmental recommendation letters. The identities of reviewers and faculty members should be provided in a separate code key (uploaded as a "Code Key of External Reviewers") |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Miscellaneous Documents <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Publications can be uploaded to AP Bears either as Non-Confidential documents in the Achievements section, or as Miscellaneous Documents in the Documents section. If you do not upload publications directly into AP Bears, you must submit a separate publications list that indicates only the publications being sent forward with the case. See http://apo.berkeley.edu/PUBLICATIONS_Chart_4.2014.pdf for guidance on cases that require publications. Please note that APO requests that publications be provided electronically in AP Bears whenever possible, either by uploading them, or by providing a list of publications in AP Bears that links to the publications on a website.• Any supplementary reports, teaching materials (for appointment cases) or other documents mentioned in the ad hoc report or Chair's letter need to be sent forward with the case. |