Check List of Required Items for AP Bears Merit & Promotion Cases

The following items should be reviewed before submitting faculty cases to the Dean’s Office. The checklist below is organized by section in the Cases tab in AP Bears. Please review the information on Bmap (bmap.berkeley.edu) for additional information about the materials to be included in the review.

OVERVIEW

1. Confirm the Review Period. 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. For promotions and threshold cases, the review period should encompass activities since the last promotion/threshold case.

2. Confirm the Case Action Type

3. Enter Job Appointments, Information, Analysts, Case Notes, and Competing Offer/Retention details. Applicable sections should be complete. Note that the “Job Appointments” field does not auto-populate and requires Department Analysts to enter the appropriate FTE.

CANDIDATE SUMMARY

Teaching - Courses Taught

4. Course evaluation statistics must be provided for all regular courses taught (usually LEC and SEM courses)

5. Department comparison statistics and explanation of methodology used must be provided for all regular courses taught

6. Student narrative comments must be uploaded to AP Bears for all merit, promotion, and 5-year reviews. For threshold reviews, narrative comments should be provided for the full period since the last threshold (not just since the last review).

7. An explanation for any missing course evaluations must be provided - this can be entered as a comment in the applicable course entry (preferred), or an explanation can be uploaded as a miscellaneous document

Sabbaticals, Leaves, and Releases

8. Any sabbaticals, leaves, and course releases taken during the period under review must be entered in this section so it is clear to reviewers the reason for any gaps in teaching.

9. A sabbatical report addressing the points outlined in APM-740-97 must be provided for any sabbatical taken during the period under review. This should be a full sabbatical report, not simply a couple of sentences entered into the text field.

Self-Statement (required for Asst. Prof. first merits using the check sheet, otherwise highly recommended)

10. A narrative discussing research accomplishments, future directions, teaching, and service contributions is encouraged to provide context for the APBears records. Candidates are encouraged to address contributions made to diversity, equity and inclusion in each area of review, either in the self-statement or a diversity statement.

Curriculum Vitae (required)

11. An updated CV must be included in the AP Bears case file.

Publications List (required)

Some units or divisions have specific formatting requirements for publications list (e.g., numbered publications lists). Please consult with your Dean’s Office for any additional requirements beyond those noted below.

12. A publications list is required with every case. This is a complete bibliography for use in a review action.

   12.a The publications list must be in Word format.

   12.b The list should be sorted by major categories, i.e. books, refereed articles, etc. as expected for a review.

   12.c Any portions of a book in progress being submitted for credit need to be clearly indicated.
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12.d Publications completed during the current review period should be clearly marked (for threshold cases, the publications list should delineate publications that have been credited since the last threshold review, and publications that are new to the current period under review).

12.e Check the submitted publications list against the items credited at the last review to ensure accuracy.

13. Candidates need to include details of their contributions to collaborative work for campus reviewers. This can be done on the publications list, or in the self-statement.

DOCUMENTS - MERIT REVIEWS

Departmental Recommendation
(Note: Guidance on requirements for departmental recommendations in promotion and threshold cases may be found below)

14. A Chair’s recommendation needs to be submitted with every case. For joint appointments, both departmental chairs may submit a recommendation, or a joint recommendation can be prepared with both Chairs’ signatures. Make sure the recommendation includes:

14.a The rank/step, salary, and effective date
14.b Justification for larger-than-normal recommendations (if applicable)
14.c Explanation of lateness (if applicable)
14.d Explanation if case is coming forward in non-normative time (if applicable)

DOCUMENTS - PROMOTIONS & THRESHOLD CASES

External Letters

15. 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 letters to correspond with code key (ex: “External Reviewer A”). 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.

16. 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

17. Ensure that the external reviewers comply with the Guidelines on Appropriate and Inappropriate Reviewers. If the department wants to request an exception for including a letter from a reviewer who campus reviewers might deem “inappropriate,” include a rationale on the code-key or upload a Chairs Personal Letter.

Code Key of External Reviewers

18. A code key of external reviewers (if any) is required. The code key must follow the campus template, clearly stating each reviewer’s name and institution, their stature/standing (rank, title, etc.), whether a letter was received (yes or no), and if no, a brief explanation of the reason (ex. “too busy”, or “on leave”), and whether the reviewer was suggested by the department, candidate, or both. Campus reviewers rely on departments to provide information about the stature of external reviewers in the code key (refer to Vice Provost Hermalin’s memo dated 1/13/18 for more information).

19. At least half of the external review letters should come from the Department’s list. The policy on external review letters is available at https://bmap.berkeley.edu/external-letters-directive-dated-12909. Also note that letters from mentors, co-authors, and collaborators typically do not count toward the minimum number of external letters required.
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Copy of Solicitation Letter (Redacted)
20. 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.

Departmental Ad Hoc Report
21. 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.

Departmental Recommendation
(Note: Guidance on requirements for departmental recommendations specific to merit cases may be found above)
22. A Chair’s recommendation needs to be submitted with every case. For joint appointments, both departmental chairs may submit a recommendation, or a joint recommendation can be prepared with both Chairs’ signatures. Make sure the recommendation includes:
   22.a The rank/step, salary, and effective date
   22.b Justification for larger-than-normal recommendations (if applicable)
   22.c Explanation of lateness (if applicable)
   22.d Explanation if case is coming forward in non-normative time (if applicable)
23. 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”)
24. Recommendation should clarify contributions since last review (which influence the size of the merit) and since the last threshold (which determine if the candidate should cross the threshold)
25. If a faculty vote is required, the departmental recommendation needs to report both the exact numeric vote results, as well as the total number of faculty who were eligible to participate in the vote. The recommendation should also include a brief overview of the faculty discussion that preceded the vote (only refer to discussants by code).
26. Make sure that the effective date, step, and salary details are included in the chair’s letter and match the data in APBears.
27. Include the rationale for the proposed step increase, referring to the Criteria for Faculty Step Accelerations.

Miscellaneous Documents
28. 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 https://bmap.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/publications_chart_9.2018.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.
29. Any supplementary reports, teaching materials, or other documents mentioned in the ad hoc report or Chair’s letter need to be sent forward with the case.

ROUTING LOG
30. 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.
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31. Confirm that the step and salary entered into AP Bears is correct, and that it matches the Chair’s recommendation. Note that salaries are rounded to the nearest hundred. Review UCPath data for current salary components.

32. Ensure that any step recommendation for appointments and promotions comply with the [Steps at Appointments and Promotions Directive](#).