ACADEMIC REVIEW PROCESS

APPOINTMENT
MERIT / REAPPOINTMENT
MID-CAREER APPRAISAL
PROMOTION
### Health Sciences Academic Affairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan Goldin, MD, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Vice Chancellor, Health Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lari Wenzel, PhD</td>
<td>Acting Vice Dean, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Helmy, MD</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Academic Affairs/Clinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Morris</td>
<td>Executive Director, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jami Holland</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maral Dakessian</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Principal Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Jurado</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Principal Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuy Vu</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Principal Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanthou Sung</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Principal Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirella Ruano</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Pearlman</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Specialist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Personnel Review Overview

**Department Review**
- Candidate submits information for review
- Department makes a recommendation
- Department Chair makes an independent recommendation (optional)

**Dean Review**
- Academic Affairs reviews dossier for completeness
- **Dean's Advisory Committee**
  - Makes a recommendation
- **Dean**
  - Decides normal merits that have been delegated to Deans (CAP review waived)
  - Makes a recommendation on promotions and non-delegated merits

**Campus Review**
- Academic Personnel reviews dossier for completeness
- **Council on Academic Personnel**
  - (elected by all Academic Senate Faculty)
  - Makes a recommendation
- **Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor or Vice Provost**
  - Decides appointments, merits and advancements
  - Recommends to Chancellor on promotions and non-reappointments
- **Chancellor**
Use of AP Review is mandatory for ALL actions excluding:

- Appointments and non-reappointments
- Split appointments
- Department Chairs reviews
Fall 2019 Kick-Off: Academic Personnel Review Process
September, 4 2019 @ 7:45 am - 9:30 am

Topic for this workshop will be the Academic Personnel Review Process. Representatives from the Council on Academic Personnel will be present to offer their advice and suggestions on preparing review files. Deans, Chairs, CPOs, MSOs/HSDAs, Departmental Academic Personnel Coordinators and Equity Advisors are encouraged to attend.
2019-20 SOM File Deadlines

OCT 7, 2019
Postponement of Tenure Review Files, Merits (including accelerations)*, Advancement to Professor Step VI, No Change, Reappointments, Midcareer Appraisals, and Fifth Year Reviews

* Non Dean-Delegated

DEC 2, 2019
Promotions, Non-reappointments, Above Scale actions, Dean-Delegated Merits, and all other actions (including non-faculty academics)

**COHS deadlines TBD**
Reminders

- Adherence to UC policy
  - Follow the appropriate checklist for each series and action
- Start the academic review process sooner rather than later
  - Solicit for those Letters of Recommendation in the summer months for promotion and Advancement to A/S files
  - Remind the faculty and Chair often that material for the academic review is due, give hard deadlines
Notifying the Faculty that a review is due

The department notifies the faculty member outside AP Review that he or she is due for a review. This step should be completed by whatever method the department currently uses, and at the correct time to ensure compliance with departments’ and Deans’ deadlines.
Call for Material

- Request review material from the faculty member
  - Updated Curriculum Vitae
  - UC AP-10 Addendum Form
  - Referee contact information from faculty member and those from the department (if applicable)
  - Teaching - Self-Evaluation
  - Research Statement (if applicable)
  - Statement on Contributions to Diversity
Careful review of the material prior to submitting to the Deans office will help to ensure less of a delay and/or return of the file with a “BACK TO SCHOOL”
Errors & Omissions

- Department letter needs to address teaching effectiveness
- Letters of recommendation missing codes from the AP-11
- Missing teaching evaluations or a teaching summary
- Incorrect review period
- Publication links not accessible
- Inadequate number of letters of recommendation
- Clearly label teaching statement
- Updated CV
- Typos/grammatical errors in file
- Missing Documents: AP-137A, AP-50, and faculty response
Letters of Recommendation (LOR)

- Guidelines for Letters of Recommendation (LOR) for SOM HS Series appointments/review actions are located on the COHS Academic Affairs website, under ‘Appointments’ tab*
  - http://som.uci.edu/academic-affairs/

*Also available on the Merits and Promotions page.

Guidelines for other series will be posted on the COHS site soon; also available under APP 3-20

**At the Fall Kickoff on 9/4/19, AP announced new letter requirements – please click on the link above (APP-3-20) to view the new requirements**
LOR: Solicitation

- When soliciting letters, the faculty member must nominate letter-writers, and provide names and contact information to the department analyst.

- At the same time, the Department Chair prepares his/her own list. Any overlapping names move to the Department List; and are marked on the AP-11 as such.

- Solicitation letters must be written on behalf of the Department Chair, and may include the department analyst’s or other representative’s contact info for response.

IMPORTANT NOTE: CANDIDATES MUST NOT SOLICIT THEIR OWN LETTERS, CONTACT LETTER-WRITERS, OR PROVIDE THEIR OWN MATERIALS DIRECTLY TO LETTER-WRITERS.
Solicitation letters must contain the following information:

1. An explanation of the proposed action (appointment, review, etc)
2. A request for analytical review of the candidate’s performance under the applicable criteria and comparison with other scholars in the field of similar rank
3. The UC Confidentiality Statement

Effective immediately, departments must use the sample solicitation letters found on the College of Health Sciences Academic Affairs Website.
Department Analysts must review all letters received to ensure:

- Letters are strong, analytical, and address the correct proposed action
- There is no duplicate language between letters
- The letter contains correct faculty information
- The letter is dated and addressed appropriately, and signed by the writer
- The letter doesn’t contain anything inappropriate, for example, a copy/paste of the faculty member’s CV, or information that is inappropriate to include in a letter of reference
Letters must be coded and added to the file in the order that they are received, with the most recent letter received going on top. The newest letter earns the lowest number code, or earliest alpha code.

The Sample Solicitation Letter is added at the end, after all of the letters (per checklist)

- E.g. The analyst receives three solicited letters for a faculty appointment file. One letter is dated 5/31, one on 6/12, and the other on 7/15. The letter that is dated 7/15 receives code “A”, the letter dated 6/12 receives code “B”, and the letter dated 5/31 receives code “C”.

Prior to submitting the file, the department analyst must review the AP-11 and letters to make sure that the letters have codes which correspond to those noted on the AP-11, and the letters are in the appropriate order within the file.
Once all letters are received by the department, the analyst must code the letters and complete all fields of the AP-11 form.

The Analyst also uses the AP-11 to record letters that are received, AND letters that were solicited, but not received.

The assigned code must be noted clearly on each page of the received letter, in the body of the letter, on the right-hand side of each page.

Coding the letter at the top of the page may result in the code being deleted if the letter is redacted.
April 15, 2019

University of California
Irvine, CA
RE: HS Clinical Professor Series

Dear Sirs:

I am delighted to write a letter of recommendation for Dr. [Redacted] to a staff position at the Anesthesiology & Perioperative Care Department, University of California. I have known [Redacted] since his residency in our program at the University of Washington in Seattle. During his last year of residency, I got to know him extremely well as a mentor. [Redacted] then continued his specialization with a pediatric anesthesia fellowship at Boston Children's. He currently provides mobile anesthesia services for the community and is a medical consultant for quality improvements.

In his capacity as a resident, [Redacted] and I worked closely on many difficult, high risk labor and delivery patients. I can say without any hesitation that [Redacted] is a superb, patient and kind clinician. He was calm and reassuring to our very wide array of patients. I remember him being skillful with all techniques, from CSEs to difficult airways. I especially appreciated his ability to reason through situations that require excellent judgment, and then plan the safest method of taking care of the complicated parturient. I have learned a lot from [Redacted] care of some of our difficult OB cases, and have enjoyed the days that we worked together.

September 26, 2018

University of California-School of Medicine
Irvine, CA

Dear Professor Said,

I am delighted to send you this very positive and supportive letter commenting on the suitability of [Redacted] for the appointment of Professor in Residence Level V in the Department of Physiology/Biophysics at the University of California Irvine. I have known Dr. [Redacted] for approximately the past 9 years in the context of our working relationship related to the use of Plasmodium falciparum and P. vivax protein microarrays to evaluate malaria exposure and susceptibility in work supported by the NIH International Centers of Excellence for Malaria Research (ICEMR) program. I was previously the program director of the Southwest Pacific ICEMR (2010-2016) based in Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands, and now serve as a project director of an ICEMR based at UC Irvine (Guiyan Yan is the program director) that involves malaria studies in Kenya and Ethiopia.
Mark one or more categories, as appropriate

- **Independent Reviewer**: a letter-writer who is not currently collaborating with the faculty member, and/or has not collaborated with them in the past 4 years. They are also not a former advisor or former student. An independent reviewer cannot be current UCI faculty member, or a Dean or Chair of a department at UC Irvine.

- **Current/Recent Collaborator**: a letter-writer who is currently collaborating with the faculty member and/or who has collaborated with the faculty member within the last 4 years.

- **Former Advisor**

- **Former Student**

- **Other**: may be used to explain other, or additional affiliations with faculty member. E.g. previous collaborator (more than 4 years), or current/former colleague.
The Analyst must review each letter and the file to determine the category of the letter-writer, and mark the AP-11 appropriately. Cross-check the CV to ensure that the correct category is selected.

Helpful Hint: CTRL+F to search for names of letter-writers within the CV to see if the letter-writer has collaborated with the faculty member; then check the year of collaboration.
For files with both External and Internal letters, the analyst must separate ‘Internal Referees’ from ‘External Referees’.

- **Internal**: Letter-writers from UC Irvine, within the faculty member’s home department, or with another department on campus
- **External**: Letter-writers from outside UC Irvine; can be from the community, other Universities, or other UC campuses

Sort External and Internal letters separately; assign letters to one set, and numbers to the other to show differentiation.

- **External Letters must come first in the file.**
  - Add ‘External’ AP-11 to file, then all External Letters, then add ‘Internal’ AP-11, then all Internal Letters.
  - Make sure to change the text at the top of the AP-11 to reflect the type of referee (External or Internal)
### Identification and Qualifications of External Referees

**Name of Candidate:**

**Department:**

PLEASE LIST ALL SOLICITED LETTER WRITERS AND INDICATE WHETHER OR NOT THEY RESPONDED (CURRENT OR RECENT COLLABORATORS ARE EXPECTED REVIEWERS WITH WHOM THE CANDIDATE HAS PUBLISHED IN THE PRECEDING FOUR YEARS.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominated by</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Cand</th>
<th>Ind. Reviewer</th>
<th>Current or Recent Collaborator</th>
<th>Former Advisor</th>
<th>Former Student</th>
<th>OTHER: Please Explain the Nature of Relationship to Referee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thorsten Mempel, M.D., Ph.D.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Harvard Medical School / Massachusetts General Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications: Dr. Mempel obtained his Ph.D. in cardiovascular physiology and M.D. from the University of Munich where he also began his residency in pediatrics. He completed his postdoctoral training in Immunology in the Center for Blood Research at Harvard Medical School. In 2002, he became a faculty member of the Center for Immunology and Inflammatory Diseases and the Division of Rheumatology, Allergy, and Immunology at Massachusetts General Hospital where he currently is an Associate Professor in Medicine at Harvard Medical School. Dr. Mempel has been a pioneer and leader in the field of immunology and has used multiphoton intravital microscopy in lymphoid and non-lymphoid tissues to study T cell trafficking and activation in vivo. He previously served as President as well as Co-Chair of the New England Immunology Conference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominated by</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>Cand</td>
<td>Ind. Reviewer</td>
<td>Current or Recent Collaborator</td>
<td>Former Advisor</td>
<td>Former Student</td>
<td>OTHER: Please Explain the Nature of Relationship to Referee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anjana Rao, Ph.D.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: California, San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications: Dr. Anjana Rao obtained her Ph.D. in Biophysics from Harvard University. She is currently a Professor with an appointment as an Adjunct Professor in the Department of Pharmacology at the University of California, San Diego. Her research focuses on the regulation of gene expression, utilizing primarily transgenic mice as a model system. Her honors and achievements include having been elected to the National Academy of Sciences. She is also a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences as well as the American Association for the Advancement of Science. In 2016, Dr. Rao received the Frederick W. Alt Award for New Discoveries in Immunology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Other...
**IDENTIFICATION AND QUALIFICATIONS OF INTERNAL REFEREES**

**Name of Candidate:**

**Department:**

**PLEASE LIST ALL SOLICITED LETTER WRITERS AND INDICATE WHETHER OR NOT THEY RESPONDED**
(CURRENT or RECENT COLLABORATORS are expert reviewers with whom the CANDIDATE has PUBLISHED in the preceding FOUR years.)

**NOMINATED BY REFEREE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Cand</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Associate Clinical Professor</td>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualifications:** Dr. graduated New York Medical College and completed residency with the University of Connecticut School of Medicine. He completed a Fellowship with the Mayo Clinic. Dr. currently serves as the Residency Program Director.

**NOMINATED BY REFEREE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Cand</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Assistant Clinical Professor</td>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualifications:** Dr. graduated the University of Utah School of Medicine and completed residency with Cedars-Sinai Medical Center. He completed a Fellowship with Cedars-Sinai Medical Center. Dr. currently serves as the Course Director for

**Please Indicate Referee's Relationship to the Candidate:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Reviewer</th>
<th>Current or Recent Collaborator</th>
<th>Former Advisor</th>
<th>Former Student</th>
<th>OTHER: Please Explain the Nature of Relationship to Referee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Residency Program Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please Indicate Referee's Relationship to the Candidate:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Reviewer</th>
<th>Current or Recent Collaborator</th>
<th>Former Advisor</th>
<th>Former Student</th>
<th>OTHER: Please Explain the Nature of Relationship to Referee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Attending_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Helpful Hints

- Creating the AP-11 and assigning codes once you have received all letters and are ready to assemble the file ensures that the codes you have assigned are in the correct order.

- On the AP-11, each letter-writer’s information must stay on one page, and it must not be cut off or continued to the next page.

- You can edit the AP-11: if your text overflows to the next page, or information is cut off, you can manipulate the text box so that everything stays together.
AP-10 Addendum

- UC-AP 10 - Addendum Form: this form documents teaching, research and service activities
  - The role of the faculty member is to submit the information for their file
  - The role of the analyst is to review and make sure that the information provided is within the review period, and complies with policy and procedures
Academic Affairs Dean’s office distributes list of faculty eligible for review to department chairs each fall.

- Important - Department must maintain their own progress report and start planning in the summer for actions due.

Assistant Professor

- Merit or Reappointment
  - Occurs every two years

- Midcareer Appraisal/Assessment (MCA)
  - Normally occurs in the third or no later than fourth year

- Promotion
  - Normally occurs during the sixth year or no later than the seventh
Include faculty name and review period on every page of addendum

All material listed on the addendum must be within the review period

Use the most current form revised as of (8/17); always use the form from AP website https://ap.uci.edu/wp-content/uploads/UCI-AP-10.docx
Merit for an Assistant Professor

- Review period begins October 1\(^{st}\) of year prior to last action received
- Curriculum Vitae & AP-10 Addendum dates must adhere to the review period

*Example:* Last action effective 7/1/17, the Merit is effective 7/1/19, review period is 10/1/16 - 9/30/18
Mid-Career Appraisal Review Period

Mid-Career Appraisal for an Assistant Professor

- Review period is from date of hire through 9/30 of the review year
- Curriculum Vitae & AP-10 Addendum dates must adhere to the review period.

*Example:* Hire Date of 7/1/15, the MCA would normally occur during the 4th year (2018-19), review period is 7/1/15 - 9/30/18
Promotion Review Period

Promotion for an Assistant Professor

- Review period is from date of hire as Assistant Professor through 9/30 of the review year
- Curriculum Vitae & AP-10 Addendum dates must adhere to the review period

*Example:* **Hire Date:** July 1, 2015  
Promotion Effective: July 1, 2021  
Review Period: July 1, 2015 - September 30, 2020
Please review for accuracy and also ensure that ALL of the UC Employment history is listed; including each rank, step and % of appointment.

**Example:**
7/1/15-6/30/17 Assistant Professor, Step I 100% Medicine
7/1/17-6/30/19 Assistant Professor, Step II 100% Medicine
### AP-10 Addendum

#### SECTION II – Teaching Activity during review period

**A. COURSES TAUGHT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qtr/Year</th>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th># Insts</th>
<th>% Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Reminder-this section must be completely filled out and please be sure that the material listed is within the review period.*
**AP-10 Addendum**

**SECTION II – Cont’d**

**B. MEDICAL STUDENT TEACHING** – Note: This section is to be filled out by Clinical Faculty only. General faculty please skip to Section II, Subsection D to continue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>Date/Date Span</th>
<th># Hours/Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Ward Rounds:

Clinical Teaching:

Lectures (Grand Rounds, Special lectures, etc.):

The faculty member must insert names if available and average the amount of hours.
C. GRADUATE TEACHING (Residents, other) – Note: This section is to be filled out by Clinical Faculty only. General faculty please skip to Section II, Subsection D to continue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>Date/Date Span</th>
<th># Hours/Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward Rounds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Teaching:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures (Grand Rounds, Special lectures, etc.):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECIION II – Cont’d

D. ADDITIONAL ITEMS THAT RELATE TO YOUR TEACHING

1. **Doctoral Students Supervised** (indicate dates, and whether as chair, co-chair, or committee member)
   - (a) those who received their Ph.D.
     | Year(s) | Student Name | Role | Department |
   - (b) those who advanced to candidacy
     | Year(s) | Student Name | Role | Department |
   - (c) pre-dissertation committees
     | Year(s) | Student Name | Role | Department |
   - (d) other research supervision
     | Year(s) | Student Name | Role | Department |

2. **Master’s Thesis Students Supervised** (indicate whether as chair, co-chair, or committee member)
   | Year(s) | Student Name | Role | Department |

3. **Postdoctoral Scholars Supervised**
   | Year(s) | Student Name | Role | Department |

4. **Undergraduate Student Research Supervision – UROP, honors courses, 199’s**
   | Year(s) | Student Name | Role | Department |

5. **Other Research Supervision**
   | Year(s) | Student Name | Role | Department |
### E. TEACHING AWARDS AND SPECIAL PEDAGOGICAL ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### F. TEACHING INNOVATIONS AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
E. DIVERSITY

- https://diversity.universityofcalifornia.edu/

- List teaching activities that promote the University’s mission of increasing diversity (see APM 210). (Please note, at least one section of Diversity must be completed)
Be sure to list authors in the published order. For co-authored or collaborative work, the faculty member must state his/her role and/or share of contribution (e.g., primary author, 50% co-author, secondary author,)

It is important to describe unique, independent contribution to each publication – just reporting % effort is generally not helpful
This section is completed only for Promotions, Advancements, MCA’s
Review the following to ensure any grants that were previously submitted are categorized correctly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previously Submitted</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Number or Title</th>
<th>Role*</th>
<th>Amount**</th>
<th>Date Span of Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
SECTION IV – Professional Recognition and Activity during review period

A. HONORS AND AWARDS
   Date(s)   Description

B. MEMBERSHIPS
   Date(s)   Description

C. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY
   Invited presentations at educational, governmental institutions (or similar organizations)
   Date(s)   Description

   Invited presentations at professional meetings
   Date(s)   Description

   Accepted presentations at educational, governmental institutions (or similar organizations)
   Date(s)   Description

   Accepted presentations at professional meetings
   Date(s)   Description

   Other presentations at professional meetings
   Date(s)   Description

   Media Appearances and Interviews
   Date(s)   Description

   Professional articles in this period about you or published reviews of your work
   Date(s)   Description

Abstracts are noted in this section under ‘Accepted presentations at professional meetings’.
### D. PROFESSIONAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE

| Service to Professional Societies / Outside Institutions (board of advisors, session chair, conference organizer, etc.) |
| Date(s) | Description |

| Journal Editor / Membership on Journal Editorial Boards |
| Date(s) | Description |
SECTION IV – Cont’d

**Reviewer of Manuscripts / Journal Articles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Standing Member of Review Boards for Funding Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Ad hoc Service as Referee of Proposals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Consulting Activities** (industry, government; indicate whether paid or pro bono)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Community Service** (including activities related to the improvement of elementary and secondary education)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
SECTION V – University & Systemwide Service during review period

A. UNIVERSITY/SYSTEMWIDE - Academic Senate, Administrative Service; Senate Assembly; MRU, UCOP

| Date(s) | Description |

B. CAMPUS - Academic Senate and Administrative Service:

| Date(s) | Description |

C. SCHOOL

| Date(s) | Description |

D. DEPARTMENT (other than listings in Section I)

| Date(s) | Description |
I certify that the information on this Addendum to the Biography form is correct:

Signature ___________________________ Date ______________

Certification via AP Review serves as a signature; if this is a paper file please be sure to have the faculty member sign and date.
Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

All faculty academic files (both dean-delegated and non dean-delegated)

- Files must include the following evidence:
  - Teaching statement
    - Must be labeled with faculty member’s name and department
    - Must be reflective and no more than 2 pages ([http://dtei.uci.edu/the-reflective-teaching-statement/](http://dtei.uci.edu/the-reflective-teaching-statement/))
    - Any negative evaluations must be addressed in the teaching statement
Teaching

Student evaluations of teaching for the period being reviewed
- Raw data
- Teaching summary

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness
- Must include:
  1. Reflective Teaching Statement
  2. Teaching Evaluations, when applicable
- May include: Other Evidence Documents (e.g. peer review of your teaching, awards, course syllabi)

If sufficient evaluations are not available, one of the following may be used:
- Self-Evaluation Documents (e.g. course syllabi)
- Other Evidence Documents (e.g. peer review of teaching, awards)
Peer reviews are reviews that are from a colleague

- Colleagues are invited to observe a faculty member’s teaching in order to make an assessment
  - e.g. Classroom, Clinics, Grand Rounds, Morning or Noon Conferences

- It is not considered a peer review if it is from a resident or fellow (that would be viewed as a teaching evaluation)

Guidelines for Teaching Effectiveness

*A WEBFILES LINK IS ACCEPTABLE FOR APPOINTMENT FILES/PAPER REVIEW FILES. FOR AP REVIEW FILES, AP/CAP NOW REQUIRES TEACHING EVALUATIONS BE UPLOADED TO AP REVIEW AS ONE .PDF FILE.

*For Paper Review Files and Appointment Files: Individual teaching evaluations must be uploaded to Webfiles (http://Webfiles.uci.edu/)
  - Live link must be active for at least one year

Exceptions would be paper files

- Paper files consist of new appointments, split appointments, non-reappointments, chair reviews
- Live link must be emailed to the dean analyst
- A printout of the live link must be included in the paper file

*Requirements Updated after guidance received at AP Fall Kickoff event on 9/4/19
Teaching

*For Files that are not submitted via AP Review: Please submit the Teaching Effectiveness as a Webfiles link. Copy/Paste the link into a Word document. The document must be labeled with faculty member’s name, department, and proposed action

Sample:

John Doe, PhD, Department of Biological Chemistry

Proposed: Appointment to Assistant Professor, III

Link to Evidence of Publications:

https://webfiles.uci.edu/xythoswfs/webui/ xy-e6280538_1-t_w3ljyvh5f

Link to Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness:

https://webfiles.uci.edu/xythoswfs/webui/ xy-e6284925_1-t_jwn5W5iI

*Updated after guidance received at AP Fall Kickoff event on 9/4/19
Teaching

*For Appointment files and other paper files submitted to SOM Dean’s Office, hard copies of individual teaching evaluations (raw data) will not be accepted (must be in Webfiles)

Only the teaching summary and teaching statement must be printed and included with the file along with a copy of the web file link (WORD or PDF format)

For appointment files:

- If individual teaching evaluations (raw data) are not available, the department letter must explain why

- An email or letter from the faculty member indicating the reason must also be printed and included in the file

- Must include a reflective teaching statement

*Updated after guidance received at AP Fall Kickoff event on 9/4/19
Publications: Guidelines

- Each Publication must be numbered, and the number assigned must match on the AP-10, CV and Webfiles link.

- The numbering must be in reverse-chronological order, with the earliest publication earning the lowest number, and the most recent publication must have the highest number.

- Publication numbers must stay consistent over time and between files – this helps reviewers compare publications.
Publications: Guidelines

- Publications must be submitted to the Dean’s office using ‘Webfiles’.
  - Put the Webfiles link on a Word document, with the faculty member’s Name, Department, and Proposed Action at the top of the page.
  - Assign permissions/tickets: make sure to give enough time for the ticket ‘expiration’ – 30 days is the default, change this to **one year**: this gives reviewers enough time to access the publications.

- Include the assigned publication numbers when you link up the publication to the Webfiles page, and add them to Webfiles in the order that they appear on the CV or AP-10/Addendum
John Doe, PhD, Department of Biological Chemistry

Proposed: Appointment to Assistant Professor, III

Link to Evidence of Publications:

https://webfiles.uci.edu/xythoswfs/webui/_xy-e6280538_1-t_w3JgyhSf

Link to Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness:

https://webfiles.uci.edu/xythoswfs/webui/_xy-e6284925_1-t_jwn5W5il
Publications: Webfiles Sample

Publications added directly to Webfiles; unique titles of publications are not included, but the analyst has added all pubs in order, with a number next to it, which matches the numbering on the CV.
Webfiles linked up to a Word document, which included links to each publication.

Notice that each publication link includes a number next to it, but the link itself links directly to the publication.

Dr. Schoen Publication links:

11. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4789594/
Publication

- A work that has been officially accepted and published and assigned a unique identifier.

**Commentary**

Commentaries on ‘Non-pharmacological interventions for assisting the induction of anaesthesia in children’ with a response by the review authors

Zeev N. Kain, Suzanne Strom, Jamila Kim, William M. Splinter, Allan Cyna


**Abstract**

Accepted Publication

Works that have been drafted and accepted for publication within the review period, but will not be published within the review period. In order to submit on the AP-10, the faculty member must have proof that the final version of the publication has been approved and accepted by the editor of the journal. This proof (a letter or Email) along with the final copy of the publication must be included as evidence of the accepted publication.

Example: The review period ends on 9/30, and the faculty member has included an item on his/her CV/AP-10 and Webfiles with a publication date of 11/1. The faculty member has a letter or Email from the publisher of the journal which shows that the journal accepted this publication on 9/15. This is acceptable to include on the AP-10 and Webfiles as part of the publications listing.
Submitted Publication

- Work that has been submitted to a journal, but has not been formally accepted within the review period. This type of publication may have been informally accepted for publication; it may be in a revision stage, or the journal may have notified the faculty member that the item will be published at a future date, pending other contributions or edits from the faculty member.

- AKA: “In Revision” or “In Review”
Work in Progress

- A work that is currently in a ‘draft’ stage. The publication could be at an early stage, it could be complete and ready for publication, or anywhere in between. The publication has not yet been submitted to a journal or accepted.

- AKA: “Drafts” or “Forthcoming”
Publications: What to include on AP-10

- Publication – Can be included on the AP-10 as long as it was published within the review period.

- Accepted – Can be included on the AP-10 as long as the faculty member has proof that it was accepted by a journal within the review period. Faculty member must also include the final version of the publication along with an acceptance letter or Email.

- Submitted and Work in Progress – Cannot be included on the AP-10 since it is not published or accepted for publication within the review period. May be included at a future review date. Faculty member may wish to include on the CV
Publications: What to include

- Any and all publications included in the AP-10 must be represented by a link in Webfiles.

- A Work in Progress may be added to the CV to show productivity, however, assigning a number to a work that is in progress can be problematic, because if that item is not published, and/or another work is published before the work in progress, it may ‘throw off’ the numbering system, and result in confusion for future review files.
For New Appointment files, the file does not need to include every single publication ever published.

- The faculty member may want to highlight recent accomplishments, within the last year, or few years, or publications they feel represents their best work.

- For Merit/Promotion files, publications on the AP-10 must include all work published or accepted within the review period.
Prior to submitting the file, the Analyst must check each publication to ensure:

- The publication has been published within the review period, OR
- If it hasn’t been published, that the accepted publication has appropriate evidence to support its acceptance
- The analyst has included a link to the publication using Webfiles.
Publications: Submitted Sample Email

Ref.: Ms. No. B-6578R1

Epstein - Barr virus (EBV) Association with Plasma Cell Neoplasms Histology and Histopathology

Dear [Name],

I am pleased to tell you that your work "Epstein - Barr virus (EBV) Association with Plasma Cell Neoplasms" is acceptable for publication in Histology and Histopathology, but it is necessary that you prepare the paper according to the editor's comments.

Comments from the Editor and Reviewers (if any) can be found below.

Note that publication of your paper will proceed on receipt the payment of 950.00 euros, to cover part of the publication cost. You will receive the invoice after you return your manuscript corrected according to the attached comments. The printer will begin to work with your article after receipt of the payment; then, is when your article will be formally accepted. If the institution that will pay the invoice is member of the EU, we need to know their VAT number for intra-community operation. It should be allowed to make intra-community operations. If not, the invoice should be increased with the VAT tax.

Editor:

1. To submit a revision, go to https://uarkdefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A___hh.edmgr.com_&d=Dwlg8Gc&c=snukDe-KyRBOwGqecHrAPc&=E333C0UUhFjerdPAWJHBl&=m-UcS2WwpcGk-cV5CJIMmZ2XXeM9Z2XXAUW3PWv-wMS-5W8%uBBf5sikHUji-n-wOWC6++Q_EinvC1Uwx8I& and log in as an Author. You will see a menu item call Submission Needing Revision. You will find your submission record there. You should upload the following items: a) the text in word or rtf (if possible, include the Tables at the end of the manuscript), and b) the figures in tif, jpg or ppt.
2. Digital Images. Black and white figures must be at gray scale. Line art files must have a 500dpi resolution, while other images must have a 300dpi resolution.
3. Please, carefully check that all the articles cited in the text are in the Reference list, and vice versa.
4. Please, check that the name of the authors is correctly spelled and that the place of work is correct.
5. The articles must be cited, both in the text and in the Reference list, according to the Instructions of the Journal. You can get them in our web site. Please, follow them carefully. They are also attached.
6. The following author(s) has(have) not answered to the Questionnaire: Kanwarpal Kahlon. All the authors must answer before publication of the article. We have recently sent a new e-mail with a link to answer to the questionnaire.

Documentation is questionable: faculty member may not be able to submit this as proof of acceptance.
From: SpringerMeteor [mailto:noreply@meteor.springer.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 28, 2015 7:54 PM
To: 
Cc: daniela.graf@springer.com; melanie.thanner.consultant@springer.com
Subject: Invitation to the Project: Encyclopedia of Cancer

Dear [Name],

Thank you very much for becoming a contributor for the Encyclopedia of Cancer, edited by Manfred Schwab. With this e-mail we invite you officially to be the author for the following topic(s):

- »Hodgkin Disease, Clinical Oncology« (entry type: "Essay"; together with [Name])

Please follow these steps:

1. Register: Please register with our online submission platform Meteor at your earliest convenience by clicking on this link: https://meteor.springer.com/meteor/access/resetpassword.jsf?user=416356&token=dc32-31d2-e5b4-2baf
   It also allows you to receive immediate unlimited access to all Major Reference content on Springer’s official publication platform SpringerLink.
2. Consent to Publish: You will then be asked to accept the copyright transfer agreement ("Terms & Conditions"). This is very important as it is a legal prerequisite to our publishing your contribution(s).
3. Check your Details: Please check if your contact details are correct. (You can correct your user data by clicking on your name in the top right corner and selecting the menu item "Profile"):
   - Your user data:
     - Last name:
     - First name:

Documentation is acceptable; the faculty member is be able to submit this as proof of acceptance.
The Department Letter (as well as the chair’s recommendation letter, if provided) must be written by the Chair, or Chair-designee (faculty member), and addressed to the appropriate approval authority.

Examples:

1. For Appointment as Professor, Step IV: Department Letter must be addressed to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor.

2. For Promotion from HS Assistant Clinical Professor, Step III, to HS Associate Clinical Professor, Step II: Department Letter must be addressed to the Vice Provost.

The complete list of the Delegation of Authority is available on AP Website: https://ap.uci.edu/policies-procedures/delegationsofauthority/
Chair letter is provided in situations when:

- The Chair does not agree with faculty opinion as reflected in the department letter
- The Chair wants to clarify, or explain information in the file (e.g. negative evaluations, contributions to collaborative work, conflicts of interest)
- If it is the department’s practice that the Chair records his/her own vote via a Chair letter
The **Department Letter** must include:

- Proposed Action
- **Department faculty’s recommendation**, including the reasons for any dissension, and discussion of strengths and weaknesses of the case
- Faculty Vote and Opinion
- Analytical evaluation of the faculty member’s performance in each of the following areas of responsibility (series-based criteria):
  - Teaching - (Please see [APM Policy 210-1-d-(1)](#))
  - Research and creative activity - (Please see [APM Policy 210-1-d-(2)](#))
  - Professional competence and activity - (Please see [APM Policy 210-1-d-(3)](#)).
  - University and public service - (Please see [APM Policy 210-1-d-(4)](#)).
The faculty representative has signed the Department Letter, and the Chair has concurred. The concurrence is a record of the Chair’s vote on the file. If this letter only contained the Chair’s signature, then the letter should still be written on behalf of the faculty, and signed ‘On Behalf of the Faculty’.
Department Letter

Faculty Vote and Opinion

- The faculty vote (which determines the department recommendation) must be included in the dossier

- It is important that the department letter summarizes each of the contrary position
  - E.g. Explanation of the no votes and abstentions

- Faculty vote (s) must be recorded appropriately and clearly so that it is understandable to all subsequent levels of reviewers
Faculty Vote and Opinion (Cont.) : Departmental Recording of Votes

Candidate’s Name:__________________________ Date of Vote:__________

Proposed Action: From/To: Rank & Step

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPT VOTE</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>ABSENT/NO RESPONSE</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>ELIGIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SENATE PROFESSORS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC. PROFESSORS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST. PROFESSOR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-SENATE PROFESSORS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC. PROFESSORS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST. PROFESSORS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Vote and Opinion: Departmental Recording of Votes

Faculty’s Name: ___________________________  Date of Vote: __________

Proposed Action: From/To: Rank & Step

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPT VOTE</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>ABSENT/NO RESPONSE</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>ELIGIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SENATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSORS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3* / ***</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC. PROFESSORS**</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST. PROFESSOR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-SENATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSORS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC. PROFESSORS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5****</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST. PROFESSORS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chair abstains on all department votes.
**Lecturers SOE counted with Associate Professors to protect confidentiality.
***Two faculty members abstained from the vote as they provided letter of recommendation for the file.
****Four faculty members did not return voting ballot.

Please note how the Chair records his or her vote and this must adhere to the department bylaw.
Department Letter – Helpful Hints

- Please note on the vote page how the Chair records his/her vote, and this must adhere to the department bylaw.

For example:
- “The Chair abstains from all department votes” (abstention) or “the Chair records his/her vote separately” (abstention). If so, the Chair must either sign department letter with a “Concur” or provide a separate Chair letter.
- Chair must always sign Chair’s letter.

- If letters of recommendation (LOR) are included in the file, the evidence provided in the letters should be weighed and discussed.
  - When referring to the letter writers, only refer to them by their assigned code.
Mid-Career Appraisal

Department chairs are responsible for conducting mid-career 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 mid-career appraisal (MCA) is:

(1) for the department to provide the Assistant Professor with a careful and analytical evaluation of his or her performance to date (including work in progress) in the areas of teaching, research and creative work, professional competence and activity, and university and public service, and

(2) to make a candid assessment concerning the probability or improbability of a favorable promotion decision based upon continuation of record
Mid-Career Appraisal

Mid-career appraisal (MCA) files must include a recommendation for a reappointment with or without a merit increase.

- The MCA and reappointment/merit recommendation may be submitted with a single letter, with 2 separate sections, and 2 separate votes.

- The letter must address the review period for the MCA, which is from date of hire through 9/30 of the third or fourth year of service, under the eight-year rule.

  Example:
  
  Hire date of 7/1/15
  MCA would normally occur during the 4th year (2018-2019)
  Review period would be from 7/1/15 – 9/30/18

- The letter must also address the review period for the reappointment/merit, which would be since the last action.

  Example:
  
  Last merit effective 7/1/17
  Reappointment/merit increase review period is from 10/1/16 - 9/30/18, to be effective July 1, 2019
Mid-Career Appraisal

- Only one AP-10 is required, and the review period is from **date of hire through 9/30** of the review year.

- The appraisal must note specific areas of deficiency (if any) and must recommend actions to be taken by the faculty member and/or the department and chair.

- The MCA votes must be labeled as **Positive, Provisional Positive, Guarded, and Negative**.
Mid-Career Appraisal

Faculty's Name: Dr. John Doe      Date of Vote: 11/5/2019

Proposed Action: *Provisional Positive Mid-Career Appraisal*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPT VOTE</th>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
<th>PROVISIONAL POSITIVE</th>
<th>GUARDED</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>ABSENT/NO RESPONSE</th>
<th>ELIGIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SENATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSORS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC. PROFESSORS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST. PROFESSOR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-SENATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSORS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC. PROFESSORS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST. PROFESSORS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty’s Name:  Dr. John Doe  Date of Vote:  11/5/2019

Proposed Action:  Merit Increase - from Asst. Professor, Step II to Asst. Professor, Step III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPT VOTE</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>ABSENT/NO RESPONSE</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>ELIGIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SENATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSORS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3* / ***</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC. PROFESSORS**</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST. PROFESSOR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-SENATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSORS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC. PROFESSORS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5****</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST. PROFESSORS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chair abstains on all department votes.

**Lecturers SOE counted with Associate Professors to protect confidentially.

***Two faculty members did not vote as they provided letter of recommendation for the file.

****Four faculty members did not return voting ballot.
Mid-Career Appraisal: Reminder

- 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.

- **FOR ALL MCA FILES***: The department letter and the vote page must include a notation at the bottom of the page with, “A copy has been provided to the candidate.”

  *NOT REQUIRED FOR FILES IN AP REVIEW
Volunteer Clinical Faculty

- Volunteer Faculty policy can be found on the link below
  - [https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/_files/apm/apm-279.pdf](https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/_files/apm/apm-279.pdf)

- Appointees in the Volunteer Clinical Professor series are clinicians in the community who teach UCI students and residents

- There is a minimum of 75 hours that are required per year
  *managed and tracked by department*

- Typically approvals are for 5 years and are reappointed/reviewed every 5 years

- Checklist for all actions can be found on our website
  - [http://som.uci.edu/academic-affairs/volunteer-clinical-faculty.asp](http://som.uci.edu/academic-affairs/volunteer-clinical-faculty.asp)
Volunteer vs. HS Clin WOS

- Volunteer Faculty are community physicians, usually in private practice and/or at non-affiliated institutions who teach on a part-time basis.
- HS WOS is a faculty member with responsibilities equivalent to a paid HS faculty member (teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and service responsibilities) and are subject to academic reviews every 2-3 years. They often have an appointment with an affiliated institution.
- HS WOS faculty have a greater responsibility in the education and teaching of students and residents. (consult with education and program directors if you are not sure which series to use.)
Advisory Committee

- **Clinical Faculty Advisory Committee (CFAC)**
  - Reviews all actions for the Health Sciences series (except HS. Clinical Instructor)
  - Files are pre-reviewed by Mohammad Helmy, MD Associate Dean for Academic Affairs/Clinical

- **Academic Resources Advisory Committee (ARAC)**
  - Reviews all actions for the Line, In Residence and Adjunct series
  - Files are pre-reviewed by Lari Wenzel, PhD Acting Vice Dean for Academic Affairs

- **Clinical X Committee (ClinX)**
  - Reviews all actions in the Clinical X series
  - Files are pre-reviewed by Lari Wenzel, PhD Acting Vice Dean for Academic Affairs

- **Volunteer Faculty Advisory Committee (VFAC)**
  - Reviews all actions in the Volunteer series
  - Files are pre-reviewed by Mohammad Helmy, MD Associate Dean for Academic Affairs/Clinical
Advisory Committee

Advisory committees meet monthly to review all new appointments and most academic actions. The meeting dates are set in advance and available on our website [https://www.som.uci.edu/academic-affairs/calendars.asp](https://www.som.uci.edu/academic-affairs/calendars.asp).

- Complete files must be in our office no later than 15 days before the scheduled meeting.
- All files are given a received date stamp.
- Incomplete files will be returned and given a new received date stamp when you re-submit the complete file.
- Complete files are then added to the agenda and reviewed at the scheduled advisory committee meeting.
- Each committee has a review file “cap”
Advisory Committee

COMMITTEE REVIEW MEETINGS SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
2019
ARAC (Academic Resources Advisory Council) Meets 3rd Thursday of every month at 4:00pm
Reviews:
- All New Appointments: Line Series, In Residence Series, Adjunct Series
- All Promotions: Line Series, In Residence Series, Adjunct Series
- All Change of Series into: Line Series, In Residence Series, Adjunct Series
- Advancement St VL & A/S: Line, In Residence Series, Adjunct Series
- Accelerated Actions of two or more years

CLINICAL X Committee (Meets 3rd Monday of every month at 8:00 a.m.) 4th Monday in January/February due to Holidays
Reviews:
- All New Appointments: Clinical X Series
- All Promotions: Clinical X Series
- Advancement St VL & A/S: Clinical X Series
- All Changes of Series into: Clinical X Series
- Accelerated Actions of two or more years

CFAC (Clinical Faculty Advisory Committee) Meets 2nd Tuesday every month at 7:30 a.m.
Reviews:
- All New Appointments: Health Sciences Clinical Series (Except H.S. Clinical Instructor)
- All Promotions: Health Sciences Clinical Series
- Advancement St VL & A/S: Health Sciences Clinical Series
- All Changes of Series into: Health Sciences Clinical Series
- All Accelerations: Health Sciences Clinical Series

VFAC (Volunteer Faculty Advisory Committee) Meets 3rd Wednesday of every month at 12:00 p.m.
Reviews:
- All New Appointments: Volunteer Faculty
- All Promotions: Volunteer Faculty

FILES MUST BE RECEIVED IN THE DEAN’S OFFICE AT LEAST 15 DAYS PRIOR TO THE MEETING DATE IN ORDER TO BE ON THE AGENDA FOR THE MONTHLY MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFAC Dates</th>
<th>ARAC Dates</th>
<th>CLINX Dates</th>
<th>VFAC Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>1/17</td>
<td>1/28*</td>
<td>1/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12</td>
<td>2/21</td>
<td>2/23*</td>
<td>2/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/6</td>
<td>4/18</td>
<td>4/15</td>
<td>4/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/14</td>
<td>5/16</td>
<td>5/20</td>
<td>5/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/11</td>
<td>6/20</td>
<td>6/17</td>
<td>6/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/9</td>
<td>7/18</td>
<td>7/15</td>
<td>7/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13</td>
<td>8/15</td>
<td>8/19</td>
<td>8/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>9/19</td>
<td>9/16</td>
<td>9/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8</td>
<td>10/17</td>
<td>10/21</td>
<td>10/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>11/21</td>
<td>11/18</td>
<td>11/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16</td>
<td>12/19</td>
<td>12/16</td>
<td>12/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Affairs Website
(https://www.som.uci.edu/academic-affairs/)
QUESTIONS