

# **Addendum to the Call (Specialists in Cooperative Extension Series) 2018-2019**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3
THE CE SPECIALIST.....	3
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION.....	3
PROCEDURES.....	4
CONFIDENTIALITY.....	4
CANDIDATE’S RESPONSE TO DEPARTMENTAL LETTER .....	4
DEAN’S OFFICE CE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CEAC) COMPOSITION AND ROLE.....	4
LEVELS OF REVIEW.....	5
PROFESSIONAL OBLIGATIONS.....	5
POSITION DESCRIPTIONS.....	6
TPYES OF APPOINTMENTS ON THE UCR CAMPUS.....	7
CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT.....	7
MERITS, APPRAISALS, PROMOTIONS AND QUINQUENNIAL REVIEWS.....	7
CRITERIA FOR MERITS, APPRAISALS, PROMOTIONS OR QUINQUENNIAL REVIEWS.....	7-12
SOLICITATION OF LETTERS.....	13
ACADEMIC SENATE MEMBERSHIP.....	14
VOTING PRIVILEGES.....	14
MODEL LETTERS.....	15-21
CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT.....	22
ATTACHMENT H .....	23
CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS.....	24- 29
DEFERRALS.....	30
EXTRAMURAL GRANTS.....	31

## INTRODUCTION

The following guidelines for Specialists in Cooperative Extension have been prepared to assist Specialists in CE, department chairs and faculty members in understanding the appointment and review process and meeting its goals. It does not replace either the Academic Personnel Manual 334 or the Annual Call, but rather supplements key aspects of the procedures in a more informal and interpretive manner.

## THE SPECIALIST IN CE

The Specialist in CE series is used for academic appointees in Cooperative Extension who are qualified by formal education and/or experience to conduct educational activities and mission oriented research in their area of specialty and who have responsibility for the interpretation, adaptation, and transmission of the results of relevant research. The Specialist in CE serves as a resource person to disseminate and instruct clientele on up-to-date information and research needs in his/her area of specialization. Teaching of regular undergraduate or graduate courses is not a responsibility of this series; however, the Specialist in CE with an appropriate I&R FTE teaching component is expected to play a role in resident instruction and graduate education within academic departments. In addition, the Specialist in CE is expected to provide services to the University and private sectors and complement University educational programs, both on and off campus. The Specialist in CE is evaluated for merits and promotions based on their ability to meet these objectives when considered in total.

Titles (and ranks) in this series are: (1) Assistant Specialist in CE; (2) Associate Specialist in CE; and, (3) Specialist in CE.

Professorial appointments are referred to as “Instruction and Research” (I&R) positions. Hence, split FTE appointments within the same department are colloquially referred to as CE/I&R appointments. Agronomists appointments are referred to as “Organized Research” (OR) positions. Hence, split FTE appointments within the same departments are colloquially referred to as CE/OR appointments. [See Sections I, IV (7), IV (8)]

## AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Affirmative action is an integral and important component of each of the above position responsibilities. Each appointee in this series is responsible for applying and furthering the affirmative action goals and objectives of the University and of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources. Specific affirmative action responsibilities include but are not limited to:

- a. Comply with all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations and University, campus, and Division policies and procedures related to civil rights, affirmative action, and equal employment opportunity.
- b. Collaborate with and provide guidance and counsel to County CE staff to meet affirmative action and equal opportunity goals at the county level.

A statement must be included on the candidate’s position description documenting their affirmative action efforts and contributions, both in the personnel and programmatic sectors.

## PROCEDURES

The Chancellor or designee shall establish procedures which entail adequate stages of review of proposed appointments, merit increases, and promotions to ensure proper evaluation of the individual candidates. Such procedures shall include appointment by the Chancellor or designee of personnel committees which include peers and which will review, when appropriate, appointments, merit increases, and promotions and which will also recommend, when appropriate, the composition of *ad hoc* review committees. *Ad hoc* review committees (for appointments with an I&R FTE component), appointed by the Chancellor or designee, will normally include appointees from the Agricultural Experiment Station (AES).

## REVIEW PROCESS

The candidate will prepare a file, as described later in this document, using eFilePlus by September 30th. Following completion of the file, the candidate's home department (if in the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, CNAS) or school (if in the School of Public Policy, SPP) will review the file using criteria described on p. 8 – 12, vote on the proposed action following their Bylaw 55, and develop a departmental (or school) letter. The candidate's file is then forwarded on to the CE Advisory Committee (CEAC), who conduct a further review of the file. The CEAC is advisory to the Dean (specifically to the Dean of CNAS for candidates holding appointments as CE Specialists within CNAS, and to the Dean of SPP for candidates holding appointments within SPP). The CEAC will provide a letter, with committee vote, summarizing their review of the file that is then forwarded to the appropriate Dean for final review and action. As noted elsewhere in this document, recommendations of the Dean are final unless the candidate holds an I&R appointment, in which case the file is forwarded to the Academic Personnel Office for review by the Committee on Academic Personnel for the I&R portion of the appointment, with final authority with the Chancellor. The outcomes of all personnel actions for CE Specialists are to be communicated annually to the UC ANR Academic Human Resources unit.

## CONFIDENTIALITY

Confidentiality is a critical requirement during the entire review process. Breaches of confidentiality are subject to disciplinary action. The candidate is not allowed to see the confidential portions of the file except in redacted form and only during specific periods between the initiation of a departmental recommendation through the final administrative decision. The candidate does, however, if requested in writing, have the right to receive redacted copies of all confidential extramural letters before the departmental review and a copy of the non-confidential departmental letter setting forth the departmental recommendation before the file is sent forward to the Dean. Following the final decision, if requested in writing, non-confidential material and a redacted copy of all confidential material presented as part of the file may be obtained. (Please refer to the checklists for listings of confidential documents contained in a merit, appraisal, deferral, quinquennial review, advancement or promotion file.)

*Note:* The identities of persons who were the sources of these documents shall not be disclosed. Redaction of a letter of evaluation (including declinations) is defined as removal of the name, title, organizational/institutional affiliation, and relational information contained below the signature block. (APM 160-20-c(4)) Any identifying information on the letterhead and emails should also be removed.

## CANDIDATE'S RESPONSE TO DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION (Attachment H)

The candidate has five business days from receipt of the departmental letter to provide a written response to the departmental recommendation (and minority reports, if any). The response should address the evaluation of extending knowledge and information, teaching (if applicable), research, and service as discussed in the department letter. The response may not contain comments on procedures/processes used to assemble the file or conduct the meeting nor should the response introduce material outside of the review period or material not otherwise represented in the file. This response may be addressed to the Chair, the Dean, or the VPAP (only if candidate has an IR component as well). The candidate's statement in quinquennial reviews and merit files (including within Above Scale) is limited to two pages. The candidate's statement in Advancement to Step VI and Above Scale, promotions, reappointments, and appraisals is limited to 10 pages.

#### CE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CEAC) COMPOSITION AND ROLE

The Committee is comprised of Specialists in CE and Academic Senate members with a partial AES appointment. The CEAC acts in an advisory capacity to the Dean(s) to provide advice on all actions (appointment, merit, appraisal, promotion, quinquennial review, advancement and deferral requests) in the CE series. The CEAC reviews the documentation in each file and writes an evaluation based on the

four criteria, as identified below in the section, *Position Description*. The written evaluation of the CEAC becomes a part of the file under review and includes, for the record, an actual vote.

## LEVELS OF REVIEW

A Specialist in CE holding a title in the CE series, but also holding an I&R title (however small a percentage) which does confer Academic Senate membership, continues to be reviewed by the full procedures for regular faculty members on this campus. However, the files for these faculty are also first reviewed by the CEAC. The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is responsible for reviewing that portion of the appointment which falls under an Academic Senate title (I&R FTE). When a campus *ad hoc* committee is required, its review of the file will precede the Dean's review.

The following chart provides, at a glance, the various levels of review for each of the different file types:

	Dept.	CEAC	Campus <i>Ad Hoc</i>	Dean	CAP	PEVC/Chancellor
<b>Appointments:</b>						
Asst I, II & III 100% CE FTE	x	x		x		
Asst I, II & III CE/OR FTE	x	x		x		
Asst I, II & III CE/I&R FTE	x	x		x		
Asst IV & Above 100% CE FTE	x	x		x		
Asst IV & Above CE/OR FTE	x	x		x		
Asst IV - VI CE/I&R FTE	x	x		x	x	
Assoc & Full CE/I&R FTE	x	x		x	x	x
<b>Promotions:</b>						
Asst to Assoc 100% CE FTE	x	x		x		
Assoc to Full 100% CE FTE	x	x		x		
Asst to Assoc Split CE/OR FTE	x	x		x		
Assoc to Full Split CE/OR FTE	x	x		x		
Asst to Assoc Split CE/I&R FTE	x	x	x	x	x	x
Assoc to Full Split CE/I&R FTE	x	x		x	x	x
<b>Advancements:</b>						
To Step VI 100% CE FTE	x	x		x		
To Step VI Split CE/OR FTE	x	x		x		
To Step VI Split CE/I&R FTE	x	x		x	x	x
Advancements to A/S 100% CE FTE	x	x		x		
Advancements to A/S Split CE/OR FTE	x	x		x		
Advancements to A/S Split CE/I&R FTE	x	x	x	x	x	x
<b>Merits:</b>						
All Levels 100% CE FTE	x	x		x		
All Levels Split CE/OR FTE	x	x		x		
All Levels Split CE/I&R FTE	x	x		x	x	x
<b>Appraisals:</b>						
At Assistant Level 100% CE FTE	x	x		x		
At Assistant Level Split CE/OR FTE	x	x		x		
At Assistant Level Split CE/I&R FTE	x	x		x	x	x

## PROFESSIONAL OBLIGATIONS

It is the candidate's and the department chair's responsibility to document the file in an adequate manner. The file should present the scholarly and intellectual contributions of the candidate in each area of review. Review will be based only on what is contained in the file. If a file is poorly documented, the candidate is disadvantaged. It is in the candidate's interest to provide all pertinent material and information to the department and to be certain the file is complete (as verified by the Procedural Safeguard Statement).

**The eFilePlus System** captures granular data in a relational database in the support of merit/promotion actions and immediate generation of candidate bio-sketches and other reports supporting various candidates' needs (e.g. extramural funds requests). It is used for a routed, paperless review of merit and

promotion files. Supporting processes outside of eFilePlus include: Chair's meeting with candidate, signing of Procedural Safeguard Statement (Part 1 and Part 2), Department meeting, Department voting, preparation of department recommendation (draft and final), CAP meeting, CAP voting and preparation of CAP recommendation. General information regarding the eFilePlus system can be found on the eFilePlus website at <http://academicpersonnel.ucr.edu/efileplus/>.

Cooperation in providing information for one's personnel file is a professional obligation without which the review process cannot be initiated.

## POSITION DESCRIPTION

The individual position description is used for evaluating the professional accomplishments of Specialists in CE. The position description encompasses the four main criteria of (1) performance in extending knowledge and information, (2) performance in mission-oriented research and creative activity, (3) professional competence and activity, (4) University and public service, as well as Affirmative Action. The position description provides a context for and a characterization of the percent of effort expended in all areas of responsibility.

Shortly after the effective date of the appointment (within 90 days), the employee and supervisor (department chair or equivalent) will meet with the CE employee to discuss performance standards and to establish specific goals by which success in the position can be determined. Every academic employee in CE will have a written position description setting forth the duties of the position. The initial position description is based on the Position Vacancy Announcement and includes a section on the employee's affirmative action responsibilities.

The position description should be prepared using the following or a similar format:

- a. Title
- b. Nature and Purpose - introductory paragraph in summary form. The primary purpose or program focus of the position should be presented and affirmative action responsibilities should be included.
- c. Major Responsibilities - major duties that must be satisfactorily accomplished to fulfill the requirements of the position, relative to the four criteria identified above, should be described, stating what is to be done. Describe duties in order of importance. Specific responsibilities in affirmative action must be described.
- d. Relationships - describe relationships that are essential to accomplish the duties of the position, including line organization, internal, and external cooperative relationships.
- e. Approval - must be signed and dated by the employee, signifying acceptance, and by the appropriate supervisor (department chair), signifying approval. Subsequently, review and approval by the Dean's Office, in consultation with the CEAC, will occur during the merit/promotion review process. When approved, this position description will be used for the next merit/promotion review.
- f. Updating - position descriptions must be reviewed at every merit/promotion cycle and updated as appropriate to include any changes in the position description.

During the merit and promotion review process, each file will include the current position description and the position description at last advance or at appointment, whichever is most recent. The current

position description, as approved by the Dean's Office in consultation with the CEAC, will be used for evaluation in the subsequent merit/promotion review cycle.

### Types of Appointments on the UCR Campus

On this campus, all titles in the Cooperative Extension Series are on the Specialist in CE Salary Scale, table 32 or Fiscal year Ladder-Rank Professor Series, table 2. The implementation in 1995 of APM 334 combined all CE academics holding such titles into one title series: the Specialist in CE Series. APM 334 applies to department-based Specialists in CE. This change repealed APM 325.

Various terms may be used in the titles to designate the subject-matter of the specialist, for example, Specialist in CE (Agronomy), Associate Plant Pathology Specialist in CE, Assistant Entomology Specialist in CE, etc. (see also APM 334-8).

An appointment occurs when an individual is employed in one of the ranks shown above if the individual's most previous status was:

- (1) Not in the employ of the University; or
- (2) In the employ of the University, but not with a title in this series.

### Criteria for Appointment

New appointees must have demonstrated the potential to meet the following areas of responsibility and will be expected to establish an effective program. Initial appointment represents a considered judgment that such individuals possess the potential to earn promotion before the time limit resulting from the eight-year rule. Components of program development consist of:

- (a) Performance in extending knowledge and information - identifying clientele and establishing educational and service activities.
- (b) Performance in mission oriented research and creative activity - developing research/demonstration projects.
- (c) Professional competence and activity - e.g., participating in a professional society.
- (d) University and public service - providing service to the University and society in general.
- (e) Resident instruction and graduate education (for the instruction component of Specialists in CE with appropriate I&R FTE).
- (f) Organized Research (for the research component of Specialists in CE with appropriate OR FTE) described under one or more AES projects.

Terms of Service– please refer to APM 334

### Merits, Appraisals, Promotions, Advancements, Quinquennial Reviews and Accelerations

- a. A merit increase is an advancement in step or to an above-scale salary rate without change of rank (see APM 615).
- b. An appraisal is a formal evaluation of an Assistant Specialist in CE or certain other titles such as Assistant Professor or Assistant Agronomist in the AES which is made in order to arrive at a preliminary assessment of the candidate's prospect for eventual promotion as well as to identify appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence expected.



- c. A promotion is an advancement from one rank to a higher rank within this series, usually the next rank as listed in APM 334-8-a. A change from a title in another series to a title in this series (possibly involving an increase in salary) is not defined as a promotion or merit increase, but as an appointment.
- d. Advancement – see The Call for specific advancement action.
- e. A quinquennial review is a formal evaluation which is made in order to fulfill the APM requirement that each faculty member be reviewed no less frequently than every five years, even if at an open step (Professor V and above). Include activity for the past five years with the exception of materials used in a previous promotion action with a positive outcome involving a 220 action.
- f. The minimum criterion for acceleration within rank is strength in all areas of review, including Extension Activities, and teaching (if applicable, during the abbreviated review period). Refer to the Call.

### Criteria for Merits, Appraisals, Promotions, Advancements or Quinquennial Reviews

A candidate for a merit increase, appraisal, promotion, advancement or quinquennial review in this series shall be evaluated by the following criteria. Individuals may not necessarily perform all activities in the sections suggested below; analyze the impact of those activities performed by the following indicators:

- (1) Performance in Extending Knowledge and Information - Specialists in CE must develop and conduct an educational program aimed at appropriate off-campus clientele groups. The Specialist in CE serves as a resource person to disseminate information and instruct clientele on up-to-date information and research in his/her area of specialization. Clientele include CE County Advisors, other Specialists in CE, AES researchers, growers, industry representatives, governmental agencies, and other end users. The Specialist in CE systemize knowledge, technologies, and practices in their area of responsibility and disseminate this information through the use of leaflets, newsletters, bulletins, news releases, electronic media, etc., and also by presenting this information or arranging for its presentation at workshops, meetings, short courses, field demonstrations, and other educational programs. The program should extend knowledge and information to those clientele groups to assist them in their abilities to understand and address problems facing them. The program should serve the University's outreach mission. Outreach applies intellectual expertise to identify issues and communicate solutions within the community or society. Activities could include interaction with other Specialists in CE, Advisors, workgroups, and programs; developing and presenting educational materials; preparing and distributing newsletters to clientele groups; participating in meetings with clientele; working with public or private schools; teaching University Extension courses or short courses; developing and presenting in-service training courses; organizing and/or participating in workshops, field tours, or symposia.
  - Effectiveness of training programs, leadership support, and cooperation provided to County CE personnel or clientele
  - Range of educational methods used, with new or improved educational methods utilized
  - Use by County CE personnel and/or clientele of information or educational products developed (e.g., publications, audio-visual packages, media releases, software, etc.)
  - Use by colleagues, AES researchers, etc., of field problem definitions and related information

- Contribution to overall program analysis, planning, and accomplishment
- Change in clientele or industry practices as a result of educational efforts
- Design and use of systematic methods to assess social or economic benefit of activities or programs
- Effective leadership of, or teamwork with, County CE personnel to identify and reach a broad range of clientele

(2) Performance in Mission-Oriented Research and Creative Activity - Specialists in CE are expected to develop, conduct, and publish the results of applied research. Specialists in CE provide leadership for planning and coordination of research related to their area of specialization. They conduct and publish results of research directed toward resolution of significant issues or problems independently; in addition, they may work in collaboration with departmental researchers, other researchers, or CE personnel. The research should be reflected in a mix between technical non-refereed and technical refereed publications. Specialists in CE should have a program of applied mission-oriented research or creative work that supports the extending knowledge program. The term mission-oriented research describes that area in the research continuum that extends from basic research to the application or extension of research information. This research may be very applied in nature and has, as a goal, the solution of a problem facing society related to the production and utilization of food, fiber, and natural resources, or in the area of human resources, in contrast to the goal of creating knowledge for the sake of a discipline. The publication outlets used should be appropriate for reaching the segments of society facing the problem dealt with, as well as other professionals seeking solutions for the problem. Activities may include publishing articles in popular and trade/industry magazines; writing articles for newspapers, radio, or visual media; developing computer software; writing newsletter articles; and publishing articles refereed or peer-reviewed in scholarly journals.

- Publication of research and/or creative activity in appropriate outlets, including peer-reviewed journals and shared authorship papers
- Ability to translate effectively disciplinary information to lay terms and vice versa
- Leadership in research and/or creative activity
- New technology, practices, or adaptations developed as a result of research activities; the role of the Specialist in shared or joint developments should be identified
- Relationship of research and/or creative activity to overall priorities and goals
- Letters of acceptance must be included for any refereed item listed as In Press.

### **Difference List:**

For each co-authored item on the Difference List (excluding abstracts or reports), candidates should indicate whether they are the corresponding author, explain their role (a maximum of 3-4 sentences) in terms of both intellectual practical participation, and provide information about the collaborators (e.g., graduate student, post doc or technician; rank and institution of collaborator). It is acceptable to say member of collaborator's group where the exact rank may be unknown. For items co-authored with other senior investigators at either UCR or another institution, the candidate should indicate either their or their research group's percent effort, whichever is more appropriate.

(3) Professional Competence and Activity (Review Panels, Professional Societies, Honors, Invited Presentations/Papers, National/International Recognition) - Specialists in CE are expected to regularly engage in professional activity which is directly related to their

professional expertise and achievement. When possible, candidates listing presentations as "keynote," "plenary", or "distinguished" are encouraged to supply supporting material in the form of an invitation email/letter or conference program brochure. These items can be placed in Other Section in eFilePlus.

- Type and degree of participation in disciplinary and professional societies
- Professional competence or recognition, including awards, honors, fellowships, grants, peer and non-peer respect, collegial testimony

- (4) Fellowship and Extramural Grant Activity - as relevant and appropriate, the candidate shall provide a list of all grant activity, including research grants, training grants, facilities grants, etc., listed on a separate page in the format shown in Attachment F of the Call. Examples of other types of grants that should be listed under this category include (but are not limited to) Divisional Senate Awards such as the Senate Omnibus Awards (travel only and/or research and travel), Senate CoR Fellowships, and Regents Faculty Fellowship and/or Development Awards. Under Award Status, use the following criteria: Current, Expired, Pending, Not Awarded (previously Declined/Denied) and Declined by Candidate.

For multi-investigator grants, indicate the candidate's role in the grant (PI, Co-PI, collaborator, consultant), the name of the PI (if not the candidate), the number and names of Co-PIs, UCR amount, and amount to candidate. If the candidate has shared PI status on a grant (e.g. if new dual PI status on NIH grants) choose Co-PI and explain dual PI status under comments. Any grant agency acronyms should be clearly identified.

- (5) University and Public Service - Specialists in CE are expected to serve on committees at the department, College or School, campus, regional, system-wide, and national levels. They provide leadership for education of the public regarding issues relevant to their area of expertise, maintain liaison, and respond to county, State and federal agencies, industry organizations, and related external groups. They participate in the affairs of appropriate professional societies and funding agencies and review research proposals, journal manuscripts, and publications in their area of expertise. Specialists in CE are evaluated on both the amount and the quality of their service to the department, the College or School, the campus, the University, and the public, with particular attention to that service which is directly related to their professional expertise and achievement. Information should be listed only once and as much as possible, organized by activity in chronological order, including beginning and ending year(s) of participation and the candidate's role (e.g. Chair, member, co-Chair and other), rather than repeating an activity. List department, college or school, Senate, administrative and systemwide service under separate categories. Ad hoc committee service (without revealing the name of the candidate) should be listed under Senate service.

- Contribution to programmatic, administrative, or organizational direction and leadership
- Commitment and effectiveness in development and maintenance of productive cooperative relationships (e.g., committee service, workgroup participation, etc.)

- Specialist's institutional leadership, exercise of peer responsibilities, and effectiveness in developing and maintaining cooperative efforts among researchers, industry, citizens, CE staff, and others
- Effectiveness in developing and maintaining liaison and cooperative working partnership between CE, industry, research agencies, and others involved in the program
- Effort and effectiveness in aiding and counseling peers and non-peers

(6) Extension Activity - The checklists for merit, appraisal, promotion, advancement or quinquennial review actions include a section entitled "Extension Activity." This section should include:

- Interaction with other Specialists in CE, Advisors, workgroups, and programs, which result in activities such as development and presentation of educational materials
- Preparation and distribution of newsletters to clientele groups
- Participation in meetings with clientele
- Work with public or private schools
- Instruction of University Extension courses or short courses
- Development and presentation of in-service training courses
- Organization and/or participation in workshops, short courses, field tours, or symposia

Include those activities which educate CE Advisors or other clientele groups to serve County, regional, institutional, or industry needs. Evidence of accomplishments would include preparation of publications directed to user groups and decision-makers in agricultural and natural resources and to consumer groups; establishment of computer networks; and preparation of films, videotapes, slide sets, etc. Do not repeat those items which are listed under Professional Activity and University/Public Service.

(7) Specialists in CE with a Professorial (I&R) Title - In addition to the responsibilities normally associated with Specialists in CE, those holding fractional I&R appointments are expected to play a role in resident instruction and graduate education within academic departments. The extent of involvement will vary depending upon the percent of I&R appointment, but generally will involve responsibility for an academic class. Clearly demonstrated evidence of high quality in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion. More than one kind of evidence should accompany each file. For examples of evidence for teaching effectiveness, see APM 210-1-d-(1). Additionally, the research component of an I&R appointment carries with it an expectation of concept-oriented or basic research. The expected degree of accomplishment in this area also will vary depending upon the percent of I&R appointment. This type of appointment will require review by the CAP (for the I&R portion of the appointment), and final authority is with the Chancellor for appointments at Assistant IV and above.

(8) Specialists in CE with an Agronomist (OR) Title - The goals of the Specialist in CE component of an appointment of a person with a split CE/OR appointment are parallel to the missions of the AES and may overlap them. The goal of the Specialist in CE is to develop and conduct a research-based education program aimed at appropriate clientele groups off-campus. On the other hand, the role for the AES component of the appointment is to carry out research or other creative activity, the work being aligned to the mission of the AES.

Research done for the CE portion of the appointment in many cases may be identical to the research done for the AES portion of the appointment, as the mission of the AES may align well with the academic direction of the appointee's discipline and outreach program.

However, work for the AES in some cases may differ substantially in content. An AES appointee is also expected to teach and perform other outreach activities, but the purpose of these activities is to provide people and groups served by the mission of the AES with information derived from or related to the research of the appointee. This teaching may occur on or off-campus. Frequently, a person with a split appointment may use research-based information from the AES portion of the appointment in his or her Extension teaching. Professional competence activities of the AES portion should serve the academic discipline in a way appropriate to the professional interests and skills of the appointee. The professional competence activities for the AES portion of a split appointment clearly overlap with the professional competence activities of the CE portion of the appointment. In a similar way, the service component of an AES appointment is guided by the organizational needs of the AES and the needs of the clientele as they relate to the mission of the AES. The service work for the CE portion of an appointment may overlap considerably with the service work done for the AES portion of the appointment because both are based upon the research competence of the appointee and organizational needs of the University and the community.

It should be clear to persons with split FTE appointments and to those evaluating accomplishments of those persons, that the goals and missions of both components of a split FTE appointment must be met, whether they are met by identical or discrete accomplishment. Specialists in CE holding fractional OR appointments will be expected to have one or more Agricultural Experiment Station (AES) projects supported by Federal and State funds earmarked for mission-oriented research, both basic and applied, and consistent with the academic plan and mission of the College or School, as well as the California AES.

Although reviewers shall be rigorous and objective in evaluating a candidate's qualifications within the established criteria, reviewers shall exercise reasonable flexibility in balancing, when the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another area. However, this balance may not be achieved by an absence of performance in any of the specified areas. In order to achieve a synergy, the partial appointments in each series have to be realistically evaluated with an eye toward encouraging the synergy. A merit increase or promotion is based on individual qualifications and meritorious performance and is not automatic after a stated number of years of service.

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 (APM 210-1-d). The new language added on July 1, 2015 does not add a fourth category of evaluation, but seeks to recognize contributions to equal opportunity and diversity within the existing categories of research, teaching, and service.

**a. First Personnel Actions at UCR Only**

Items that were not credited at appointment but which have been completed (e.g. grants awarded, papers published, talks given) between the submission of the appointment file and date of appointment may be included. The review period should be adjusted to capture these items. List of the items that would normally fall under an eFilePlus category must be included on the cover sheet of the Department Letter.

## Solicitation of Letters

- a. Farm Advisor/County Advisor/Other Clientele Letters- Letters of evaluation are required for merit, fifth- year appraisal, and promotion files for Assistant Specialists in CE. Letters of evaluation are optional for merit and quinquennial files for Associate and Full Specialists in CE; however, they are required for promotion, Advancement to Step VI and Above Scale files. Input is essential, particularly if we are to look at the impact of programs on counties and clientele. Clientele include CE County Advisors, other Specialists in CE, AES researchers, growers, industry representatives, governmental agencies, and other end users. If Farm Advisor or other Clientele input is lacking or too sparse, which is not uncommon in certain program areas, input from other leaders (other Specialists in CE, industry, local, State and Federal agencies, commodity boards, etc.) may be solicited.
- b. Extramural Letters - Required for all appointment and promotion cases and for advancement to Specialist in CE VI and Specialist in CE Above Scale. Extramural letters are not required for merits, appraisals, or for merits within Above-Scale. Letters requesting extramural evaluations are critical and are used to assess achievement, particularly in the areas of research and professional activity.

All extramural letters should be from qualified persons of a rank equal to or above the rank sought by the candidate. The reviewers' qualifications should include an established reputation and a disciplinary expertise enabling them to comment and assess in an informed manner. Preferable, such persons should be affiliated with institutions comparable in quality to the University of California.

In suggesting referees, it is desirable to include not only the best qualified persons in the field or subdiscipline but also external evaluators who are not closely affiliated with the candidate or his/her work. The external reviewers should include a preponderance of reviewers who have not had a close working relationship with the candidate (e.g., as mentor or collaborator).

It is preferable that the file includes some extramural referees familiar with the UC rank and step system. No more than two letters should be from the same campus.

In the case of both letter solicitations from Farm Advisors/County Advisors/Other Clientele and letters from extramural referees (applicable as noted above), letters should be requested from 3 to 6 individuals suggested by the candidate and from 3 to 6 individuals suggested by the department and/or chair, respectively; both lists should be adequately balanced between the candidate's suggestions and those of his/her colleagues. It is the Chair's responsibility to ensure sufficient re-solicitation to achieve this end. If an adequate number and/or balance is not forthcoming the Chair must provide a memo describing efforts to achieve the requirement.

In the case of both letter solicitations from Farm Advisors/County Advisors/Other Clientele and letters from extramural referees, candidates may provide a list of no more than three (3) individuals from whom they prefer that letters not be solicited. This list should include reasons for potential exclusion. The Chair should make good faith effort to abide by the candidate's request. The candidate's exclusion list and the Chair's acknowledgement of receipt must be included in the file.

Sample solicitation letters are provided in Model Letters A-G, respectively. The University of California policy on confidentiality is to be enclosed with the solicitation letters A through G for Farm Advisor/County Advisor/Other Clientele Letters and Extramural Letters.

### Academic Senate Membership

Specialists in CE who hold a partial I&R appointment with a professorial title are members of the Academic Senate. Specialists in CE and Specialists in CE with an OR FTE appointment are not members of the Academic Senate if they do not have an I&R split.

### Voting Privileges

Each department may, by following the procedures that are set out in Academic Senate Bylaw 55 for the extension of the right to vote to lesser professorial ranks, choose to extend the privilege to participate to Specialists in CE without I&R appointments. Such extension may only be granted by a 2/3 vote of the tenured departmental Senate faculty, and it is subject to review by the Committee on Academic Personnel. Thus, these Specialists in CE would be able to read the personnel files, participate in the department meeting, and cast an advisory vote.



## Specialist in Cooperative Extension

### MODEL LETTER A

The following text must be included in solicitation of letters (to extramural reviewers) of evaluation for academic appointment or promotion to Associate Specialist in CE (1.00 CE FTE), or for academic appointment or promotion to full title Specialist in CE (1.00 CE FTE). < The Chair may add to this language.>

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

The Department of \_\_\_\_\_ / School of Public Policy is evaluating \_\_\_\_\_ for possible appointment (or promotion) to the rank of Associate Specialist in CE (or Specialist in Cooperative Extension). I write to ask whether you might be willing to assist us in this regard by providing a written evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_'s accomplishments, emphasizing (his/her) performance in the four criteria described below. This evaluation is crucial in maintaining the high scholarly standards of the University of California. We in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ / School of Public Policy would be most grateful if you would assist us in this important assessment.

#### **For Associate Rank:**

The Associate rank is reserved for Specialists in CE who demonstrate significant potential for a productive career. Promotion to this and higher ranks are reserved for individuals demonstrating intellectual attainment in extending knowledge and information and in research and creative activity. The four criteria used for assessing the performance of a Specialist in CE are: 1) performance in extending knowledge and information in a specialty area; 2) performance in mission-oriented research and creative activity; 3) professional competence and activity; and 4) University and public service.

#### **For Full Rank:**

Candidates considered for promotion from the Associate rank to full Specialist in CE must have developed an excellent program in the four criteria of performance in extending knowledge and information in a specialty area, performance in mission-oriented research and creative activity, professional competence and activity, and University and public service for advancement, as well as continuing to demonstrate superior intellectual attainment in extending knowledge and information and in research and creative activity.

Please add your own description and evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_'s career accomplishments and potential achievements in whatever terms you feel would best apply.

In writing your response, please take note of the attached University of California policy regarding the confidentiality of letters of evaluation that are included in the personnel review files.

## Specialist in Cooperative Extension

### MODEL LETTER B

The following text must be included in solicitation of letters (to extramural reviewers) of evaluation for academic appointment or promotion to Associate Specialist in CE (split CE & I&R FTE), or for academic appointment or promotion to full title Specialist in CE (split CE & I&R FTE). <The Chair may add to this language.>

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

The Department of \_\_\_\_\_ / School of Public Policy is evaluating \_\_\_\_\_ for possible promotion to the rank of Associate Specialist in CE (or Specialist in CE) (\_\_\_\_ %) and Associate Professor (or Professor) (\_\_\_\_ % with tenure). I write to ask whether you might be willing to assist us in this regard by providing a written evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_'s accomplishments, emphasizing (his/her) performance in teaching as well as the four criteria described below. The evaluation is crucial in maintaining the high scholarly standards of the University of California. We in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ / School of Public Policy would be most grateful if you would assist us in this important assessment.

#### **For Associate Rank:**

The Associate rank is reserved for Specialists in CE who demonstrate significant potential for a productive career. Promotion to this and higher ranks are reserved for individuals demonstrating intellectual attainment in extending knowledge and information and in research and creative activity. The four criteria used for assessing the performance of a Specialist in CE are: 1) performance in extending knowledge and information in a specialty area; 2) performance in mission-oriented research and creative activity; 3) professional competence and activity; and 4) University and public service.

#### **For Full Rank:**

The full rank is reserved for Specialists in CE who have developed an excellent program in the four criteria for advancement, as well as continued demonstration of superior intellectual attainment in extending knowledge and information and in research and creative activity. The four criteria used for assessing the performance of a Specialist in CE are: 1) performance in extending knowledge and information in a specialty area; 2) performance in mission-oriented research and creative activity; 3) professional competence and activity; and 4) University and public service.

In addition to the responsibilities normally associated with Specialists in CE, those holding fractional I&R appointments are expected to play a role in resident instruction and graduate education within academic departments. The research component of this appointment carries with it an expectation of concept-oriented or basic research. We would appreciate your evaluation of the candidate's teaching, if you have the basis for such an evaluation.

The University of California standard to which tenure candidates are held uses the language "superior intellectual attainment" in regard to the candidate's record of teaching and research. The measure of \_\_\_\_\_'s work against this standard requires careful analysis of the work and of its significance for the field: Has the work made a substantial impact on the discipline? Has the thinking of others in the field been changed by the work? Your response would be most useful to the department's deliberations if it addresses these questions in analytical detail. Please note that review committees on campus focus on accepted publications when determining whether or not the standard has been met.

Please add your own description and evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_'s career accomplishments and potential achievements in whatever terms you feel would best apply.

In writing your response, please take note of the attached University of California policy regarding the confidentiality of letters of evaluation that are included in the personnel review files.

## Specialist in Cooperative Extension

### MODEL LETTER C

The following text must be included in solicitation of letters (to extramural reviewers) of evaluation for academic appointment or promotion to Associate Specialist in CE (split CE & OR FTE), or academic appointment or promotion to Specialist in CE (split CE & OR FTE). < The Chair may add to this language.>

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

The Department of \_\_\_\_\_ / School of Public Policy is evaluating \_\_\_\_\_ for possible promotion to the rank of Associate Specialist in CE (or Specialist in CE) (\_\_\_\_%) and Associate \_\_\_\_\_ (or \_\_\_\_\_) (\_\_\_\_\_% with tenure). I write to ask whether you might be willing to assist us in this regard by providing a written evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_'s accomplishments, emphasizing (his/her) performance in research, as well as the four criteria described below. The evaluation is crucial in maintaining the high scholarly standards of the University of California. We in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ / School of Public Policy would be most grateful if you would assist us in this important assessment.

#### **If Applicable:**

Promotion to the Associate rank for Specialists in CE with an OR FTE component constitutes a tenure action for the OR portion of the appointment.

#### **For Associate Rank:**

The Associate rank is reserved for Specialists in CE who demonstrate significant potential for a productive career. Promotion to this and higher ranks are reserved for individuals demonstrating superior intellectual attainment in extending knowledge and information and in research and creative activity. The four criteria used for assessing the performance of a Specialist in CE are: 1) performance in extending knowledge and information in a specialty area; 2) performance in mission-oriented research and creative activity; 3) professional competence and activity; and 4) University and public service. In addition, Specialists in CE with a fractional OR (AES) FTE appointment are expected to carry out mission-oriented research, both basic and applied.

#### **For Full Rank:**

The full title rank is reserved for individuals demonstrating superior intellectual attainment in extending knowledge and information and in research and creative activity. The four criteria used for assessing the performance of a Specialist in CE are: 1) performance in extending knowledge and information in a specialty area; 2) performance in mission-oriented research and creative activity; 3) professional competence and activity; and 4) University and public service. In addition, Specialists in CE with a fractional OR (AES) FTE appointment are expected to carry out mission-oriented research, both basic and applied.

Please add your own description and evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_'s career accomplishments and potential achievements in whatever terms you feel would best apply.

In writing your response, please take note of the enclosed University of California policy regarding the confidentiality of letters of evaluation that are included in the personnel review files.

## Specialist in Cooperative Extension

### MODEL LETTER D

The following text must be included in solicitation of letters (to extramural reviewers) for advancement to Specialist in CE VI (1.00 CE FTE, split CE & I&R FTE, or split CE & OR FTE). < The Chair may add to this language.>

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

The University of California, Riverside is conducting an exceptional review of the scholarly record of \_\_\_\_\_ for the rank of Specialist in CE, Step VI. In the University of California system this rank would be roughly equivalent to that of a senior Full Professor at a major private research university. The evaluation is crucial in maintaining the high scholarly standards of the University of California. We in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ / School of Public Policy would be most grateful if you would assist us in this important assessment.

Within the University of California, appointment or promotion to Associate Specialist in CE requires the demonstration of superior intellectual attainment, evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement. For promotion to the rank of (full) Specialist in CE, we look for further evidence of superior intellectual attainment and excellence beyond that which was achieved for promotion to Associate Specialist in CE, and for significant impact within the scholarly community.

The next full career evaluation is typically made in connection with advancement to Specialist in CE, Step VI. Advancement to Specialist in CE, Step VI or higher, involves an evaluation of the candidate's entire career but with emphasis on accomplishments since achievement of the rank of (full) Specialist in CE. There must be evidence of sustained and continuing excellence. Criteria include great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally in the performance of (1) extending knowledge and information or (2) in scholarly and creative achievement. A comparison to the work of others in the field is often useful.

#### **If Applicable**

Your evaluation should also consider the fact that \_\_\_\_\_'s appointment is \_\_\_\_\_% in Cooperative Extension and \_\_\_\_\_% as a \_\_\_\_\_ in the Agricultural Experiment Station (or \_\_\_\_\_% as an I&R Professor).

#### **If Applicable**

In addition, Specialists in CE with a fractional OR (AES) FTE appointment are expected to carry out mission-oriented research, both basic and applied.

#### **If Applicable**

In addition to the responsibilities normally associated with Specialists in CE, those holding fractional I&R appointments are expected to play a role in resident instruction and graduate education within academic departments. The research component of this appointment carries with it an expectation of concept-oriented or basic research. We would appreciate your evaluation of the candidate's teaching, if you have the basis for such evaluation.

In writing your response, please take note of the enclosed University of California policy regarding the confidentiality of letters of evaluation that are included in the personnel review files.

## Specialist in Cooperative Extension

### MODEL LETTER E

The following text must be included in solicitation of letters (to extramural reviewers) for advancement to Specialist in CE, Above-Scale (1.00 CE FTE, split CE & I&R FTE, or split CE & OR FTE). < The Chair may add to this language.>

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

The University of California, Riverside is conducting an exceptional review of the scholarly record of \_\_\_\_\_ for the rank of Specialist in CE, Above-Scale. Each campus in the University of California system has only a small number of Specialists in CE, Above-Scale. The evaluation is crucial in maintaining the high scholarly standards of the University of California. We in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ / School of Public Policy would be most grateful if you would assist us in this important assessment.

Within the University of California, appointment or promotion to Associate Specialist in CE requires the demonstration of superior intellectual attainment, evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement. For promotion to the rank of (full) Specialist in CE, we look for further evidence of superior intellectual attainment and excellence beyond that which was achieved for promotion to Associate Specialist in CE, and for significant impact within the scholarly community.

The next full career evaluation is typically made in connection with advancement to Specialist in CE, Step VI. The criteria for advancement to Specialist in CE, Step VI, which calls for evidence of sustained and continuing excellence. The criteria for advancement to CE Specialist Step VI state that this step will be granted upon evidence of great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally in the performance of (1) extending knowledge and information or (2) in scholarly and creative achievement.

Specialist in CE, Above-Scale, represents an even higher standard. Our personnel rules state that advancement to this level “is reserved for Specialists in CE of the highest distinction whose performance in the extension of knowledge is excellent and whose work has been internationally recognized and acknowledged. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Specialist in CE, Step IX is not a justification. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance of which advancement to Step IX was based.”

#### **If Applicable**

Your evaluation should also consider the fact that \_\_\_\_\_’s appointment is \_\_\_\_% in Cooperative Extension and \_\_\_\_% as a \_\_\_\_\_ in the Agricultural Experiment Station (or \_\_\_\_% as an I&R Professor).

#### **If Applicable**

In addition, Specialists in CE with a fractional OR (AES) FTE appointment are expected to carry out mission-oriented research, both basic and applied.

#### **If Applicable**

In addition to the responsibilities normally associated with Specialists in CE, those holding fractional I&R appointments are expected to play a role in resident instruction and graduate education within academic departments. The research component of this appointment carries with it an expectation of concept-oriented or basic research. We would appreciate your evaluation of the candidate’s teaching, if you have the basis for such evaluation.

In writing your response, please take note of the enclosed University of California policy regarding the confidentiality of letters of evaluation that are included in the personnel review files.

## Specialist in Cooperative Extension

### MODEL LETTER F

The following text must be included in solicitation of letters (to Farm Advisors and/or other clientele) for evaluation in a fifth-year appraisal, merit advancement, promotion or quinquennial review file for Specialists in CE. <The Chair may add to this language.>

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

#### **For Appraisal:**

The University of California requires a formal appraisal of Assistant Specialists in CE in their fifth year of service within that rank. \_\_\_\_\_, who holds an appointment as \_\_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_%), is currently under review for a formal fifth-year appraisal. The purpose of the appraisal is to arrive at a preliminary assessment of the prospects of a candidate for eventual promotion to the Associate rank.

In writing your response, please take note of the attached University of California policy regarding the confidentiality of letters of evaluation that are included in the personnel review files.

#### **For Merit or Promotion:**

The Department of \_\_\_\_\_ / School of Public Policy is evaluating \_\_\_\_\_, who holds an appointment as \_\_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_%) and \_\_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_%) for possible promotion to the rank of Associate Specialist in CE (or possible merit advancement to \_\_\_\_\_). I write to ask whether you might be willing to assist us in this regard by providing a written evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_'s accomplishments, emphasizing (his/her) Extension activities (extension of knowledge and applied research).

\_\_\_\_\_ will be evaluated on his/ her (1) performance in extending knowledge and information, (2) performance in mission-oriented research and creative activity, (3) professional competence and activity, and (4) University and public service. Your evaluation should consider this information, as well as your direct knowledge of \_\_\_\_\_'s accomplishments.

In writing your response, please take note of the attached University of California policy regarding the confidentiality of letters of evaluation that are included in the personnel review files.

#### **For Quinquennial Review:**

The University of California requires that every academic is reviewed no less than every five years. \_\_\_\_\_, who holds an appointment as \_\_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_%), is currently under review for a formal fifth-year evaluation. The purpose of the evaluation is to provide constructive feedback aimed at maximizing the candidate's effectiveness in the following areas: (1) performance in extending knowledge and information; (2) performance in mission-oriented research and creative activity; (3) professional competence and activity; and (4) University and public service. Your evaluation should consider this information, as well as your direct knowledge of \_\_\_\_\_'s accomplishments.

In writing your response, please take note of the attached University of California policy regarding the confidentiality of letters of evaluation that are included in the personnel review files.

## **Specialist in Cooperative Extension**

### **MODEL LETTER G**

(For use when unsolicited letters of evaluation for promotion have been received)

Thank you for sending us your letter of evaluation on \_\_\_\_\_, who is being considered for promotion at \_\_\_\_\_.

Evaluations submitted in confidence become part of the candidate's official personnel review file. The candidate will, upon request, be provided with a redaction of the confidential documents in the file. Redaction is defined as the removal of identifying information (including name, title, institutional affiliation, and relationship to the candidate) contained either at the top of the letterhead or within and below the signature block of the letter of evaluation.

The full text of the body of your letter will therefore be provided to the candidate if so requested. Although we cannot guarantee that at some future time a court or governmental agency will not require disclosure of the source of confidential evaluations in University of California personnel files, we can assure you that the University will endeavor to protect the identity of authors of letters of evaluation to the fullest extent allowable under the law.

I shall appreciate it if you will inform me whether in light of our policies we may proceed to use the material you have sent to us, or whether you wish us to return the material to you. If you do not request return of the material by \_\_\_\_\_ it will be maintained in our files.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA POLICY ON THE  
CONFIDENTIALITY OF OUTSIDE LETTERS OF EVALUATION

The University of California will keep your name and institutional affiliation confidential. Any identifying information on the letterhead and within your signature block will be removed. However, pursuant to state law and University policy, the full text of the body of your letter will be provided to the candidate. **In order to keep your identity confidential, you may want to avoid putting information in the body of your letter that would identify you.** If you wish, you may provide a brief factual statement regarding your relationship to the faculty member as a separate attachment to your letter that we will not disclose to the candidate.

In those rare instances where a court or government agency seeks to compel the disclosure of the source of a confidential evaluation in University of California academic personnel files, it is University practice to protect the identity of authors of letters of evaluation to the fullest extent allowable under the law. The judicially mandated disclosure of the identity of confidential evaluations has been extremely rare at the University of California.



**Candidate's Response to the Departmental Letter**

Select one:

- a) \_\_\_\_ Addressed to the **Chair / Associate Dean of the School of Public Policy:**  
This is intended to be included in the file at the departmental level. I understand it will be added to the department's copy of the file and will proceed with the forwarded file through the review process.
- b) \_\_\_\_ Addressed to the **Dean:**  
This is intended to be included in the file at the Dean's level. I understand the Dean, or her designee will see this document, but that it will not be added to the department's copy of the file. The Dean will inform the Department Chair / Associate Dean of the School of Public Policy that a written statement has been received without revealing the contents.

Candidate's

Signature

\_\_\_\_\_ Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

# CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR APPRAISALS FOR ASSISTANT SPECIALISTS IN CE

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Submit original and electronic copy

- ☐ A. Checklist of Documents in File
- ☐ B. Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
- ☐ C. Chair's Letter (*optional*) (*confidential*)
- ☐ D. Department Letter (must include vote)
- ☐ E. Minority Report (*if applicable*)
- ☐ F. Candidate's Response to department letter (*optional*)
- ☐ G. Candidate's Self-Statement (*optional, but strongly encouraged*)
- ☐ H. Candidate's Response to material in the file (*optional*)
- \*\* ☐ I. Evaluation Letters from Farm Advisors or other Clientele Stakeholdersevaluating  
Include letters of declination and count in total number  
Include the following:  
☐ Solicitation letter  
☐ Indicate those suggested by department and by candidate, as well as
- \*\* ☐ J. Student Letters Evaluating Teaching (*if applicable, include letters if non-confidential teaching evaluations are not provided*)  
☐ Solicitation letter or statement as to how obtained
- ☐ K. Current Position Description (for CE portion of appointment) & Position Description at last advance or at appointment, whichever is most recent; must include Affirmative Action Statement here
- ☐ L. Current Biography
- ☐ M. Current Bibliography of Publications/Creative Activity (*include candidate's contributions to joint-authored works since arrival at UCR*)
- ☐ N. List of Professional Activity and Service (*since appointment, include the current year*)
- ☐ O. List of University/Public Service (*since appointment, include the current year*)
- ☐ P. List of Extension Activity (*since appointment, include the current year*)
- ☐ Q. Grant Activity (*if applicable, since appointment, include the current year*)
- ☐ R. Teaching Information (*if applicable, include teaching activity for the previous nine quarters*)
- ☐ S. Student Evaluation of Teaching (*if applicable, include evaluations for the previous nine quarters*)
- \*\* ☐ T. Letters from other Departments/Programs/Institutes/Centers (*optional*)
- \*\* ☐ U. Other – Confidential (specify item(s) below)
- \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ V. Other – Non-Confidential (specify item(s) below)
- \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ W. File of Publications/Creative Activity (*one copy only*)  
Package separately with cover list of contents and mark "Please return to the Department of \_\_\_\_\_"

\*\* = Indicate # included

\_\_\_\_\_file sent to Dean's office \*\*\*Forward to APO if title includes I & R component

Dept chair initial & date

Received in Deans office	Returned for corrections			Received in APO	Returned for corrections		Sent to Ad Hoc	Ad hoc report received	Ad hoc report sent to Dean	Dean letter received in APO	Sent to CAP	CAP vote date	CAP minute received	Sent to VPAP	Sent to EVCP	Sent to Chancellor	Final Decision	Announced
	sent	sent	sent		sent	sent												

---

rcvd	rcvd	rcvd		rcvd	rcvd
------	------	------	--	------	------

**CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR MERITS FOR ASSISTANT SPECIALISTS IN CE**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Submit original and electronic copy

- ☐ A. Checklist of Documents in File
- ☐ B. Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
- ☐ C. Chair's Letter *(optional) (confidential)*
- ☐ D. Department Letter *(must include vote) 2 page max*
- ☐ E. Minority Report (if applicable) **2 page max**
- ☐ F. Candidate's Response to the Department Letter *(optional) 2 page max*
- ☐ G. Candidate's Self-Statement *(optional, but strongly encouraged) 2 page max*
- ☐ H. Candidate's Response to material in the file *(optional)*
- \*\* ☐ I. Evaluation Letters from Farm Advisors or other Clientele evaluating Extension activities - *(required)*  
Include letters of declination and count in total number  
Include the following:  
☐ Solicitation letter  
☐ Indicate those suggested by department and by candidate, as well as a brief statement regarding academic standing of each letter writer
- \*\* ☐ J. Student Letters Evaluating Teaching *(if applicable; include letters if non-confidential teaching evaluations are not provided)*  
☐ Solicitation letter or statement as to how obtained
- ☐ K. Current Position Description (for CE portion of appointment) & Position Description at last advance or at appointment, whichever is most recent; must include Affirmative Action Statement
- ☐ L. Current Biography
- ☐ M. Current Bibliography of Publications/Creative Activity *(retained at CNAS or SPP Dean's Office)*
- ☐ N. Bibliography at Last Advance *(retained at CNAS or SPP Dean's Office)*
- ☐ O. Difference List with items to be credited since last advance *(blue paper)*  
☐ Difference List cover sheet included *(blue paper) (optional)*
- ☐ P. Professional Activity and Service *(since last advance or last merit if following a lateral promotion; include the current year)*
- ☐ Q. University and Public Service *(since last advance or last merit if following a lateral promotion; include the current year)*
- ☐ R. Extension Activity *(since last advance or last merit if following a lateral promotion; include the current year)*
- ☐ S. Grant Activity *(if applicable, since last advance or last merit if following a lateral promotion; include the current year)*
- ☐ T. Teaching Information since last advance *(if applicable; include teaching activity for the previous three years or since the last advance; whichever period of time is shorter)*
- ☐ U. Student Evaluation of Teaching *(if applicable; include evaluations for the previous three years or since the last advance; whichever period of time is shorter)*
- ☐ V. Letters from other Departments/Programs/Institutes/Centers *(optional)*
- \*\* ☐ W. Other – Confidential *(specify item(s) below):*  
\_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ X. Other – Non-Confidential *(specify item(s) below):*  
\_\_\_\_\_

**\*\* = Indicate # included**

\_\_\_\_\_ file sent to the Dean's Office \*\*\*Forward to APO if title includes I & R component

Dept chair initial & date

Received in Deans office	Returned for corrections			Received in APO	Returned for corrections		Sent to Ad Hoc	Ad hoc report received	Ad hoc report sent to Dean	Dean letter received in APO	Sent to CAP	CAP vote date	CAP minute received	Sent to VPAP	Sent to EVCP	Sent to Chancellor	Final Decision	Announced
	sent	sent	sent		<input type="checkbox"/> sent	sent												
	rcvd	rcvd	rcvd		rcvd	rcvd												

**CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR PROMOTIONS TO ASSOCIATE SPECIALIST IN CE OR SPECIALIST in CE, AND ADVANCEMENTS TO SPECIALIST IN CE VI, ABOVE-SCALE OR WITHIN SPECIALIST in CE ABOVE SCALE**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Submit original and electronic copy

- ☐ A. Checklist of Documents in File
- ☐ B. Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
- ☐ C. Chair's Letter (*optional*) (*confidential*)
- ☐ D. Department Letter (*must include vote*)
- ☐ E. Minority Report (*if applicable*)
- ☐ F. Candidate's Response to the Department Letter (*optional*)
- ☐ G. Candidate's Self-Statement (*optional, but strongly encouraged*)
- ☐ H. Candidate's Response to material in the file (*optional*)
- \*\* ☐ I. Extramural Letters (*required for promotions, to Step VI & to A/S*) (*confidential*)  
 Include letters of declination and count in total number  
 Include the following:  
☐ Solicitation letter  
☐ List of extramural reviewers. Indicate those suggested by department, by candidate as well as a brief statement regarding academic standing of each letter writer  
 The packet of information sent to extramural referees, if different from the documents submitted as part of the file.  
 Please include CV if sent to extramural reviewers. (See Section III.M)
- \*\* ☐ J. Evaluation Letters from Farm Advisors or other Clientele evaluating Extension activities - (*Required except for within A/S*)  
 Include letters of declination and count in total number  
 Include the following:  
☐ Solicitation letter  
☐ Indicate those suggested by department, by candidate as well as a brief statement regarding academic standing of each letter writer
- \*\* ☐ K. Student Letters Evaluating Teaching (*if applicable; required if non-confidential teaching evaluations are not provided*)  
☐ Solicitation letter or statement as to how obtained
- ☐ L. Current Position Description (for CE portion of appointment) & Position Description at last advance or at appointment, whichever is most recent; must include Affirmative Action Statement here
- ☐ M. Current Biography
- ☐ N. Current Bibliography of Publications/Creative Activity
- ☐ O. Bibliography at Last Advance (*retained at CNAS or SPP Dean's Office*)
- ☐ P. Difference List with items to be credited since last advance (*blue paper*)  
☐ Difference List cover sheet included (*blue paper*) (*optional*)
- ☐ Q. Professional Activity and Service (*see Section III.R of The Call for the period of review*) - *include the current year*
- ☐ R. University/Public Service (*see Section III.Y of The Call for the period of review*) - *include the current year*
- ☐ S. Extension Activity (*include the current year*)
- ☐ T. Grant Activity (*if applicable, see Section III.N of The Call for the period of review*) - *include the current year*
- ☐ U. Teaching Information (*if applicable; include teaching activity for the previous nine quarters; see The Call, Section III.X for the period of review for listing Graduate Student Instruction*)
- ☐ V. Student Evaluation of Teaching (*if applicable, include evaluations for the previous nine quarters; to coincide with the teaching activity*)
- ☐ W. Letters from other Departments/Programs/Institutions/Centers (*optional*)
- \*\* ☐ X. Other – Confidential (*specify item(s) below*):  
 \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Y. Other – Non-Confidential (*specify item(s) below*):  
 \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Z. File of Publications/Creative Activity (*one copy only; either on a flash drive, CD or in a binder*)  
 Package separately with cover list of contents and mark "Please return to the Department of \_\_\_\_\_."

\*\* = Indicate # included

NOTE: For advancement to Specialist in CE VI, and within Specialist in CE Above-Scale, do not forward publications, but keep them available in the department.

\_\_\_\_\_ file sent to Dean's office \*\*\*Forward to APO if title includes I & R component  
 Dept chair initial & date

Received in Deans office	<input type="checkbox"/>	Returned for corrections	Received in APO	Returned for corrections	Sent to Ad Hoc	Ad hoc report received	Ad hoc report sent to Dean	Dean letter received in APO	Sent to CAP	CAP vote date	CAP minute received	Sent to VPAP	Sent to EVCIP	Sent to Chancellor	Final Decision	Announced
	sent	sent		sent												

---

rcvd	rcvd	rcvd		rcvd	rcvd
------	------	------	--	------	------

# CHECKLIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR **MERITS** FOR SPECIALISTS IN COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Submit original and electronic copy

- \*\***
- ☐ A. Checklist of Documents in File
  - ☐ B. Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
  - ☐ C. Chair's Letter *(optional) (confidential)*
  - ☐ D. Department Letter *(must include vote) 2 page max*
  - ☐ E. Minority Report (if applicable) **2 page max**
  - ☐ F. Candidate's Response to the Department Letter *(optional) 2 page max*
  - ☐ G. Candidate's Self-Statement *(optional, but strongly encouraged) 2 page max*
  - ☐ H. Candidate's Response to material in the file *(optional)*
  - \*\*** ☐ I. Evaluation Letters from Farm Advisors or other Clientele Stakeholdersevaluating
- Include letters of declination and count in total number
- Include the following:
- ☐ Solicitation letter
  - ☐ Indicate those suggested by department and by candidate, as well as a brief statement regarding academic standing of each letter writer
- \*\*** ☐ J. Student Letters Evaluating Teaching (if applicable; *required if non-confidential teaching evaluations are not provided*)
- Solicitation letter or statement as to how obtained
- ☐ K. Current Position Description (for CE portion of appointment) & Position Description at last advance or at appointment, whichever is most recent; must include Affirmative Action Statement
- here
- ☐ L. Current Biography
  - ☐ M. Current Bibliography of Publications/Creative Activity *(retained at CNAS Dean's Office)*
  - ☐ N. Bibliography at Last Advance *(retained at CNAS Dean's Office)*
  - ☐ O. Difference List with items to be credited since last advance *(blue paper)*
    - ☐ Difference List cover sheet included *(blue paper) (optional)*
  - ☐ P. Professional Activity and Service *(since last advance or last merit if following a lateral promotion; include the current year)*
  - ☐ Q. University and Public Service *(since last advance or last merit if following a lateral promotion; include the current year)*
  - ☐ R. Extension Activity *(since last advance or last merit if following a lateral promotion; include the current year)*
  - ☐ S. Grant Activity *(if applicable, since last advance or last merit if following a lateral promotion; include the current year)*
  - ☐ T. (If applicable) Teaching Information since last advance *(if applicable; include teaching activity for the previous three years or since the last advance, whichever period of time is shorter)*
  - ☐ U. (If applicable) Student Evaluation of Teaching *(if applicable; include evaluations for the previous three years or since the last advance, whichever period of time is shorter)*
  - ☐ V. Letters from other Departments/Programs/Institutes/Centers *(optional)*
  - \*\*** ☐ W. Other – Confidential *(specify item(s) below):*
  - ☐ X. Other – Non-Confidential *(specify item(s) below):*

**\*\* = Indicate # included**

\_\_\_\_\_ file sent to Dean's office **\*\*\*Forward to APO if title includes I & R component**

Dept chair initial & date

Received in Deans office	<input type="checkbox"/> Returned for corrections	Received in APO	<input type="checkbox"/> Returned for corrections	Sent to Ad Hoc	Ad hoc report received	Ad hoc report sent to Dean	Dean letter received in APO	Sent to CAP	CAP vote date	CAP minute received	Sent to VPAP	Sent to EVCP	Sent to Chancellor	Final Decision	Announced
sent	sent	sent	sent												
rcvd	rcvd	rcvd	rcvd												

# CHECKLIST FOR QUINQUENNIAL REVIEWS FOR ASSOCIATE & SPECIALISTS IN CE

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Submit original and electronic copy

**\*\* = Confidential**

- Indicate # \*\* \_\_\_\_\_
- Included
- ☐ A. Checklist of Documents in File
  - ☐ B. Signed Procedural Safeguards Statement
  - ☐ C. Chair's Letter (*optional*)
  - ☐ D. Department Letter (*vote required*)
  - ☐ E. Minority Report (*if applicable*)
  - ☐ F. Candidate's Response to the Department Letter (*optional*)
  - ☐ G. Candidate's Self-Statement (*optional but encouraged*) **2 page maximum**
  - ☐ H. Candidate's Response to the material in the file (*optional*)
  - ☐ I. Evaluation Letters from Farm Advisors or other Clientele evaluating Extension  
Include letters of declination and count in total number  
Include the following:
    - ☐ Solicitation Letter
    - ☐ Indicate those suggested by department and by candidate, as well as a brief statement regarding academic standing of each letter writer
  - ☐ J. Position Description (for CE portion of appointment) at last advance or at appointment, whichever is most recent; must include Affirmative Action Statement here
  - ☐ K. Current Biography
  - ☐ L. Current Bibliography of Publications/Creative Activity
  - ☐ M. Bibliography at Last Advance
  - ☐ N. Publication and Creative Activity during last 5 years (*include candidate's contributions to joint-authored works during last 5 years*)
  - ☐ O. Professional Activity and Service (*for last 5 years, include the current year*)
  - ☐ P. University/Public Service (*for last 5 years, include the current year*)
  - ☐ Q. Extension Activity (*for last 5 years*)
  - ☐ R. Grant Activity (*for last 5 years, if applicable*)
  - ☐ S. (If applicable) Teaching Information (*if applicable*) (*showing last 5 years*)
  - ☐ T. (If applicable) Student Evaluation of Teaching  
Evaluations for all courses taught in last 5 years -- campus teaching evaluation forms, etc.
  - ☐ U. Letters from other Departments/Programs/Institutions/Centers (*optional*)
  - ☐ V. Other – Confidential (*specify item(s) below*):  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
  - ☐ W. Other – Non-Confidential (*specify item(s) below*):  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ file sent to Dean's office \*\*\*Forward to APO if title includes I & R component

Dept chair initial & date

Received in Deans office	Returned for corrections			Received in APO	Returned for corrections		Sent to Ad Hoc	Ad hoc report received	Ad hoc report sent to Dean	Dean letter received in APO	Sent to CAP	CAP vote date	CAP minute received	Sent to VPAP	Sent to EVCP	Sent to Chancellor	Final Decision	Announced
	sent	sent	sent		sent	sent												
	rcvd	rcvd	rcvd		rcvd	rcvd												



Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Submit original and electronic copy

\_\_\_\_\_file sent to Dean's office \*\*\*Forward to APO if title includes I & R component  
Dept chair initial & date

Addendum to the Call (Specialists in CE Series), Revised for 2017-2018  
Updated: 7/20/2017

## SIGNED STATEMENT FOR REQUESTING A DEFERRAL

Name	
College	
Department	
Years at Rank/Step	
Current Title	
Proposed Title	
Enclosures (if applicable)	

**Candidate's Comments:** (Use a separate sheet if necessary)

---

---

---

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Chair's Comments:** (Use a separate sheet if necessary)

---

---

---

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Dean's Comments:** (Use a separate sheet if necessary)

---

---

---

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## EXTRAMURAL GRANT ACTIVITY FORMAT

John Doe

October 2000

AGENCY	TITLE	AWARD DATES	PROJECT PERIOD	AMOUNT	PI STATUS	AWARD STATUS
NSF <sup>1</sup>	"The Role of the Educational Levels of Jurors in Deadlocked Panels"	1/94	2/94 – 1/98	\$90,000	PI	
	Other PI: I.M. Right, P.C. Tech & U.R. Wrong					
CRB <sup>2</sup>	"A Strategy for Development of After School Programs for Grades 7-12"	1/96	7/96 – 6/99	\$80,000	PI	
	Other Investigators: None					

\*Award Dates are optional

**For multi-investigator grants, provide the following information: number of co-PIs, names of co-PIs, UCR amount and amount to candidate\*.**

\*For amount to candidate, this field can be a numeric value or N/A. If N/A is selected, include an explanation as to why it is not appropriate to enter an amount.

For example, institutional grants which would include grants received to purchase major equipment will not have dollar value and should have N/A. For an equipment purchase grant, the money doesn't come to the investigators - all of it goes to buy the equipment. In this case the UCR Amount will be N/A and the explanation would state: "Not Applicable, equipment grant."

- 
- 
- 
- 1 National Science Foundation
  - 2 Citrus Research Board