

APPRAISAL PROCEDURES

Mid-career Appraisal

Department chairs are responsible for conducting mid-career appraisals of assistant professors during the **seventh (7th) semester** of service on the tenure clock. The purpose of the mid-career appraisal is to provide the assistant professor with a careful, considered **analytical evaluation** of his or her performance to date in the areas of teaching, research and creative work, professional competence and activity, and university and public service, and to make a candid assessment concerning the prospects for tenure based upon the evidence in the file.

The department should conduct the review in accordance with its written procedures. Some units appoint a departmental ad hoc committee to develop a report and assessment for discussion by the tenured members of the faculty. In other units, the chair prepares the report for discussion by the tenured faculty. The report of the ad hoc committee and/or the departmental recommendation (chair's letter) should analyze the complete record to date (including work in progress), and it should assess carefully and frankly the prospects for the individual's achieving promotion based upon continuation of that record. The appraisal should note specific areas of deficiency (if any) and should recommend actions to be taken by the individual and/or the department and chair to address those areas.

The department is required to hold a vote on mid-career appraisals. Academic Senate By-law 55 outlines voting rights.

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/manual/blpart1.html#bl55>

The tenured faculty (whether at a meeting or by mail ballot after a fixed period of review) must vote on whether the candidate's prospects for tenure are "good," "fair, or "poor" and not simply to accept or reject the recommendation of the departmental ad hoc report. The department should have reviewed the internal ad hoc committee report and/or the Chair's letter and the candidate's response, if any. After the department's deliberations, **the chair's letter should assess the candidate's prospects for promotion**, including a report of the faculty discussion and vote, and an evaluation of the candidate's performance in the following areas:

- a. Teaching
- b. Research or creative work
- c. Professional competence and activity
- d. University and public service

After the faculty deliberation and vote the chair also must convey to the candidate, either in writing or via an in-person meeting, the substance of the mid-career appraisal, along with any recommendations for changes in activities or emphasis. The chair should avoid making or implying any guarantees that the candidate will achieve tenure if s/he accomplishes certain tasks, e.g., completion of a book. Because the mid-career appraisal is directed primarily to the candidate, it is in the best interests of the candidate and the department that it be careful, cautious and candid, addressing problems where they exist while there is still time for adjustment and improvement. For this reason, requests for deferral of a mid-career appraisal will not be considered. It is important that the candidate is made thoroughly aware, in a formal way, of his or her prospects for eventual promotion. If the candidate has not yet been assigned a departmental mentor, this would be an appropriate time to do so. Mentoring resources are available at: <http://vpaafw.chance.berkeley.edu/facultymentoring.html>

The mid-career appraisal should be forwarded to the Academic Personnel Office through the appropriate dean, who will provide his or her independent assessment. The Budget Committee will provide analysis and a recommendation, and a final letter conveying this analysis and the review outcome will be issued by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Welfare. The candidate is provided a copy of the final letter.

There are instances in which the record of the candidate is so strong at the mid-career appraisal that the department considers the possibility of recommending tenure. In such a case, the department must follow the procedures for conducting a final appraisal, including soliciting external referee letters. The department must also seek campus approval for a late submission of the case. This decision should be made in consultation with the candidate and the resulting case should summarize the mid-career review and discussion as well as the tenure review and discussion. Should the final outcome of this early tenure review be not to recommend or to grant tenure, another tenure review may occur during the candidate's eleventh (11th) semester.

Final Appraisal

The final appraisal is conducted in the 11th semester on the tenure clock. This review is conducted to reach a decision regarding promotion and must be conducted in accordance with departmental and campus procedures, including the solicitation of external referee letters [see campus guidelines regarding external letters] and a faculty vote on tenure.

If this appraisal leads to a recommendation and a vote from the department in favor of tenure, then the case is submitted in the customary fashion.

If the appraisal does not lead the department to support tenure, then the recommendation may be either for termination or for deferral of the tenure decision to the 13th semester.

A departmental vote "to deny tenure" is a recommendation to terminate, which requires the normal campus level review, including assessment by a Campus Ad Hoc Review Committee if the candidate chooses.

However, in consideration of the candidate's record in the 11th semester the department may recognize that, while a positive recommendation for tenure is not possible at that time, there are strong reasons to think that a positive recommendation could be made in the following year. The department may request deferral of the tenure decision from the 11th semester to the 13th semester, but only under the following conditions:

- A full tenure review at the departmental level is conducted during the 11th semester, including a departmental report (if normally submitted) and external referee letters.
- The initial vote taken is specifically for or against the award of tenure (yes or no).
- A second faculty vote, which must state explicitly that the prospects for tenure are "good, fair, or poor," concludes that the prospects for a positive tenure recommendation in the 13th semester are good and the votes are reported accordingly.
- The department must provide a detailed explanation of its recommendation for deferral based on the candidate's record. In short, a department may not recommend deferral of a tenure decision without a fully informed vote of its faculty and without good reason to expect the deferral to lead to a positive outcome.

If campus reviewers recommend deferral and the Vice Provost approves it, the terminal nature of the 7th and 8th years of appointment is not altered; this is conveyed to the candidate explicitly in the written notification of the review outcome.

Voting Procedures

It is important that all departments document in writing their practices as they relate to appraisals and tenure reviews, including the voting process for tenure and any voting threshold for a department (e.g., some departments require a two-thirds vote for tenure, others a simple majority).

Departmental voting practices vary, and this impacts the voting process for tenure or deferral. For example, the following are two of several possible acceptable voting strategies:

Department A: Tenure votes are conducted at the faculty meeting during which the tenure file has been discussed. Absent faculty have the right to cast a vote in advance of the meeting. Should the tenure vote be negative, the faculty may immediately move to vote on the prospects for tenure in the 13th semester, using the “good,” “fair,” or “poor” vote categories. This may result in a recommendation for deferral.

Department B: The faculty meet to discuss the tenure file. Voting takes place over the next week by mail or email ballot. The ballot should simply ask whether the candidate should be awarded tenure (yes or no). If the departmental discussion revealed support for a possible deferral, a second vote needs to be conducted on the prospects for tenure using the “good,” “fair,” or “poor” categories. Another strategy is for the department to opt for a second meeting to discuss the possibility of deferral and to vote on prospects as discussed above.

The above guidelines will help ensure consistency within departments and across the campus. Copies of departmental procedures and practices for the conduct of mid-career and final appraisals should be on file with the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Welfare.

Preliminary Assessment Guidelines

If the initial outcome of the final appraisal/tenure review at the campus level is to make a terminal appointment, is not to reappoint or promote, or is contrary to the departmental recommendation, a preliminary assessment is issued [APM 220-84b]. This is similar to a tentative decision and is addressed to the dean, with copies to the department chair and the candidate. It affords the candidate, department, and dean an opportunity to review the reasons for the initial outcome and to respond prior to the final decision at the campus level. A period of 10 working days is allowed for this response. (A preliminary assessment is not issued if the department recommends deferral of the tenure decision and there is consensus by the dean and campus reviewers.)

The preliminary assessment letter will indicate that the candidate has the opportunity to request access to the tenure review file at this point. This request should be made as soon as possible in writing (email is acceptable) and should be directed to the Academic Personnel Office. If access is requested, the redacted file will be provided to the candidate, with copies to the department chair and dean. The due date for response to the preliminary assessment will be extended until 10 working days from date of access.

Campus practice is to make allowances for exceptional circumstances, such as travel by the candidate, the department chair, or the dean, in considering extensions of the due date for response. Such extension requests must be in writing (email is acceptable) and directed to the Academic Personnel Office.

The candidate's response to the preliminary assessment should be directed to the department chair, who has the opportunity to comment before forwarding the response to the dean, who in turn may comment before forwarding the entire response to the Academic Personnel Office for reconsideration by campus reviewers. The intent is that the candidate will work with the departmental chair in formulating the response to the preliminary assessment. In this effort the departmental chair may find it useful to consult with faculty colleagues. However, the department chair is not required to consult with colleagues and under no circumstances should there be another faculty vote.

It is recognized that in some instances the candidate may not wish to work with his/her departmental chair in formulating a response. In this case, the candidate may provide the response directly to the dean or to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Welfare; however, the response will be shared with the dean and department chair for comment prior to the augmented case being reconsidered by campus reviewers.

Responses to the preliminary assessment may include clarification of the record, submission of new material, and updates to material already submitted. New external referee letters of assessment, while not generally expected, may be included. These should be solicited in the same manner as the original set of letters. All submissions in response to the preliminary assessment are subject to fairness safeguards.

The role of the dean is to reassess the augmented case and either to confirm or to revise his/her initial recommendation. The dean also has the option to transmit the response to the preliminary assessment to the campus without comment.

Upon receipt of the response to the preliminary assessment, review of the augmented case by campus reviewers will continue. In rare circumstances, campus reviewers have the option of requesting further assessment by a Campus Ad Hoc Review Committee (CAHRC).

The final decision of a tenure case will be one of three possible outcomes: (1) Promotion to tenure; (2) Deferral of the tenure decision to the following year (unless the current case represents a previously approved deferral); or (3) Termination.