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## Academic Affairs Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Abbott, PhD</td>
<td>Senior Associate Dean, Academic Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Helmy, MD</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Academic Affairs/Non-Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoko Yokomori, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Academic Affairs/Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jami Holland</td>
<td>Executive Director, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuy Vu</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJ Kennedy</td>
<td>HS Compensation Plan Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maral Dakessian</td>
<td>Training Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Jurado</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Dean’s Level Review Analyst - Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirella Ruano</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Dean’s Level Review Analyst - Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanthou Sung</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Dean’s Level Review Analyst - Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Heath</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Dean’s Level Review Analyst - Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaylee Mai</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Dean’s Level Review Analyst - Non-Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Weirich</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Dean’s Level Review Analyst - Non-Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonha Castelli</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Dean’s Level Review Analyst - Vol. Fac/Special Licenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushi Patel</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Project and Policy Analyst Lead Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Do</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Project and Policy Analyst Analyst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please be patient with us while we make improvements to our page!
**Department Review**

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

**Dean Review**

- Academic Affairs reviews dossier for completeness
- Dean’s Advisory Committee: Makes a recommendation

**Dean**

- Decides normal merits that have been delegated to Deans (CAP review waived)
- Makes a recommendation on promotions and non-delegated merits

**Campus Review**

- Academic Personnel reviews dossier for completeness

**Council on Academic Personnel**

- (elected by all Academic Senate Faculty)
- Makes a recommendation

**Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor or Vice Provost**

- Decides appointments, merits and advancements
- Recommends to Chancellor on promotions and non-reappointments

**Chancellor**
ScholarSteps

ScholarSteps can be used for all Senate and non-Senate review actions except:

• Appointments
• Non-Reappointments
• Midcareer Appraisals
• Reviews representing split appointments (split titles or split schools/departments)
• Reviews for individuals that would require a surrogate Chair, Dean, etc.

☐ Please share any feedback with your Dean’s Analyst
2023-24 SOM File Deadlines

*SOM Academic Affairs encourages early file submissions beginning September 1, 2023*

Files that are incomplete or require a return for revisions are not considered to be on time*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Type</th>
<th>Due to SOM Academic Affairs Office</th>
<th>Due to Academic Personnel Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postponement of Tenure Review</td>
<td>10/3/2023</td>
<td>11/1/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits and Accelerated Merits – VP/CAP delegated</td>
<td>10/3/2023</td>
<td>12/2/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>10/3/2023</td>
<td>12/2/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointments - VP/CAP delegated</td>
<td>10/3/2023</td>
<td>12/2/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Year Reviews</td>
<td>10/3/2023</td>
<td>1/3/2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancements to Professor, step VI</td>
<td>10/3/2023</td>
<td>1/3/2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Faculty Promotions (normal and accelerated)</td>
<td>11/1/2023</td>
<td>2/1/2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Delegated Accelerated Merits</td>
<td>11/1/2023</td>
<td>3/1/2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reappointments</td>
<td>12/1/2023</td>
<td>2/1/2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Scale actions</td>
<td>12/1/2023</td>
<td>2/1/2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean-Delegated Faculty Reappointments, Merits, and MCAs</td>
<td>12/1/2023</td>
<td>3/1/2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean-Delegated Non-Faculty Merits and Promotions (for ARUs and non-represented Researcher series)</td>
<td>12/1/2023</td>
<td>3/1/2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Progress Report

- The Academic Personnel office coordinates list of faculty eligible for review to department chairs each Fall; this is called the “Progress Report”

  - Important – The Department must maintain their own Progress Report and start planning in the spring for actions due.

  - The SOM Dean’s office asks for a Proposed Actions report due May 1 of each year. This report records the faculty who the department thinks may have an action in the Fall and is for the SOM Dean’s office use.
Normal Times at Rank/Step: Faculty

APP 3-40 See Appendix I

Normal Time at Rank of Assistant Professor is 6 years; must not exceed 8 years, unless there is a Stop the Clock (STC) and/or a COVID Stop the Clock. Mid-Career Appraisal occurs at year 3 or 4, SOM practice has been to complete by year 4. STC will delay the MCA and Promotion ‘clock’ by 1 year.

The normal period of service at the rank of Associate Professor is six years. The normal period of service at any one of the first three steps is two years.

Professor, Step 5 is an ‘indefinite’ step; faculty may remain at this step indefinitely;

Advancement from Professor, Step 6 to Step 7, from Step 7 to Step 8, and from Step 8 to Step 9, usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the lower step and will be granted only on evidence of continuing great distinction, national or international recognition, highly meritorious service and excellent teaching performance.
Careful review of the material prior to submitting to the Dean’s office will help to ensure less of a delay and/or return of the file with a “Back to School/Department”

SPLIT FILES – WITH ANOTHER SCHOOL OR SOM DEPT:
It is the responsibility of the HOME School/Dept to assemble the file and review for completeness
Notifying the Faculty that a review is due

The department notifies the faculty member outside Scholar Steps that he or she is due for a review in early spring.

This step should be completed by whichever method the department currently uses and early in the Academic Year to ensure compliance with department and Dean’s deadlines.

* March/April 2023, the department chair should have met with faculty to discuss proposed actions.
Call for Material

- Request review material from the faculty member (SEE APPROPRIATE CHECKLIST)
  - Updated Curriculum Vitae
  - UC AP-10 Addendum Form
  - Referee contact information from faculty member and those from the department (if applicable)
  - Reflective Teaching Statement
  - Research Statement (if applicable)
  - Contributions to Diversity Statement/Inclusive Excellence Activity Statement (if applicable)
Reminders

- Adhere to UC policy and guidelines

- Start the academic review process sooner rather than later (Chair meets with faculty in early spring)

- Solicitation of Letters of Recommendation (LORs) in late spring for promotion and Advancement to A/S files (Solicitation of LOR’s were due on June 1, 2022)

- Remind the faculty and Chair often that material for the academic review is due, give hard deadlines

Follow the appropriate current checklist for each series and action
Common Errors & Omissions

- Department letter needs to address teaching effectiveness
- Letters of recommendation missing codes from the AP-11
- Missing teaching evaluations or a teaching summary
- Incorrect review period or materials include outside of correct review period
- Publication links not accessible
- AP-10 must have all relevant sections completed
  - Example: Service section (section V) is commonly left blank
- Inadequate number of letters of recommendation
- Clearly label teaching statement and other applicable statements
- Updated CV
- Typos/grammatical errors in file
- Missing Required Documents: AP-137A, AP-50 (for paper files), etc.
Updates for 23-24: TBA at AP’s Fall Kickoff

Fall 2023 Kick-Off: Academic Personnel Review Process

DATE/TIME TBA

PLAN ON ATTENDING: IMPORTANT UPDATES

Representatives from the Council on Academic Personnel will be present to offer advice and recommendations on preparing review files.

Deans, Chairs, CPOs, MSOs/HSDAs, Departmental Academic Personnel Coordinators and Equity Advisors are encouraged to attend via Zoom.
NEW in 22-23: Dept and Chair Letters

- **Department letters**
  - **NEW page limit: 3 pages maximum**
  - **Department Letter Signatures:** must be from non-conflicted committee member
  - **Anonymous/unsigned letters will not be accepted**
  - **NO CHAIR SIGNATURE ON DEPT LETTER**

- **Chair Letters**
  - **Senate Files:** CAP appreciates an Independent Chair letter for Promotions, Accelerations and A/S Merits
NEW in 22-23: Voting Terminology and Vote Grids

APP 1-14 has been updated; please review

Main takeaways: Change to Voting Terminology and Eligibility

SOM Vote Grid is will be updated online, please follow AP’s new format: For/Against/Abstain/Did Not Vote/Total Eligible to Vote

Files that do not follow this format will be sent back for revision
NEW in 22-23: Self-Statements

- New page limits: 3 pages maximum per statement (Research, Teaching, Service, Inclusive Excellence)

- COVID Impact can be contextualized within one or more self-statement

GUIDANCE FOR FACULTY ON PREPARING FILES
UPDATE & REMINDERS for 22-23: Teaching Evals & COVID

- Winter, Spring, Fall 2020 Evaluations were watermarked with “COVID-19” and can be excluded from future review unless faculty chooses to include them.

- Winter 2021-Winter 2022 Evaluations are required in review, but still watermarked.

- Spring 2022 and forward evaluations are required in review file, and NOT watermarked.

- REMINDER: SOM AA REQUIRES Reflective Teaching Statements that include reflections on student Teaching Evaluation comments.
REMINDER from 21-22:
Required SHORT FORM AP-12 for Department Letter in Merit Reviews

- CAP requires the AP-12 for all SENATE Dean-Delegated merit, CAP normal merits and first No Change

- **SOM AA requires** the AP-12 for Non-Senate Dean-Delegated FACULTY normal merits and reappointments. In 22-23, the SOM Dean’s Office will return files that do not use the AP-12 form for these files.
REMINDERS from 20-21: Declaration of Potential Conflict of Interest (COI) in Personnel Review

- If there is a potential COI for reviewers above the department level (chair, associate dean, etc) they should:
  - Complete new COI form [UCI AP-COI](#)
  - Submit form to Dean’s office before the review occurs; Dean’s office analysts will forward to AP

- CAP will review and advise on course of action. For example:
  - No involvement in a faculty member’s review: Family relationship, current close collaborator
  - Reduced role that might include participation in a department letter, but not writing the chair’s letter: small # joint pubs or co-PI status in past.
Reminders from 20-21: Updated Delegations of Authority

- Effective 2020-2021 review cycle: At the Associate rank, every other normal merit will be delegated to the Dean

Delegations of Authority are here: https://ap.uci.edu/policies-procedures/delegationsofauthority/
# Reminder from 20-21: Changes in Above-Scale Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>% Increase on Total Salary</th>
<th>Clock</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merit Plus</td>
<td>4 or 5 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>reset</td>
<td>Excellence in all three areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>4 or 5 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>reset</td>
<td>Professor series*: excellence in scholarship and second area; Professor of Teaching: excellence in teaching and second area; No area subpar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>not reset</td>
<td>Does not meet standards for merit at 4 years; Required review in year 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>reset</td>
<td>Continuing contributions in all review areas. No area subpar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>not reset</td>
<td>Three year action plan with yearly progress reports required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Applies to the following titles: Professor/Professor In Residence/Professor Clinical X.
Letters of Recommendation (LOR)

- Guidelines for Letters of Recommendation (LOR) are located on the SOM Academic Affairs website

- See also: APP 3-20
Letters of Recommendation (LOR)

UCI School of Medicine Guidelines on Letters of Recommendation (LOR)
(Updated 1/07/2020)

Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series

Appointments to HS Clinical Instructor: LORs NOT required

Appointment to HS Assistant Clinical Professor: 3 LORs; letter-writers do not need to be non-conflicted; candidate-nominated letter-writers are acceptable.

Appointment to HS Associate Clinical Professor: 4-5 LORs. At least 3 letter-writers must be department-nominated and non-conflicted. However, for this rank, letter-writers may be current UCI invite faculty but must be from outside of the faculty member’s home or joint department (including affiliate sites). Other conflict categories still apply (please see examples below).

Appointment or Promotion to HS Clinical Professor and Appointment or Advancement to Professor Above Scale: 4-5 LORs.
At least 3 letter-writers must be department-nominated and non-conflicted.

Advancement to Professor Step VI: LORs NOT required, though the department may solicit letters if it feels that letters will strengthen the file. Note: Candidate has the right to request that the Chair solicit LORs.

All Accelerated Merits: LORs NOT required, though the department may solicit letters if it feels that letters will strengthen the file.

Professor, Professor in Residence, Professor of Clinical-X, and Adjunct Professor Series

Appointment or (COS) to Assistant Professor: 3 LORs, letter-writers do not need to be non-conflicted; candidate-nominated letter-writers are acceptable.

Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor/Professor AND Appointment or Advancement to Professor, Above Scale: 4-5 LORs. At least three letters must be department-nominated and non-conflicted.

Advancement to Professor Step VI: LORs are NOT required, though the Department may solicit letters if it feels that letters will strengthen the file. Note: Candidate has the right to request that the Chair solicit LORs.

Accelerated Merits: LORs are NOT required, though the department may solicit letters if it feels that letters will strengthen the file.

Professional Research Series

Appointment to Assistant Professional Researcher: 3 LORs; letter-writers do not need to be non-conflicted; candidate recommended acceptable

Appointment or Promotion to Associate Professional Researcher, Professional Researcher: 4-5 LORs. At least three letters must be department-nominated and non-conflicted.

Accelerated Merits: LORs are NOT required, though the department may solicit letters if it feels that letters will strengthen the file.

Update for AY 2019-20: CAP is using ‘Conflicted’ and ‘Non-Conflicted’ to evaluate specific conflicts between letter-writers and the faculty member being evaluated.

Conflicts might include:
- An advisor/mentor at any level (lifelong conflict)
- Substantive collaboration in the last 4 years
- Close personal or familial relationship
- Current faculty at UCI (“Please see above for exceptions/allowance related to appointment/promotion to the HS Associate Clinical Professor rank”)
- Direct financial relationship
LOR: Solicitation

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

- The Department Chair also prepares his/her own list of referees.

- Any overlapping names move to the Department List; and are marked on the AP-11 as such.

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** CANDIDATES MUST NOT SOLICIT THEIR OWN LETTERS, CONTACT LETTER-WRITERS, OR PROVIDE THEIR OWN MATERIALS DIRECTLY TO LETTER-WRITERS.
Departments must use the sample solicitation letters found on the School of Medicine Academic Affairs Website

- Solicitation letters must be written on behalf of the Chair, signed by the Chair and contain the following:

1. An explanation of the proposed action (appointment, review, etc)
2. Candidate’s proposed rank, but **not the proposed step**
3. A request for analytical review of the candidate’s performance under the applicable criteria and comparison with other scholars in the field of similar rank
4. The UC Confidentiality Statement

**REMINDER:** When assembling the file, the Sample Solicitation letter in file must (a) be labeled as ‘Sample Solicitation Letter’ and (b) it must not include the addressee’s name – it should just read ‘Dear______’ (redact name)
REMINDER: A majority of the letter-writers must be AT or ABOVE the rank of the faculty/candidate that is being evaluated; make sure solicited referees meet this criteria.
Letters of Reference (LOR)

- Department Analysts must review all letters received to ensure:
  - Letter must be CURRENT, or no older than 1 year old
  - Letters are strong, analytical, address the correct proposed action, and contains correct faculty information
  - There is no duplicate language between letters
  - The letter is on letterhead, dated and addressed appropriately, and signed by the letter-writer (can be electronic signature).
  - The letter does not contain anything inappropriate (e.g. a copy/paste of the faculty member’s CV) or any other information that is inappropriate to include in a letter of reference

Reminder: If the letter-writer is from the faculty’s department, the letter-writer must abstain from voting on the file, and the reason for abstention must be noted in the Vote Grid.
LOR - Redactions

- For files submitted in Scholar Steps, analyst must redact identifying information from the LOR.

- Per AP’s guidelines, you may only redact the letter-writer’s identifying information in the letterhead and signature areas - you may not redact the body of the letter.

- If you receive a letter with identifying information in the body of the letter, ask the letter-writer for a revision; identifying information may be included below the letter-writer’s signature block.
Letters are added to the file in *Reverse Chronological Order*, with the newest letter coming in first, and the oldest letter coming in last.

**USE THE DATE ON THE LETTER WHEN ARRANGING IN FILE**

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

- Each page of the LOR must be coded with either a letter or number. The newest letter earns the lowest number code, or earliest alpha code (see previous slide for example).

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

- Coding the letter at the top of the page may result in the code being deleted if the letter is redacted.
May 9, 2019

RE: Pablo J. Abbena, M.D.

Dear Dr. Yoshioka,

It is my pleasure to write this letter of recommendation on behalf of Dr. Pablo Abbena, who is applying for promotion to Health Sciences Clinical Professor. Dr. Abbena is an accomplished clinician, teacher and researcher. I first met Dr. Abbena in 2013 after he had been recruited to the University of California, Irvine (UCI) from the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). At UCLA he served as a multi-specialty radiologist, with a focus in Pediatric Radiology and Cardiovascular Radiology. He has interacted with the vascular surgery division closely at UCI by organizing and participating in our weekly Vascular/Endovascular Surgery and Radiology Case Planning Conference. At this venue he offers our vascular surgeons expert, in-depth evaluation and radiological assessment of complicated open and minimally invasive cases. He also assists with the training of our medical students and general surgery residents, teaching basic aspects of imaging acquisition and interpretation.
He has participated in a number of national research studies as principal investigator and/or co-investigator. Dr. Abbona has published peer-reviewed articles in leading medical journals, and book chapters on numerous topics. He has presented at local and national conferences and he holds professional memberships in radiological societies.

In addition, to his clinical responsibilities Dr. Abbona has held academic and hospital appointments at UCI. Demonstrating leadership skills and the ability to collaborate in order to improve the quality of healthcare delivery at our institution.

Dr. Abbona is an exceptional radiologist and academic that has clearly demonstrated the potential to make significant contributions to UCI and the field of radiology. It is without hesitation that I give Dr. Pablo Abbona my highest recommendation. He is an outstanding asset to the Radiology department and the University of California, Irvine.

Sincerely,
Once all letters are received and coded, the analyst must complete ALL fields of the AP-11 form.

Record letters that are received AND letters that were solicited, but not received.

Prior to submitting the file, review the AP-11 and letters to make sure that letter codes correspond to what is noted on the AP-11, and letters are in the appropriate order within the file.
As of Fall 2019, “Non-Conflicted” has replaced “Independent”

Make sure to note whether the referee is conflicted (Y/N)

Conflicts might include:

- Advisor/Mentor at any level
- Substantive collaboration in the last 4 years
  - Substitutive collaboration includes past or pending grant collaboration, co-authorship
  - Team Science co-authorship, grant funding, or editorial work on candidate publications are not conflicted if the department explains the incidental or minor nature of relationship.
- Close personal or familial relationship
- Current faculty at UCI
- Direct financial relationship
Add Letter-writer Qualifications to AP-11 form: can use letter-writer’s biography OR a live, clickable link to referee website

Describe relationship of referee to candidate; do not conclude. Examples:

- Conclusion: Referee is not conflicted ❌
- Not Descriptive Enough: Professor at Peer Institution ❌
- Description of Relationship: Referee has worked with Dr. XX at XX institution, mentor relationship ✔
- Description of Relationship: Referee has attended conferences with Dr. XX but has not collaborated with him/her in the past ✔
Ways to determine if a letter-writer is conflicted:

1. Review with the faculty member, Merits/Promotions committee, or Chair

2. Check the faculty member’s CV. Look for recent collaborations, mentor/mentee relationship, current faculty at UCI, etc.

3. Read the letter closely: how does the letter-writer describe their relationship to the candidate?

Helpful Hint: In PDF or Word, use CTRL+F to search for names of letter-writers in the CV
For files with both External and Internal letters, the analyst must separate ‘Internal Referees’ from ‘External Referees’.

- **Internal**: Letter-writers from UC Irvine, either within the faculty member’s home department, or in another department

- **External**: Letter-writers from outside UC Irvine; can be from the community, other Universities, or other UC campuses

**External Letters must come first in the file.**

- Add ‘External’ AP-11 to file, then all External Letters, then add ‘Internal’ AP-11, then all Internal Letters.
- Make sure to change the text at the top of the AP-11 to reflect the type of referee (External or Internal)

**Assign letters to one set of LORs, numbers to the other to show differentiation**
Helpful Hints

- Create the AP-11 and assign codes once you have received all letters and are ready to assemble the file; this ensures that the codes you have assigned are in the correct chronological order.

- On the AP-11, each letter-writer’s information must stay on one page.

- If your text overflows to the next page, or information is cut off, you can manipulate the text box so that everything stays together.
5 MINUTE BREAK
AP-10 Addendum

- UC-AP 10 - Addendum Form: this form documents teaching, research and service activities

- The role of the faculty member is to submit the information for their file

- The role of the analyst is to review and make sure that the information provided is within the review period, and complies with policy and procedures
AP-10 Training

RESOURCES TO USE WHILE REVIEWING THE FACULTY AP-10/ADDENDUM:

- **AP-10** Sample emailed to department analysts
- **AP-10 Training for Faculty** - Recording
- **Updated** **AP-10** *(6/2022)*
UC-AP-10 Addendum

- Section I -- Employment History
- Section II -- Teaching/mentoring
- Section III -- Research/Creative activities
- Section IV -- Profession recognition/Clinical competence and service activities
- Section V -- University services
Reminders: AP-10 Addendum

Include faculty name and review period on every page of addendum

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

Use the most current form revised as of (6/22); always use the form from AP website https://ap.uci.edu/wp-content/uploads/UCI-AP-10.docx

Inclusive Excellence/Diversity statement - only required for the initial appointment but may be included for merits, etc., if there is something you want to highlight

- CAP typically prefers Inclusive Excellence & Diversity information is included in the diversity sections in AP-10 for merit/promotion review.
Review Periods for Academic Review Files

**Merit Increase:**
The review period is October 1st prior to the July 1 effective date of the last action. If this is a first merit increase, following initial appointment, the effective date will from the date of appointment through 09/30.

**MCA:**
The review period for a mid-career appraisal is from the date of initial appointment as Assistant Professor through 09/30. These review period dates will apply to the information included in the AP-10, which is included in a Merit + MCA file.

**Promotion:**
The review period is from October 1 prior to the last change in rank through 09/30. If the faculty member hasn’t had a change in rank since his initial appointment, the review period will be from the date of his initial appointment through 09/30.

**Promotion to tenure (Assistant Professor to Associate Professor):**
The review period is from the date of appointment as Assistant Professor through 09/30. However, if a tentative decision, additional information prior to decision, or preliminary assessment is requested by AP, the faculty may submit dossier materials all the way up through the date of final decision.

**Advancement to Professor, Step VI:**
The review period is from the date of initial appointment to the rank of Full Professor, or October 1 prior to the last change in rank, through 09/30.

**Advancement to Professor Above Scale:**
The review period is from October 1st prior to the faculty member’s advancement to Professor, Step VI, through 09/30. If the faculty member was initially appointed to UCI as Professor, Step VI, the review period for his advancement to Professor A/S would be from the date of his initial appointment through 9/30.
List each step and don’t consolidate by ranks.

List any academic employment at other institutions
### ADDENDUM
for the review period
October 1, 2020 through September 30, 2020

### SECTION II – Teaching Activity during review period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ortr/Year</th>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Enrollm.</th>
<th># Instructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
<td>BC225</td>
<td>Epigen. Hum. Health/Dis.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(graduate course)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
<td>BIO199</td>
<td>Chromatin Biol.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(undergraduate research)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
<td>BC200C</td>
<td>Chromatin Biol.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(your own graduate student research A (fall), B (winter), C (spring))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
<td>BC200R</td>
<td>Chromatin Biol.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rotation, student)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
<td>BC523A</td>
<td>Medical Biochemistry</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Add asterisks to those with teaching evaluations. (For promotions, evaluations from the last 5 years should be included.)
- Underline regular courses.
C. GRADUATE TEACHING (Residents, Fellows, PA, etc.) — Note: This section is to be filled out by Clinical Faculty only. General faculty please skip to Section II, Subsection D to continue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>Date/Date Span</th>
<th># Hours/Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward Rounds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Ward rounds</td>
<td>1-3 residents</td>
<td>2019-present</td>
<td>4-5 hrs/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastroenterology Consult Service</td>
<td>2 Gastroenterology Fellows</td>
<td>Dec 24-Dec 28, 2019,</td>
<td>4 to 6 hours/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Teaching:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscular Dystrophy clinic</td>
<td>1 resident &amp; 1-2 fellows</td>
<td>2004-present</td>
<td>4hrs 2x week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anteater GI Continuity Clinic</td>
<td>1 GASTROENTEROLOGY FELLOW</td>
<td>10/2018 TO 9/2021, 4 HOURS WEEKLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures (Grand Rounds, Special lectures, etc.):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship core curriculum lecture</td>
<td>1 resident &amp; 1-2 fellows</td>
<td>7/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(list all lectures, journal clubs, etc. you gave to residents and fellows during the review period)

DO NOT NEED TO LIST NAMES OF STUDENTS, RESIDENTS AND FELLOWS DO NOT COPY PASTE THE SAME LIST TWICE. JUST EXPLAIN IF THE LECTURES WERE GIVEN TO BOTH
SECTION III – Research and Creative Activity during review period

A. PUBLICATIONS AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY NOT CREDITED IN A PRIOR REVIEW

INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Articles, Peer-Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Co-corresponding author. Both co-corresponding authors were responsible for designing the experiments, organizing the data figures, overseeing the manual confirmation of critical results, and writing of the manuscript together.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokomori is the corresponding author who was primarily responsible for conceiving the idea, designing the experiments, analyzing data, and writing the manuscript.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokomori lab helped with some of the protein biochemistry experiments. 10% contribution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Reference numbers must be sequential from old (#1 is your first ever published paper) to new (#78 for example) is your latest paper) in your CV, which should not be changed and matched with the numbers here.
- Your name in bold for easy detection.
- Explain your role/contribution for each paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invited Reviews and Book Chapters, Peer Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Reports, Peer Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books, Peer Reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLICATIONS SINCE LAST REVIEW

- Make sure that they are published during the review period.
- Stipulate "peer-reviewed" (or not).
- Separate original research articles and review articles.
- Stipulate your role as corresponding or co-corresponding author.
- For a middle author, explain your role and degree of contribution. (minor, moderate, major or %)
- Make sure the numbers match with those in CV.
SECTION III – Research and Creative Activity during review period

A. PUBLICATIONS AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY NOT CONSIDERED IN A PRIOR REVIEW

INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ARTISTIC AND PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCES AND EXHIBITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Creative Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Be sure to list authors in the published order. For co-authored or collaborative work, the faculty member must state his/her role and/or share of contribution (e.g., primary author, 50% co-author, secondary author, etc.)

- It is important to describe unique, independent contribution to each publication – reporting only the % effort is generally not helpful.

- CAP appreciates a well-organized, clear file: Publications should be grouped and listed on the AP-10 as to whether they are peer-reviewed, case studies, reviews, commentaries, etc., and then the links to those works should be grouped together. All peer-reviewed publications should be listed together on the AP-10 and presented together. Book chapters should be listed together and presented together, etc.
Research and Creative Activity

- Publishing peer-reviewed original research articles, case reports, review articles (“invited” review is a plus), and book chapters
  - Important to publish as a first or senior author – corresponding author status is crucial
  - Middle authorship should be documented/explained (subject matter expert, supply of special resource, expert analysis of dataset). Do not assume peers will understand your role
  - Evidence of impact: author- or paper-level metrics (not required but can be used)
    - H-Index in Google Scholar or Semantic Scholar: an author-level metric that measures both the productivity and citation impact of the publication. H-index should increase each year.
    - iCite: Relative Citation Ratio (RCR) values, which measure the scientific influence of each paper by field- and time-adjusting the citation.

- Publishing case reports, review articles, and book chapters, development of teaching materials or web site content, and clinical trials are also considered important creative activity for Clinical X and Adjunct faculty members

- Extramural funding (grants) and/or investigator-initiated clinical trials as the PI, MPI or site-PI

- Current Research protocols that have IRB approval, no presentation yet, can be mentioned in research statement.
Research Articles, Commentary, and Book Chapters are LABELED, GROUPED TOGETHER, AND IN ORDER, with the most recent publications listed first, followed by older publications.

RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS ARE CLEARLY LISTED AND EXPLAINED (e.g. major contribution vs. moderate-major contribution)

### A. PUBLICATIONS AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY NOT CONSIDERED IN A PRIOR REVIEW

#### INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This research paper is from my laboratory, funded by my R01, and I am a corresponding author. The first and third authors are my graduate students and authors #4-6 were my undergraduates. The second author is a postdoc in Qing Nie’s group with whom we collaborated on this project. Major contribution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My graduate student Ziguang Lin is the co-first author on this research paper. We were responsible for much of the single cell RNA-seq analysis, I helped interpret data, plan experiments, write and edit the manuscript. The senior author, Dr. Yu, was my past postdoc, how holding an independent professor position. Moderate-major contribution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A commentary, co-written with my colleague Max Plikus; I wrote the first draft and finalized the editing. Major contribution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This book chapter is from my laboratory and I am the corresponding author. The first author, Ghaidaa Kashgari, was my graduate student. Major contribution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. PUBLICATIONS AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY NOT CONSIDERED IN A PRIOR REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Tewari KS, Penzon RT,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Monk BJ. Chapter 77;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovarian Cancer. In: DeVita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT, Lawrence TS,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg SA, eds. DeVita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellman, and Rosenberg’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer: Principles &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice of Oncology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lippincott Williams &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkins, 2019. [jennihl/OGYN Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications/Publications, K. Tewari/Book Chapter #27, Tewari</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contribution to this publication: I am the primary author and corresponding author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Articles, Peer Reviewed – Original Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>184. Tewari KS, Sill MW, Monk BJ, Penzon RT,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore DH, Lankes HA, Ramondetta LM, Landrum LM,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall LM, Oatman A, Leitao MM, Eisenhauser EL,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiSilvestro P, Van Le L, Pearl ML, Burke JJ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to this publication: I am the first author and corresponding author of this study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Research contributions are brief, but clearly listed. Links to pubs are included in the AP-10 and they were also included in the appropriate location in the file – including links here can make it easy for reviewers to review the file. |

| 183. Tewari KS, Sill MW, Coleman RL, Ahsanian C, |             |
| Manivel R, DiSilvestro PA, Powell M, Randall |             |
| Contribution to this publication: I am the first author and corresponding author of this study. | |
Professional Recognition and Activity

- Awards and Honors, media coverage
- Participation in activities of clinical and/or professional organizations
- Membership on editorial boards and manuscript review
- Grant review, NIH and other study section membership
- Invited lectures at other institutions and professional meetings
- Community outreach activities

Clinical competence
- Evidence of provision of high-quality patient care
- Board certification
- Leadership role in your division, clinical program
This section is completed only for Promotions, Advancements, MCA’s
SECTION IV – Professional Recognition and Activity during review period

A. **HONORS AND AWARDS**
   - **Date(s)**
   - **Description**

B. **MEMBERSHIPS**
   - **Date(s)**
   - **Description**

C. **PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY**
   - **Invited presentations at educational, governmental institutions (or similar organizations)**
     - **Date(s)**
     - **Description**
   - **Invited presentations at professional meetings**
     - **Date(s)**
     - **Description**
   - **Accepted presentations at educational, governmental institutions (or similar organizations)**
     - **Date(s)**
     - **Description**
   - **Accepted presentations at professional meetings**
     - **Date(s)**
     - **Description**
   - **Other presentations at professional meetings**
     - **Date(s)**
     - **Description**
   - **Media Appearances and Interviews**
     - **Date(s)**
     - **Description**
   - **Professional articles in this period about you or published reviews of your work**
     - **Date(s)**
     - **Description**

Abstracts are noted in this section under ‘Accepted presentations at professional meetings’.
University Service

**Division/Department Committees:** PEC, CCC, Educational, Wellness, Interviews, etc

**School of Medicine:** Interview medical student applicants, office of medical education, curriculum review, advisory committee for dean’s office, cross collaborations across depts; UCIMC hospital committee work, e.g. UCI Medical Center Service: M-Power Committee, SQIS, Patient experience, etc

**Campus-wide:** work with school of nursing, school of arts, Samueli Institute,

**University:** Across the UC system, UCOP advisory committee, EPIC

Less service is expected from Assistant Professors
Significant service is expected at higher ranks
University: Across the UC system, UCOP advisory committee, EPIC liaison for UC system

Campus-wide: work with school of nursing, school of arts, Samueli Institute, Administrative role

School of Medicine: Interview medical student applicants, office of medical education, curriculum review, advisory committee for dean’s office, cross collaborations across depts

UCI Health, Hospital committee (may include a brief bullet point about their contribution)

Division/Department Committees: PEC, CCC, Educational, Wellness, Resident/fellows Interviews
I certify that the information on this Addendum to the Biography form is correct:

_________________________________________  ________________________
Signature                                      Date

Certification via ScholarSteps serves as a signature; if this is a paper file (i.e., appointment, split-appointment, non-reappointment or department chair administrative review) please be sure to have the faculty member sign and date.
TEACHING
Teaching – 2022 UPDATE

- Winter, Spring, Fall 2020 Evaluations were watermarked with “COVID-19” and can be excluded from future review unless faculty chooses to include them.

- Winter 2021-Winter 2022 Evaluations are required in review, but still watermarked.

- Spring 2022 and forward evaluations are required in review file, and NOT watermarked.

- REMINDER: SOM AA REQUIRES Reflective Teaching Statements that include reflections on student Teaching Evaluation comments.

FAQ’s related to COVID’s impact on Review Files can be found here: https://ap.uci.edu/covid19/
Teaching Effectiveness – Evidence Req’d

File MUST include the following:
1) Student Teaching Evaluations
2) Any of the following additional evidence

https://ap.uci.edu/faculty/guidance/

- Teaching self statement *(similar to research self statement)*
- Course syllabi
- Teaching Practice inventory (Weiman and Gilbert, CBE 13: 552-569)
- Peer evaluation
- Teaching Awards (with appropriate context – school, Dept, National level)
- Student achievement/learning gains

*SOM Practice is to use this as the 2nd piece of Evidence*
All faculty Appointment/Review files MUST include the following evidence (see checklist):

1. **Student Teaching Evaluations** - Raw data and Summary of teaching evaluations

   - **Merit and Promotion Files MUST include Student Teaching Evaluations**

   - If there are no student Teaching Evaluations available (new appointments only), and/or if there are ANY negative teaching evaluations or comments, this must be addressed in the Department Letter, AND the faculty must address this in the reflective teaching statement. Candidate may include additional evidence in the file.
2. Reflective Teaching Statement OR other Evidence (see previous slide and https://ap.uci.edu/evidence-of-teaching-effectiveness/). SOM Practice is to use a Reflective Teaching Statement as 2\textsuperscript{nd} piece of Evidence

- Must be labeled with faculty member’s name and department, and proposed action

- Teaching Statement must be reflective of current review period and no more than 2 pages (https://ap.uci.edu/faculty/guidance/teachstatement/)

- If there are ANY negative teaching evaluations or comments, this must be addressed in the Department Letter, AND the faculty must address this in the reflective teaching statement. Candidate may include additional evidence in the file
Peer reviews are from a **colleague**

- Colleagues are invited to observe a faculty member’s teaching in order to make an assessment
  - e.g. Classroom, Clinics, Grand Rounds, Morning or Noon Conferences
- Peer-review must be contemporaneous
- **It is not considered a peer review if it is from a resident or fellow** (that would be viewed as a teaching evaluation)

ScholarSteps Files: AP/CAP requires teaching evaluations be uploaded to ScholarSteps as ONE continuous .PDF file; Additional Evidence should be included in the appropriate area of ScholarSteps
Please make sure that all evaluations in the File are within the Review Period, and are CLEARLY LABELED with the correct date, name of Faculty and Course name or other teaching event name.

Other than the COVID Accommodations mentioned previously, FACULTY MAY NOT PICK AND CHOOSE WHICH EVALUATIONS ARE INCLUDED IN THE FILE – Analyst should make sure that all evaluations for the Review Period are included in the file.

PLEASE REVIEW THE TEACHING EVALUATIONS AND REMOVE ANY DUPLICATED INFORMATION

The following items should not be included with the teaching evaluations:

- Sign-In Sheets, or Blank pages with no useful information
- “No Contact” or Blank Evaluations
- Evaluations which include names/evaluations related to other faculty (*if it’s a team-taught course or event, REDACT the other faculty’s name)
- Student Names or other Identifying Information – REDACT STUDENT NAMES
PUBLICATIONS
Publications: Definitions

Publication

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

Commentary

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

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


Abstract

Accepted Publication

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

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

- Work that has been submitted to a journal but has not been formally accepted within the review period.

- This type of publication may have been informally accepted for publication; it may be in a revision stage, or the journal may have notified the faculty member that the item will be published at a future date, pending other contributions or edits from the faculty member.

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

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

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

- **Published**: Can be included on the AP-10 as long as it was published within the review period.

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

- **Submitted and Work in Progress**: Cannot be included on the AP-10 since these are neither published or accepted for publication within the review period. May be included at a future review date. Faculty member may wish to include on the CV to show productivity.
Publications: Tips

- **New Appointment files**
  - File does not need to include every single publication ever published
  - The faculty member may wish to highlight recent accomplishments, within the last year, or few years, or publications they feel represents their best work.

- **Merit/Promotion files**
  - All work published or accepted within the review period, must be included in the AP-10, and represented by a live link
Submitted and Works in Progress/Numbering on the CV: Assigning a number to these works may be problematic. If the item is not published, and/or another work is published before the work in progress, it may ‘throw off’ the numbering system, and result in confusion for future review files (especially Promotion files).
Each Publication in a review/appointment file must be numbered, and the number assigned must match across the AP-10, CV and Webfiles/Publication link.

Pub #’s must be in reverse-chronological order. The earliest publication earns the lowest number, and the most recent publication earns the highest number.

Pub #’s must stay consistent over time and between files – this is especially important for Promotion files. It helps reviewers compare publications and determine which are new vs. previously submitted.
For both Scholar Steps files and .PDF files, publications must be submitted via a live, clickable link. All links must lead to the correct publication, and must be accessible without a password.

All pubs in the AP-10 must be published or accepted within the file review period (*accepted publications require back-up to show proof of acceptance)
For more information, see announcement about how to include publications in the file, see Academic Personnel’s announcement here:

https://ap.uci.edu/webfilesend63021/
Publications: Analyst Review

Prior to submitting the file, the Analyst must check each publication to ensure:

- The publication has been published within the review period, OR
- If it hasn’t been published, that the accepted publication has appropriate evidence to support its acceptance – include an Email or memo that clearly indicates acceptance
- The publications page must include the faculty member’s Name, Department, and Proposed Action at the top of the page.
- The file must include a **live, clickable link that takes the reviewer to the correct publication.** Publication must be accessible without passwords
- Include publication numbers next to each link – **pub #s must correspond to what is in the AP-10 and CV, must be in order, organized, easy to review**

When all links have been added TEST ALL YOUR LINKS, before uploading to ScholarSteps
Publications: Example

Copy relevant publications from the CV/AP-10, paste them onto a Word doc.

Find article online, add Hyperlink to the publication title.

Easy for reviewers to view pub title, assigned #, Publication type (Peer-reviewed papers), pubs look well-organized.

TIPS:
When all links are added, convert Word document to .PDF, upload to Review, or include in ‘paper’ file.

LINKS HERE SHOULD BE SUPPORTED BY AP-10

Please make sure the links are ‘live’, clickable, and are accessible without a password

Publications must be published or accepted within the file review period; ‘accepted’ publications require additional evidence

William Yong, APPOINTMENT TO PROFESSOR, STEP V, 7/1/23

Peer-reviewed Papers (published)


Publications: Submitted Sample Email

Ref.: Ms. No. B-E570R1

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

Dear [Name],

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

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

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

Editor:

1. To submit a revision, go to https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__h2.edmgr.com_8d=1xIgcaOc8b-dnukDo-KyR8WtGqqcHtPA%3D9133GCUhFidpAUWLHkGRmJmZK2eW9ZXXAUXPKW7v-Mk157VW8Fam6BoR5fnkHUC0jn-w0WChAR6Q_EvHC1wuB1ke= and log in as an Author. You will see a menu item call Submission Needing Revision. You will find your submission record there. You should upload the following items: a) the text in word or rtf (if possible, include the Tables at the end of the manuscript), and b) the figures in tif, jpg or ppt.
2. Digital images: Black and white figures must be at gray scale. Line art files must have a 500dpi resolution, while other images must have a 300dpi resolution.
3. Please, carefully check that all the articles cited in the text are in the Reference list, and vice versa.
4. Please, check that the name of the authors is correctly spelled and that the place of work is correct.
5. The articles must be cited, both in the text and in the Reference list, according to the Instructions of the Journal. You can get them in our web site. Please, follow them carefully. They are also attached.
6. The following author(s) has(have) not answered to the Questionnaire: Kanwarpal Kohlon. All the authors must answer before publication of the article. We have recently sent a new e-mail with a link to answer to the questionnaire.

Documentation is questionable: faculty member may not be able to submit this as proof of acceptance; analyst should ask whether faculty has any other evidence.
Publications: Accepted Sample Email

From: SpringerMeteor [mailto:noreply@meteor.springer.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 28, 2015 7:54 PM
To: 
Cc: daniela.graf@springer.com; melanie.thanner.consultant@springer.com
Subject: Invitation to the Project: Encyclopedia of Cancer

Dear X,

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

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

Please follow these steps:

1. **Register**: Please register with our online submission platform Meteor at your earliest convenience by clicking on this link: https://meteor.springer.com/meteor/access/resetpassword.jsp?user=416356&token=dc32-31d2-c5b4-2baf
   It also allows you to receive immediate unlimited access to all Major Reference content on Springer’s official publication platform SpringerLink.
2. **Consent to Publish**: You will then be asked to accept the copyright transfer agreement ("Terms & Conditions"). This is very important as it is a legal prerequisite to our publishing your contribution(s).
3. **Check your Details**: Please check if your contact details are correct. (You can correct your user data by clicking on your name in the top right corner and selecting the menu item "Profile"):
   - Your user data:
     - Last name: X
     - First name: X

Documentation is acceptable; the faculty member may submit this as proof of acceptance.
Department Letter
5 MINUTE BREAK
Department Letter

Must be written on behalf of the department by a member of Merit/Promotions Committee or Chair-designee and addressed to the appropriate approval authority.

For More Info:

- See APP 3-20 for more information about Department Letter
- See APP 3-60-D1 for Addressing Guidelines
- See SOM AA ‘Addressing Letters’ document, here
Department Letter

MUST INCLUDE:

- Proposed Action
- Department faculty’s recommendation, including the reasons for any dissension, and discussion of strengths and weaknesses of the case
- Report of faculty opinion and vote, as described in Section APP 1-14. When there are significant divisions of opinion, the reasons for the opposing positions should be summarized
  - Report of faculty opinion must be included BOTH in the body of the letter and as a separate document, attached to the end of the letter (*SOM Vote Grid Template; on our website)
- Analytical evaluation of the faculty member’s performance in each of the following areas of responsibility (series-based criteria):
  - Teaching - (Please see APM Policy 210-1-d-(1))
  - Research and creative activity - (Please see APM Policy 210-1-d-(2))
  - Professional competence and activity - (Please see APM Policy 210-1-d-(3)).
  - University and public service – (Please see APM Policy 210-1-d-(4)).

- If letters of recommendation (LOR) are included in the file, the evidence provided in the letters should be weighed and discussed in the department letter. **When referring to the LORs, must only be referred to by their assigned code**
Chair letter is provided in situations when:

- It is the department’s practice that the Chair does not vote with the department and instead, records his/her own vote via a Chair letter.
- The Chair wishes to provide their own opinion, SEPARATE from the department.
- In cases where the Chair does not agree with faculty opinion.
- The Chair wants to clarify, or provide additional information in the file (e.g. negative evaluations, contributions to collaborative work, conflicts of interest).

**NEW FOR 2022-23:** CAP appreciates a Chair letter for Senate Promotions and Accelerations, and A/S Merits.
Please note on the vote page how the Chair records his/her vote, and this must adhere to the department bylaws.

For example:

- “The Chair voted with department” - include Chair in eligible count. The Chair must not sign the letter as ‘I concur’ and should not include an independent Chair letter.

- “The Chair did not vote with the department” (Chair should not be included in ‘eligible’ count). OR “The Chair records his/her vote separately” (Chair should not be included in ‘eligible’ count).
  - In this case, the Chair must either sign department letter with “I concur” or provide a separate Chair letter.

- New 22-23 – Chair MUST NOT DRAFT, SIGN, OR OTHERWISE PARTICIPATE IN THE DEPARTMENT LETTER.
*NEW* Department Voting Grid Terminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>The faculty vote is in favor of the proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>The faculty vote is not in favor of the proposed action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTAIN</td>
<td>The faculty vote is abstain on the proposed action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DID NOT VOTE</td>
<td>The faculty did not vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ELIGIBLE TO VOTE</td>
<td>The members of the department eligible to vote excluding: Administrators serving at other levels of review [example, CFAC, ARAC, CXAC, Assoc. Deans, members of CAP, etc.: refer to APP 1-14-D, Multilevel Review Process] Near relatives Faculty who recuse themselves because of conflict of interest The individual under review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PLEASE REVIEW* APP 1-14

USE UPDATED SOM VOTE GRID TEMPLATE
**Department Letter – Vote Sample**

The following two samples of departmental vote summaries display the vote in ways that are easy for reviewers to read:

### Department Vote Sample #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>DID NOT VOTE</th>
<th>TOTAL ELIGIBLE TO VOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The chair voted with the department.

### Department Vote Sample #2

**DEPARTMENT VOTE FOR, AGAINST, ABSTAIN, DID NOT VOTE, TOTAL ELIGIBLE TO VOTE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATE</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>DID NOT VOTE</th>
<th>TOTAL ELIGIBLE TO VOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NON-SENATE**

| Professors      | 2   | 0       | 0       | 2            | 4                      |
| Associate Prof. | 11  | 0       | 0       | 1            | 12                     |
| Assistant Prof. | 3   | 0       | 0       | 0            | 3                      |

Note: The chair votes separately from the department and is not counted in the total eligible to vote.  
*Associate Professor of Teaching counted with Professors to preserve confidentiality.

### Department Vote Sample #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>DID NOT VOTE</th>
<th>TOTAL ELIGIBLE TO VOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Associate and Full Professor combined to retain anonymity.

**REMINDER**

(1) MUST FOLLOW DEPARTMENT VOTE PROCEDURES

(2) Non-Senate votes on Senate files must be approved in advance, and noted as ‘Non-Senate Advisory’
Department Letter – SOM Vote Grid

Faculty Vote and Opinion: Departmental Recording of Votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department:</th>
<th>Date of Vote:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPT VOTE</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>DID NOT VOTE</th>
<th>TOTAL ELIGIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

*Use the Comments area to describe reasons for abstentions or negative votes

**See APP 1-14 for policy on Departmental Voting Procedures

SOM Vote Grid - Revised 08/2022

*Revised: 8/2022
Mid-Career Appraisal (MCA)
Mid-Career Appraisal (MCA)

Department chairs are responsible for conducting Mid-Career Appraisals of Assistant Professors and persons in equivalent ranks during the third or fourth year of service, under the eight-year rule.

**Purpose** of the MCA is:

1. Department provides the Assistant Professor with a **careful** and **analytical evaluation** of his/her performance to date (including work in progress) in the areas of teaching, research and creative work, professional competence and activity, and university and public service, and

2. To make a **candid assessment** concerning the **probability** or **improbability** of a favorable promotion decision based upon continuation of record
Mid-Career Appraisal

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

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

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

  Example: Hire date of 7/1/19
  
  MCA would normally occur during the 4th year (2022-2023)
  
  Review period would be from 7/1/19 – 9/30/22

- The letter must also address the review period for the reappointment/merit, which would be October 1st prior to the July 1 effective date of the last action

  Example: Last merit effective 7/1/21

  Reappointment/merit increase review period is from 10/1/20 - 9/30/22, to be effective July 1, 2023
Mid-Career Appraisal

- Only one AP-10 is required, and the review period is from the date of initial appointment as Assistant Professor through 9/30 of the review year.

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

- The MCA votes must be labeled as Positive, Provisional Positive, Guarded, Negative, Abstain, and Absent/Not Available.
## Mid-Career Appraisal

### Faculty Vote and Opinion: Departmental Recording of Votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department:</th>
<th>Faculty Name:</th>
<th>Date of Vote:</th>
<th>Proposed Action:</th>
<th>From:</th>
<th>To:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPT VOTE</th>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
<th>PROVISIONAL POSITIVE</th>
<th>GUARDED</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>DID NOT VOTE</th>
<th>TOTAL ELIGIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

*Use the Comments area to describe reasons for abstentions or negative votes
**See APP 1-14 for policy on Departmental Voting Procedures
FOR ALL MCA FILES*: The department letter and the vote page must include a notation at the bottom of the page with, “A copy has been provided to the candidate.”

It is important that the faculty member is made thoroughly aware, in a formal way, of his or her situation in regard to eventual promotion.

*NOT REQUIRED FOR FILES IN ScholarSteps
Advisory Committees
Advisory Committees

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

- **Academic Resources Advisory Committee (ARAC)**
  - Reviews all actions for the Line, In Residence and Adjunct series
  - Files are pre-reviewed by Geoffrey Abbott, PhD, Senior Associate Dean of Academic Personnel

- **Clinical X Committee (CXAC)**
  - Reviews all actions in the Clinical X series
  - Files are pre-reviewed by Geoffrey Abbott, PhD, Senior Associate Dean of Academic Personnel

- **Volunteer Faculty Advisory Committee (VFAC)**
  - Reviews all actions in the Volunteer series
  - Files are pre-reviewed by Mohammad Helmy, MD Associate Dean for Academic Affairs/Clinical
Advisory committees meet monthly to review all new appointments and most academic actions. The meeting dates are set in advance and available on the SOM Academic Affairs website, ‘Calendars’ page.

Complete files must arrive no later than 15 days before the scheduled meeting.

- Incomplete files will be returned and may not make it to the next monthly meeting.
- Complete files are added to the agenda and reviewed at the scheduled advisory committee meeting.
- Each committee has a review file “cap”/maximum.
Advisory Committee

COMMITTEE REVIEW MEETINGS SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
2023

ARAC (Academic Resources Advisory Council) Meets 2nd Thursday of every month at 4:00 pm

Reviews:
- All New Appointments: Line Series, In Residence Series, Adjunct Series
- All Promotions: Line Series, In Residence Series, Adjunct Series
- All Changes of Series into: Line Series, In Residence Series, Adjunct Series
- Advancement At VI & A/S: Line, In Residence Series, Adjunct Series
- Accelerated Actions of two or more years

CLINICAL X Committee Meets 3rd Monday of every month at 5:00 pm. (4th Monday in January/February/June due to University Holiday)

Reviews:
- All New Appointments: Clinical X Series
- All Promotions: Clinical X Series
- All Changes of Series into: Clinical X Series
- Accelerated Actions of two or more years

CFAC (Clinical Faculty Advisory Committee) Meets 2nd Tuesday every month at 7:00 am

Reviews:
- All New Appointments: Health Sciences Clinical Series (Except H.S. Clinical Instructor)
- All Promotions: Health Sciences Clinical Series
- All Changes of Series into: Health Sciences Clinical Series
- All Accelerations: Health Sciences Clinical Series

VFAC (Volunteer Faculty Advisory Committee) Meets 3rd Wednesday of every month at 12:00 pm

Reviews:
- All New Appointments: Volunteer Faculty
- All Promotions: Volunteer Faculty

*Files must be received in the Dean's Office at least 15 days prior to the meeting date in order to be on the agenda for the monthly meeting*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFAC Dates</th>
<th>ARAC Dates</th>
<th>CLINX Dates</th>
<th>VFAC Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>1/19</td>
<td>1/23*</td>
<td>1/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14</td>
<td>2/16</td>
<td>2/27*</td>
<td>2/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14</td>
<td>3/16</td>
<td>3/20</td>
<td>3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/11</td>
<td>4/20</td>
<td>4/17</td>
<td>4/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/9</td>
<td>5/18</td>
<td>5/15</td>
<td>5/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/11</td>
<td>7/20</td>
<td>7/17</td>
<td>7/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>8/17</td>
<td>8/21</td>
<td>8/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12</td>
<td>9/21</td>
<td>9/18</td>
<td>9/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>10/19</td>
<td>10/16</td>
<td>10/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14</td>
<td>11/16</td>
<td>11/20</td>
<td>11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12</td>
<td>12/21</td>
<td>12/18</td>
<td>12/26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTIONS