[**Non-Threshold Merit Review:**](https://bmap.berkeley.edu/case-prepreview/non-threshold-merit-reviews) **Professor Series**

This form is for use by *Chairs of Departments and Deans of Professional Schools* for non-threshold merit reviews and five-year reviews through Professor, Step IX (with the exception of first merit review after appointment for Assistant Professors). The purpose of this form is to guide your assessment of faculty for merit advances (please see BMAP for more complete guidance). We encourage you to keep in mind that this assessment is for the benefit both of reviewers in reaching decisions about merit increases and of faculty members, for whom it is valuable to receive an evaluation of their accomplishments. In making your recommendations, please keep in mind the criteria for different degrees of advancement (see Section C); if recommending an increase that is greater than normal, it is important to specify the area(s) warranting such an increase.

**A. CANDIDATE INFORMATION & SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION**

**NAME:       UNIT(S):**

**PROPOSED:       SALARY:**

 Title, Step, %, AY/FY Base Off-Scale Total Salary

**EFFECTIVE DATE:**

Explanation if review is coming forward in non-normative time (i.e., due to deferral):

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Explanation of urgency, if applicable:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Explanation of lateness, if applicable:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**B. DEPARTMENT CHAIR/SCHOOL DEAN’S ASSESSMENT OF THE RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT**

Merit reviews should include an assessment of the candidate’s qualifications and performance in the areas of: (1) research and other creative work, (2) teaching and mentoring, and (3) service to the University (department, school, college, campus and systemwide), profession, and public. In your assessment of each of the three areas, please include details of aspects of the candidate’s record that promote diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging.

**1) RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENT**

*(see BMAP sections on* [*Research and Creative Accomplishment*](https://bmap.berkeley.edu/research-and-other-creative-accomplishment) *Assessment)*

1. List below the items eligible for review and credit to the review period (this can simply be a copy of the candidate’s publication list, checked for accuracy, or it can be a reference to the publication numbers from the candidate’s numbered publications list). The Department/School should ensure that items listed are accurate and have not been previously credited. Please check that these publications or other items (e.g., exhibitions of creative work or performances) are eligible to be considered for credit for this review. With the exception of crediting chapters for books in progress, publications should be published, forthcoming, or accepted.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Please note any recognition of the candidate’s research to be credited to the review period, e.g., awards that the candidate has received, prestigious invitations to give talks, and published reviews of the work. If no notable recognition was received, please insert “N/A.”

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Describe the candidate’s contribution to collaborative work or co-authored publications. Indicate for which work they have served as lead/senior/corresponding author*.*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

d. Relative to the expectations and norms of the field and your unit, and recognizing changes in expectations as one’s career advances, the quality and quantity of the candidate’s research and/or creative accomplishment, combined with recognition of their research/creative activity during the review period is:

[ ]  below expectations

[ ]  commensurate with Berkeley’s high expectations for achievement

[ ]  outstanding (truly distinctive)

1. Provide an explanation/justification for your assessment, just given, of the candidate’s record of research and research recognition. As part of your assessment, please discuss the quantity, quality, significance, and influence of the candidate’s work. Please contextualize achievements for subsequent reviewers (e.g., comment on the significance of publication or performance/exhibit venues). In your assessment, discuss the importance of the contributions and of the questions being posed, and how the candidate is, through the work, advancing or changing the field or influencing policy or practice. Please help subsequent reviewers to understand the significance and importance of any research recognition received. If the candidate has met or exceeded expectations, please make sure to highlight some of the ways in which they have done so. In highlighting key contributions, please make sure to refer to specific work. Please refrain from copying and pasting from past assessments, as this leads to confusion about work to be credited in the review period; please also aim to assess the work rather than summarize it. If there are aspects of the candidate’s research record that can be considered contributions that promote diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging, as they pertain to the APM criteria on equal opportunity and diversity, please provide details in your assessment.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 **2) TEACHING & MENTORING**

 *(see BMAP section on* [*Teaching*](https://bmap.berkeley.edu/teaching) *Assessment)*

1. Relative to the expectations and norms of the field and your unit, and recognizing changes in expectations as one’s career advances, the quality of the candidate’s classroom teaching during the review period is:

[ ]  below expectations

[ ]  commensurate with Berkeley’s high expectations for achievement

[ ]  outstanding (truly distinctive)

b. Provide an explanation/justification for your assessment, just given, of the candidate’s record of teaching. There is no need to repeat information that is available in APBears (e.g., student comments). Your qualitative assessment is appreciated. If the candidate has met or exceeded expectations, please make sure to highlight some of the ways in which they have done so.If there are problems or challenges in the record (e.g., negative comments in student evaluations of teaching), please be sure to contextualize them. If there are aspects of the candidate’s teaching record that can be considered contributions that promote diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging, as they pertain to the APM criteria on equal opportunity and diversity, please provide details.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

c. Was the candidate’s teaching load (quantity and mix of courses taught at different levels) in line with departmental or School expectations for the period under review? If not, please provide an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

d. Relative to the expectations and norms of the field and your unit, and recognizing changes in expectations as one’s career advances, the quality of the candidate’s mentoring during the review period is:

[ ]  below expectations

[ ]  commensurate with Berkeley’s high expectations for achievement

[ ]  outstanding (truly distinctive)

e. Provide an explanation/justification for your assessment, just given, of the candidate’s record of mentoring. If there are aspects of the candidate’s mentoring record that can be considered contributions that promote diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging, as they pertain to the APM criteria on equal opportunity and diversity, please provide details.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**3) UNIVERSITY, PROFESSIONAL, AND PUBLIC SERVICE**

*(see BMAP sections on* [*Service*](https://bmap.berkeley.edu/service) *and* [*Professional Activity*](https://bmap.berkeley.edu/professional-activity) *Assessments)*

a. Relative to the expectations and norms of your unit, and recognizing changes in expectations as one’s career advances, the quantity and quality of the candidate’s service (including at appropriate levels across the University and professionally) during the review period is:

[ ]  below expectations

[ ]  commensurate with Berkeley’s high expectations for achievement

[ ]  outstanding (truly distinctive)

b. Provide an explanation/justification for your assessment, just given, of the candidate’s University, professional, and public service*.* A focus on the quality, effectiveness, and influence of the candidate’s contributions is more helpful than a list of activities.If there are aspects of the candidate’s service record that can be considered contributions that promote diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging, as they pertain to the APM criteria on equal opportunity and diversity, please provide details in your assessment. Please note instances in which service has been compensated (e.g., via a stipend or course relief).

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**4) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

1. If relevant, please discuss how the candidate has addressed areas identified in previous reviews as warranting improvement (e.g., if advised to avail themselves of the services of CTL to improve their teaching, did they do so). If no areas were previously flagged for improvement, please insert “N/A.”

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. In your view, is the candidate on track to be successful at their next promotion (i.e., promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor or from Associate to full Professor) or threshold review (i.e., crossing the Step-VI threshold or advancing to Above Scale)? What, if any, actions should they take to ensure they are on track?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**C. DEPARTMENT CHAIR/SCHOOL DEAN’S RECOMMENDATION**

(*see BMAP section on* [*Advancement Criteria*](https://bmap.berkeley.edu/basics/advancement-criteria); note that for a review effective one-year after the last review, a normal advance is 0.5 step, a larger-than-normal advance is one step, and a rarely granted advance is 1.5 step):

Please recommend one of the options below. The selected option should be consistent with the assessments provided above, e.g., a normal advancement would be one that is commensurate with Berkeley’s high expectations in all three areas of review.

[ ]    **Normal, one-step advancement**: A one-step merit advancement requires a record that is strong and balanced across all three areas of review.

[ ]  **One-step merit advancement with a** [**one-time COVID-19 offset**](https://apo.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/merit_offset_due2covid_policy_11-21revision.pdf): For candidates whose records show clear evidence of significant loss of research productivity due to the COVID-19 pandemic, a one-time, half-step offset may be recommended so that the individual receives a full-step advance or the equivalent thereof (available for merit actions with effective dates of July 1, 2021 through July 1, 2027 only; please review policy for eligibility criteria). If you believe that further justification is needed beyond the assessment you have provided above, you may provide additional information here (please, however, be brief).

|  |
| --- |
|  |

[ ]    **Accelerated, larger-than-normal, 1.5-step advancement**: A 1.5-step merit advancement requires a strong and balanced record with outstanding achievement in at least one area of review, normally that of research. Please indicate the area of review that demonstrates outstanding achievement. If you believe that further justification is needed beyond the assessment you have provided above, you may provide additional information here (please, however, be brief).

|  |
| --- |
|  |

[ ]  **Accelerated, two-step advancement**: A two-step merit advancement requires an exceptionally strong and balanced record in all three areas of review, with outstanding achievement in at least two areas of review, one of which would ordinarily be research. When the Berkeley standards in teaching and service are met, but not exceeded, only in the most exceptional cases can research achievement warrant a two-step advance on its own. Please indicate the areas of review that demonstrate outstanding achievement. If you believe that further justification is needed beyond the assessment you have provided above, you may provide additional information here (please, however, be brief).

|  |
| --- |
|  |

[ ]    **Decelerated, half-step advancement:** If a record does not meet expectations in one or more areas, a merit increase of less than one step may be appropriate. Please identify the area(s) of review that does(do) not meet expectations, and provide a brief explanation:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

[ ]    **Decelerated; no advancement**: If a record does not meet expectations in one or more areas, a recommendation for no advancement may be appropriate. Please identify the area(s) of review that does(do) not meet expectations, and provide a brief explanation:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

[ ]    **Threshold prohibits advancement, salary increase recommended in lieu of merit**: For candidates whose record would otherwise support a merit increase, but for whom no advancement in step is possible because they are not yet ready for the next promotion or threshold advance, please indicate the size of merit you believe their record would support but for being held at the threshold. (You may wish to consult the [campus’s policy on excess of merit](https://bmap.berkeley.edu/uc-berkeley-campus-policy-replacing-excess-merit-increased-scale); note that salary increases in lieu of steps are generally available only once per threshold.) Additionally, please provide the departmental criteria for advancement over the threshold and efforts the candidate should undertake to meet these criteria at a future review.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**D. SIGNATURES (please add additional signature lines as needed)**

Chair/School Dean Name: Date

For joint appointments:

Chair/School Dean Name: Date