

Timeline

Section I, Page 4

Personnel Review Action	Date Due in Deans' Offices	Date Due in Academic Personnel Office	File Entry Cut-Off Date
Promotion to Associate Professor Advancement to Above Scale (A/S)	The Monday following the end of instruction in December	The fifth business day of the new Year	September 30, 2009 Exceptions 7th year promotion to tenure Files may be updated until April 30 of the seventh year.
Promotion to Full Professor Advancement to Professor VI Career Review	The Monday following the end of instruction in December	The first Monday in February	Extramural and student letters may be received to November 1, 2009
Appraisal	One-third due the Tuesday following MLK day in January	The first Monday in March	September 30, 2009 Exceptions Extramural and student letters may be received to November 1, 2009
Merit	Two-thirds due the Tuesday following President's Day in February	The first Monday in April	
Quinquennial Review	100% due the third Monday in March	The first Monday in May	

NOTE: The dates will be adjusted accordingly for off-cycle cases. For 7th year promotion to tenure cases, extramural letters should not be solicited until after June 30 (or any earlier than the end of the 6th year). For all cases, letters should be solicited before September 1 to allow reviewers ample time to respond.

Announcement of final Academic Personnel Review decisions will be made as follows:

Last business day in January	January Announcements
Last business day in February	February Announcements
Last business day in March	March Announcements

Announcements after the last business day in March will be made once a week on Friday. Final decisions for 7th Year Promotions to Tenure and decisions after the last calendar day in June will be announced as soon they become available. In the interest of equity and efficiency for candidates and reviewers alike, it is important that the schedule and its deadlines be adhered to carefully. The Deans, CAP, and the VPAP feel no obligation to consider cases in which a faculty member does not supply documents and information by the deadlines that Chairs may set.

1. The Schedule for Academic Personnel Reviews was revised to include new dates that are more realistic.
2. In light of the significant date changes, it is important that the schedule and deadlines be followed.
3. Files received after the extension deadline may be returned for re-submission during the next academic year.

Acceleration

Section II A-4-b, Pages 6-7

b. Acceleration

Advancement to a higher step before normal eligibility constitutes acceleration. The campus encourages departments to put forward deserving candidates for acceleration. Advancement to a higher rank must meet the appropriate criteria for promotion (APM 210-1-d and APM 220-18-b(4)). The minimum criterion for acceleration within rank is excellence in all areas of review during the abbreviated review period. In addition:

- (i) For one-year accelerations within rank, the record for the abbreviated review period must reflect a level of accomplishments commensurate with the normal on-time merit.
- (ii) For multiple year accelerations within rank, the records for the abbreviated review period must reflect a level of accomplishments commensurate with the proposed step, in addition to performance deemed to be outstanding in at least one of the areas of review.
- (iii) The bar is set higher for both advancement and acceleration to steps at the senior professor and distinguished professor levels, as required in APM 220-18-b(4), revised in 2008. Advancement to Professor VII, VIII or IX requires evidence of “continuing achievement” at the level of “great academic distinction” that was required for the advancement to Professor VI. Such advancements usually will not occur after less than three years at the lower step. A recommendation for acceleration to these steps requires exceptional performance at the standards noted in APM 220-18-b(4).
- (iv) Advancement into Professor Above-Scale usually requires four years of service at Professor IX; advancement within Professor Above-Scale usually requires four years of service at the current scale. Only in the most superior cases where there is strong and compelling evidence will increases at intervals shorter than four years be approved. A recommendation for acceleration must demonstrate a signal achievement or honor in one of the three areas of assessment in addition to exceptional performance at the standards noted in APM 220-18-b(4).
- (v) Normally a promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, or advancement to Professor VI or Professor Above-Scale, is not accompanied by a recommendation for a step acceleration. In exceptional cases, a promotion or advancement is recommended simultaneously with a post-promotion acceleration in step. In such cases, the department and dean should vote separately on the promotion and the post-promotion acceleration in step, and the recommendation for acceleration in step should be explicitly and separately justified. For example, a promotion from Assistant Professor IV to Associate Professor II (rather than Associate Professor I) would be considered a promotion to an accelerated step within the new rank, thus requiring separate votes and justification for the two actions., i.e. the department letter will include a vote for the normal progression to Associate I and a second vote for the acceleration to Associate II.
- (vi) The department and dean are expected to explicitly address the acceleration recommendation in their letters. Multiple-year accelerations and those at the senior professor and distinguished professor steps should be particularly well justified.

The Department Chair has the responsibility to review the record of each member of the department to determine whether a recommendation for acceleration should be considered by the voting members of the department. Chairs and colleagues should always be alert to exceptionally strong performances and should be prepared to make appropriate recommendations which are carefully and thoroughly documented by evidence appropriate to the case

A recommendation for acceleration must be considered by the voting members of the department if a request is made by the candidate, by the Chair, or by any other ladder rank faculty member of the department eligible to vote on the recommendation. If the request is made by the candidate, a vote must be taken. If a department vote is taken, the candidate must be informed of the vote.

After the departmental vote is taken and the candidate is informed of the vote, the department and candidate may agree not to have the recommendation for acceleration forwarded for further review. Ultimately, however, this is the candidate's choice.

Off Scale (O/S Salary)

Section II-B-9, Pages 16-17

http://academicpersonnel.ucr.edu/academicreviews/FacCall/Preemptive_Retention_Procedures.pdf

9. Off-Scale (O/S) Salary (APM 620)

Off Scale is typically awarded only at appointment or retention. Departments or deans should not propose O/S for existing faculty unless this action is supported by extraordinary circumstances or extraordinary accomplishment of the candidate.

All O/S salary proposals for new faculty appointments require approval from the EVCP except for Assistant Professor I, II, III (and acting titles) when the o/s is no more than one step. Further guidelines are located in APM 620.

The EVCP may consult CAP, on an ad hoc basis, for review of O/S proposals for retention of faculty.

All O/S proposals for preemptive retention requests from Deans will be reviewed by CAP.

All O/S salary granted will be qualified by the statement "this O/S will be maintained as long as satisfactory academic progress is made". This is in effect for 2010 actions.

09/10 AY – Preemptive Retention Guidelines

Please refer to the CALL and APM 620 for more information on Off Scale Salary.

Off Scale is typically awarded only at appointment or retention. Departments or deans should not propose O/S for existing faculty without prior consultation with the VPAP. Such a recommendation will have to be supported by the extraordinary circumstances or the extraordinary accomplishment of the candidate that would not otherwise support an accelerated or on-time merit adjustment.

Consistent with other UC campuses, this will provide another mechanism to accommodate market issues without recourse to written external offers and encourage a limited number of cases for pre-emptive retention of stellar faculty.

These cases will be reviewed by CAP and CAP commits to conducting expedited review for such cases.

For the review, a case for a pre-emptive retention off-scale salary adjustment should be accompanied by the following:

1. Fully up to date bio-bibliography
2. Thorough analysis of the retention threat perceived
3. Explanation of the market factors on which the proposed off-scale salary adjustment was based
4. The case should be presented in a joint letter from the Department Chair and the Dean. The letter must describe the process of consultation with department faculty in arriving at the pre-emptive offer.
5. If the Department Chair is the faculty member nominated for a pre-emptive salary adjustment, the Dean may nominate another senior faculty member from the same or disciplinary-related department to serve in the role of Chair for this purpose.

Quinquennial Reviews

Section II-B-11, Page 17

11. Quinquennial Review

Although service at open steps (Professor V and above) may be of indefinite duration, the APM (200-0 and 220-80-b) requires that each faculty member be reviewed no less frequently than every five years. For such cases, the Chair is to prepare a file with the candidate after the fourth year with no review. The candidate may choose whether to submit a merit, promotion (if appropriate) or quinquennial review file. Merit and promotion files would follow their normal procedures. Non-submission of materials by a faculty member will not constitute automatic deferral. If a faculty member does not submit materials by the departmental due date, the department will conduct the mandatory review based on the materials available in the department as of the due date.

A quinquennial review file results in a satisfactory or unsatisfactory outcome. Candidates need not meet the criteria for merit advancement to receive a satisfactory recommendation in a quinquennial review, but they should show an acceptable level of performance in each of the areas of evaluation. A satisfactory quinquennial review requires suitable evidence of the following aspects of the candidate's performance during the last five years:

- Documented record of quality teaching, commensurable with the candidate's rank and stature as a faculty member in the University of California system;
- Documented record of substantial and valuable service to the University and to the public, commensurable with the candidate's rank and step;
- Documented record of a serious effort to engage in meaningful research and/or creative activity and professional service.

The focus of this review should be to provide constructive feedback aimed at maximizing the candidate's effectiveness in the above-mentioned areas.

Should an evaluation result in a review decision of "unsatisfactory", the candidate can expect guidance from the Department Chair, Dean, and/or the Chancellor's office.

A deferral does not qualify as a quinquennial review.

For quinquennial reviews, use the checklist found in [Attachment C-6](#).

1. This section was revised to state that the file is to be prepared after the fourth year with no review (i. e., in the fifth year).
2. Non-submission of a file by a faculty member will not constitute automatic deferral. If a faculty member does not submit a file by the due date, the department will conduct a mandatory review based on the materials available in the department by the due date.

220 Process

Section II-A-11 and Section II-A-12, Pages 13-14

Section II-A-11 -b

Appointment, reappointment, formal appraisal, or promotion to Associate Professor and Professor:

- (i) In the following situations the Chancellor's first assessment is considered preliminary and it triggers the 220 process (see II.A.12):
- If the Chancellor's preliminary assessment is negative in cases for seventh-year promotions to tenure, or
 - If the Chancellor's preliminary assessment is contrary to the recommendation of the department, dean or CAP.

In these cases the Chancellor makes the final decision after the completion of the 220 process.

- (ii) In cases where all reviewing bodies are negative for a non-seventh-year promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, promotion to Professor, appointment, reappointment, or fifth-year appraisals, the Chancellor's first assessment constitutes the final decision and a 220 process will not be initiated.
- (iii) The final decision of the Chancellor will be communicated in writing by the EVCP to the chair of the department through the dean. The chair shall promptly communicate the decision to the candidate. The announcement for seventh-year cases will occur soon after the Chancellor's final decision. The decision announcement will be communicated in writing by the EVCP to the Chair of the department through the dean, with a copy to CAP. The chair shall promptly communicate the decision to the candidate.

Section II-A-12

Appeals of Promotion, Appraisals and Appointment Cases

a. Updates

- (i) The seventh year promotion to tenure candidate may continuously update the file until the earlier of two events: the announcement of a positive promotion decision by the Chancellor or April 30 of the seventh year. See II.A.12.b for details.
- (ii) Promotion to tenure cases that are brought before the seventh year, promotions to Professor, appointments, reappointments or fifth-year appraisals are not allowed the continuous update to file. In these instances, the one-time 220 update through April 30, is allowed if the preliminary assessment is contrary to the recommendation of the department, dean or CAP as described in section II.A.12.b.
- b. Preliminary Contrary or Negative Decisions (220 process; APM 220-80-j and 220-84-b)
- If a 220 process is mandatory the VPAP shall initiate the 220 process as follows:
- (i) The EVCP shall communicate the preliminary assessment in writing to the chair of the department through the dean, with a copy to CAP. The letter must indicate the reasons for the preliminary decision and ask for any further information that might support a different decision. The chair shall provide the candidate with a copy of the VPAP's statement.
- (ii) If the 220 process is completed prior to April 30, the file will be held at APO until April 30 to await further updates. During that period, the candidate has the right to submit further updates. Updated information may include additions to the originally submitted file, such as grants, publications, and/or teaching evaluations. Extramural letters shall not be solicited. If the 220 process is completed after April 30, only material dated April 30 or before will be accepted.
- (iii) The candidate may waive the right to hold the file open until April 30 in the interest of an earlier decision. In this case, the file is closed to further updates when the candidate waives updating rights.

- (iv) The candidate may request (in writing) access to records from APO. The request form is given as Attachment A-1. If the candidate has requested access to designated records on the Procedural Safeguards Statement, these will automatically be furnished by the APO. The department chair and the dean will also be provided with
 - (v) The department review shall include a new departmental vote. Procedures after the department recommendation is determined, as set forth under II-A-9, shall be followed.
 - (vi) The updated file is forwarded by the chair to the dean for review. The dean shall include his/her recommendation based on the updated file. The updated file is then reviewed by CAP, and a final decision is made by the Chancellor. No appeal of the final decision is permitted since the addition of information to the file has provided the opportunity for appeal of the Chancellor's preliminary assessment.
 - (vii) If the promotion is approved as a result of the response to the preliminary assessment, the decision is based on the resubmitted file.
 - (viii) The final decision of the Chancellor will be communicated in writing by the EVCP to the chair of the department through the dean. Once the final decision has been communicated to the candidate, the candidate may request access to records. The request form is given as Attachment A-1. If the candidate has requested access to designated records on the Procedural Safeguards Statement, these will automatically be furnished by the APO. The department chair and the dean will also be provided with copies of records supplied to the candidate at this time. At this time, the candidate may also request a statement of reasons for the final negative decision.
- c. **Non-reappointment for Assistant Professors or Other Appointees of Equivalent Rank.**
According to academic personnel regulations, each appointment and reappointment of an Assistant Professor is for a maximum term of two years. Thus, it is possible that non-reappointment of an Assistant Professor may occur at the end of any such term of contract.
If a recommendation for the terminal appointment of an Assistant Professor is made by a dean, campus ad hoc review committee, and/or CAP, or if the Chancellor's preliminary assessment is to make a terminal appointment or not to reappoint, then, before there is a final decision by the Chancellor to make a terminal appointment or not to reappoint, the procedures set forth in the preceding section (II.A.12.b) must be followed.

For an electronic copy, please go to the Academic Personnel website:
<http://academicpersonnel.ucr.edu/academicreviews/FacCall/index.php>