

## The CALL 2020-2021AY Summary of Changes

August 1, 2020

Page 1 of 2

The list below includes substantive changes to the CALL for 2020-2021 academic year. “Clean-up” and/or cosmetic changes and typographical errors have been updated accordingly and are not included in this summary. For questions or more information, please send an email to [academicpersonnel@ucr.edu](mailto:academicpersonnel@ucr.edu).

### 1. Addendum (pages 2-5)

Added addendum to the AY20-21 Call provides guidance to address the impact the covid-19 pandemic will have on the personnel review process of senate faculty.

### 2. Review Criteria (page 14)

Added the following: “In teaching, “clearly demonstrated evidence of high quality in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion.” In addition, participation in graduate programs is expected, although the degree of participation may depend on whether the department has a graduate program. Attention may be given to the role of the candidate and the candidate’s field in attracting high-caliber graduate students to the campus.”

“For Professional Activity, see [APM 210-1-d\(3\)](#). For University and Public Service see [APM 210-1-d\(4\)](#). The level of involvement in each should be commensurate with stage of career. Thus, for full professors, evidence of leadership in both professional and university service would increasingly be expected with moves to higher steps. University service would normally graduate from contributions to the department at the assistant professor level to include contributions to the campus, senate, and system-wide governance at higher ranks of the professoriate.”

### 3. Procedures Before the Departmental Recommendation is Determined (page 16)

Added the following: Per information given to extramural letter writers “The University of California will keep your name and institutional affiliation confidential. Any identifying information on the letterhead and within your signature block will be removed. However, pursuant to state law and University policy, the full text of the body of your letter will be provided to the candidate. **In order to keep your identity confidential, you may want to avoid putting information in the body of your letter that would identify you”.**

### 4. Appointment (page 24, 33, 69, 73-75)

Added the following: ***Effective October 2019, the title of Assistant and Associate Professor of Teaching is equivalent to the former title of LPSOE an LSOE. This title should be used when referring to these faculty members.***

Added the following: **The cover sheet must be complete in regard to previous employment at other institution(s).**

Added the following: (page 74)

#### **Associate Professor of Teaching**

Formerly referred to as Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series. An appointee in this series holds a continuous appointment that may not be terminated except for good cause after the opportunity for a hearing before the properly constituted advisory committee of the Academic Senate. A permanently budgeted position must be allocated for each LSOE appointment.

## The CALL 2020-2021AY

### Summary of Changes

August 1, 2020

Page 2 of 2

#### 5. Merit Advancement (page 27)

Added the following: Assistant professors with a positive merit vote from the department and a final negative decision on the merit do not require a separate and later submission of a new reappointment file. The negative reasons memo will include a statement to the following effect: Although the merit advance has been denied, there will be an automatic reappointment at Assistant Professor, Step [X], valid for two years. Your next merit file is therefore due with a cutoff date of [insert date]. No separate reappointment file is necessary for the [insert cycle] cycle.” If the candidate is ready for a merit in less than two years and puts a file forward after one year, this would not be considered an acceleration.

Added the following: Assistant Professors whose merit is denied are reappointed for two years. However, a possible outcome of a negative merit review at the department level for Assistant Professors is consideration of non-reappointment.

#### 6. Off-Scale (O/S) Salary (page 28)

Added the following: It may be appropriate to suggest an additional off-scale when one of the three categories of review demonstrates exceptional achievement but the same level of accomplishment is not present in all three areas of review.

Added the following: Additionally, if an assistant professor is already at Step VI, is not ready for promotion, there is at least one year left on the clock, and the file would normally be sufficient for a merit at this level, then the department and subsequent reviewing bodies may consider award of an additional half step off-scale.

#### 7. Reappointment of Assistant Professors (page 31)

Added the following: Additionally, if an assistant professor is already at Step VI, is not ready for promotion, there is at least one year left on the clock, and the file would normally be sufficient for a merit at this level, then the department and subsequent reviewing bodies may consider award of an additional half step off-scale.

#### 8. Ad Hoc Committee Report (page 34)

Added the following: Composition of any departmental ad hoc committee is confidential to the candidate, but not to voting faculty.

#### 9. Dean's Recommendation Letter (page 39)

Added the following: If the dean's recommendation is for a step higher than recommended by the department, the file should be returned to the department for a vote on the higher step.

#### 10. Fellowship and Grant Activity (page 44)

Added the following: For multi-investigator grants, indicate the candidate's role in the grant (PI, CoPI, collaborator, consultant), the name of the PI (if not the candidate), the number and names of co-PIs, UCR amount (sum of direct and indirect), and amount to candidate.

#### 11. Attachment H (page 70)

Added the following: Addressed to the VPAP at [vpap@ucr.edu](mailto:vpap@ucr.edu) and [apomail@ucr.edu](mailto:apomail@ucr.edu):