

Fall Quarter 09-10 AY  
Department Chair Forum  
October 23, 2009

David Bocian  
Vice Provost for Academic Personnel



# Agenda

- Summary of Major Changes to The CALL 09-10  
David Bocian
- Academic Personnel (AP) Policy Updates & Announcements – Antonette Toney/Sara Umali
- Faculty Diversity in Challenging Times  
Marlene Zuk
- Office of the Ombudsman – Indu Sen
- Cover Your Academic (CYA) Career – Debbie Artis
- eFile Updates – Chuck Rowley & Eric Martin

# Summary of Major Changes to The CALL

## Timeline

Page 4, Section I, The CALL 09-10

The Schedule for Academic Personnel Reviews was revised to include new dates that are more realistic.

In light of the significant date changes, it is important that the schedule and deadlines be followed.

Files received after the extension deadline may be returned for re-submission during the next academic year.

Personal Review Action	Date Due in Dean's 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  <b>Exceptions:</b> 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
Merit	Two-thirds due the Tuesday following President's Day in February	The first Monday in April	<b>Exceptions:</b> Extramural and student letters may be received to November 1, 2009
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 7<sup>th</sup> year promotion to tenure cases, extramural letters should not be solicited until after June 30 (or any earlier than the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> 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 7<sup>th</sup> 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.

# Summary of Major Changes to The CALL

## Acceleration

Pages 6-7, Section II A-4-b, The CALL 09-10

The revised language in APM 220-18-b(4) and APM 210-1-d is highlighted in this section.

The minimum criteria for acceleration within rank is excellence in all areas of review during the abbreviated review period. There should be no perceived weaknesses in the file.

### b. 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 require 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.

# Summary of Major Changes to The CALL

## Off Scale (O/S) Salary

Pages 16-17, Section II B-9, The CALL 09-10

The guidelines for o/s were revised and expanded to include o/s proposals for pre-emptive retention.

A document on Pre-emptive Retention Guidelines is available in the AP website.

<http://academicpersonnel.ucr.edu/academicreviews/FacCall/PreemptiveRetentionProcedures.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.

# Summary of Major Changes to The CALL

## Quinquennial Reviews

Page 17, Section II B-11, The CALL 09-10

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).

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.

### 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](#).

# Summary of Major Changes to The CALL

## 220 Process

Pages 13-14, Section II A-11 and  
Section II A-12, The CALL 09-10

File closing and updates have been  
modified.

For 7<sup>th</sup> year cases, the file is closed to  
updates at the earlier of two events:  
(1) the announcement of a positive  
decision or (2) April 30<sup>th</sup> of the 7<sup>th</sup>  
year review.

For update requests involving cases  
other than a 220 response or 7<sup>th</sup> year  
tenure review , the last calendar day  
in February will be used as the file  
cut-off date.

- 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.

✓ See Section II A-12 for the  
220 Process

# Summary of Major Changes to The CALL

The following **documents** were added:

- By-law 55, a link to the Academic Senate form was added.
- Department Chair Checklist
- Acronyms and Glossary of Terms

