

The list below includes substantive changes to the CALL for 2021-2022 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.

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.

Changes to #1 - For assistant professors who have reached their 2-year Stop the Clock maximum, the required approval for a third year will receive expedited review by the systemwide Provost, Michael Brown. It remains the case that the total number of STCs that can be approved for any reason is three.

Changes to #8 - This provision does not apply to accelerated merit advances, merit advances to Professor Step VI, merit advances to Professor Above-Scale, or promotions since those personnel actions occur at barrier steps that involve longer review periods. Nor does the provision apply to files that received a “COVID-19 Impacted” outcome in AY20-21.

Addition of #9 – Faculty who have positive outcomes in AY21-22 for promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Full Professor are eligible for consideration of a retroactive pay increase for the raise that accompanies the promotion.

For consideration of the retroactive pay increase, faculty who put forward promotion files should submit a COVID-19 Promotion Statement that explains why the effects of covid cause the file to be held back for promotion in AY20-21. The statement should explain clearly how COVID-related impacts were the reason the promotion file was not put forward in AY20-21, and how those impacts were overcome during AY20-21 to get the file ready for review in AY21-22.

When review bodies are positive about the promotion, they will also provide a vote on their assessment of the COVID-19 Promotion Statement in terms of whether or not the assertion the promotion was delayed one year by COVID is valid. Faculty who receive a positive outcome to their promotion file along with a determination that the promotion was delayed one year by the impact of COVID will receive their salary increase for the promotion retroactive to July 1, 2021.

2. Table of Contents (pages 6-7)

Added C.4. Professor of Teaching Series

Added Y. Department Research Statement

3. Review Criteria (pages 12-14)

Added the following: ([APM 210-1-d](#)). The flexibility provided in APM-210-1-d should be used when weighing achievements across the different evaluation areas. The relevant verbiage in APM-210-1-d is: “In evaluating the candidate’s qualifications within these areas, the review committee shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing when the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another.” Some level of compensation between achievements can support a merit advance, but a significant imbalance will not be successful.

Discussion of mentoring (such as of individual undergraduates, undergraduate groups/organizations, individual graduate students, graduate organizations, postdoctoral scholars, project scientists or junior faculty, especially those from groups underrepresented within the discipline) and what has been achieved through that mentoring is expected and appropriate. For example, metrics such as the number of completed or in-progress MS, MA, MFA or PhD students, if graduate students won fellowships, co-authored papers, presented at conferences, gained internship opportunities are indications of positive mentoring. It is appropriate to bring attention to mentoring awards. One way to indicate time and effort dedicated to mentoring within eFilePlus is to go under Other Teaching Info, click on Activity and then choose Other Supervision/Advising. Here one can, for example, list mentoring activities that take place at conferences, on the campus, or within the community as well as names of students mentored. Mentoring activities relating to staff can also be included.

Research and scholarship must be performed at the highest level. In many areas, extramural support is essential for a high quality research program. Although grants are not a necessary metric of research productivity, in many disciplines the receipt of major research grant or fellowship is considered work that has undergone a rigorous peer-review process that can denote current research productivity, sustainability of future research productivity, peer recognition, and leadership. For faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor, Step IV or lower, major research grants or fellowships secured during the merit review period reflect research productivity and impact, and should be treated in a similar way as technical journal articles. Additionally, grants or fellowships that recognize overall career accomplishment may be viewed as awards or honors, and faculty who lead large center and/or training grants can have these efforts recognized as contributions to campus service. Moreover, extraordinary success in being awarded extramural grants or fellowships can be the basis for additional off-scale or acceleration.

It is recognized that the timeline from the start of a book project to the appearance of the book in print must nearly always be measured in years, and it often extends across multiple

review periods. Withholding credit until publication can thus disadvantage a scholar in a book-based discipline (disciplines in which a book-length monograph is typically required for promotion relative to colleagues for whom completion of an item of research has a much shorter arc. To this end, a completed book chapter that is part of an established, single-author book project can be accepted as sufficient scholarly activity for a merit one time for all faculty at each rank (assistant, associate, full) under the following conditions: 1) the book chapter was completed during the review period; 2) the book chapter qualifies as an essentially finished entity and its place in the eventual book is identified; 3) the book chapter is uploaded into eFilePlus along with the book project plan 4) completed but unpublished book chapters cannot be used to support acceleration, additional off-scale, or promotion; 5) if a book chapter that received this accommodation is subsequently published in lieu of the book project (e.g., a stand-alone book chapter or an article in a book) the candidate contribution statement should note that the work was previously credited with this accommodation.

In addition to listing committees they serve on, candidates should also explain their role and provide a sense for the level of their involvement and their specific contributions.

The language in APM-210-1-d does not add a fourth category of evaluation, and therefore contributions to equal opportunity and diversity is not a specific, required review category for files. However, extraordinary contributions to equal opportunity and diversity within the existing categories of research, teaching, and service can be recognized as additional strengths of a file.

4. Procedures During Departmental Review (page 16)

Added the following: Remote attendance is permissible if it can be organized in a way that enables engagement and preserves confidentiality.

5. Instructions for Specific Actions (pages 23 -32)

Advancement to Above-Scale (page 23)

Added the following: Period of Review: Entire career with emphasis on activity since Advancement to Professor VI. See also sections K, U, and W.

Advancement to Professor VI (page 23)

Added the following: Period of Review: Entire career with emphasis since promotion to Professor. See also sections K, U, and W.

Added the following: Period of Review: Entire career with emphasis since Promotion to Professor. As specified in Section II.A.4.b.iii, advancement to Step VI usually will not occur after less than three years of service at Step V. For placement at a higher step, the candidates record with respect to expectations for the proposed step should be clearly articulated. In the absence of such justification, acceleration criteria will apply.

Appraisal (page 24)

Added the following: Following APM 220-83-(a), normally each Assistant Professor shall have a one-time appraisal well in advance of possible promotion to tenure rank. Typically, there would be an appraisal in the fifth year of service as Assistant Professor, though a candidate may request an appraisal at any time.

Career Review (page 25)

Added the following: The purpose of a Career Review is to remedy inequities that may accumulate over time, leading a candidate to be seriously out of step with their appropriate level on the Professorial ladder. The case for action as a result of a Career Review should explain the basis for judging that the current level is seriously different from what would be an equitable placement.

Merit Advancement (page 27)

Added the following: If a higher step advancement is proposed by the Dean the Department will be asked to provide a vote on the proposal. If a higher step advancement is proposed by CAP, the Dean and the Department will be asked to provide a vote on the proposal. If a higher step advancement is proposed by the Provost, the Department, Dean and CAP will be asked to provide a vote on the proposal.

Off-Scale (O/S) Salary (page 28)

Added the following: It may be appropriate for the Department 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.

When the Department proposes an additional off-scale, a vote on the proposal should be included in the Department letter. If additional off-scale is proposed by the Dean, the Department will be asked to provide a vote on the proposal. If additional off-scale is proposed by CAP or the Provost, the file is not sent back to the Dean or the Department for the additional vote.

Promotion (page 29)

Added the following: Period of Review: Promotion to Associate Professor – Entire career with emphasis on activity since Appointment, including activities as an Assistant Professor at institutions other than UC if appropriate. See also sections K, U, and W.

Promotion to Full Professor – Entire career with emphasis on activity since Promotion to Associate Professor. See also sections K, U, and W.

A promotion review examines the candidate's record with respect to the criteria as set forth in Section [II.A.5](#). Unless appointed at a barrier step, at least one positive merit will normally be required before a candidate is reviewed for promotion. The question of acceleration should not be an issue in promotion to Associate Professor and Professor cases; the issue is whether the candidate has met the criteria, not whether the criteria have been met in a particular time frame.

A promotion involves reviewing the overall career and reviewing bodies should consider where to place the candidate relative to their record. For placement at a higher step, the candidates record with respect to expectations for the proposed step should be clearly articulated. The Department Letter must offer specific recommendations for placement and rationale in support of these recommendations. There is no appeal process for decisions on placements.

If a higher than normal placement is proposed by the Dean, the Department will be asked to provide a vote on the proposal. If a higher than normal placement is proposed by CAP, the Dean and the Department will be asked to provide a vote on the proposal. If a higher than normal placement is proposed by the Provost, the Department, Dean and CAP will be asked to provide a vote on the proposal.

In cases where the departmental recommendation for a normal promotion is negative, there must also be a vote on a lateral promotion.

In cases where the departmental recommendation for promotion is negative and instead a merit is recommended, all subsequent reviewing bodies must address the merit as well as the promotion.

Quinquennial Review (page 30)

Added the following: For personnel reviews, the Chair is to prepare a file with the candidate during the fifth year of a no review period.

However, in the interest of trying to ensure the best career progression for all faculty, and unless the candidate is at a barrier step or in an administrative position, multiple quinquennial reviews will initiate a request from the Vice Provost of Academic Personnel for a mentoring plan from the department chair.

In the case of an “unsatisfactory” quinquennial, the review period for an immediately following quinquennial will not include the period of review of the “unsatisfactory” quinquennial. In the case of two successive “unsatisfactory” quinquennials, the APM-075 process will be initiated.

6. Professor of Teaching Series (also referred to as Lecturer with Security of Employment Series) (APM 285) (page 34)

Added the following: Assistant/Associate Professor of Teaching are members of the Academic Senate when appointed at 100%. Refer to [APM-210-3](#) and UCR Guidelines for Appointment, Compensation, Advancement, and Promotion criteria:

It is important to keep in mind that for faculty in this series, per APM-210, the category of “Research and/or Creative Work is relabeled as “Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity,” and that evidence of this work can be in pedagogical/educational research, field-specific research, or a combination of both.

7. Ad Hoc Committee Report (Departmental) (page 35)

Added the following: Departments may also form advisory committees to work with and advise candidates during the preparation of their files. Members of advisory committees for a candidate may serve on a departmental ad hoc committee for the candidate, but roles in the latter capacity are confidential to the candidate.

8. Patents (pages 37-38)

Added the following: While filing a UC Disclosure of Invention and Patent Application Filing with US Patent and Trademark Office are important, issuance of a US Patent by US Patent and Trademark Office provides persuasive evidence of research productivity and impact.”

Faculty are encouraged to include, when possible, the amounts of royalty revenue received by the campus and/or their research labs from their UC-owned intellectual property (i.e., patents, provisional patent applications, and other forms of IP). This information can be included in the “more detail” section of the patent information).

9. Departmental Recommendation Letter (pages 40-42)

Contents of the Departmental Letter (page 40)

Added the following: The department letter should not contain information that cannot be documented, such as hearsay remarks. The department letter should not contain comments on procedures/ processes used to assemble the file or conduct the meeting. The department letter should also not contain detailed discussion of the reasons for a leave of absence as this may constitute a breach of confidentiality.

Any recommendation for an additional O/S or acceleration in step must be explicitly and separately justified with a discussion of how the achievements in the file measure up to normal expectations

Evaluation of Teaching (page 41)

i. The role of the candidate in the graduate and undergraduate instructional program including such items as the amount relative to the department norms, variety and difficulty of the teaching assignments, relative successes with undergraduate classes versus graduate classes and the preparation and attention given by the candidate their teaching responsibilities. Make reference to teaching information form.

v. Evaluation of teaching as judged by departmental colleagues. Guidelines dealing with the evaluation of teaching are contained in APM 210-1 and should be consulted by Chairs on behalf of their departments. Among other elements of teaching, faculty colleagues are particularly well qualified to make thoughtful and substantial assessments of the candidate's command of subject matter and continuous growth in their field. Faculty **opinions** derived from direct observation **and anecdotes** and information should be shared with colleagues at the departmental personnel meeting concerning the candidate and incorporated into the file **provided they have been formally documented as classroom visitation reports.**

vi. Evaluation of teaching by students. **See section U below.** Materials submitted by students should be discussed by the department in its meeting and summarized and evaluated in the departmental letter. All teaching evaluations performed during the review period should be assessed and commented on. Hearsay is not acceptable for use in teaching evaluations.

Evaluation of Research and Creative Activity (pages 41-42)

In the evaluation of Research and Creative Activity, [APM 210-1-d\(2\)](#) must be considered. Department letters must explain the quality of the candidate's publication **and creative** venues. References to "top tier" should include information to support such claim in order to inform and assist the review process. Supporting detail is needed since colleagues in a wide variety of fields are involved in the review process.

10. Difference List (page 42)

Added the following: The "Difference List" **enumerates the candidate's recent publications and/or creative activity to be credited since the time of appointment, merit advance, promotion, advancement to VI or advancement to A/S advance. Refer to the table for more information on what to include when creating the Difference List.** The numbering and format of publications should be consistent in the Difference List and the current Bibliography

11. Extramural Letters (page 44-45)

Added the following: For candidates with joint appointments, letters should be requested from 4-8 referees suggested by the candidate, and from 4-8 referees suggested by the department and/or Chair. **In joint appointment cases, the departments are encouraged to solicit letters jointly, or agree to share letters solicited independently. At a minimum, departments should work together to assure that they are not independently contacting the same individuals and that an appropriate mix of evaluators is being contacted.**

All extramural letters should be from qualified persons of a rank equal to or above the rank sought by the candidate. It is desirable to include not only the best qualified persons in the field or sub discipline but also external evaluators who are not closely affiliated with the candidate or their work. The external reviewers should include a preponderance of reviewers who have not had a close working relationship with the candidate (e.g., as mentor or collaborator). It is preferable that the file includes some extramural referees familiar with the UC rank and step system. No more than two letters should be from the same campus.

It is the Chair's responsibility to ensure sufficient re-solicitation to achieve balance between candidate and department choices with respect to the letters received. If an adequate number and/or balance is not forthcoming the Chair must provide a memo describing efforts to achieve the requirement.

12. Merit Professional Activity and Service (page 48)

Added the following: Please maintain confidentiality of reviewing activities when completing this section by not including names of individuals for whom you have written letters of recommendation

13. Student or Resident Evaluations of Teaching (page 49)

Added the following: Per APM-210 at least two kinds of evidence for teaching quality should be included with each file. Evidence in the file pertaining to mentoring constitute one source of evidence, and most often student evaluations from most, if not all, of the courses taught by the candidate will be a second source. If the candidate does not provide student evaluations for specific courses this must be explained by the Chair in the department letter. If the candidate chooses not to provide any student evaluations in the file, they must otherwise provide an adequate source of evidence from among the options presented in APM-210. It is strongly recommended that some type of student feedback be included as evidence.

For merits, student evaluations to assess the quality of teaching should be documented for the period since last advance.

For quinquennials, student evaluations to assess the quality of teaching should be documented for the past five years.

For promotion, advancement to Professor VI, and advancement to Professor Above Scale, student evaluations to assess the quality of teaching should be documented either for the period since last promotion, or otherwise at least 10 years.

For appraisals, student evaluations to assess the quality of teaching should be documented for the period since appointment.

For career review, student evaluations to assess the quality of teaching should be documented for at least the last 10 years of the candidate's career.

14. Department Research Statement (page 50)

Added the following: Department Chairs, in consultation with faculty, are required to include a statement about research norms in the department. This statement should appear in the "Other/Miscellaneous" section of eFilePlus, and should be referenced when discussing the candidate's research productivity in the department letter. The statement should address basic issues such as the conventions on authorship order, the view of multi-authored papers, the prestige of book chapters and articles in books, the necessity and/or prestige of grant supported research, and the opportunity and need for graduate student mentoring.

15. Attachment H form (page 72)

Added the following: See section III.E for Attachment H page limitations that apply.

16. Faculty Member (page 77)

Added the following: Professor of Teaching Series

