MAPP Section 400:
Faculty Merit, Promotion and Appraisal Review – Academic Senate Titles

The following policies and procedures have been developed to support the University's goal of retaining high quality faculty. It is the policy of the University to evaluate objectively and thoroughly each candidate for promotion or merit increase. Promotions and merit increases are not automatic but based on meritorious achievement.

401. GENERAL POLICIES

401-1. Authority

a. Chancellor

The Chancellor is authorized by the Regents to approve all appointments, reappointments, merit increases and promotions except those appointments involving above-scale salaries beyond the Regental compensation threshold and appointments of Regents' Professor and University Professors. The Chancellor may delegate this authority.

b. Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) and Provost

The Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) and Provost is delegated authority to approve appointments, reappointment, merit increases and promotions with the exception of promotion to tenure and Above Scale.

c. Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) evaluates the case file and recommends an action to the EVC and Provost.

d. Dean

The Dean assesses the review file, makes a recommendation on the proposed action and sends forward the case file to the Academic Personnel Office.

e. School's Academic Personnel Chair (APC)

The Academic Personnel Chair (APC) presents the review file to the faculty, allows for a full discussion and following the School's bylaws and voting procedure obtains the vote on the proposed action and then forwards the review file to the School Dean.

f. Case Writer and/or Review Committee

The case writer and/or review committee appraises the review file and forwards a recommendation to the School APC.

401-2. Types of Actions

a. Merit increase

Person is being recommended for advancement to a higher step within the same rank.

b. Accelerated advancement

Person is being recommended for advancement in step before serving the normal time at the current step, or person is being recommended for advancement to a higher step than normal.

c. Reappointment

Person is being recommended for continued service with no change in step. (Used for reappointments of assistant professor and equivalent ranks.)

d. Midcareer appraisal

Assistant professor is being reviewed for progress toward tenure or candidate in another series with a limit on service (i.e., eight-year clock) is undergoing similar review. This review is ordinarily conducted during the **fourth** year of service but may be done earlier. Results of the review must be given to the candidate in writing.

e. Postponement (of tenure review)

Assistant professor is due for tenure review in the sixth year. The department (with Dean's approval) has determined that postponement is warranted due to the candidate's significant work in progress.

f. Promotion

Person is being recommended for a promotion to a higher rank within the same series.

g. Nonreappointment

Assistant professor is being recommended for a terminal appointment.

h. No action

Associate professor or higher rank is required to be reviewed for a merit increase or promotion but the recommendation is against action at this time. (This is not used for assistant professors or others whose appointments must be renewed.)

i. Deferral (of normal review)

Person has requested a one year postponement of normal review.

j. Change in series

Person is to be appointed to a title in a different series.

k. Fifth year review

A faculty member at Professor, Step V or above is being reviewed for performance after serving five years at the same step.

401-3. Normal Periods of Service – Professor Series

a. Instructor

Service in the rank of Instructor is limited to two years.

b. Assistant Professor

The total period of University service in the title Assistant Professor shall not exceed eight years, except as provided in APM 133-12. Each appointment and reappointment is limited to a maximum term of two years. *(APM 133)*

c. Associate Professor and Professor

The normal term of service as Associate Professor is six years, but there is no obligation on the part of the University to promote an Associate Professor to the rank of Professor solely on the basis of years of service at the lower rank. Accelerated promotion is possible if achievement is exceptional.

The normal period of service as Professor at any of the first four steps is three years. Service at Step V may be of indefinite duration. Advancement to Step VI usually will not occur after less than three years of service at Step V and will be granted on evidence of highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service and evidence of excellent University teaching. Service at Professor, Step VI or higher may be of indefinite duration. Advancement from Professor, Step VI to Step VII, from Step VII to Step VIII, and from Step VIII to Step IX usually will

not occur after less than three years of service at the lower step and will only be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step VI.

d. Professor Above-scale

Advancement to an above-scale is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed and whose teaching performance is excellent. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at Step IX. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not justification for further advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement of Step IX was based.

401-4. Effective Date

Promotions and merit increases are effective July 1 of each year. Chancellors are authorized to promote personnel within the authority granted in APM 200-24 at any effective date during the year. *(APM 200)*

405. GENERAL ROLES, PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

405-1. Roles

a. Academic Personnel Office (APO)

- Office of record.
- Develops the eligibility list and notifies the School Dean and each faculty member of his/her eligibility.
- Receives and analyzes the Case file to ensure compliance with MAPP and APM policy and procedure.
- Works with the Schools to verify all documentation submitted adheres to MAPP and APM policies and procedures.
- Forwards the Case file to the Academic Senate Office.
- Acts as the liaison between the Academic Senate Office and the Schools.
- Drafts the final action letter for the Executive Vice Chancellor.
- Mails the final action letter to the faculty member with a copy to the School Dean.
- Notifies academic payroll of the approved action.
- Updates the faculty academic personnel file.

b. Academic Personnel Chair (APC)

- Consults with the eligible candidate about the review process through each stage of the review process.
- Informs the eligible candidate of information required for the review.
- Informs the eligible candidate of his/her rights in the process.

- Solicits extramural letters, if required.
- Writes the Case Analysis or designates another faculty member to do so.
- Reviews Case Analysis and materials in the review file to ensure compliance with policy and procedure.
- Ensures that the review file is posted for faculty review and discussion.
- Arranges faculty meeting to discuss proposed action and records the faculty vote.
- Follows the School's bylaw and voting procedure to obtain a vote.
- Writes the Transmittal Letter that includes the faculty vote and discussion.
- Ensures that the Transmittal letter is posted and faculty notified to review the letter. The letter is posted a minimum of 3 days or the School's agreed upon duration.
- Forwards the review file to the School Dean.

c. Dean

- Approves and signs the candidate's acceptance for review action.
- Analyzes the review file to ensure the School's review is fair and rigorous in maintaining University standards.
- Writes a letter recommending a proposed action.
- Writes a confidential Dean's letter, if needed.
- Forwards the case file and required documentation to the EVC/Provost and Academic Personnel Office.

d. Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)

- Assesses the proposed action and supporting materials.
- Forwards their recommendation to the EVC/Provost.

405-2. Review Process and Procedure

a. Academic Personnel Office

1). Eligibility list

Verify all faculty records, develop the Eligibility List, and notify the School Deans and each faculty member of his/her eligibility for advancement review.

2). Processing the case file

Verify that all documents provided by the School adhere to UCM MAPP and APM policies and procedures and if necessary, work with the School to complete the file.

Forward the case file to the Academic Senate Office.

Obtain any additional material requested by CAP from the School.

3). Processing the final action

Draft the final action letter for the Executive Vice Chancellor's signature and mail the letter to the faculty member with a copy to the School Dean. Note: The Chancellor has authority on any promotion decisions in which tenure is awarded.

Notify academic payroll of the approved action and update the faculty academic personnel file.

b. Academic Personnel Chair (APC)

1). Consulting with eligible candidate

Inform the eligible candidate about the review process and provide access to copies of the Academic Personnel Manual. Provide the eligible candidate with ample opportunity to ask questions. Complete section 1 of the Procedural Safeguard Statement.
(Provide candidate with copies of *APM 210-1, APM 220* and *APM 160*)
(Procedural Safeguard Statement - UCM-AP43)

Inform the eligible candidate of the information required for the review file. Examples include: self statement covering research and teaching, publications, teaching evaluations, honors and awards, Annual Bio-Bibliographies, Summary of the Bio-Bibliographies and updated curriculum vitae.

Inform the eligible candidate of their right to provide, in writing to the Dean, names of persons who, for reasons specified by the eligible candidate may not provide an objective evaluation.

Prior to the faculty discussion, provide an opportunity for the eligible candidate to review and comment on the complete review file including any extramural letters in the file. The extramural letters are appropriately redacted by the AP office so as not to reveal the names or identities of individual evaluators. *(APM 160-20-b)*

Subsequent to the faculty discussion, advise the eligible candidate of his/her right to provide comment.

Complete the Procedural Safeguard Statement with the candidate.

2). Developing the review file

Solicit extramural letters if required for the proposed advancement action. *Solicitation letters to extramural reviewers* provides instructions pertaining to language and other requirements when letters of evaluation are solicited including model formats for letters and other guidelines.

Matrix 1 lists the specific documents that are needed for an advancement package and provides a copy of the forms that need to be transmitted. (*Matrix 1)*

In all cases of promotion, and for advancement to Professor VI and Professor Above Scale, letters from distinguished extramural reviewers are required. Letters must be sought from individuals who are experts in the candidate's field who are able to provide an objective appraisal of the candidate's work. There should be a balanced set of reviewers suggested by both the eligible faculty member and the School. Five to eight analytical letters are adequate for most actions as substance of the letters and not the numerical proportion of the positive recommendations is evaluated. Extramural reviewers who have provided confidential letters of evaluation should not be identified, except by means of a coded list (e.g. "Reviewer A").

Extramural reviewers should be selected from academic or research institutions with standards comparable to the University of California. Extramural reviewers should normally be full professors or of equivalent stature, although occasionally it might be appropriate to ask an associate professor to provide a letter for an assistant professor coming up for tenure

Extramural letters from mentors and collaborators, while valuable, should be supplemented by letters from sources without close, personal connections to the faculty member. For promotions to Associate Professor, Full Professor, Professor, Step VI, and Professor, Above Scale, it is desirable to avoid excessive use of external reviewers that others may not regard as objective, either because they are too close to the candidate professionally (e.g., collaborators, doctoral supervisors), or because they have a personal relationship with the candidate.

The National Science Foundation criteria serve as an appropriate guide in selecting external reviewers. Reviewers should not be individuals who are known family members, who are business or professional partners, who have a past or present association as thesis advisor or thesis student, who have served as a collaborator on a project, book, article, report or paper within the last 48 months; who have worked to co-edit a journal, a compendium, or conference proceedings within the last 24 months. Contact between the Chair and individuals from whom letters are being solicited is permissible in order to encourage response, but great care must be taken to not bias or influence the judgment of the referee.

Letters soliciting such extramural evaluations should contain the following:

- An explanation of the proposed action (essential with Step VI and Above Scale);

- A request for analytical review of the candidate's performance under the applicable criteria and comparison with other scholars in the field at similar rank;
- The University's confidentiality statement.

3). Case analysis, consultation with faculty, and the transmittal letter

The APC may designate another faculty member (at the appropriate rank) to write and present the Case Analysis. This typically occurs when a large number of eligible candidates make the caseload too heavy for a single person.

The Case Analysis should provide a comprehensive assessment of the candidate's scholarship, supported by evidence from extramural letters. The Case Analysis should be a complete professional evaluation of the eligible candidate's work with respect to the proposed rank. It should be accurate and analytical, including both supportive and contrary evidence. The Case Analysis should strive for balance, yet be succinct. Extended quotations from supporting documents (e.g. extramural letters) and rhetorical statements are to be avoided.

The Case Analysis should evaluate the contributions the candidate has made to promote diversity and equal opportunity in the areas of teaching, research, professional and public service as set forth in APM210. Candidates who have engaged in service to increase participation and remove the barriers that prevent full participation of all qualified people, including women, minorities, veterans and people with disabilities in the science and engineering field as well as in the various disciplines of social sciences, humanities, fine arts and education should be given recognition. Engaging in this service is critical to developing a scientific and educated workforce with the values, culture and perspectives to provide solutions to pressing local, state, national and international problems. (Refer to *UCM-AP46A* and *UCM-AP46B* for guidelines.)

The Case Analysis and supporting materials are posted for faculty review a minimum of 3 days and the faculty notified.

The APC (or designee) presents the Case Analysis to the faculty and allows for a full discussion. When the discussion has concluded, the APC follows the School's bylaws and voting procedures to obtain a vote on the proposed advancement and records the vote and faculty discussion to be included in the Transmittal Letter. The Transmittal Letter written by the APC is a critical component of the review file. It recommends the step and effective date of the advancement. The Transmittal Letter is the single document that reflects the discussion of the faculty. Hence, the letter should be balanced, identifying strengths and specific accomplishments; but also identifying any criticisms and

reservations that help explain the faculty's opinion and vote. As this is the official record of the faculty's opinion, the vote is given considerable importance by other reviewing bodies. Hence, schools should develop guidelines that encourage the maximum number of faculty to participate in the evaluation of candidates. Excessive abstentions or a small number of votes relative to the number of faculty eligible to vote are likely to raise concerns about the appointment as other reviewers evaluate the file. In the case of individuals who abstain or who recuse themselves from voting, the transmittal letter should provide a reason, i.e. member of CAP (APM *210* and *220*)

When the APC has completed the Transmittal Letter, the letter is posted and the faculty notified. The Transmittal Letter is available for review for a minimum of 3 days, or the School's agreed upon duration. Any faculty concerns about the Transmittal Letter should be discussed with the APC. Any substantive revision to the Transmittal Letter must be posted and the faculty notified.

4). Forwarding the review file

Once the Transmittal Letter has been finalized, the APC forwards the review file to the School Dean.

5). Joint appointments

Whenever a candidate has split appointment (with the FTE split between two Schools), a joint committee comprised of faculty from both schools decide who will be the lead school. The lead school will write the single case analysis and present it to the joint committee for review. The case analysis covers the candidate's research, teaching, professional activity, university and public service from both schools perspective. Each school will vote separately on the recommended action and prepare separate Transmittal letters. Each School Dean will write separate Dean's recommendation and Salary justification letters. The Transmittal letter, Dean's recommendation letter and Salary justification letter from the non-lead school will be forwarded to the EVC via APO directly. The lead school will gather all the remaining materials including their Transmittal letter, Dean's letter and Salary justification letter and forward the case to the EVC via APO.

c. Dean

1). Dean's recommendation letter

The Dean assesses the Transmittal Letter, Case Analysis and the evidence provided in the review file to ensure that the School review is fair and rigorous in maintaining University standards. The Dean writes

a letter that recommends a proposed action and provides additional analysis as needed.

2). Dean's confidential letter

The Dean may submit a separate letter indicating his/her analysis and recommendation. A Dean's confidential letter may also be used to address unresolved issues related to a case.

3). Forwarding the Case file

The Dean forwards the complete case file and the Dean's recommendation letter to the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost and the Academic Personnel Office.

405-3. Required Materials to be Included for Review of the File

Each time a recommendation for a personnel action is initiated, the eligible candidate and the School prepares a review file containing materials relevant to the proposed recommendation. The complete review file includes the following:

a. Candidate provides

1). University Bio-Bibliography Forms (Required)

Prepared annually by the candidate, this form details the work accomplished each year. This information needs to detail clearly the work accomplished since the last review. A web based version will allow for the individual to easily identify and sort the data required to highlight the differences. *(UCM-AP41)*

2). Self Statement of Faculty (Required)

Brief summary of the candidate's record covering the review areas of teaching, research and other professional creative work, professional recognition and activity, and university and public service.

3). Publications (Required)

A sample of 3-5 publications that represent the most significant work during the review period. Copies of reviews and/or exhibits, including work in press may also be submitted. In the case of "In Press" or "Accepted" work, the letter indicating acceptance from the publisher must be included.

4). Evidence of Teaching (Required)

Evaluative information assessing the teaching record during the review period includes student surveys, graduate student placement, and peer assessments.

5). Updated Curriculum Vitae (Required)

b. The School's Academic Personnel Chair provides

1). Extramural letters *(Solicitation letters to extramural reviewers)*

2). Transmittal Letter *(Sample letter)*

3). Case Analysis *(Sample letter)*

4). Candidate's complete case file to be forwarded to the School Dean

c. The Dean provides

1). Dean's Recommendation Letter *(Sample letter)*

2). Dean's Salary Justification Letter *(Sample letter)*

3). Dean Confidential Letter (if applicable)

4). Candidate's Review file to be forwarded to the EVC/Provost via APO

5). Voting Procedures

Each By-law 55 unit must establish and follow voting procedures for their School. The Dean must forward the report of the voting procedures and any approved changes to the voting procedures to the EVC by September 1st. The EVC will collect and forward the reports to the office of the Committee on Academic Personnel.

Matrix 1 lists the specific documents that are needed for an advancement package and provides a copy of the forms that need to be transmitted**.** *(Matrix 1)*

Updated 10-24-08